



# City Council Study Session

---

## AGENDA

April 10, 2012

6:30 pm – 8:00 pm

### Call to Order

### Public Comment

*This is an opportunity for the public to address the Council. Three-minutes limit per person or 5 minutes if representing the official position of a recognized community organization.*

### Topics

- 228<sup>th</sup> Operational Analysis
- Stormwater Mitigation/Improvements
- PRO Plan/Review and Discussion

### Adjournment

City Council meetings are wheelchair accessible. American Sign Language (ASL) interpretation is available upon request. Please phone (425) 295-0500 at least 48 hours in advance. Assisted Listening Devices are also available upon request.





## Memorandum

---

**DATE:** April 4, 2012

**TO:** City Council  
Ben Yazici, City Manager

**FROM:** Laura Philpot, PE; Public Works Director

**RE:** 228<sup>th</sup> Avenue Operational Analysis

---

At the City Council meeting on April 10, 2012 staff will be sharing the results from the 228<sup>th</sup> Avenue Operational Analysis that was conducted in response to concerns about peak hour delays and left turn storage issues.

The following outline is a summary of both the report completed by our consultant team from David Evans and Associates and our presentation at the April 10, 2012 study session. Please let me know if you have any questions.

### **1.0 PROJECT HISTORY AND OVERVIEW**

We will share the current conditions along 228<sup>th</sup> and the history of what prompted this study.

The study evaluated six intersections of concern on the 228th Corridor from SE 24th street at the south to NE 28th Place/Sahalee Way NE at the north.

### **2.0 METHODOLOGY AND ASSUMPTIONS**

Staff collected traffic counts in 2011 and used them to determine the existing conditions. In order to be sure that any improvements recommended would have long term cost benefit, our consultant analyzed traffic forecasts from the citywide model. In order to be as conservative as possible, we directed our consultant to assume the adopted Town Center Plan and Community Center improvements were in place when evaluating the 2020 condition. This was not a full build out scenario, but represents a reasonably conservative estimate of long term volumes for the intersections of concern.

### **3.0 INTERSECTION LOS DEFINITION AND STANDARDS**

When evaluating the intersections, our consultant used the Highway Capacity Manual methodology to calculate delay which is then translated into a Level of Service (LOS) grade. The City has adopted an intersection LOS standard of D. A summary of what the various "grades" means is in the following table and will be included in the presentation on Tuesday evening:

### Intersection LOS Criteria

Level of Service (LOS1)	Control Delay (seconds/vehicle)			Expected Delays
	Sign Control Intersections	Roundabouts	Signalized Intersections	
A	0-10	0-10	≤10	Little or no delay
B	>10-15	>10-15	>10-20	Short traffic delays
C	>15-25	>15-25	>20-35	Average traffic delays
D	>25-35	>25-35	>35-55	Long traffic delays
E	>35-50	>35-50	>55-80	Very long traffic delays
F	>50	>50	>80	Extremely long traffic delays

1 LOS F is assigned if the volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio exceeds 1.0, regardless of the control delay. For assessment of LOS at the approach and intersection level, LOS is based solely on control delay.

SOURCE: 2010 Highway Capacity Manual (TRB 2010)

#### 4.0 STUDY AREA

The study focused on the following intersections of concern on the 228<sup>th</sup> Corridor

- NE 28th Place/Sahalee Way NE
- NE Inglewood Hill Road/NE 8th Street/228th Avenue NE
- SE 8th Street/228th Avenue SE
- SE 20th Street/228th Avenue SE
- SE 24th Street/228th Avenue SE
- Issaquah-Pine Lake Road SE/228th Avenue SE

#### 5.0 SIGNAL WARRANT ANALYSIS RESULTS

As a part of the work completed by our consultant, the intersection of NE 28<sup>th</sup> Place and Sahalee Way NE was evaluated to see if a traffic signal was warranted. Before a traffic signal can be installed one or more of the standard warrants in described within the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) 2009 must be met. The signal warrant was not met using existing data or forecasted data.

#### 6.0 INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE

Our consultant evaluated each of the intersections listed in section 4.0 of this memo. The following scenarios were evaluated for both the AM and PM peak hours:

- Scenario 1: Existing Counts 2011 + Existing Configurations + Existing Signal Timing
- Scenario 2: Existing Counts 2011 + Existing Configurations + Optimized Signal Timing
- Scenario 3: Future Traffic 2020 + Existing Configurations + Existing Signal Timing
- Scenario 4: Future Traffic 2020+ Existing Configurations + Optimized Signal Timing
- Scenario 5: Future Traffic 2011+ Modified Configurations + Optimized Signal Timing
- Scenario 6: Future Traffic 2020+ Modified Configurations + Optimized Signal Timing

Each intersection was evaluated to determine their Level of Service and queue lengths (backups) for each scenario.

## Item 1

In general traffic signal timing optimization, turn pocket length increases, and driveway restrictions can correct most of the operational concerns in the existing and future condition at a relatively minor cost.

NE Inglewood Hill Road/NE 8th Street/228th Avenue NE and Issaquah-Pine Lake Road SE/228th Avenue SE require more significant striping and signal timing changes plus minor widening to improve operations.

### **7.0 ROUNDABOUT EVALUATIONS**

Roundabouts are operationally and physically feasible at the following intersections

- NE 28th Place/Sahalee Way NE
- SE 8th Street/228th Avenue SE
- SE 10<sup>th</sup> Street/228<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE
- SE 20th Street/228th Avenue SE
- SE 24th Street/228th Avenue SE

### **8.0 EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES**

The following items are relatively new in the traffic operational world. These new technologies may provide improvements to the operations along 228th. Additional explanation, detail and pros and cons will be shared at the study session:

- **FLASHING YELLOW LEFT-TURN AND ADAPTIVE SIGNAL CONTROL**  
Flashing left turn arrows have been implemented in the city of Bellevue and Seattle as an off-peak enhancement to traffic signal operations allowing permissive (yielding) left turns off-peak to minimize overall intersection delays.
- **ADAPTIVE SIGNAL CONTROL**  
Adaptive signal control systems are now available that require little if any staff support time (no traffic management center with big screen monitors). These new systems allow the traffic signal controllers in the existing cabinets to more effectively use the green time available each hour to serve variable traffic demands. In essence the signals continuously monitor traffic volumes and demands and continuously adjust the signal phasing and timing to meet the demand with user established priorities for arterials and or side streets. These systems work best in a corridor setting with highly variable traffic flow operating near, but not over the ultimate capacity of the street system. This is the effective condition of the 228th corridor.

### **9.0 CONCLUSIONS**

In general traffic signal timing optimization, turn pocket length increases, and driveway restrictions can correct most of the operational concerns in the existing and future condition at a relatively minor cost.

NE Inglewood Hill Road/NE 8th Street/228th Avenue NE and Issaquah-Pine Lake Road SE/228th Avenue SE require more significant striping and signal timing changes plus minor widening to improve operations.





## Memorandum

---

**DATE:** April 4, 2012  
**TO:** City Council  
Ben Yazici, City Manager  
**FROM:** Laura Philpot, PE; Public Works Director  
**RE:** Neighborhood Drainage Projects

---

At the City Council meeting on April 10, 2012 staff will be providing an overview of the progress with the neighborhood drainage projects. The specific neighborhoods that will be discussed include Inglewood, Tamarack and SE 24<sup>th</sup> Way. In addition, staff will be looking for guidance from City Council on the next steps for the projects.

The following items will be covered in detail in the presentation:

- Project History
- Alternatives for Inglewood and Tamarack Neighborhoods
- Work completed to date on the SE 24<sup>th</sup> Way Neighborhood drainage solutions
- Water Quality Treatment Options
- Funding Alternatives
- Project Next Steps

### **Project Background:**

During the development of the 2011/2012 budget, the City Council expressed interest in determining what would be needed to upgrade stormwater facilities in the Inglewood and Tamarack neighborhoods to resolve existing drainage problems and support future development. The Inglewood neighborhood is currently undergoing redevelopment on a lot by lot basis, and the existing infrastructure does not support the ad-hoc residential in-filling. The Tamarack neighborhood has localized drainage problems in the vicinity of 209th Avenue NE and erosion in open ditches along NE 4th Street that convey water from the upslope neighborhood. Windward Environmental was hired in 2011 to assist staff in completing project development and conceptual design alternatives.

On November 8, 2011 staff presented the preliminary alternatives and findings associated with this work. During the presentation city staff recommended the addition of the neighborhood around SE 24<sup>th</sup> Way as it too is experiencing drainage problems and the potential for greater problems with increasing development pressure. City Council concurred and the contract with Windward was later amended to include this area to the design work being done at the other two locations on the west side of the city.





## Memorandum

---

DATE: April 10, 2012

TO: Ben Yazici, City Manager

FROM: Jessi Richardson, Director of Parks and Recreation

RE: 2012 Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan Update

---

At the March 19, 2012 regular council meeting, the Parks Commission presented their recommendations on the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PRO) Plan to the City Council. Since that time staff have been compiling a list of comments, feedback and suggestions from City Council members (see attached matrix). Many of the items included in the matrix are technical in nature – formatting errors, typos etc. These items will be corrected in the final copy and do not require further discussion.

The policy related items, however, will be discussed at the City Council study session on April 10, 2012. It is our hope that we can address these issues and receive policy direction from the council at this meeting. Staff will use the Council direction to revise the PRO Plan document and issue a “Council draft PRO Plan” in May.

### **Level of Service Discussion**

In reviewing the comments from the City Council it is apparent that we need to focus our discussion on clarifying the park level of service standards in the PRO Plan. Staff are preparing a presentation on this subject for the study session. In the meantime, I am attaching two additional documents for your reference:

1. Memo on Comparison of Level of Service Standards
2. *Parks: How Far Is Too Far*, December 2004 Article from the American Planning Association on Park Service Areas and Walkability

Both documents provide good background information that will aid our PRO Plan discussion at the study session.

### Item 3

#### **Meeting Schedule:**

Our objective is to conclude our work on the PRO Plan by the end of May. To meet this timeline, the following meeting schedule has been established:

April 10, 2012	Study Session – Review/Discussion on PRO Plan
May 1, 2012	First Reading – Ordinance Adopting PRO Plan (Note: This is an amendment to the City Comprehensive Plan)
May 14, 2012	Second Reading – Ordinance Adopting PRO Plan

City of Sammamish - 2012 PRO Plan Update  
City Council Comment Matrix

Date	Submitted By	Item	Page	Comment	Response/Resolution
3/12/2012	Ramiro Valderrama-Aramayo	General Comment	0.0	Will measures be prepared so we can see where we are in meeting the objectives chosen - for example where are we today on meeting diverse community needs - which are they? Goal one has some reference to it but, no real description.	Yes, looking ahead it is assumed that we will use these goals and objectives to measure our performance/progress. We do not intend to provide a report on our current status.
3/12/2012	Ramiro Valderrama-Aramayo	General Comment	0.0	Have you been able to get initial utilization rates of our parks as requested by both Councilman Curley and myself?	Per the discussion at the city council meeting on 3/19, we will be obtaining sample usage data for Ebright Creek Park. Work will begin on this in May.
3/12/2012	Ramiro Valderrama-Aramayo	Vision Statement	1.2	On the Vision statement are these objectives in prioritized order? Are they weighed equally?	These items are not in priority order and the Parks Commission felt that all were equally important in defining the parks and recreation vision for Sammamish.
3/10/2012	Don Gerend	Community Profile	2.1	I don't think Sammamish is 26 miles east of Seattle. As the crow flies it is perhaps 15 miles, center to center and probably more like 20 miles by road. I also wouldn't say that it measures 6.72 miles north to south and 5.76 miles east to west. Three significant figures are misleading when describing an irregularly shaped area. Perhaps it would be better to say that Sammamish measures some 7 miles north to south along the shore of Lake Sammamish and some 6 miles east to west at its widest point.	Good suggestion. Changes will be made to the final copy.

City of Sammamish - 2012 PRO Plan Update  
City Council Comment Matrix

Date	Submitted By	Item	Page	Comment	Response/Resolution
3/10/2012	Don Gerend	Community Profile	2.1	...you describe "two small shopping centers" which perhaps would be better described as "two neighborhood shopping center districts and a Town Center zoned for mixed use development of some 2,000 dwelling units and 600,000 square feet of commercial/retail space".	Changes will be made to the final copy.
3/10/2012	Don Gerend	Figure 2.4	2.6	Figure 2.4: Age Distribution of Residents 2010 on page 2.6 has an error in the pie chart. Two sectors are labeled "0-19 yrs 34.18%", whereas one of them should be labeled "60-64 yrs 4.47%".	Good catch. Changes/corrections will be made to the final copy.
3/12/2012	Ramiro Valderrama-Aramayo	Level of Service	3.2	The Pro Plan reiterates questions of how much park land should Sammamish have - but, no answer provided in the plan and based on the earlier metrics used and cited - and the zero (0) deficiency in capacity of parks and recreational facilities cited - we can then assume we are now fully provided for.	Staff are preparing information for a discussion on Levels of Service (LOS) at the council meeting on April 10.
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Figure 3.1	3.2	I believe the darker green caption for Figure 3.1 should be entitled "Developed and Undeveloped Park Land" rather than "Undeveloped Park Land".	The darker green caption will read "Total Park Land" in the final copy. Thanks for catching this error.
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	TBP status	3.7	Just wondering what the status of the Trails, Bikeways, and Paths Plan update is? Or isn't this being updated along with the PRO Plan?	The TBP Plan update will begin once the PRO Plan update is complete. This is a joint effort between Parks and Public Works. We anticipate a draft will be presented to the City Council sometime in 2013. The project timeline is still in development.

City of Sammamish - 2012 PRO Plan Update  
City Council Comment Matrix

Date	Submitted By	Item	Page	Comment	Response/Resolution
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Sammamish Landing classification	3.8	Sammamish Landing is listed as a Neighborhood Park, based solely on it's acreage I assume. However, I view it more as a Community Park, or even a Regional Park if you consider who will be using it.	<p>Park classifications are based on three main elements: size of park, activities/amenities and anticipated service radius. Our classifications are consistent with neighboring jurisdictions and standard in the industry.</p> <p>The classifications are intended as a guideline for our parks system. As an example, a community park is larger, has many more elements such as trails, ball fields, playground, etc. and attracts a larger population. Community parks provide activities for a broader audience and are larger and generally more costly to build and maintain. Sammamish Landing does meet the definition of a neighborhood park and the staff recommendation is to retain this proposed classification.</p>
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	LOS	3.11	The map only shows the 1/2 mile neighborhood park buffer for all parks rather than having the 2 mile radius around the community parks.	Staff are preparing information for a discussion on Levels of Service (LOS) at the council meeting on April 10.

City of Sammamish - 2012 PRO Plan Update  
City Council Comment Matrix

Date	Submitted By	Item	Page	Comment	Response/Resolution
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Figure 3.6	3.14	<p>Figure 3.6 showing the Budget for 2012 lists Total Acres Developed Park Land as 442 but that is rather misleading since only a portion of Evans Creek Preserve is developed.</p>	<p>For the purpose of preparing a simple analysis, we chose to count all of the acreage in a developed park. And even though some of our parks contain areas that are not developed, we still maintain these areas to ensure they are safe. As an example, we routinely inspect undeveloped areas of BL Preserve and as a result we have cleared numerous dump sites in recent years.</p> <p>Looking forward, is there something we can do to better understand levels of maintenance at each park? Yes.</p> <p>Chapter 3, Goal 5, Objective 1, Action Item #2: <b><i>Develop a maintenance plan for every park and facility.</i></b></p> <p>Staff are working on this task now. We recently completed the maintenance plan for Evans Creek Preserve (ECP). The plan indicates that ECP will require 2,000 labor hours per year with an estimated annual maintenance cost of \$40k. This amount can be reduced through the use of volunteers. This is maintenance only, not project work. We are working on similar plans for Sammamish Landing and SE 8th Street Park, and also intend to update plans for all of the other parks.</p>

City of Sammamish - 2012 PRO Plan Update  
City Council Comment Matrix

Date	Submitted By	Item	Page	Comment	Response/Resolution
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Figure 3.7	3.15	<p>In Figure 3.7 where the comparison is made of 2011 Park Maintenance Expenditures per Acre, the total acreage of 460 is used in comparison to other cities to develop the cost per acre comparison, but we have no idea what percentage of each city's acreage is developed requiring maintenance. The second line of the Figure 3.7 has a double asterisk, but I don't see a footnote explanation of that.</p>	<p>We concur. We have included the cost of maintenance per acre because it is a standard people like to see for comparison. But, there is too much variability when comparing park systems to other park systems and parks to other parks. As noted at the top of page 3.16, "this is generally not a reliable comparison."</p> <p>Instead, we prefer to use the maintenance cost per capita as a standard comparison. This is shown in figure 3.8.</p> <p>The missing double asterisk will be corrected in the final copy. The note here would have indicated that the Sammamish maintenance expenditures include facility maintenance (BL Lodge, Rec Ctr etc.) and other cities do not. But, all of other cities include trail maintenance and Sammamish does not.</p>

City of Sammamish - 2012 PRO Plan Update  
City Council Comment Matrix

Date	Submitted By	Item	Page	Comment	Response/Resolution
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	CPTED	3.18	The Objective regarding "Ensure public safety...through the utilization of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) techniques"; could you explain what those techniques are?	CPTED refers to a cooperative design strategy between law enforcement and park designers. The idea is that we can prevent/minimize crime through our park design. For example, we want clear and open lines of site from our parking lots into our parks. So, no large view-blocking foliage in these areas. We also want clear lines of site around the structures in our parks. We also keep our buildings lit at all hours to discourage vandalism. Just a few examples. We have made it a practice to review all of our park designs with both police and fire and will continue to do so.
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	CIP	3.19	Regarding "Objective: Adopt a six-year capital improvement plan (CIP) every two years, off-cycle from the adoption of the biennial budget." Comment: You then say that the CIP will be updated this year (2012), but aren't we also adopting the biennial budget for 2013/2014 this year?	Yes, we are adopting a CIP the same year as the budget...only because we got off track. Our hope is to get back to a two-year cycle and focus on adopting the CIP the year before the budget update.  The CIP is intended to identify long-range capital goals. Most capital projects require three years to complete - from public process to ribbon cutting. Staff will share a graphic at the April 10 CC meeting that illustrates the timeline challenges we've been dealing with in regards to capital projects.

City of Sammamish - 2012 PRO Plan Update  
City Council Comment Matrix

Date	Submitted By	Item	Page	Comment	Response/Resolution
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	TBP Update	3.19	I see that Action items are to "Inventory all trail connections - identify existing trails and connectivity gaps" and "Update the Trails, Bikeways and Paths (TBP) Plan every six years or as needed." When are these action items scheduled for?	The TBP Plan update will begin once the PRO Plan update is complete. This is a joint effort between Parks and Public Works. We anticipate a draft will be presented to the City Council sometime in 2013. The project timeline is still in development.
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Acquisition	3.20	Parks Goal #4: You have one Action: "Acquire land suitable for a community park in the northeast quadrant of the City." Another Action might be "Acquire the Viewpoint connection to Evans Creek Preserve and connect the viewpoint to the Evans Creek Preserve by a trail down the old logging road"	Goals, objectives and action items are subject to change based on council direction. We will add this to the list of discussion items for the April 10 cc meeting.
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Invasive Removal	3.21	The third Objective: "Remove invasive....by using native plants to increase the diversity..." Comment: I would suggest changing to "by using native <b>and non-native non-invasive</b> plants..."	If the majority of council agrees, we can modify the language, which simply allows us to use non-native plants when appropriate. It should be noted, however, that our current practice is to primarily use native plant species. We will add this to the discussion list for the April 10 meeting

City of Sammamish - 2012 PRO Plan Update  
City Council Comment Matrix

Date	Submitted By	Item	Page	Comment	Response/Resolution
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Wildlife Corridors	3.22	<p>The fifth Objective: "Identify areas where native habitat should be improved to protect wildlife and <b>enhance wildlife corridors</b> through the incorporation of native plantings and access controls and removal of barriers to fish passage." Comment: I object to <b>enhancing wildlife corridors within the city</b>; while it is interesting to have a bear grappling against a picture window removing bird seed from a suction cup bird feeder, and to see bobcats wander through your yard, not to mention coyotes, deer, raccoons and some unidentified woodchuck-like creatures and, elsewhere in the city, possibly mountain lions, these animals should not be encouraged to interact with humans in urban designated areas. The point of the Urban Growth Boundary is to keep humans from sprawling into and destroying their habitats, not to encourage them to become semi-domesticated and dangerous to our children, pets and scaring the _ _ _ _ out of us old folks. I do support the removal of barriers to some fish passage.</p>	<p>Let's discuss modifying or this objective at the council meeting on April 10. Staff would concur with removing the words "enhance wildlife corridors."</p>
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Signage	3.23	<p>"Action: Implement interpretive signage program to promote unobtrusive wildlife and habitat viewing and learning at ..." Comment: This is a good idea. Maybe even have signage in Pine Lake Park identifying trees and bushes.</p>	<p>Thank you. All of our parks provide great opportunities for education.</p>

City of Sammamish - 2012 PRO Plan Update  
City Council Comment Matrix

Date	Submitted By	Item	Page	Comment	Response/Resolution
3/12/2012	Ramiro Valderrama-Aramayo	Athletic Fields	4.0	Do we have any measures of the demand for new recreational fields? From leagues, teams etc.?	We interact with all of the leagues on a regular basis and they are consistent in asking for more fields. Unfortunately, none of them have hard data to show the deficiencies.
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Figure 4.3	4.3	I notice that Creekside Elementary isn't listed as having a field; doesn't it? Also, under Sport Type Skyline High School field should be marked in green for football, shouldn't it? Last I heard, they played some pretty good football there.	Creekside Elementary, much like many of the elementary schools on the plateau has 2 covered play areas and a small sand playfield.  We do play football on the community sports fields at Skyline. This correction will be made to the final copy.

City of Sammamish - 2012 PRO Plan Update  
City Council Comment Matrix

Date	Submitted By	Item	Page	Comment	Response/Resolution
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Field Use	4.5	<p>We see that "In many cases, Sammamish leagues have had to limit the number of participants because of the limited availability of athletic fields." and yet when we look at the usage tables on weekdays and weekends, there are times (May and June during the week on the synthetic fields and July through October on the synthetic fields, for example) where they are categorized as "low use (less than 60% reserved)". It would seem perhaps that some leagues could be encouraged, either by pricing field use rates lower or simply be begging, to changing their schedules to better use these time slots.</p>	<p>Your comment prompted me to go back and look again at the data and the way it was calculated. We discovered an error in our analysis of the natural grass fields and will be correcting the charts in the final copy. I will share the revisions with the council at the meeting on April 10.</p> <p>The low times on the synthetic turf fields directly correlate with the way the youth leagues schedule their practices and games: practices during the week and games on the weekend. In general, there is not much we can do about this as all of the leagues are part of larger state associations and have very little control over game schedules. The good news is that the Council gave us the authority to discount last minute field rentals and we are currently doing that with the hope of booking additional field time.</p> <p>Bottom line...still more work to do!</p>
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Indoor Fields	4.13	<p><b>Athletic Field Goal #1:</b> "Objective: Explore the potential of building a field house with indoor synthetic-turf fields." <b>Comment:</b> This is a good Objective, perhaps there could be an <b>Action:</b> associated with it this year, such as "explore the development concept with the YMCA for their Pine Lake site."</p>	<p>I will add this to the discussion list for the April 10 City Council meeting.</p>

City of Sammamish - 2012 PRO Plan Update  
City Council Comment Matrix

Date	Submitted By	Item	Page	Comment	Response/Resolution
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Figure 5.1	5.2	I notice that reservations at Beaver Lake Lodge dropped significantly in 2011. Perhaps an explanatory footnote would be wise to include.	Thank you and good observation. The Lodge was closed November and December 2011 for the interior renovation, thus the drop in rentals. We will add a footnote explaining this in the final copy.
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	General Comment	5.6	The Sammamish Club in Issaquah is mentioned. I understand that it was for sale last year; did it sell and if so, for how much?	We are uncertain of the status of the sale.
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Indoor Recreation Goals	5.22	Regarding the "Indoor Recreation Goal #2 and the first Objective: Modify the findings from the 2011 feasibility study and the project approach as necessary to meet the changing needs and financial expectations of the community." Perhaps we should be formulating one or more Actions under this Objective.	I will add this to the discussion list for the April 10 City Council meeting.
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Shelter Use	5.25	Regarding "Action: Accept credit cards for pavilion and shelter rentals..." Question: Do we allow drop in use of shelters if they aren't reserved, and how do people know if a shelter is open? Perhaps a sign on the shelters referring people to a website which lists the reservation schedule would be helpful, so drop in picnickers could check on their smart phones and see if the shelter is reserved.	Signs are posted on shelters with the date and the time of the reservation. If a shelter is not booked it is available on a first-come, first-served basis.  Unfortunately, the only way to post this information on the website would be to do it manually. And since shelter reservations change daily, it would not be practical for us to do this. But, the good news is that a local company has developed a real-time facility booking program/website and we are considering partnering with them to help "move" our last minute inventory. Stay tuned!

City of Sammamish - 2012 PRO Plan Update  
City Council Comment Matrix

Date	Submitted By	Item	Page	Comment	Response/Resolution
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Figure 6.3	6.7	Percentage of Obesity. Comment: This is a very telling table and reinforces Michelle Obama's "Let's Move" campaign and should be a motivation for the City to emphasize action recreation facilities.	Staff and Parks Commission agree.
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Cultural Arts Trends	7.5	Regarding Trends in Cultural Arts from the 2010 phone survey. "Music performances received the most first-choice votes, as well as the highest percent of total votes." Comment: I suspect that our Concerts in the Park and the Sammamish Symphony helped in this category. The survey results are shown graphically in Figure 7.2 and 7.3, although I am not sure that I understand the last row in Figure 7.3 "Combined". How was First Choice and Second Choice combined; it doesn't seem to be the average of the two?	I am uncertain of the methodology used to generate the combined number, but will follow- up and make sure this is explained in the final copy.
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Cultural Arts Goals	7.7	"Looking to the Future: Cultural Arts in Sammamish" Comment: There are 6 Cultural Arts Goals, but there are no Objectives or Actions, and the words "music performances", which received the most first-choice votes, don't appear in any of the Goals.	We intentionally omitted objectives and action items from the programmatic chapters (chapters 6, 7 & 8). Trends in these areas change rapidly and for that reason we didn't want to lock ourselves into long-term commitments on programming.  "Music performances" are not specifically referenced, but I believe these types of performances fall into many of the goals listed. If you would like to propose a modification we can discuss at the next council meeting on April 10.

City of Sammamish - 2012 PRO Plan Update  
City Council Comment Matrix

Date	Submitted By	Item	Page	Comment	Response/Resolution
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	Volunteer Program	8.0	The City is doing a great job of encouraging and rewarding volunteerism! Let's keep it up and even enhance it.	Thank you.
3/10/2012	Don Gerend	Volunteers and Partnerships	8.0	I particularly like Section 8 "Volunteers & Partnerships" which dramatically illustrates the growth of volunteerism in the City. The more people we get to participate in these programs, the more they come to learn about and appreciate the variety and wealth of our natural and artificial habitat here in the Great City of Sammamish. And, thus, the more we get buy-in by our citizens which should reflect itself in better care for the environs.	Thank you.
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	CIP Funding Sources	9.2	In the second paragraph it states "Funds for parks capital projects come from two primary sources - the real estate excise tax (REET) and impact fees." Comment: While this is true, it might be good to add two more sources of funds, "grants and citizen donations". Also, one of the advantages of having Master Plans completed is that if and when grant opportunities come along, we can pull plans off of the shelf to fit the grant criteria. Later Comment: I see that Page 9.8 covers these other sources of funds.	Staff recommendation is to leave the sentence on page 9.2 as-is. The primary source of parks CIP funding is REET and impact fees. There are other minor sources of funding as you observed and as we've listed on page 9.8.

City of Sammamish - 2012 PRO Plan Update  
City Council Comment Matrix

Date	Submitted By	Item	Page	Comment	Response/Resolution
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	REET	9.5	<p>In the first paragraph there is a reference to footnote #3 after the sentence "The other half must be used to fund capital projects in transportation."            Comment: It would seem that this #3 should be after the next paragraph on Park Impact Fees (it refers to the Rate Study for Impact Fees...). Also, could you clarify whether or not it is State law that one half must be used to fund capital projects in transportation or whether that simply is our city code?</p>	<p>You are correct, the footnote is in the wrong location.</p> <p>REET 1 and 2 may both be used for transportation acquisition and construction projects. The main difference between REET 1 and 2 for the city is that REET 1 may be used to acquire park and recreation property as well as for construction projects. REET 2 can't be used to acquire park and recreation property but can be used for construction.</p> <p>To avoid any possible misuse of REET 2 for park acquisition, all of REET 1 goes to the Parks CIP fund and all of REET 2 goes to the Transportation CIP fund.</p> <p>It is up to the city council to decide how REET funds are allocated between the capital budgets.</p>
3/18/2012	Don Gerend	King County Conservation District	9.8	<p>Perhaps a little explanation there about how much KCD money is due to Sammamish every year based on the number of tax lots in the city, so that some grants are automatic out of the pot of money accrued by Sammamish and some are out of the KCD general fund.</p>	<p>We will provide a more thorough explanation about KCD funding in the final copy of the plan.</p>

City of Sammamish - 2012 PRO Plan Update  
City Council Comment Matrix

Date	Submitted By	Item	Page	Comment	Response/Resolution
3/10/2012	Don Gerend	2009 Programs	B.4	Under Programs in 2009, the third bullet states "Celebrated the City's 10th birthday with a Kid's Parade, Sammamish Days and Sammamish Nights in partnership with Sammamish Chamber of Commerce." Comment: This is true, but as part of the 10th birthday we also had a Math Contest and buried a time capsule to be opened in 2049 when the City is 50 years old, which contains messages from many of our current citizens to themselves or their descendants 40 years into the future.	We will add the additional information to 2009 in the final copy.
3/12/2012	Ramiro Valderrama-Aramayo	CIP	G	What is the Parks budgets for this and the projected for next year? Is it all for 2013 included in the CIP budget of Appendix G under 2013- or are other amounts needing to be added to it?	The parks <u>general fund</u> budgets for 2013 and beyond have not yet been developed.
3/12/2012	Ramiro Valderrama-Aramayo	CIP	G	I was disappointed not to see a list of recommended prioritized projects in the plan as discussed at the retreat and as I asked for in my Feb 15 and 25th e-mails. I hope this will be included for our discussions with the Park Commission and Park Staff.	The recommended projects for CIP funding are included in the draft CIP. Amongst all of the options, the projects identified are the highest priority for the Parks Commission.



DATE: April 3, 2012

TO: Jessi Richardson, Director of Parks and Recreation

FROM: Linda Frkuska, Deputy Director of Parks and Recreation

RE: Comparison of Level of Service Standards

---

The parks level of service standard provides a benchmark to help determine how many parks and what kinds of parks are needed to meet community needs.

Many public services such as transportation and utilities are able to quantify performance through counts, calculations and future-oriented modeling of things such as vehicle trips and water flow rates. Measuring and quantifying parks and recreation services is much more difficult.

In 1983, the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA), the leading professional organization in the field, established a uniform standard for level of service at 10 acres of parkland per 1,000 people. In 1996, that standard was revised to allow each community to establish level of service recommendations customized to its individual characteristics. The association recommends defining levels that are “practical and achievable, provide for an equitable allocation of park and recreation resources throughout the community, and reflect the real-time demand of the citizens.”

In response to the recommendations from NRPA, state and local agencies began to modify their level of service standards in the late 1990’s. The information below provides an overview of some of these changes.

### **Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan (SCORP):**

SCORP was developed by the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) to help decision-makers better understand statewide park and recreation issues and maintain state eligibility for federal grants.

One of the key components of SCORP is a recommendation on establishing and updating level of service measures for parks and recreation facilities. The recommendations are as follows:

- State agencies are encouraged to emphasize sustainable access to state resources, measuring success by the degree to which resources *are protected*, with further emphasis on service area, facility condition, and public satisfaction.

- Local agencies [counties, cities and park districts] are encouraged to emphasize individual *active participation*, balanced with facility capacity, service area, facility condition, and public satisfaction.

**Bellevue:**

In the 2010 edition of the Parks & Open Space System Plan, the city of Bellevue has selected three level of service measures:

- Individual Active Participation – this provides information on the percentage of population that participates in one or more active outdoor activities (i.e. identifies park users and type of use). Information for this performance measure is obtained by survey and used to guide future development and improvements to the parks system.
- Public Satisfaction – this measures overall satisfaction with the condition of existing park and recreation facilities. Information for this performance measure is obtained by survey and used to guide future developments and improvements to the parks system.
- Service Area – measures the percentage of households within 1/3 mile of a park or trail access point and establishes 1/3 mile as the level of service standard.

In addition to these three new level of service measures, Bellevue continues to use park acreage per thousand population as an analytical tool.

**Redmond:**

Redmond’s 2010 park plan update includes the following level of service standards:

- Neighborhood Park: 1 acre/1,000 people
- Community Park: 3 acre/1,000 people
- Resource Park: 2.5 acre/1,000 people

While Redmond continues to use the original NRPA standards, they did change their approach to calculating acreage and established several new goals:

- Target Population – total population served is the residential population plus 25% of the employment population.
- Credit for non-Redmond parks – credit is applied for non-Redmond parks within the city or within walking distance of Redmond’s borders to account for parks that residents use.
- Walkability – established a goal of a park or trail within 1/4 mile safe walking distance of each residence.
- Geographic Equity – acknowledges the importance of having a park in every neighborhood.

- Applied Neighborhood Park level of service standards by neighborhood population – applies the 1 acre/1,000 population standard to each individual neighborhood. Example: SE Redmond has a target population of 6,400 people (residents plus 25% of employees); therefore it should have 6.4 acres of neighborhood parks.

**Issaquah:**

The City of Issaquah Parks Plan, updated in 2009, uses capital investment per person, calculated at \$4,336.82, as their standard level of service. This is the same method used by Sammamish to calculate level of service for the park impact fee.

Issaquah continues to use the national standard of acres per 1,000 population as a secondary level of service. By this comparison, they report a shortfall in their community and neighborhood parks.

Issaquah does not include school facilities in their park calculations citing the fact that they do not have primary and/or unlimited use of these facilities.

**Mercer Island:**

The City of Mercer Island uses the NRPA guidelines (acres per capita) in conjunction with other user demands and metrics to determine the appropriate number of park and recreational facilities. The plan, adopted in 2007, lists park classifications, service areas and population ratios, and includes an inventory of existing park land and future needs.

**Kirkland:**

Kirkland's 2010 plan measures level of service by acres per capita in conjunction with additional guidelines for park classifications. For example, neighborhood parks are defined as "readily accessible to nearby residents and are geographically positioned within safe walking and bicycle distance." Kirkland uses a ¼ mile radius as their standard for a safe walking and biking distance, which translates into a 'Desirable Population Service Level (DLOS) of 2.06 acres/1,000 population.

Kirkland includes school property in their analysis of available park land. Elementary schools are included at a factor of 50% of total acreage and secondary schools at a factor of 100%.

**Conclusion:**

Most jurisdictions are beginning to explore new park level of service standards that go well beyond the original acreage per population analysis. And it is certainly appropriate to consider implementing these standards for Sammamish as well. But, it is important to remember that Sammamish is still a young city with a young parks system. The key is establishing level of service standards that are realistic for the next 6 to 20 years.



December 2004

## Parks: How Far Is Too Far?

*By Peter Harnik and Jeff Simms*

How far is the nearest park from your home? Can you walk there?



What if you were pushing a stroller or using a cane? If there's a park near your office, is it close enough for a lunchtime visit? These questions may seem obvious, but surprisingly few cities ask them. Even fewer have the kind of answers that would help to develop an excellent park system. Last spring, the Trust for Public Land surveyed the 50 largest U.S. cities. The results were dismaying.

TPL found that only 18 of the cities had a goal for the maximum distance any resident should live from the nearest park — and among the 18, the standard ranged from as close as one-eighth of a mile to as far as a mile.

Distance from a park is an important measure. It may be more significant even than counting up the absolute amount of parkland in a city. Los Angeles is a case in point. L.A. ranks fifth among big cities with more than 30,000 acres of parkland, but more than half of that land is located in the mountainous — and relatively inaccessible — central section of the city. Meanwhile, poorer neighborhoods often lack any significant parks at all. Large segments of L.A.'s 3.7 million residents are too far from a park to use it easily, conveniently, or frequently.

The fact is, it's easier to count gross acreage than to figure out how far anyone is from a park, so the average person can't rate his or her city against a norm. What's worse, there's no standard for acceptable distance. A common maximum distance selected as a goal by Cleveland, Colorado Springs, Columbus, Nashville, Phoenix, and Portland is half a mile. But other cities — including Austin, Fresno, Indianapolis, Jacksonville, and Charlotte — allow a full mile. Yet the argument can be made that even a half a mile is too far.

### **The best of the bunch**

The five top cities have selected standards that relate to the needs and capabilities of their

citizens. They are: Denver (three to six blocks, depending upon the neighborhood); Minneapolis (six blocks); Long Beach, California (a quarter mile in high-density neighborhoods); Seattle (an eighth of a mile in dense neighborhoods); and Chicago (a tenth of a mile to a pocket park).

The others seem to have set their standards based more on their perception of political realities — mostly the lack of funding and the difficulty in acquiring enough land.

Most successful of all is Minneapolis. According to Rachel Ramadhyani, a landscape architect with the Minneapolis Park Board, fully 99.4 percent of city residents live within six blocks of a park (although Minneapolis's blocks are so long that six of them can add up to more than half a mile). The city's six-block standard, which dates back more than 50 years, can be found in the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board policies document.

Susan Baird, the director of community outreach and partnership for Denver's parks and recreation department, says of her city's parkland goal: "We just thought about being able to walk for 10 or 15 minutes." To reach that goal, Denver set its maximum distance in most neighborhoods at six *walkable* blocks, meaning that parks cannot be counted if they are on the other side of such barriers as interstate highways, railroad tracks, or unbridged stream valleys.

City parks officials solicited resident input on parks during public meetings leading up to the adoption of Denver's most recent parks master plan in 2003. In focus groups, many parents, particularly those who spoke little English, indicated that they were uncomfortable when children had to walk more than six blocks to a park. Thus, Denver has set an even more ambitious goal for its newer, denser subdivisions: No house can be more than three blocks from a park.

"These newer homes have virtually no yards, so it kind of balances," Baird says, and closer parks help give more breathing room and play space. Today, she says, upwards of 90 percent of the city's 555,000 people live within the mandated six blocks of the city's 6,200 acres of parkland.

Denver officials are also "repurposing" land for parks. One approach is to convert sites for "learning landscapes." Using bond funding, more than 200 old, gravel-covered elementary and middle school grounds are being revamped with trees, gardens, artwork, and playground equipment. The new landscapes remain part of the school property but will be accessible to the public after school hours and on weekends.

With schoolyards located every half mile, the learning landscapes add green space to built-out neighborhoods that previously lacked adequate parks and open areas. "They really provide a large amenity in the neighborhoods," says Baird.

Seattle, while not quite at this point yet, is steadily approaching its two distinct goals: In

the single-family neighborhoods (which cover about 70 percent of the city), the half-mile standard is close to being met, says Kevin Stoops, the planning manager for Seattle's parks and recreation department.

In the denser, multifamily and commercial neighborhoods, designated "urban villages," the city's goal is to have a park or mini-park no more than an eighth of a mile from every resident. Stoops estimates that close to 60 percent of those areas will meet that goal within the next few years.

### **Walking vs. driving**



Numerous recent studies show that Americans today are rarely willing to walk more than a block or two. Some are physically incapable of going farther; others may be afraid to cross neighborhood boundaries; many more simply do not have the time. For seniors and young children, time and capability factors become even more of an issue.

"Most people perceive parks as strong amenities, and more people will use them if they're within walking distance," says Richard Killingsworth, director of the Active Living by Design program at the University of North Carolina.

Officials in cities with walkable park distance standards say that pedestrian accessibility increases physical fitness and general good health. Moreover, accessible city parks allow neighbors to connect during morning playground sessions, lunchtime picnics, afternoon pick-up games, after-dinner strolls, or weekend festivals. It is relationships with people that make parks more than just fields, trees, and playground equipment.

On the other hand, a distance of over half a mile to a park almost guarantees that most people will either skip the trip or they will drive. Once a standard is downgraded so that it is based on driving, it loses the "community" portion of the benefit. At that point, it no longer matters how far away the park is. The park has become a formal destination, not a place to drop in.

Other issues also enter the equation. Those who must travel a greater distance to get to the park are less likely to know other park visitors. Younger children and teens will no longer be able to get to the park on their own. More drivers may make it necessary to devote part of the park itself to a parking lot.

### **Hard to meet**

The health value also goes down. According to a study on obesity, community design, and physical activity soon to be published by Lawrence D. Frank of the School of Community and Regional Planning at the University of British Columbia, every additional hour spent in a car is associated with a six percent increase in the likelihood of obesity.

But even a city that recognizes the connection between fitness and walking can have trouble meeting the standard. In its 1983 parks master plan, officials in Austin set a goal of placing every resident within one mile of a park. But even that rather low goal has been hard to meet, says Stuart Strong, planning, design, and construction manager for the Department of Parks and Recreation. "We just couldn't keep up with a one-mile standard."

Austin has, in fact, acquired large tracts of open space in recent decades. But money has not always been available to buy smaller parcels for neighborhood parks, Strong says. As an alternative, the city has provided greenways to link existing parks. It also encourages residents to bike instead of drive to park facilities like the famous Barton Springs Pool.

Other places have similar problems. "We're not even close to meeting the one-mile goal," says Phil Bruce, the planning director of Jacksonville. A planner in Indianapolis estimates that, even with the city's one-mile standard, 30 percent of its residents do not have the mandated access to a park.

Geographic information systems have made calculating distance from parks far easier than in the past. In North Carolina, officials of the merged Charlotte-Mecklenburg County park and recreation department use GIS to plot a one-mile service radius on maps marked with population figures and existing parks. The computer can then determine how many people live inside each service circle; the maps make it obvious where new parkland should be acquired. Currently, only 49 percent of Mecklenburg County's residents live within a mile of the closest park, according to park planner John DeKemper.

## Keeping up



But even with GIS and other tools, park planners often face an uphill battle when it comes to acquiring land. That's especially true in inner-city areas, according to DeKemper.

"We're competing with developers who want to build housing, and we have a very limited budget," he says. "A quarter mile or a half mile would be a nice goal, but I don't think it's

something we would be able to achieve here."

Michael Krosschell, principal planner for Indianapolis's Department of Parks and Recreation, faces the same problem. "We're running to try to keep up, but subdivisions are going up," he says, explaining the city's modest one-mile goal.

David Fisher has another view, based on his long experience as the superintendent of the Minneapolis park system. (He left in 1999 to become executive director of the newly created Great Rivers Greenway in St. Louis.)

Fisher thinks city park officials are too timid in their outreach. "We tell people, 'You need a park in your neighborhood just like everyone else.'" He adds, "Park systems suffer too quietly. Fire departments don't do that. You lose out when the money gets low because people don't think parks are a priority."

In Fisher's view, park officials must take a marketing-oriented approach if they are to overcome the resistance of mayors and city councils to buying land and developing parks in needy areas. That approach worked in greater St. Louis, where residents of six jurisdictions in two states voted to tax themselves to pay for parkland to create interconnecting greenways in the Mississippi River corridor.

Kathy Dickhut, assistant commissioner of Chicago's Department of Planning and Development, agrees that planners must take aggressive steps to add parkland. In rapidly developing areas, Dickhut recommends charging developers an open space impact fee, "based on clear open space goals and objectives." (Chicago's impact fee ranges from \$313 to \$1,253 per unit, depending on location, and the money goes toward buying parkland.)

With more than 500 parks occupying 7,000 acres, the Chicago Park District estimates that more than 90 percent of the city's 2.9 million residents have a park or play lot within a half mile of their home. Nineteen different park districts operated separately before being consolidated in 1934. "I think that helped get this distribution across the whole city," says Dickhut. "You had separate focuses on different parts of the town and everyone wanted to make sure they had their own parks."

Still, there were charges of discrimination in predominantly African American neighborhoods. In the 1990s, the city undertook the highly detailed study that led to its "City Space" plan, which identified gaps in parkland. Based on those findings, the planning department and the park district now earmark impact fees paid by developers of new housing units. Since 1998, says Dickhut, over \$23 million in impact fees has been collected — enough to buy land for 21 parks, totaling 17 acres.

*Peter Harnik is the author of Inside City Parks (Urban Land Institute, 2000) and the director of the Center for City Park Excellence, a division of the Trust for Public Land, located in Washington, D.C. Jeff Simms is an intern at the center.*

---

## When Standards Fall Short

*By Mary Eysenbach*

In doing research for APA's City Parks Forum, I reviewed countless park and open space plans. According to many of the plans, the park standards set by the National Recreation and Park Association ranged from as low as four acres for every 1,000 people to 17 acres per 1,000 people. Why such a spread? Apparently, the original 1979 standards calling for a certain number of acres for certain types of parks had been misinterpreted, miscalculated, or both.

Some plans took a different approach, based on the 1996 edition of NRPA's *Park, Recreation, Open Space and Greenway Guidelines*. This edition (the latest) calls for local park standards to be based on a level-of-service analysis, an improvement over the cookie-cutter method, but still not a perfect solution.

The problem with both approaches is that they consider parks only as recreational facilities. Even the more up-to-date, LOS version is based upon resident demand garnered from use and survey data fed into a formula that determines the amount of space needed for ballfields, sports courts, and other facilities. The demand for unstructured park space such as open lawns or wooded areas is not addressed. How many surveys include questions about those kinds of spaces?

The fact is that parks play multiple roles in our communities. Parks are integral parts of our physical, social, emotional, and in some cases, spiritual landscapes. They provide public gathering places. Parks and open spaces are a critical tool for protecting natural resources. Exposure to green spaces helps reduce our stress levels. Parks as open space have a key urban design role in development patterns.

None of those functions is captured by the recreational facility standards we use today. Standards that take into account proximity, service areas, and percentage of land cover, are an improvement but they still fall short.

What we need is a set of indicators that relates to park function in a more holistic way. That might mean looking at the amount of pervious land cover, percentage of tree canopy, or public triangulation points. This kind of multivariable analysis, while made easier by geographic information systems, is still sure to be uncomfortably messy. But as the great landscape planner Jens Jensen said, "A little inconvenience for the sake of a better environment is well worth the cost."

*Mary Eysenbach is the former director of APA's City Parks Forum.*

---

## Standards for Maximum Allowable Distance from a Park

City	Distance (in feet)	Approximate % of Residents Meeting the Distance Standard	Year Standard Adopted
Austin	5,280	60	early 1980s
Charlotte	5,280	50	1989
Chicago	2,640	90	unknown
Cleveland	2,640	unknown	1988
Columbus	2,640	unknown	unknown
Colorado Springs	2,640	unknown	unknown
Denver (new development)	1,050	unknown	unknown
Denver (older development)	2,100	90+	2003
Fresno	1,320	unknown	unknown
Indianapolis	5,280	70	"last 5-10 years"
Jacksonville	5,280	unknown	2003
Long Beach (high density neighborhoods)	1,320	unknown	unknown
Long Beach: low density neighborhoods)	2,640	unknown	unknown
Minneapolis	3,200	99+	unknown
Nashville	2,640	unknown	2002
Phoenix	2,640	unknown	unknown
Portland	2,640	unknown	unknown
San Jose	3,960	unknown	unknown
Seattle (urban villages)	660	unknown	1993

Seattle (single family neighborhoods)	2,640	90+	1993
Average Distance	2,925	.	.

Source: Trust for Public Land

## Resources

**Images:** Top — Austin's Barton Springs Pool. Photo courtesy Austin Parks and Recreation Department. Middle — The new bicycle parking facility in Chicago's Millennium Park. Photo by Sylvia Lewis. Bottom — Denver is converting schoolyards into parklike "learning landscapes" open to the public after school hours. Photo courtesy Lois Brink, Denver Parks and Recreation Department.

**TPL.** The Trust for Public Land is based in San Francisco and has offices in 40 cities. Since 1972, TPL has completed more than 2,500 land-conservation projects on some 1.5 million acres. Its urban program has acquired parkland in park-poor communities in more than 400 cities. TPL's most recent report, *No Place to Play*, compares park access in almost two dozen cities is scheduled for release early next year. For more information, go to [www.tpl.org](http://www.tpl.org).