

SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED BY TASK FORCE MEMBERS / GUESTS

Questions for KCP staff to address

Question	Status
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At what point would a regional levy bump junior taxing district levies? 	Covered in Meeting #5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can we demonstrate economic benefit from having the county parks system (and other funded items)? 	See Task Force webpage after 08/09/2012 for links to related reports and articles
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe how 5 cent rate in 2008 to maintain the system gets to be 8.4 cent rate in 2014. 	Covered at multiple meetings See "Parks Levy 101 Tutorial" on TF webpage
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can you further explain the county's annual cost growth increases? 	Covered at multiple meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What other options are there for funding other than the levy lid lift, which has been used in the last 10 years 	Covered in Meeting #5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the County really not have the capacity to provide any general fund support? 	Covered at multiple meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How much are cities giving / receiving? 	See COB cities report handout from Meeting #5 for preliminary information
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How has the County addressed geographic equity issues? 	Covered in Meeting #4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe the differences between major maintenance, regular maintenance, capital for expansion and enhancement. 	Covered at multiple meetings
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is the relationship of a County Fair to 4H and the WSU Extension Program? What don't we have if we don't have a fair? 	KCP staff is preparing response as of 08/07/2012

Issues brought up by TF members for discussion among TF:

- Need to consider implications of combining and separating the various funding options into one or more funding packages.
- How much is too much in a funding request given that we are in a recession?
- If we can't get direct information on the type and size of funding package that might appeal to voters, 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?
- We need to be clear on the implications to the system if a levy were to fail.
- Should the County keep buying more acreage/developing more trails or focus on taking care of what it has?

- How can we justify the growth in the system costs/ associated levy? Some ideas:
 - Compare acreage then and now—system growth
 - Level of service cuts—need to document
 - Efficiencies/increases in productivity – need to document
- 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.
- What is the relevance of the Fair in the context of funding for Parks?

City funding issues:

- 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, some would like to be able to support recreational programs (ballfields, etc.) since the county shed so much of their recreational programming and the cities have picked it up.
- Some cities seek a “better return on their residents’ tax contribution”.
- Is it as important to preserve the cities levy funding given how small it is in terms of contributing to their systems?

Zoo funding issues:

- The Zoo seeks renewal of current funding.
- What is the implication for the Zoo if that funding is not included? What is implication for levy success if that funding is not included?

Comments from Task Force Members

- Concern over deteriorating capital funding, backlog of major maintenance.
- Regionally, trails (county and other) could benefit from coordinated signage, and cross-county links coordination, transit connections enhancement, more maintenance.
- Completion of missing trail links important.
- Important to fund habitat areas through the levy.
- Field shops are in terrible condition.
- It's important not to defer maintenance to the point that parts of the system are unusable and the costs of repairing/restoring get much larger.
- City and county system are symbiotic—they support each other, although they have different focuses
- Levy funds can provide local match needed for habitat acquisition.
- It's important that Zoo funding not supplant other funding.

Comments from Citizen Oversight Board

- Levy should support greater access to the system we already have.
- Levy should support more use of the system we have.
- Maximize spending on CPGs.
- Improve back-county trails.
- Collaborate with cities on trail links
- Maintain/expand volunteer hours
- Increase marketing of parks