



2011-2012 Budget Proposal

Section 1: Proposal Descriptors

Proposal Title: Neighborhood Park Development – 2008 Parks Levy Project		Proposal Number: 100.67NN
Outcome: Quality Neighborhoods		Proposal Type: Enhancing an Existing Service
Staff Contact: Glenn Kost, x5258		One-Time/On-Going: One-Time
Fund: Parks Levy/CIP	Attachments: Yes	Enter CIP Plan #: P-AD-88
List Parent/Dependent Proposal(s): N/A		

Section 2: Executive Summary

This proposal seeks \$5 million (\$5 million Parks Levy/\$0 CIP) funding for two neighborhood park planning and development projects, one in the Bridle Trails neighborhood area and the other along Lake Sammamish. Each project will include a citizen outreach process to inform a long-range community plan. Following Park Board and City Council review and adoption of the new park plans, the sites will be developed according to the plan vision. This project is funded entirely by the 2008 voter-approved Parks and Natural Areas Levy (see Attachment 1).

Section 3: Required Resources

CIP Expenditure	Projected Spending Thru							
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Costs	\$0.0	\$0.1	\$0.4	\$1.3	\$1.5	\$1.5	\$0.2	\$0.0
2011-2017 Total		\$5.0						
CIP M&O		\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.12	\$0.12
Supporting Revenue		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
LTE/FTE								
FTE		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LTE		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Section 4: Cost Savings/Innovation/Partnerships/Collaboration

At this time no additional funding sources have been identified.

Section 5: Budget Proposal Description

This proposal seeks \$5 million (\$5 million Parks Levy/\$0 CIP) funding for two neighborhood park planning and development projects with funding spread over 7 years beginning in 2011. These projects are funded entirely by the 2008 voter-approved Parks Levy. Each project will include a citizen outreach process to inform a long-range community plan. Following City Council review and adoption of the new community-driven park plans, the sites will be developed to incorporate the approved plan features. Staffing to implement these projects is contained in proposal #100.46A1. Funding for maintenance and operation of these projects will be provided by the 2008 voter-approved levy lid lift.

- **Bridle Trails Neighborhood Park:** Outreach is underway to identify neighborhood needs and preferences for new park facilities in the Bridle Trails neighborhood. The City has been working with a park sub-committee appointed by the Bridle Trails Community Club, who will present its recommendations to the Park Board

2011-2012 Budget Proposal

later in 2010. Upon approval of a scope of work, the staff will continue working with the neighborhood to further plan, design and construct park improvements in the Bridle Trails neighborhood.

- **Lake Sammamish Park:** The City currently owns Lake Sammamish waterfront property that is presently undeveloped for public use. The significance of this project is that it would establish Bellevue's only public waterfront access to Lake Sammamish. Citizen outreach has yet to begin for this project; therefore, no project goals have been established. Funds for this proposal would be used to plan, design and construct park improvements on the City-owned Lake Sammamish waterfront property.

Section 6: Mandates and Contractual Agreements

Five million dollars to create "smaller-scale parks...along Lake Sammamish and in the Bridle Trails neighborhoods" was identified in the 2008 Parks Levy endorsed by 67% of voters (**Attachment 1**). Completing these two neighborhood parks would fulfill this obligation.

Section 7: Proposal Justification/Evidence (may insert charts, graphs, tables, etc.)

A. Factors/Purchasing strategies addressed by this proposal - for the PRIMARY outcome:

Facilities and Amenities

Community Value Statement: "neighborhoods that support families, particular those with children"

The purchasing strategies that support this proposal are: Develop, maintain and enhance trails, parks, open spaces and facilities; promote active, clean and safe gathering places; and promote the community's use of public spaces.

This proposal would satisfy neighborhood park needs identified in the adopted *Parks & Open Space System Plan* (Park Plan). The Park Plan states that "mini-parks are pedestrian oriented facilities for the immediate neighborhood. Accordingly, a mini-park should be within safe walking distance in the neighborhood, especially since these parks often include play areas and other elements attractive to children." The Park Plan identifies a need for these new parks. The Bridle Trails subarea neighborhood park need is identified as 3.2 acres to meet standards, and 5.9 acres are needed in the Southeast Bellevue subarea that encompasses Lake Sammamish.

A 2009 survey by the Gilmore Group asked Bellevue households with children about their frequency of park use by facility type. Survey respondents indicated their two most frequently visited park facilities types were those that contained a playground and waterfront parks. This proposal enhances opportunities for Bellevue residents with children to engage in activities at facilities they frequent the most.

B. Factors/Purchasing strategies addressed by this proposal - for the OTHER outcome(s):

Innovative, Vibrant & Caring Community: Built Environment

Community Value Statement: "A City in a Park"

The purchasing strategies that support this proposal are: providing and maintaining accessible parks and open spaces; and providing outdoor spaces for people to gather, interact and recreate.

According to a September 2009 survey of Bellevue residents, 97% of respondents indicated that parks and recreation opportunities enhance Bellevue's quality of life. Funding this proposal will allow for improvements in two underserved community areas. The resulting improvements will enhance Bellevue's "City in a Park" image and philosophy that residents have indicated directly influences their quality of living.

C. Short- and long-term benefits of this proposal:

The City of Bellevue's Comprehensive Plan and Parks & Open Space System Plan goals and objectives are addressed within these park development projects. The neighborhood needs for parks in these subareas are identified as both short- and long-term goals in both policy documents. Other benefits include:

2011-2012 Budget Proposal

- Contributing to expanded opportunities for engaging citizens in social and recreational activities.
- Establishing public waterfront access to Lake Sammamish.
- Satisfying public expectations established by the citizen-driven planning processes and voter-approved levy.
- Increasing passive and active recreational opportunities to serve the neighborhood and overall community.
- Improving park visitor experience.
- Enhancing Bellevue's image as a "City in a Park" and contribute to citizens' quality of life.
- Promoting Bellevue's image of "Beautiful View."

D. Performance metrics/benchmarks and targets for this proposal:

Standards for this proposal are identified in the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan and Parks & Open Space System Plan. Targets include the provision of additional neighborhood parks for the Bridle Trails and Southeast Subareas (which include the Lake Sammamish property), and to provide public waterfront access to Lake Sammamish, which this proposal would achieve. Additional benchmarks include:

- 95% of households visited a Bellevue park or park facility in the last year
- 92% of citizens rating overall satisfaction with parks and recreation good or better
- 95% of citizens surveyed rated appearance of Bellevue parks and park facilities as good or excellent

The most popular outdoor recreation activities in Washington are walking/hiking, team/individual sports, nature activities, picnicking and playground recreation (Washington State Recreation and Conservation Survey). A survey completed for Bellevue's 2010 Parks & Open Space Plan Update yielded similar results, with Bellevue's top priorities for developing park and recreational facilities being nature trails, waterfront access, picnic, playground and sport fields/courts. These projects would satisfy several of these identified priorities.

E. Describe why the level of service being proposed is the appropriate level:

These projects meet specific objectives adopted in the City's Comprehensive Plan and Parks & Open Space System Plan, and these projects were specifically identified in the 2008 voter-approved Parks Levy.

Section 8: Provide a Description of Supporting Revenue

These projects are funded entirely by the 2008 Parks Levy. No other funding sources are identified at this time.

Section 9: Consequences of Not Funding the Proposal

A. Consequence of not funding the proposal at all:

1. **Legal:** The terms of 2008 voter-approved Parks Levy may be jeopardized.
2. **Customer Impact:**
 - The integrity of the voter-approved Parks Levy would be compromised.
 - Citizen expectations would not be met, especially for those residents already engaged in the public outreach process in Bridle Trails.
 - Identified recreation needs would not be met.
3. **Investment/Costs already incurred:** \$10,000 for planning
4. **Other:** N/A

B. Consequence of funding at a lower level:

Reduced funding would likely require that one of the park initiatives would be delayed.



2011-2012 Budget Proposal

Section 1: Proposal Descriptors

Proposal Title: Neighborhood Partnerships		Proposal Number: 115.08D2
Outcome: Quality Neighborhoods		Proposal Type: Reduction of Service
Staff Contact: Cheryl Kuhn, x4089		One-Time/On-Going: On-Going
Fund: CIP	Attachments: No	Enter CIP Plan #: NIS-2
List Parent/Dependent Proposal(s): Dependent on staffing in proposal 115.08PN		

Section 2: Executive Summary

The Neighborhood Partnerships proposal would provide funding for the Neighborhood Match Program and the Neighborhood Fitness projects currently managed by Neighborhood Outreach staff and funded at \$264K annually in the CIP. This proposal would provide a smaller capital fund of \$100,000 annually (a 60 percent reduction) to continue the city’s partnership with neighborhoods and community groups as they:

- Plan and implement small neighborhood improvements through the Neighborhood Match Program – creating neighborhood entries, landscaping and beautification projects, repairing and replacing unsightly community mailbox shelters, etc.;
- Work with the city and other partners to clean up public and private property within the neighborhood, and address community eyesores through volunteer efforts.

Section 3: Required Resource

CIP Expenditure	Projected Spending Thru 2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Costs	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000	\$100,000
2011-2017 Total		\$700,000						
CIP M&O		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Supporting Revenue		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
LTE/FTE								
FTE		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LTE		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Section 4: Cost Savings/Innovation/Partnerships/Collaboration

This proposal would:

- Streamline current activities funded by NIS-2 at \$264k/year, and reduce the need for CIP funding by more than 60 percent (to \$100k/year).
- Draw upon the resources of volunteers and community partners to match and enhance the city’s investment in neighborhoods.

2011-2012 Budget Proposal

Section 5: Budget Proposal Description

Continue to fund Neighborhood Match and Fitness projects at a reduced level, through the Neighborhood Partnerships fund. Neighborhood Match funding would be used to leverage community resources, stimulate community involvement and teach collaborative skills for neighborhoods willing to partner in the development of small local improvement projects. Neighborhood Fitness funding would be used to help neighborhoods plan and implement projects designed to maintain neighborhood appearance, livability and property values (e.g., neighborhood clean-ups, community volunteer projects). Both types of projects would require active partnership and a 50 percent match of resources by neighborhoods. Both types of projects would engage residents in projects that build personal relationships and stronger community connections.

CIP budget requirements

The CIP allocation of \$100k/year would be used to match neighborhood participation in small improvement and community building projects. Program staffing and operational expenses would be provided in the Neighborhood Outreach operating budget.

Section 6: Mandates and Contractual Agreements

N/A

Section 7: Proposal Justification/Evidence (may insert charts, graphs, tables, etc.)

A. Factors/Purchasing strategies addressed by this proposal - for the PRIMARY outcome:

QUALITY NEIGHBORHOODS

Sense of Community – Conducted at the grassroots level, these neighborhood projects and events help neighborhoods develop cohesive relationships, **sense of community**, and neighborhood **identity**. Match and Fitness projects bring residents together to work toward the common good; they inspire cooperation and strengthen the **capacity** of neighborhoods to set and meet their own goals.

“Community activities” shouldn’t be undervalued. “These are the very activities that bind us together as a community and reinforce a shared sense of place and who we are. . . . The money that we budget to put on these events . . . is just as important a public service as are the traditional city and county services. . . .”
- Jerry Newfarmer, president of Management Partners, in *Public Management* magazine

Facilities & Amenities, Public Health & Safety – Neighborhood Partnerships projects are designed to build and maintain healthy neighborhoods that are **safe, clean and well connected** to community services and amenities. Through Neighborhood Fitness campaigns, residents engage in neighborhood clean-ups and related projects (e.g., charity drives, community sales, etc.) to address the public interest in **clean and well-maintained** residential and commercial areas. Fitness efforts also focus on **education**, giving residents tools and resources to **keep neighborhoods fit; i.e., clean, connected, and prepared for emergencies**.

B. Factors/Purchasing strategies addressed by this proposal - for the OTHER outcome(s):

INNOVATIVE, VIBRANT & CARING COMMUNITY OUTCOME

Access to Services -- Partnerships bring residents into **closer communication with the city**, and provide the city with opportunities for public education (e.g., how to find resources for home and community improvement and maintenance).



2011-2012 Budget Proposal

Opportunities for Interaction, Involve Citizens -- Neighborhood Partnerships bring people together for collaborative projects, **strengthening individual and community ties**. These partnerships in which people discover their common interests, and work side by side to pursue those interests, result in a stronger community – a more **cohesive and self-sufficient** community. Residents also contribute to the common good of society by working together, and with such community groups as Jubilee Services, to help elderly and disabled residents with home maintenance. By working together, residents come to **understand and accept people of different socio-economic, ethnic and cultural backgrounds**.

Built Environment – Partnerships enhance the **built environment** of neighborhoods by funding small local improvements – improved community mailbox structures, neighborhood entry signs, landscaped areas, etc.

CITYWIDE PURCHASING STRATEGIES

By engaging the neighborhoods, community groups and neighborhood businesses in partnerships to improve the community for everyone, the city is providing the **best value in meeting community needs**. Through these partnerships, the city is **catalyzing citizen participation**, promoting **fiscal and environmental stewardship**, and **enhancing Bellevue's image** as a beautiful place.

C. Short- and long-term benefits of this proposal:

- 1. Well maintained and attractive neighborhoods** – neighborhoods that maintain their livability and appeal in the face of change and aging;
- 2. Sense of community and neighborhood pride** -- By doing the work themselves (with city help) neighbors take pride in the resulting improvements and neighbors, working together, feel a stronger sense of connection to one another.
- 3. Neighborhood empowerment and capacity** – Neighborhoods learn the skills of collaboration through their participation in small, successful Match and Fitness projects – and they go on to apply these skills to larger issues and challenges. They recognize the city's role in encouraging them to attain a stronger voice and a more livable community.

D. Performance metrics/benchmarks and targets for this proposal:

- Citizen participation in projects, programs
- Citizen satisfaction with projects, programs
- Citizens believing neighborhood quality is a city priority
- Citizens agreeing that neighborhoods are healthy and livable
- Citizens agreeing that neighborhoods have a sense of community

E. Describe why the level of service being proposed is the appropriate level:

This level of funding allows the city to meet current demand for Matching Fund (small improvement) projects up to \$5k per neighborhood. This level of funding significantly reduces the assistance available for Neighborhood Fitness projects, but maintains the opportunity for neighborhoods to apply for Fitness projects on a first-come, first-served basis.

Section 8: Provide Description of Supporting Revenue

N/A

2011-2012 Budget Proposal

Section 9: Consequences of Not Funding the Proposal

A. Consequence of not funding the proposal at all:

1. **Legal:** N/A
2. **Customer Impact:** Neighborhoods lose the impetus and support for building the small projects that enhance neighborhood appearance and boost community pride.
3. **Investment/Costs already incurred:** N/A
4. **Other:** N/A

B. Consequence of funding at a lower level:

Outreach would fund fewer Match and Fitness projects, meeting some but not all, of the demand from neighborhoods for assistance in the area of neighborhood appearance and quality. The City would lose opportunities to develop partnerships with residents, businesses, and community groups – partnerships that leverage investment in the city and keep Bellevue beautiful.



2011-2012 Budget Proposal

Section 1: Proposal Descriptors

Proposal Title: NEP Project Funding		Proposal Number: 115.08D3
Outcome: Quality Neighborhoods		Proposal Type: Existing Service
Staff Contact: Cheryl Kuhn, x4089		One-Time/On-Going: On-Going
Fund: CIP	Attachments: No	Enter CIP Plan #: NEP-1
List Parent/Dependent Proposal(s):		

Section 2: Executive Summary

This proposal would provide capital funding to complete the current cycle of the existing Neighborhood Enhancement Program, including:

- \$2,512,550 to complete outstanding small neighborhood improvement projects already selected by neighborhoods and approved by the Neighborhood Enhancement Steering Committee (\$2,812,550 is currently outstanding, with \$300,000 anticipated for 2010 expenditure);
- \$585,000 for projects currently being selected and prioritized by the last three neighborhoods in the cycle (Newport, Factoria and Somerset).

This proposal also calls for elimination of the current NEP fund after the project backlog is addressed. A new program proposal – for an updated, less costly version of Neighborhood Enhancement – is being submitted separately under 115.08D1.

Section 3: Required Resources

CIP Expenditure	Projected Spending Thru 2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Costs	\$17,800,000	\$1,548,775	\$1,548,775	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000
2011-2017 Total				\$9,097,550				
CIP M&O		TBD						
Supporting Revenue		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
LTE/FTE								
FTE		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LTE		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

Section 4: Cost Savings/Innovation/Partnerships/Collaboration

Funding is proposed for projects that were previously approved for funding in the current CIP. No cost saving is involved. However, it is proposed that the existing NEP be eliminated after the project backlog is addressed, and that the existing program be replaced with New NEP – an updated and less costly outreach program.

Section 5: Budget Proposal Description



2011-2012 Budget Proposal

Since 1988, the Neighborhood Enhancement Program has built more than 400 small capital projects (sidewalks, walkways, trails, playgrounds, miniparks, etc.) selected by neighborhoods. In the course of each three-year cycle, all 13 Neighborhood Areas are engaged in a process to identify and prioritize neighborhood-enhancing projects which the city funds and builds with a \$1.5 million annual allocation from the CIP.

It is proposed that the existing NEP program be terminated at the end of the current cycle ending in 2010, and that a new and improved Neighborhood Enhancement Program be considered for funding in the next CIP.

At the same time, some projects approved during the current cycle have not been completed. This proposal would extend Neighborhood Enhancement funding for those projects selected, or in the process of being selected, by neighborhoods during the current three-year cycle.

Completion of these projects would require minimal administrative supervision by PCD, and project management responsibilities to complete the backlog of approved transportation and parks-related projects. Staffing to implement the parks projects is provided in proposals 100.46NN, 100.37NA and 100.38NA. Staffing to implement the transportation projects is provided in proposal 130.33NA.

Section 6: Mandates and Contractual Agreements

N/A

Section 7: Proposal Justification/Evidence (may insert charts, graphs, tables, etc.)

A. Factors/Purchasing strategies addressed by this proposal - for the PRIMARY outcome:

HEALTHY NEIGHBORHOODS OUTCOME

Sense of Community – Neighborhood Enhancement has been **engaging citizens** and improving neighborhoods for 22 years. During those 22 years, the program has developed important relationships with neighborhoods, community groups and community leaders. Through their participation in NEP and their ability to **share ownership of local decisions**, residents have developed a **stronger sense of community** and a stronger **appreciation for the city’s commitment** to neighborhoods.

Facilities & Amenities, Public Safety, and Mobility – The 400 projects already built by NEP include 90-some sidewalk connections -- safe **walking routes** from neighborhoods to schools, parks and shopping areas that would not have been built without this funding source. Other projects have provided the community with **safe and accessible playgrounds and recreational amenities** for people of all ages. The current project backlog reflects this diversity of project choices, as Bellevue’s various neighborhoods have worked with the city to identify the specific projects that residents believe would enhance the safety, mobility and livability of their community.

B. Factors/Purchasing strategies addressed by this proposal - for the OTHER outcome(s):

INNOVATIVE, VIBRANT & CARING COMMUNITY OUTCOME

Affordable Access to Services, Opportunities for Interaction – Part of the mission of NEP is to bring neighborhoods into a closer relationship with the city: to **educate residents on services and programs available** to them; to **promote involvement and collaboration** within neighborhoods; and to **engage people in the provision of services and facilities**.



2011-2012 Budget Proposal

Built Environment – NEP provides a mechanism for residents to identify **opportunities for improvement**, and to prioritize neighborhood projects that enhance neighborhood safety and livability, strengthen neighborhood identity, and **create positive, memorable experiences for those who live in or visit the community**.

RESPONSIVE GOVERNMENT

The activities of Neighborhood and Community Outreach, as described above, clearly address the priorities of this team for:

- **Community Connections** – Increasing the **community’s understanding of city programs, services and decision-making, and** building community skills in communication, persuasion and consensus building.
- **Exceptional Service** – Demonstrating the city’s commitment to neighborhoods through an exceptionally **collaborative interdepartmental process** of outreach, **consensus building**, design and construction of community priorities.

C. Short- and long-term benefits of this proposal:

1. **Neighborhood empowerment** – NEP is the only citywide program engaging residents on a regular basis in a discussion of what THEY need in the way of neighborhood capital improvements.
2. **Neighborhood infrastructure update/ intelligence gathering** – NEP offers an ongoing method for gauging neighborhood capital needs and determining the level of support for measures to meet those needs.
3. **Interdepartmental collaboration model** – NEP provides a highly collaborative, streamlined process for assessing, designing and building small capital improvements.
4. **Public trust in government** – NEP delivers on what it promises. It is the only program that is regularly funded to build small capital projects that wouldn’t otherwise get funded through CIP. People see NEP as direct access to city decision-making.

D. Performance metrics/benchmarks and targets for this proposal:

- Citizen participation in projects, programs
- Citizen satisfaction with projects, programs
- Citizens believing neighborhood quality is a city priority
- Citizens agreeing that neighborhoods are healthy and livable
- Citizens agreeing that neighborhoods have a sense of community

E. Describe why the level of service being proposed is the appropriate level:

This is the lowest level of funding required to complete projects already approved, or currently in the approval process, for the final cycle of the existing Neighborhood Enhancement Program.

Section 8: Provide Description of Supporting Revenue

N/A

2011-2012 Budget Proposal

Section 9: Consequences of Not Funding the Proposal

A. Consequence of not funding the proposal at all:

1. **Legal:** Some projects are already under contract.
2. **Customer Impact:** All 13 Neighborhood Areas have participated in the NEP process during the current 3-year cycle, and all have expectations concerning the projects that they have proposed and selected for funding. To eliminate funding at this time could be seen as a breach of faith and a significant blow to the trust neighborhoods have invested in the city.
3. **Investment/Costs already incurred:** Some projects are already designed, or are in some stage of design, development, or permitting – and costs have been incurred to reach this point.
4. **Other:**

B. Consequence of funding at a lower level:

Funding at a lower level would require:

- Some method (by subjective judgment or by a list of criteria to be determined) of selecting which projects should be completed, and which projects should not; or
- A return to public engagement to narrow down the community project lists to a smaller number of projects; or
- Suspension or cancellation of all projects that have not reached a certain stage of development; e.g., not out to bid; not designed; design not completed; etc.