

King County Parks Task Force

Running List of Comments and Questions

#	Q / A / C*	Item
*Q = Questions from TF members to KC Parks staff A = Answers from KC Parks staff to TF members C = Comments from TF members		
Meetings 1-4		
Questions asked / Response provided		
1	A	At what point would a regional levy bump junior taxing district levies?
2	A	How can we demonstrate economic benefit from having the county parks system (and other items) supported by levies?
3	A	Describe how 5 cent rate in 2008 to maintain the system becomes 8.4 cents in 2014?
4	A	Please further explain the County's annual cost growth increases?
5	A	What other options are there for funding parks besides the levy lid lift which has been used in the last 10 years?
6	A	Does the County really not have the capacity to provide Parks any general fund support?
7	A	How much are city residents giving to the County and how much are they receiving within their jurisdiction?
8	A	How has the County addressed geographic equity issues?
9	A	Describe the differences between major maintenance, regular maintenance, capital for expansion and enhancement
10	A	What is the relationship of a County Fair to 4-H and the WSU Extension Program? What if we don't have a county fair?
General comments from TF members		
11	C	Need to consider implications of combining and separating the various funding proposals into one or more voter propositions.
12	C	How much is too much in a funding request given that we are in a recession?
13	C	If we can't get direct information on this funding package, is there other information we can look to in order to assess the likelihood of success if the TF were to recommend a proposal to voters?
14	C	We need to be clear on the implications to the system if a levy were to fail
15	C	Should the county keep buying more acreage/developing more trails or focus on taking care of what it has?
16	C	How can we justify the growth in the system costs/ associated levy? Some ideas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Compare acreage then and now—system growth • Level of service cuts—need to document • Efficiencies/increases in productivity – need to document
17	C	How is the County providing recreation programs in White Center consistent with the streamlined vision for the system? It doesn't match well with the rural/regional vision.
18	C	What is the relevance of the Fair in the context of funding for Parks?
19	C	Concern over deteriorating capital funding, backlog of major maintenance.
20	C	Completion of missing trail links is important.

#	Q/A/C*	Item
21	C	Important to fund critical habitat areas through the levy
22	C	Important to fund habitat
23	C	Field shops are in terrible condition
24	C	It is important not to defer maintenance to the point that parts of the system are unusable and the costs of repairing/restoring get much larger.
25	C	It is important that any funding requests to the public be successful at the ballot: How do we know how much the voters are likely to accept?
26	C	City and county systems are symbiotic—they support each other, although they have different focuses
27	C	Levy funds can provide local match needed for habitat acquisition
City funding issues: Input from guests; Questions/comments from TF members (italicized)		
28	C	Cities seek greater flexibility in the use of their funds in part because the amounts are so small, and in part because their needs are so varied. Particularly, would like to be able to support recreational programming, as the county shed so much of its recreational programming and the cities have assumed more of that role.
29	C	Some cities seek a “better return on their residents’ tax contribution”.
30	C	Regionally, trails (county and other) could benefit from coordinated signage, and better coordination on cross-county links, transit connection enhancement, more maintenance.
31	C	<i>Is it as important to preserve the cities’ levy funding given how small it is in terms of contributing to their systems?</i>
Zoo issues: Input from guests; Questions/comments from Task Force members (italicized)		
32	C	Zoo seeks renewal of current funding.
33	Q	<i>What is implication for zoo if that funding is not included? What is implication for levy success if that funding is not included?</i>
34	C	<i>It’s important that funding for the Zoo not supplant other funding.</i>
Comments from Parks Levy Citizen Oversight Board (COB)		
35	C	Levy should support greater access to the system we already have.
36	C	Levy should support more use of the system we have.
37	C	Maximize spending on CPG projects.
38	C	Improve backcountry trails.
39	C	Collaborate with cities on trail links.
40	C	Maintain/expand volunteers.
41	C	Increase marketing of parks.
Meeting 5 (08/07/12)		
General comments from TF members		
42	C	Need to talk about the change in levy from current to proposed in an “apples to apples” way. Talk about the effective rate.
43	C	Unincorporated area has 300,000 residents, pays its own road levy (those roads connect cities). The rural area cannot absorb the whole parks system cost.
44	C	Focus areas for further acquisition of open space, development of trails are areas without many voters. What is the strategy for serving dense urban areas?
45	C	Partnerships are a big selling point.
46	C	Voters are unclear about jurisdictional boundaries. How can we combine resources

#	Q/A/C*	Item
		to keep the parks / trail experience seamless across the county?
47	C	We're talking in a vacuum without polling data.
48	C	The mix of options on the table is in total too much.
49	C	Despite the recession, we need to give voters a realistic proposal that will preserve the system.
50	C	Polling will show support for parks but not necessarily everything on the table.
51	C	What will happen if we reduce funding allocated to the cities and/or the Zoo?
52	C	As a task force, there is more to our work than just doing what the polling says.
53	C	We need to find a simple message on the 5 cents to 6.5 cents to 8.4 cents. It's very confusing.
54	C	Message is stronger on a "dollars per household" rate.
55	C	Will there be opposition?
56	C	Our role is to recommend something that will pass. This means we need to consider the Zoo and cities at a 1 cent minimum allocation.
57	C	Maybe someone else can pick up the White Center programming.
58	C	Is the city money redundant? Many cities will be going out with a levy for their operations in the next couple of years.
59	C	11.66 cents seems too large. Can we separate between keeping the doors open and expansion—two propositions, potentially on different election ballots.
Questions asked / Response provided		
60	A	Can we lower the up-front rate of the levy? Going to 8.4 cents is a big jump from either 5 or 6.5.
61	A	Does Parks have a recommendation as to what the proposal should be or the mechanism?
62	A	How much work has there been on cutting operating expenses including through outsourcing?
63	Q	How does the total amount on the table compare to other levies voters are approving?
64	Q	Need more information on the Fair and the 4-H issue. Is alternative funding available?
65	Q	What is the history of support for parks levies in our region?