### APPENDIX A GLOSSARY

| **Accessibility (for people with disabilities)** | Under the Americans with Disabilities Act, state and local governments that construct new buildings and facilities, or make specific alterations to existing buildings, facilities and programs, must make them accessible. Title II requires a public entity to ensure that persons with disabilities are not excluded from services, programs, and activities because existing buildings and facilities are inaccessible. Title I and Title III would also be applicable. (For ADA guidelines, see Americans with Disabilities Act at www.adata.org). |
| **Archeological Site** | A bounded area containing archaeological deposits or features, defined in part by the character and location of such deposits or features. |
| **Best Management Practices** | Best Management Practice (BMP) means a practice, or combination of practices, that is determined to be an effective and practical (including technological, economic, and institutional considerations) means of park and recreation management and trails development. Examples of agencies that use trail construction/maintenance best management practices include:
| **BILT** | Bainbridge Island Land Trust |
| **BIMPRD** | Bainbridge Island Metropolitan Park & Recreation District |
| **Biodiversity** | The variety of life forms and their processes at several levels of organization. Biological diversity or ‘Biodiversity’ means the full range of variety and variability within and among living organisms and the ecological complexes in which they occur, and encompasses ecosystem or community diversity, species diversity, and genetic diversity.” |
| **BISCC** | Bainbridge Island Senior Community Center Non-Profit |
| **BISD** | Bainbridge Island School District |
| **Capital facilities** | Includes park planning, land acquisition, site improvements, buildings, and equipment but excludes maintenance, operation, repair, alteration, or replacement. |
| **Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)** | A 6 year plan that is annually updated and approved by the Board of Commissioners to finance the development and improvement of capital facilities necessary to support the population projected within Bainbridge Island over the 6 year projection period. As defined in the GMA, the capital improvement plan will include:
a) forecast of future needs for park facilities;b) identification of additional demands placed on existing public facilities by new development;c) long-range construction and capital improvement projects of the City;d) parks under construction or expansion;e) proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new park facilities;f) inventory of existing park facilities;g) at least a 6 year financing component, updated as necessary to maintain at least a 6-year forecast period, for financing needed for park facilities within projected funding levels, and identifying sources of financing for such purposes, including bond issues authorized by the voters; andh) identification of deficiencies in park facilities and the means by which existing deficiencies will be eliminated within a reasonable period of time. In accordance with GMA requirements, the current 6-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) will identify all projects that are to be included in the calculation of existing levels-of-service (ELOS) for the purposes of identifying a growth impact fee assessment. |
<p>| <strong>Climate Change</strong> | Climate change refers to changes in climate affected by a warming planet and has been widely recognized on a global, national, and regional level. &quot;Global warming&quot; refers to increases in global temperatures resulting from an accumulation of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere. Greenhouse gases include carbon dioxide, methane, and chlorofluorocarbons. These gases trap the sun's heat as it is radiated from the earth and prevent it from escaping back into space. State and local governments are addressing climate change in their plans and policies and starting to take actions to reduce greenhouse gases. Source: MRSC (Municipal Research Services Corporation) <a href="http://mrsc.org/Home/Explore-Topics/Environment/Special-Topics/Climate-Change.aspx">http://mrsc.org/Home/Explore-Topics/Environment/Special-Topics/Climate-Change.aspx</a> |
| <strong>COBI City of Bainbridge Island</strong> |
| <strong>Community Park</strong> | A park with focus on meeting community-based recreational needs, as well as preserving unique landscapes and open spaces. Community parks are generally larger in scale than neighborhood parks, but smaller than regional parks and are designed typically for residents who live within a 2-5-mile radius. Community parks are usually six to sixty acres in size depending on the community and have a variety of park and recreation facilities and amenities. Facilities may include those found at a neighborhood park, plus permanent restrooms, landscaped areas, and specialized recreation facilities such as, ball fields, tennis court, special facilities or courts and trails. |
| <strong>Comprehensive Park, Recreation &amp; Open Space Plan (PROS)</strong> | The Park District’s planning document that includes a park and recreation inventory, facility demand, policy and guidance on developing regional/island-wide and local park and recreation facilities. |
| <strong>Conservation</strong> | The management of cultural and natural resources to prevent deterioration, loss or waste; management actions may include preservation, restoration and enhancement. Webster’s Dictionary defines conservation as “careful preservation and protection of something, planned management of a national resource to prevent exploitation, destruction, or neglect.” Conservation of a cultural resource includes the preservation of the significant historic material/fabric; properties or collection of properties, information, or knowledge. |
| <strong>Developer</strong> | The person or entity that owns or holds purchase options or other development control over property for which development activity is proposed. |
| <strong>Development Activity</strong> | Any construction or expansion of a building, structure, or use, any change in use of a building or structure, or any change in the use of land, that creates additional demand for park and recreational facilities (GMA, Section 48, RCW 82.090). |
| <strong>Development Approval</strong> | Any written authorization from a county, city or other municipal jurisdiction that authorizes the commencement of development activity. |
| <strong>District, The</strong> | Bainbridge Island Metropolitan Park &amp; Recreation District |
| <strong>Dog Park Area</strong> | Off leash dog exercise area. A specifically designated recreational outdoor facility where dogs are allowed to be off-leash while still under voice control by their handlers. |
| <strong>Ecological Sustainability</strong> | Maintenance or restoration of the composition, structure, and processes of ecosystems, including the diversity of plant and animal communities and the productive capacity of ecological systems. Important to park and recreational professionals as all life is dependent on ecological sustainability. |
| <strong>Elderly</strong> | A person aged 65 or older. |
| <strong>Endangered Species Act</strong> | Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA): Federal and state legislation that provides protection for species that are in danger of extinction. |
| <strong>Feasible or Where Practical</strong> | Terms used periodically in this PROS plan when a definitive statement cannot be made due to varying circumstances that cannot be fully anticipated. The terms feasible or where practical could apply to finance restrictions, land use requirements, ecological and topographical constraints, etc. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Infrastructure</td>
<td>Integrated network of watersheds, airsheds, woodlands, wildlife habitat, greenways, parks, working farms, ranches, forests, urban trees and parkways, and other open spaces that when incorporated into local and regional plans, policies, and practices provide vital services that are intended to sustain and ensure the quality of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Management Act (GMA)</td>
<td>The GMA or RCW 36.70A.160 stipulates that every county and city that is required or chooses to prepare a comprehensive land use plan under GMA may optionally include a park, recreation, and open space element plan. The GMA park plan element, however, is a requirement to be considered by the Washington State Resource Conservation Office (RCO) for state and federal parks, wildlife habitat, and trail grants. GMA requires every jurisdiction (which includes BIMPRD as part of COBI) to update their plans on a comprehensive basis every 6 years, and on an annual basis for housekeeping updates and revisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>The physical location or type of environment in which an organism or biological population lives or occurs, often characterized by a dominant plant form or physical characteristic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat Enhancement</td>
<td>Improves habitat through alteration, treatment, or other land management of existing habitat to increase habitat value for one or more species without bringing the habitat to a fully restored or naturally occurring condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic &amp; Interpretative Sites</td>
<td>Significant archaeological, historical, and cultural sites and facilities throughout the island. Generally, these properties conserve and provide interpretive access to significant sites including Native American sites, original homesteads or prominent building sites, commercial or public buildings of unique architectural characteristics, locations of important industrial or resource oriented activities, and other culturally important areas. Lands may also be protected or acquired that conserve significant man-made constructions on the land including bridges, dikes, dams, and other features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fees</td>
<td>A one-time fee levied against new development to cover the development’s proportionate share of the cost of providing the infrastructure (including parks and recreation) needed to fill the demand created by residents of the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements: Project</td>
<td>Project or site improvements and facilities planned and designed to provide service for a particular development project. Project improvements are necessary for the use and convenience of the occupants or users of the project, and are not system improvements. Project improvement examples include the construction of water and sewer lines or interior roads that serve only the structures and occupants located within the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements: System</td>
<td>System improvements for public facilities designed to serve areas within the community at large, in contrast to project improvements designed to service occupants of a particular development project or site. System improvement examples include collector or arterial roads, schools, and parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Facilities &amp; Community Centers</td>
<td>A classification for park land in this PROS Plan that provides a variety of indoor activities that exist within a convenient and serviceable proximity to using populations. Provides indoor activities on a year-round basis for day and evening use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-fee Property</td>
<td>A form of property ownership indicating complete ownership without any limitations or conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>A communication process that forges emotional and intellectual connections between the interests of the audience and the inherent meanings in the resource. The term is used to describe communication activities designed to improve understanding at parks, zoos, museums, nature centers, historic sites, aquariums and other travel destinations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Conservancies &amp; Land Trusts</td>
<td>Private and non-profit organizations whose purpose is to purchase land or easements in order to prevent land from being developed. Often they are formed to promote resource stewardship through acquisition, conservation, protection, and public education. Acquisition includes purchase, donation, trade, transfer or easements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave No Trace</td>
<td>A set of outdoor ethics promoting conservation in the outdoors to protect and preserve the natural world. Provides principles for responsible recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Service</td>
<td>An expression of the minimum capacity for park lands, facilities, and recreation infrastructure required to satisfy the park and recreation needs of residents in a community. Various level of services may exist. This can include national, state and local standards. Examples include: NRPA (National Recreation &amp; Park Association), WA State RCO, and local community standards. Levels of service are based on the ratio of park land, facilities, and recreation units (acres, fields, square feet, etc.) to the number of persons in the population (expressed as a unit per 1,000 persons). ELOS: Existing level of service. This includes all park land, facilities and recreation units that currently exist or have been included within the time period specified in the Park District’s Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). PLOS: Proposed level of service. This includes park land, facilities and recreation units that are intended to be added to the current Comprehensive Plan inventory as specified in the Park District’s 6-year and 20-year Capital Improvement Plan. The purpose is to maintain/improve community standards as the population continues to grow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lid Lift</td>
<td>A term used by the District for funds received as a result of a 2008 property tax levy approved by island voters for the acquisition, development and operation of parks, recreation, and open space facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monument</td>
<td>An object, whether fixed or movable, that is primarily artistic in nature rather than functional and was constructed to commemorate a historic person or event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Species</td>
<td>A species that normally lives and thrives in a particular ecosystem. This can include any species that developed with the surrounding habitat and can be assisted by or affected by an introduced or new species (non-native species).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Area</td>
<td>A classification for park land that protects, preserves, and conserves lands that may have environmental features of critical area significance (wildlife corridors), ecological importance (shorelines, wetlands and watersheds), forestland (second growth, woodland canopy for carbon capture), farmland, wildlife habitat (threatened and endangered species), and open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>A relatively small area or park site (usually five-acres or less) that serves the recreational and social focus of the adjoining neighborhood. Publicly owned land intended to serve the recreation needs of people living or working within a one-half mile radius of the park and also intended to contribute to a distinct neighborhood identity. Typical park features include walkways, a small play area, picnic area, benches, trees, and other landscaping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit</td>
<td>An organization eligible for tax-exempt status pursuant to § 501(c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code. 501(c)(3). The organizations described in Federal Government Code § 501 are commonly referred to under the general heading of &quot;charitable organizations.&quot; Organizations described in Code § 501(c)(3), other than testing for public safety organizations, are eligible to receive tax-deductible contributions in accordance with § 170. The exempt purposes set forth in Code § 501(c)(3) are charitable, religious, educational, scientific, library, testing for public safety, fostering national or international amateur sports competition, and the prevention of cruelty to children or animals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRPA</td>
<td>National Recreation &amp; Park Association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| **Open Space Park** | Land that has been acquired to be maintained in its natural state for its intrinsic and/or open space value (buffer, habitat preservation, heritage tree stands, park and recreation, conservation of natural resources for historic or scenic purposes.) |
| **Owner** | The owner of record of real property, although when real property is being purchased under a real estate contract, the purchaser shall be considered the owner of the real property if the contract is recorded. |
| **Park** | Understood to include a wide variety of parks and recreation areas ranging from developed sites (e.g., playgrounds, sports fields, courts, mini-parks, pocket parks, and tot-lots) to remote, essentially natural areas. May include buildings, sites, and cultural venues developed or preserved for their recreational, educational and historic value. May also may include active areas for non-motorized vehicle recreation, in addition to trails, waterways, and greenways. |
| **Partnership** | An umbrella term that includes agreements, cooperative ventures, joint arrangements, alliances, collaborations, coalitions, and work forces. |
| **Playgrounds & Athletics Facilities** | A classification for park land used in this PROS Plan that includes playground and outdoor athletic fields and facilities. This classification can include playgrounds and informal ballfields suited to younger age and local neighborhood game activities in sites convenient to neighborhood youth and families. This classification can also include high quality athletic fields for organized youth and adult recreational leagues that are likely to be at sites with adjacent compatible land use such as schools or other major public facilities. |
| **Private Recreational Facility** | Any recreational facility that is not owned by or dedicated to a public or governmental entity. |
| **PROS** | Park, Recreation & Open Space Plan |
| **Public facility** | Includes the following capital facilities owned or operated by government entities: |
| | a) public streets and roads; |
| | b) publicly owned parks, open space, and recreation facilities; |
| | c) school facilities, and |
| | d) fire protection facilities in jurisdictions that are not part of a fire district. |
| **Reasonable Accommodation** | Those adjustments within a work or school site that allow an otherwise qualified employee or student with a disability to perform the tasks required. |
| **Recreation** | The pleasurable and constructive use of leisure time. To recreate is to re-create (i.e. impart fresh life, refresh mentally and physically, or provide diversion in order to replenish). |
| **Recreation, Active Use** | An active recreation area is generally a developed park or facility such as ballfields, courts, gymnasiums, swimming pools, and playgrounds. Entities such as park agencies may maintain active recreation facilities for the health and well-being of the public and for informal or formal use by individuals, organized sports, and competition leagues. |
| **Recreation, Passive Use** | A passive recreation area is generally an undeveloped space or environmentally sensitive area with minimal development. Entities such as park agencies may maintain passive recreation areas for the health and well-being of the public and for the preservation of wildlife and the environment. |
| **Recreational Shoreline** | A classification for park land used in this PROS Plan that provides public access to shoreline designated for more active recreational functions such as boating, swimming, and fishing. Parks in this classification may also have woodlands, scenic areas, and park improvements such as picnic shelters and restrooms. |
| **Recreational Trail** | A classification for park land used in this PROS Plan. In general, park trails are multi-purpose trails located within greenways, parks, and natural resource areas with a focus on recreational elements and connections to the environment. |
| **Regional Park** | A locally operated park typically 60-500 acres in size or more, although can be 2,000 acres or greater in size. A regional park focuses on activities and natural |
| **Resource Conservation Office (RCO)** | The central coordinating agency for the State that reviews and certifies Comprehensive Park, Recreation & Open Space Plans and administers state and federal grants for outdoor recreation, wildlife habitat, and trail development. |
| **Riparian** | The strip of land adjacent to a natural watercourse such as a river or stream. Often supports vegetation that provides fish habitat when growing large enough to overhang the bank. |
| **Sakai Park Concept Plan** | Concept plan for Sakai Park adopted by the Park Board of Commissioners on 6/21/18. This concept plan was developed by architect/landscape architect Jones & Jones in 2017 and incorporates community recommendations that came out of an extensive public process in 2016. It serves as a planning document for the development of Sakai Park and includes natural areas, facilities, and trails. |
| **Service Areas** | Regional/local park and recreational - a geographic area in which a defined set of public facilities provide service to the population within the area. Park and recreational lands, facilities, and services will be provided under a tiered approach that includes:  
   a) a regional or island-wide system that will be organized on an island-wide basis; and  
   b) a local system that may be organized on a neighborhood basis. |
<p>| <strong>Special Purpose Facility</strong> | A classification for park land in this PROS Plan that is used for single purpose recreational facilities or activities. Some examples of these include golf courses and public plazas. |
| <strong>Special Use Park</strong> | A type of park oriented towards a single-purpose use. |
| <strong>Stakeholder</strong> | Group or individual who can affect, or is affected by, the achievement of the jurisdiction or organization’s mission; examples include managers, employees, policy makers, suppliers, vendors, citizens, users, community activists, businesses, and community groups; and who should have a right to participate in the decision-making process. |
| <strong>Superfund Site</strong> | Sites related to the federal Superfund Site Program administered by EPA (Environmental Protection Agency). These sites are under investigation and clean-up from hazardous materials generated by prior use. The point at Pritchard Park is a Superfund site owned by the City of Bainbridge Island and is currently not available for park use. |
| <strong>Support Facility</strong> | A classification for park land in this PROS Plan that provides maintenance yard, plant nursery, and administrative activities necessary to support park, recreation, and open space programs and facilities. Support facilities may be independent properties or portions of other sites that include administrative offices, maintenance yards and shops. Park caretaker residences are also included under support facilities. |
| <strong>Sustainable Design</strong> | To locate, design, reconstruct, construct, rehabilitate, renovate, operate, and maintain built environments that are models of energy, water, and materials efficiency, while providing healthy, productive, and comfortable habitable environments and long term benefits. This design approach is sometimes called “green design” or “green technology.” |
| <strong>Sustainable Landscape</strong> | A landscape enhanced and maintained to the highest degree of ecological harmony. |
| <strong>Threatened Species</strong> | An animal or plant species that is considered likely to become endangered throughout a significant portion of its range within the foreseeable future because its prospects for survival and reproduction are in jeopardy from one or more causes. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and/or the WA State Department of Fish &amp; Wildlife make this designation. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Tot Lot</strong></th>
<th>Playgrounds or areas for toddlers (18-months to 4 years old) situated within larger recreational areas, usually providing shade and benches for caregivers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Universal Access</strong></td>
<td>Refers to the ability of all people to have equal opportunity and access to a service or product from which they can benefit regardless of physical abilities or other characteristics. Refers to creating equal opportunity for all community members by reducing barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Universal Design</strong></td>
<td>An approach to design that increases the potential for developing a better quality of life for a wide range of individuals. It is a design process that enables and empowers a diverse population by improving human performance, health and wellness, and social participation (Steinfeld and Maisel, 2012).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Growth Boundary (UGB)</strong></td>
<td>A boundary around a given municipality or developed area beyond which urban development will be reduced or not considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</strong></td>
<td>The federal regulatory agency empowered by Congress to protect the environment; provide an array of financial assistance programs; and set standards for State environmental protection. The Office of Environmental Education supports projects that enhance the public’s awareness, knowledge, and skills to make informed decisions that affect environmental quality. <a href="http://www.epa.gov/enviroed/">http://www.epa.gov/enviroed/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>View Corridor</strong></td>
<td>The line of sight identified as to height, width, and distance of an observer looking toward an object of significance to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wetlands</strong></td>
<td>Lands that may be covered periodically or permanently with shallow water and include saltwater marshes, freshwater marshes, open or close brackish water marshes, swamps, mudflats, and fens.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Dear Reader:

We all know that parks and open space improve our quality of life and contribute significantly to the health and well-being of our families and our community. In the past few years, we islanders have worked hard at creating parks and open spaces outside of Winslow. Now it’s time to “green” our downtown, to make it a lovely, inviting place, now and in the future.

City plans and policies allocate half of all population growth on Bainbridge Island to Winslow – 10,000 or more people – yet there is no comprehensive open space, parks and recreation system plan for our town. Few opportunities still exist to create new parks in the Winslow core and immediate surrounding area, and what opportunities remain are rapidly being lost. Visualize hundreds of condominiums and apartments in Winslow, with attendant commercial space, roads, parking lots and parking garages – all of which is on the city’s drawing boards – in a built-up-and-paved-over land bereft of public green space. Now picture a healthy, green and vibrant Winslow with community and neighborhood parks, picnic areas, tot lots with playground equipment, and trails along wooded streams, the waterfront, and grassy fields.

It’s time for us – citizens, elected representatives, city, and park district officials – to implement a vision of more parks and open space for our town before it’s too late. The following report offers a blueprint for achieving the greening of Winslow – for today and tomorrow.

Dave Shorett, Chairman
Winslow Parks Task Force
# GREENING WINSLOW
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I. Executive summary

From May through early October 2007 the Winslow Parks Task Force analyzed the existing parks and park needs of the Winslow Study Area (WSA), the area used in the 2025 Growth Advisory Committee Report and Winslow Master Plan. The resulting key findings led the Task Force to recommend four action steps.

Key findings

♦ **Winslow’s population will increase 50% by 2025 and will eventually double in size.**
  Winslow’s present population of just over 6,000 will grow to nearly 10,000 by 2025, and may reach 15,000 eventually. One-half of the island’s population is expected to live within the Winslow Study Area.

♦ **Downtown Winslow is currently deficient in parks.**
  Using applicable quantitative guidelines, the WSA is already deficient in certain types of parkland. (See following report for details.)

♦ **Winslow’s lack of parks will be even more severe by 2025.**
  Currently, only four percent of the island’s parks – about thirty-eight acres – is located within the WSA where one-half of island residents will live. Using national standards, by 2025, if no new parkland is acquired, Winslow could be deficient by two acres in miniparks/small playgrounds and over forty acres in larger community parks.

♦ **Existing and projected park deficits are not distributed equally within the Winslow Study Area.**
  Organized play areas in Winslow are mostly located near schools and Rotary Park but are lacking in other parts of the WSA. Residents in downtown Winslow are, or will soon be, underserved by small playgrounds or gathering areas. A citizen survey would define each specific WSA neighborhood’s desires for parkland.

♦ **The Winslow Study Area lacks an overall park plan and an acquisition/development plan.**
  There are at least eight recent planning reports discussing parks in the WSA. All recommend increases in acreage for parks but there is no overall vision to acquire and develop needed parklands.

♦ **Responsible planning must match parkland to population growth.**
  Land for park needs must be acquired with a view to fully populated Winslow area of fifty or more years from now. Failure to acquire parkland to serve the future population of Winslow would be a dramatic failure of government to serve its citizens.

♦ **Land for parks in Winslow should be acquired now.**
  Available undeveloped/underdeveloped land for parks or other public use in the Winslow area is already extremely scarce. It is highly probable that none will be available in the near future.
Four action steps to achieve parks for people in Winslow

♦ Acquire land for parks today – DO NOT WAIT.
   An immediate effort must be made to acquire new parkland for the WSA and obtain easements for trails and trail connections.

♦ Identify a minimum of $10 million in capital funds over the next two years to acquire land for parks in Winslow.
   An exact dollar amount for new parkland is impossible to determine without identifying specific parcels. However, the Task Force determined that the assessed value of several potentially suitable undeveloped/under-developed parcels within the WSA totaled close to $11 million. Therefore the Task Force recommends identifying a minimum of $10 million in capital funds over the next two years to begin to acquire land for parks within the WSA.

♦ Examine the means of financing and acquiring park land now for Winslow.
   The Task Force identified a number of monetary and policy/tax incentive approaches that other communities are using successfully to acquire parklands; two of the most compelling are a land-dedication standard for new development used in Colorado and a Real Estate Excise Tax in San Juan County, WA. (See following report for a detailed list and discussion of approaches.)

♦ Survey citizen needs and desires for parks in Winslow.
   Citizen surveys have become the most widely used means of determining how much parkland is desirable for a given community. The last such survey, island-wide, was done in 2000. It is time for another survey, including specific questions about the desire and willingness to fund parkland acquisition in Winslow. However, the Task Force is emphatic that such a process should not delay acquisition of land in the Winslow area.

Most governmental capital projects can be accomplished over time. However, if we do not invest in parkland acquisition now, this community will lose the opportunity forever.
II. Vision for the future: Green Winslow

Every day, rain or sun, Bainbridge Islanders are out using their parks, connecting with nature and with each other. They are strolling, biking, picnicking, launching boats, attending concerts, and watching their children play, explore, and learn about team-building and friendly competition. Again and again we’ve spoken loud and clear that protecting our environment is important to us. We love our public spaces, our parks, natural areas, and having recreational opportunities close to home. Bainbridge Islanders treasure the protected areas we have preserved for ourselves today and for the generations to come.

Now it’s time for us to extend our park and open space ethic and commitment to Winslow, which has become our center of growth, where in a few short years half of all islanders are projected to live. Within two decades, our town will be a small city of more than 10,000 people and there is great need for everything from tot lots to neighborhood parks, and for greenways and trails that connect a rich, new park system.

This report offers bold thinking and advances opportunities for new parks for Winslow. Of course, all new parks will require funding, leadership, and political will. We have no time to waste. Each and every day we’re out using our parks; but also each and every day we are forever losing opportunities to have adequate park and recreation space in Winslow.

We must begin now to green Winslow.
III. Why was the Winslow Park Task Force created?

The Bainbridge Island Metropolitan Park & Recreation District (Park District) is required by the Washington Growth Management Act to prepare a comprehensive plan for parks and recreation on the island. Until now, the Park District has treated the entire island as a single entity for park system planning; this plan for the Winslow area would thus be a part of the overall plan. Why should there be a separate park system plan for just the Winslow area?

City of Bainbridge Island policies and plans call for fully half the island’s population growth to occur in the Winslow core area, and the city has taken the position that the Park District is responsible for planning parks downtown. The city has been particularly active in the past few years in planning for growth in the downtown area. As a result the Park District Board of Commissioners has determined that there is an urgent need for an aggressive plan for a system of parks for the people in Winslow today and especially for future generations. In June 2007, the Board of Park Commissioners created the short-term Winslow Park Task Force (Task Force) to conduct a park assessment for the island’s urban center.

This report analyzes Winslow’s park assets based on national standards in light of our current and projected populations, and presents an action plan for moving forward to incorporate – through collaboration and cooperation – the critically important, quality-of-life elements of parks and recreation into all city and state growth management blueprints.

The following islanders prepared this park system plan for Winslow:
  - Dave Shorett, Task Force chair, and chairman of Park District Board of Commissioners
  - Martha Droge, urban planner and landscape architect for Mithun
  - Kevin Dwyer, director, Bainbridge Island Chamber of Commerce
  - Neil Johannsen, retired director, Alaska State Parks
  - Tom Kilbane, president of the board, Bainbridge Island Senior Community Center
  - Lynda McMaken, Bainbridge Island attorney
  - Kirk Robinson, member, Park District Board of Commissioners

The Winslow Park Task Force met every few weeks through the summer and fall to analyze information, apply standards and propose a direction for parklands in Winslow. Park District Director Terry Lande, Senior Planner Perry Barrett and Landscape Architect Lauren Perry provided assistance.
IV. What were the objectives of the Park Task Force?

The Winslow Park Task Force had the following objectives:

A. Determine whether the Winslow Study Area, the geographic area defined by the *Winslow Master Plan* and the *Final Report of the Mayor's 2025 Growth Advisory Committee*, is appropriate to park planning for the Winslow area, or whether other boundaries would be more appropriate;

B. Determine existing population as of 2007 and projected population growth to 2025 for the Winslow area;

C. Inventory existing parklands in the Winslow area;

D. Using national park and recreation standards and guidelines developed in other jurisdictions, determine reasonable levels of park service for both existing and projected populations of the Winslow area, and determine whether gaps exist between standard levels of park service and Winslow’s present park assets;

E. Examine the current city and state planning efforts for the Winslow area;

F. Identify remaining natural-landscapes and “underdeveloped” parcels of a half-acre or more in the Winslow area; and,

G. In cooperation with the City, recommend specific actions that the City and Park District might take to create and implement a park plan for the Winslow core area.
V. What geographic area did the Park Task Force choose for analysis?

To allow for consistency between the Winslow Master Plan and the Final Report of the Mayor’s 2025 Growth Advisory Committee and the Task Force report, the Winslow Study Area (WSA) was selected. The WSA is bounded on the east by Puget Sound, on the west by Weaver Road, on the south by Eagle Harbor, and the north by New Brooklyn Road. (See Appendix A: Map 1 – “Winslow Master Plan Study Area;” and Map 2 – “Planning Sub Areas” from the 2025 Report.)

VI. What is the present population of the Winslow?

The city projected the 2007 population of Winslow to be 6,232 – a 7 percent increase over 2006.

VII. What is the projected population of Winslow?

The Washington Growth Management Act mandates that the City of Bainbridge Island, like all cities in the state, accept growth projections from the state’s Office of Financial Management, and to plan for that anticipated growth through a comprehensive planning process. The state estimates that Bainbridge Island’s population will grow from 21,760 in 2004 to 28,660 by 2025. City policy and plans call for fully half of all island residents to live in the Winslow Study Area.

The City’s 2025 Growth Advisory Committee Report projects an annual growth rate of 2.5 percent over the next 18 years – a very conservative number compared to Winslow’s growth rate in 2007 of 7 percent.

Using the 2025 Report growth rate, Winslow’s population would total 9,682 by the year 2025.

However, if historical growth rates are used to project Winslow’s population to the year 2025, the likely number of residents increases considerably. The following table projects Winslow population in 2025 using historic growth rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Range</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
<th>Projected Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990-2007</td>
<td>2.8 percent</td>
<td>10,987 WSA residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2007</td>
<td>3.7 percent</td>
<td>11,900 WSA residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>7.0 percent</td>
<td>21,064 WSA residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be consistent with other planning efforts, the Winslow Park Task Force chose to apply the 2025 Report projection as its working figure, but members deemed it very likely that the Winslow Study Area population will increase well beyond 10,000, eventually reaching 15,000 or more. Winslow has become an extremely popular place to live and zoning will probably change over time to accommodate an ever-increasing number of residents.
VIII. How should we plan for parks given Winslow's projected growth?

Responsible park planning identifies actions that must be taken now rather than later because land – already scarce and expensive – will only become more so over time. Land for park needs must be acquired with a view to the long run, i.e. the fully populated Winslow area of 50 or more years from today.

While the recommendations of this report do use – for consistency’s sake – the population projections of the 2025 Report, task force members also believe that planning for greater numbers of residents, well over 10,000, is not only desirable but realistic as well.

The need to act now cannot be overemphasized. Failure to acquire parkland to serve the ultimate population of Winslow would be a dramatic failure of government to serve its citizens.
XI. What parks presently exist in Winslow?

Currently, according to the 2025 Report, approximately 13 percent of Bainbridge Island’s 17,428 acres – 2,324 acres – are considered protected open space. Of this protected open space, about half – 1,247 acres – is in park status, owned and/or managed by State Parks, Bainbridge Island Metropolitan Park District, or City of Bainbridge Island.

Only three percent of the island’s parks – 37.6 acres – are located within the Winslow Study Area boundaries, where half of all residents are destined to live.

Within the Winslow Study Area, ten areas, 37.6 acres, are classified and actively managed as parks. For the most part these parks are situated on the edges of the study area and are of varying size and program mix. The following table shows these parks and their sizes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Park</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon Park</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Tot Lot</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary Park</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strawberry Packing Plant Open Space</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawley Cove Park</td>
<td>11.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Yeomalt</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Tot Lot</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Bainbridge Aquatics Center (located on School District property), the Bainbridge High School Athletic fields, and the Ordway and Commodore School playgrounds and playfields are located in the Winslow Study Area. In addition, there are two private parcels available for public access and another private, publicly accessible park in the planning stage. There is also a public gathering place as part of the City Hall complex that often hosts the Farmer’s Market.

Below are brief descriptions of Winslow’s parks, open spaces and recreation areas. In addition, Appendix A, Map 3 – “Existing Parks and Open Space in the Winslow Study Area” shows the location of all the parks and facilities discussed below.

A. Waterfront Park

The original city park for Winslow encompasses about six acres (including the BI senior Center), and has some native forest, a public dock, the Bainbridge Commons, and a play area for children. The open lawn area is used for summer concerts and other gatherings. The Bainbridge Rowing Club is based in Waterfront Park on one of the tennis courts. The Waterfront Trail runs through the park. A master plan for Waterfront Park is currently being developed as part of the Winslow Master Plan and the Ferry-Gateway planning effort (more on these planning efforts later in the report).
B. Gideon Park
Located at the corner of Grow Avenue and Gideon Lane, this 2.4-acre park includes play equipment for young children, a bird-and-butterfly garden and an open field area for unstructured play. The park, which also includes a small wooded area and a log cabin used as a caretaker's residence, is intended for quiet and passive activities.

C. Madison Avenue Tot Lot
This half-acre park near the intersection of Madison Avenue and Wyatt Way has a play structure for young children.

D. Rotary Park
Rotary Park is a 9.6-acre park on the east side of Weaver Road between High School Road and Wyatt Way. The property was donated to the Park District by the Rotary Club in 1966 and has become home to Bainbridge Island Little League. The park contains two baseball fields, an open play field area, children's play equipment, a snack shack and spectator areas.

E. Strawberry Packing Plant Open Space
Located at the western edge of the Winslow Study Area, currently undeveloped, this four-acre parcel was acquired by the city in trade for the John Nelson property.

F. Hawley Cove Park
One of the first properties purchased by the Bainbridge Island Open Space Commission, Hawley Cove Park is located on the north shore of Eagle Harbor in the Wing Point neighborhood. This 11.7-acre park includes a trail/boardwalk from Wing Point Way to the beach. The park also encompasses upland forest and includes a large wetland, and is restricted to passive use.

G. Camp Yeomalt
Camp Yeomalt is a former Boy Scout camp located on the corner of Dingley and Park Avenues in the Wing Point neighborhood. The nearly three-acre site is home to the Yeomalt Cabin, built in the 1930s, a listed historic building. The cabin will be restored in the near future thanks to a volunteer community effort. Camp Yeomalt is home to a classroom building used by the Park District for art and nature classes. Scout groups still use the park for outings, including overnight camping.

H. Aaron Avenue Tot Lot
The Aaron Avenue Tot Lot is located in the Wing Point neighborhood at the corner of Aaron and Grand avenues. This half-acre site includes playground equipment and picnic tables. Property is currently owned by the city but is planned for transfer to the Park District.

I. Farmers Market Square (Civic Center Plaza)
Located between City Hall and the Bainbridge Performing Arts building, the Farmer’s Market Square is an open grassy area of almost half an acre that is home to the Farmer’s Market during from April into October.
J. Bainbridge Aquatics Center
The Bainbridge Aquatics Center, open to the public, is located in the Bainbridge School District Campus (see below), and is operated and maintained by the Park District. The center consists of two pools, the Ray Williamson and the Don Nakata Memorial pools; a spa; water slide; and other amenities associated with a pool complex. The School District uses the Williamson pool for its swim teams and water polo teams.

K. School Facilities
Bainbridge High School, Commodore Options School and Ordway Elementary Schools are all within the Winslow Study Area. The school district campus is 75.6 acres in size, however most of the land is covered by structures and parking – including administration buildings, maintenance facility and transportation center – or is otherwise unsuitable for public recreation. About 25 acres is dedicated to recreational use fields and facilities, some of which is available to the public when not in use by the schools. Both the School District and Park District schedule limited public use of the Paski Gymnasium, the Lower or Commodore Gym, the Gymnastics Room at the High School, and the small gym at Ordway. The Commodore Field and Ordway Field are used by the Soccer Club and Little League for practice and some games. The high school campus includes a softball field, baseball field, open practice fields for soccer and lacrosse. The stadium track and field allows only limited access for the general public. Ordway and Commodore both have playground structures.

L. Harbor Square (private)
The private Harbor Square development includes one acre of public access open space, an easement granted by the Harbor Square condominium association as a condition of development. Located under the shade of several large, old trees, Harbor Square provides a walking path and minimal play equipment for small children. The paved Harbor Square plaza is also open to the public.

L. Winslow Green (private)
The small grassy area in Winslow Green is heavily used and is a very good example of the benefit of open land available to public use in the heart of the downtown area.

M. John Nelson Park (private, future)
As a condition of the property exchange that brought the Strawberry Packing Plant parcel land into public ownership in exchange for John Nelson Park, the developer of Vineyard Lane has agreed to a one acre publicly accessible park on the north side of Vineyard Lane.
X. How do Winslow’s existing parks compare to park standards?

A. Citizen surveys
The trend nationally and within Washington State has been to determine park needs based upon citizen surveys, rather than by quantitative baseline standards. To the best of our knowledge, however, there is no citizen survey on Bainbridge asking what its citizens view as appropriate park service levels in the Winslow core area. A 2000 island-wide survey did make it clear that Islanders at that time highly valued parks and open space but the survey did not ask for their views on Winslow parks specifically.

B. Quantitative standards
Without a pertinent survey, the Winslow Park Task Force looked at known national and state level of service quantitative standards, which are described in Appendix B:

- Washington State standards
  - Level of Service Standards: Measures for Maintaining the Quality of Community Life, Report No. 31. Municipal Research and Services Center of Washington [September 1994]
  - Outdoor Active Recreation Level of Service [Draft, February 2005]
- State of Colorado standards: Small Community Park & Recreation Planning Standards [2003]

C. Gap between present/planned parks and what’s needed
By most standards used the in the quantitative analysis, the Task Force concluded that Winslow is already deficient in certain types of parkland and will be significantly deficient by 2025.

According to National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) standards for more populated areas, the Winslow Study Area is currently deficient by between 0.5 and 1.5 acres of Mini-parks – typically small playgrounds or gathering areas. If no new parkland of this type is acquired and developed, Winslow could be deficient by over 2 acres in this category by 2025.

NRPA standards and a comparative state standard the Park Task Force found useful, Colorado State’s guidelines, also indicate that the Winslow Study Area is close to – or is already – significantly deficient in Community Parks, space for large gatherings, multiple uses and organized play. Waterfront Park and the ball fields at Bainbridge High School, and Ordway and Commodore schools are in this category. (Many municipalities do not count school facilities as parkland or apply a percentage to these fields in calculating community parkland because school ball fields are available to the public only on a limited basis as school activities have priority.) If no new parkland of this type is created, by 2025 Winslow could be deficient in this category by well over 40 acres – or much more depending on how school fields are counted.
Existing and projected parkland deficits are not distributed equally within the Winslow Study Area. For example:

- Winslow residents near the schools and Rotary Park are better served by organized play areas than residents in the south and east of Winslow.

- Likewise, residents in the core of downtown Winslow are, or will soon be, underserved by small playgrounds or gathering areas.

Also, each neighborhood may have a different set of desires for parkland. Some individual homes on large lots in less developed areas may provide adequate play opportunities. If this premise is correct, additional Tot Lots in high numbers may be deemed unnecessary. Only a thorough survey of citizen opinion would define the true desired need in any area.
XI. What parkland for Winslow is included in current planning efforts?

Over the past three years, Winslow has been the center of numerous planning efforts, some completed, some still underway. Many of these plans address parks, recreation, trails and open space but only to a limited degree.

A. Winslow Master Plan
The process called “Winslow Tomorrow” was approved in December 2006 and is now the Winslow Master Plan (WMP). This plan is part of the overall Comprehensive Plan for the Bainbridge Island. The WMP endeavors to put in place a vision for Winslow that strengthens the vitality of the town center as a commercial, cultural and community hub for the whole island and, in the process, promotes mixed-use development, transportation, parking, streetscape improvements and park proposals. The plan calls for a “green” and “sustainable” community where half of all islanders would someday live.

The plan’s chapter on open space and trails states, “Winslow contains very little open space that is publicly owned” and points out that even though the city has acquired numerous parks and other open space over the past few years, few are easily available to town residents and people must “drive to make use of them.”

Although the WMP contains some conflicting statements, it does propose that, “Development of Winslow will include an open space network consisting of a combination of small parks and larger parks,” and that, “usable parks throughout the Winslow area should be created and enhanced.” The WMP proposes “Target 1-acre Parks” and “Target Pocket Parks” within its boundary. The WMP also recommends that the Winslow Ravine be “preserved as open space” and that a trail be built along the east side of the ravine.

However, in the final recommendation, the WMP only proposes acquiring “2 to 3 acres” of new parks in the years ahead. This level of acquisition would bring Winslow’s total parkland acreage to barely 40 acres for the 10,000 to 15,000 downtown residents – a ratio viewed as insufficient to serve both present and future residents of Winslow under any national, state or local standard applied by the Task Force.

B. Waterfront Master Plan
Waterfront Park is easily the most popular of downtown Winslow parks. A new draft master plan recommends restoration of shoreline (now held in place with armor rock bulkheads), and construction of a new city dock, restroom and shower facility, plus other developments. Proposals contained in this plan are now undergoing an Environmental Impact Statement process.
C. Ferry Gateway Urban Design Plan
This planning effort was conceived by the city as a way to interface with the Washington State Department of Transportation in developing a plan for the Bainbridge Island Ferry Terminal. The Ferry Gateway Plan (FGP) covers a substantial area around the terminal, and advances recommendations for high-density housing, business space, new roads and open space. Many large-scale, high-impact proposals are part of this plan, including: the possibility of more than 700 residential units; a vehicle bridge spanning the mouth of Winslow Creek; and a traffic “connector” between Wyatt Way and Ferncliff Avenue – a vehicle overpass spanning SR 305 as well as Winslow Ravine at its widest place.

The Ferry Gateway Plan also contains several possible park areas, which could mitigate and soften an area likely destined for large-scale development under any of the plan’s three options. Like the Winslow Master Plan, the FGP calls for “protection” of the Winslow Ravine and the construction of a trail on the east side of the waterfront. Other ideas in the FGP include: creating a park on half or all of the 4.89-acre historic Cave property located immediately to the north of the 180-home Harbor Square Condominium complex; creating a “shoreline bluff park” on the ferry terminal’s eastern side on land now partly dedicated surface parking; and establishing some parkland on the former gas station site and another parcel at the southwest corner of the intersection of SR 305 and Winslow Way.

The park proposal for the privately owned Cave property is one end of a wide continuum of possibilities; the other end is a two-story parking structure and upwards of 60 residences per acre. An Environmental Impact Statement is now being prepared on the FGP area. (The FGP and Waterfront Park plans are contained in the same document.)

D. Bainbridge Island Ferry Passenger Terminal Planning – still underway
Three options were prepared for the redevelopment of the ferry passenger terminal. None of the plans suggests the establishment of parks, though landscaping would certainly mitigate the large amount of pavement necessary to move high volumes of cars and buses as well as parking for hundreds of vehicles. Option Three includes a two-way vehicle bridge across the Winslow Creek estuary in Waterfront Park, designed to eliminate ferry loading and unloading traffic impediments that result from Harbor View Drive intersecting with Olympic View Drive. The Ferry Gateway Plan also has an option to build this bridge. Note: As of this writing, funding issues for the redevelopment of the terminal have led the state to put on hold most planning and EIS work for the Bainbridge Island Ferry Passenger Terminal for the next two to three years.

E. Eagle Harbor Ferry Maintenance Terminal – stalled by a legal challenge
Plans to proceed with redevelopment and expansion of the state’s ferry maintenance facilities on this waterfront parcel await a decision in Kitsap County Superior Court in a lawsuit filed by the city. A possible recreational element for this area is contained in a “memorandum of understanding” signed by the Washington State Department of Transportation and the City of Bainbridge Island in the 1990s that would allow the city to develop and operate a marina and small boat maintenance yard on one acre of the property for a period of 20 years, likely under a concession contract. In addition, recommendations have been made that the ferry maintenance terminal should be relocated and that all or part of the property dedicated to park and recreation purposes.
F. SR 305 Corridor Vision Plan – still underway
This effort seeks to expand the capacity of Highway 305 that bisects the Winslow Study Area to carry more personal vehicles and mass transit. Kitsap Transit is the lead organization in this planning effort and, to date, the plan contains no proposals related to parks and recreation.

G. Bainbridge Island Non-Motorized Transportation Plan
The 2003 Non-Motorized trail plan is intended to guide the creation of a planned, coordinated network of sidewalks, trails, footpaths, bikeways, and multi-purpose trails connecting neighborhoods with parks, schools, the shoreline, ferry terminal, and commercial areas in ways that maximize mobility, and provide a sense of safety and comfort for pedestrians, bicyclists and equestrians on Bainbridge Island. The plan has numerous trails and routes within the Winslow Study Area. (See Appendix A: Map 4 – “Existing Non-Motorized Facilities – Winslow Area;” and Map 5 – “Non-Motorized System Plan – Winslow Area.”) Trails in this plan would serve both transportation needs as well as offer recreational opportunities. The Non-motorized Trail Plan has a direct relationship to any park system plan and all efforts should be made to link existing and proposed parks to existing and proposed trail routes.

H. Report of the Mayor’s 2025 Growth Advisory Committee
Completed in May 2007, this plan proposes how the island should accommodate 6,900 more people over the next eighteen years. Under current projections, by 2025 a total of 28,660 people are expected to live on Bainbridge Island. Since half of all new residents would live in Winslow, that is the equivalent of 11 more Harbor Square developments. The 2025 study examines factors such as existing plans, open space, water, septic, transportation, housing, and demographics.

While the 2025 plan does not mention the need for parks and recreational lands for the growing population, it does advance a strong argument for the general preservation of open space, critical areas (“frequently flooded areas, geologically hazardous areas, critical aquifer recharge areas, wetlands, and fish and wildlife conservation habitats” - definition from the State of Washington), agricultural and pastoral lands, greenways and forests. The document encourages the development and adoption of an “Island-wide Open Space Conservation Plan” in which the “Winslow portion of the Open Space Plan would be given high priority because a majority of new growth is recommended to go into the Winslow area.” However, in June 2007, the City Council declined to fund such a plan.
XII. What new park and recreation areas are proposed in current plans?

A. Winslow Master Plan
This plan specifically states that “new parks should be acquired (emphasis added) ranging from pocket parks (approx. 10,000 sf.) to sites up to 1 acre ...” The plan further states “these parks could be either an acre or more in size or pocket parks, depending on site availability and distribution. However, the WMP’s final recommendation is for acquiring only two to three acres of new parks in Winslow, far short of the desired acreage based on national, state and local standards. The plan does include a conceptual map that provides some ideas as to where some of these parks could be located. (See Appendix A: Map 6 – “Winslow Master Plan – Open Space Plan.”) While several of the possible park locations are already in public ownership and could be developed as parks, it is not clear if the total acreage recommended in the WMP only includes existing city lands that would be simply re-classified as “parkland.”

B. Ferry/Gateway Plan
This plan suggests the possibility of up to three new parks being established around the Ferry Terminal:
- Part or all of the five-acre Cave parcel immediately north of Harbor Square;
- The east bluff shoreline of the ferry passenger terminal area; and/or
- The majority of the now-vacant two parcels (at the former gas station site) at the corner of Olympic Drive and Winslow Way.  
  (See Appendix A: Maps 7A, 7B and 7C – Options 1 (No Action), 2, and 3 under the Ferry Gateway EIS.)

C. Non-motorized Plan
This plan recommends several trail corridors, the primary one in the Winslow Study Area being along the ravine. Many of the recommended routes would involve purchase of public trail rights-of-way easements.
XIII. How can Bainbridge provide parklands needed in Winslow?

A. Gap between existing and needed parklands; closing the gap
The Winslow Park Task Force concludes that, by any reasonable measure, there is presently a gap between existing and needed parkland. In particular, there is a critical shortage of larger neighborhood parks, mini-parks and play areas in the Winslow Study Area. But more significantly, without acquisition of additional land, there will be a very large gap by 2025 and on to such future time as the Winslow core area becomes fully populated.

How can the citizens of Bainbridge Island close this gap in a satisfactory manner? We believe that a “do-nothing” approach is wholly unacceptable and that a “go-slow-acquire-more-land-as population-grows-approach” is also unacceptable — and unrealistic. Undeveloped and “underdeveloped” land is available now, whereas it’s likely that little — if any — will be available in 5 to 10 years and it’s a virtual certainty that none will be available in 2025. If more acreage is not acquired now, there is no hope of closing the gap and serving the park needs of those who live, work and shop in Winslow.

B. Potential parklands in Winslow
In any discussion of potential parkland, it must immediately be stated that land can be acquired either through purchase between a willing seller and willing buyer, or by eminent domain. The Park Task Force did not consider eminent domain in its analysis and takes no position on eminent domain.

The Winslow Park Task Force inventoried, to the best of its ability, all undeveloped land in the Winslow Study Area. (See Appendix A, Map 8 — “Undeveloped Land in the Winslow Study Area.”) When considering opportunities for additional parkland, the task force looked at lands that provided a natural landscape, undeveloped and “underdeveloped” land, that is, parcels with existing structures or residence that could be developed at higher densities under existing zoning. (See Appendix A, Map 9 — “Underdeveloped Land in the Winslow Study Area.”) For example, there are two parcels, one 4.89 acres and another of almost 10 acres, each of which presently has one residence. These parcels present immediate opportunities because the undeveloped portion of each is substantial and could support parkland and park usage.

Special attention should be given to the area north of Winslow Way extending to High School Road, bounded by Grow Avenue on the west and Ferncliff Avenue on the east, as a very significant opportunity may exist to partially meet the gap between existing parkland and long-term community park needs.
The following alphabetical list describes the larger parcels and other possibilities identified by the Task Force for their potential park and recreation opportunities for Winslow. Each parcel could be developed in part or whole for park and recreation purposes.

♦ **Cave Property** (Acreage: 4.89, 2008 Assessed value: $1,988,650)
  This parcel located adjacent to the Harbor Square Condos to the north stretches from Cave to Ferncliff Avenues. Owned by the descendants of the pioneering Cave family, the sunny, gently sloping property includes the historic Cave home, several 100+ year-old trees, and several acres of blackberries on what were once fields. If acquired in whole or in part, this property would provide a “Central Park” type space east of SR 305 for both passive and limited active recreation, with possible connection to a Winslow Ravine Trail.

♦ **Civic Center/Farmer’s Market Square** (In public ownership)
  Redevelop the area between City Hall and the Bainbridge Island Playhouse into more of a park like setting, removing parking (to the parking garage - see below) and enlarging the landscaped area.

♦ **Civic Center/Parking Garage** (Potential Public/Private Partnership)
  If or when the downtown Parking Garage is built, design the structure to have a green roof/park on top that would be adjacent to the Farmer’s Market Square (see above).

♦ **Curtis Property** (Acreage: 6.0 acres; 2008 Assessed value: $966,340)
  In the summer of 2007, the Curtis family generously donated 6 acres abutting the Winslow Ravine on the west and Ferncliff Avenue on the east for the purpose of affordable housing. Clustering housing would allow for open space or a neighborhood park, and with an easy connection to a Winslow Ravine Trail.

♦ **Government Way Development** (Acreage: 7.97; 2008 Assessed value: $6,053,950)
  The Task Force understands that the City, Park District and the purchaser of the Government Way parcel (Navy housing) and seven adjacent parcels are discussing development plans, and that the developer is open to the idea of developing a portion of the site for park purposes. This could include maintaining some open space and/or providing an area for active recreation. The City and Park District should make every effort to work to accomplish this goal.

♦ **Moritani Property** (Acreage: 8.87; 2008 Assessed value: $1,380,480)
  Located at the west end of Winslow Way, this is one of the largest parcels remaining in the Winslow Study Area.

♦ **Shoreline Bluff Park** (Acreage: 1.0 acres proposed; part of Ferry Terminal parcel)
  Identified under Alternative Two of the draft Ferry/Gateway Urban Design Plan, “Shoreline Bluff Park” would be a one-acre park created on the lands immediately south of the current vehicle parking lot where cars queue up for loading onto the ferry to, “…provide residents and visitors a vantage point for views of Eagle Harbor, Puget Sound, and the City of Seattle skyline. This park could include a waterfront trail extension, benches, and picnic benches, and would serve as a recreational amenity to residents and visitors to the Ferry Study Area.”
♦ SW Corner of Knechtel and Ericksen (Acreage: 1.1; 2008 Assessed value: $925,420)
Presently on the market, two adjacent parcels totaling 1.1 acres are centrally located in
Winslow and large enough to provide any number of future parkland uses.

♦ Corner of Winslow Way and SR 305 (Acreage: 4.75; 2008 Assessed value: $2,134,500)
There are two parcels located amid the Winslow Ravine, the ferry maintenance yard,
Highway 305 and Winslow Way. The site of the old gas station is jointly owned by the City
and Kitsap Transit. The parcel to the south is owned by the state Department of
Transportation. Option 2 of the Ferry-Gateway EIS identifies these parcels as potential
parkland. These parcels could be developed into a wonderful green gateway into downtown
Winslow either along Winslow Way or through Waterfront Park. The Waterfront Trail
currently marks the southern edge of this potential park.

♦ Town & Country High School Road Property (Acreage: 3.8; 2008 Assessed value:
$1,942,010)
Owned by Town & Country, Inc., this piece borders High School Road on the north and the
Winslow Ravine on the south. While we assume that this property will be developed, it has
parkland potential is as a connection to a Winslow Ravine Trail, and perhaps some open
space or small active-use park. Town & Country also owns the land adjacent to Ace
Hardware and Key Bank, a total of approximately 9 contiguous acres.

♦ Waterfront Trail and other trail connections
The Waterfront Trail could be extended all the way from the Ferry Terminal to the
Strawberry Packing Plant open space land, by acquiring easements in several areas, and
developing access to the Terminal from the south side of the Ferry holding area. In addition,
other trail connections identified in the City’s Non-Motorized plan should be completed to
improve pedestrian and bicycle transportation in the Winslow Study Area.

♦ Winslow Co-Housing Common Area (Acreage: 0.98; 2008 Assessed Value: $0 - due to
easement granted in 2005)
Winslow Co-Housing owns this one-acre parcel located on the west side of Ericksen. The
Bainbridge Island Land Trust holds a conservation easement on the property. Within the
terms of the easement, this property could be developed as a passive neighborhood park.

♦ Winslow Ravine (Acreage: ~28.5 acres in 5 parcels - 3 owners - split by both Winslow Way
and Highway 305; 2008 Assessed value: $132,020)
Even though none of the plans above actually calls for public acquisition of the greenway,
most mention its importance, the need for protective management and for a trail to be built
along its east side. The ravine appears as a priority in the Winslow Master, Ferry Gateway,
and non-motorized plans. The ravine, which runs north from Eagle Harbor to High School
Road, is in relatively pristine condition. Due to the stream, steep slopes and critical areas set-
backs, it is unlikely that the ravine itself could be developed. If property or easements were
acquired, a pedestrian/bicycle path could be built on both sides of the ravine, from at least
Cave Avenue and Vineyard Lane to High School Road. The trail could be an out-and-back
route or a loop. If a pedestrian crosswalk, overpass or underpass were constructed on, over or
under SR 305, the trail could link to Ericksen Avenue and the greater downtown area.
XIV. TAKE IMMEDIATE ACTION TO ACHIEVE PARKS FOR PEOPLE IN WINSLOW

A. Acquire land for parks today – do not wait!
The Winslow Park Task Force recommends an immediate effort be made to acquire new parkland in the Winslow Study Area, particularly land that can be developed as larger neighborhood parks, mini-parks, and play areas. In addition, there is an opportunity to obtain easements from the few landowners along both sides of the Winslow Ravine to create a trail system through this lovely natural area.

The Winslow Park Task Force recommends immediate and widespread advertising of the need for downtown parkland. If citizens become aware of the present and long-term needs for parkland in order to safeguard the quality of life for our community, private individuals or organizations may partner with community leaders to provide parkland now and for the future.

B. Identify a minimum of $10 million in capital funds over the next two years to acquire land for parks in Winslow
An exact dollar amount for new parkland is impossible to determine without identifying specific parcels. However, the Task Force determined that the assessed value of several potentially suitable undeveloped/underdeveloped parcels within the WSA totaled close to $11 million. Therefore, the Task Force recommends identifying and dedicating a minimum of $10 million in capital funds over the next two years to acquire land for parks within the WSA.

C. Examine ways to finance and acquire parkland now for Winslow
The Task Force identified a number of monetary and policy/tax incentive approaches that other cities are using successfully to acquire parklands; two of the most compelling are a land-dedication standard for new development and a real estate excise tax; however, all of the following strategies have been useful to growing communities. (See Appendix C for details.)

1. Park financing options
   - Real estate excise tax
   - Conservation futures tax
   - General obligation bonds
   - Fee-in-lieu of dedication of parks and open space
   - Grants
   - Development rights program (would still need funding, e.g., bond measure)

2. Non-monetary options for park and open space acquisition
   - Adopt a land dedication standard (see "E" below.)
   - Parks and/or open space dedication requirement as part of subdivision
   - Density bonus or clustering for preservation of open space
   - Density transfer
   - Development agreements (not involving fee-in-lieu of dedication)
   - Transfer of development rights program
   - Less than fee simple purchase of development rights; conservation easements
   - King County four-to-one program
3. Current-use tax incentives to preserve land in open space

4. Park foundations that assist individuals and communities in preserving open space and current-use practices.

D. Survey citizen needs and desires
Citizen surveys have become the most widely used means of determining how much parkland is desirable for a given community. The last such survey on Bainbridge was done in 2000. It is time for another such survey, including one asking specific questions about the Winslow area. However, the Park Task Force is emphatic that designing and completing such a survey should not delay acquisition of new parkland in the Winslow area.

An advantage of such a survey, as shown in a Colorado example, is that it is possible to design “level of service” guidelines for parks that embrace both a community’s unique needs and the natural opportunities afforded by the land. Such guidelines, best developed through citizen surveys, could specify qualitative and quantitative levels of park service for the Winslow core area; the island’s “service centers” of Rolling Bay, Lynwood, and Island Center; and for the more rural areas.

Citizen input would lead to guidelines for Winslow, for example, that may call for a greater number of small playgrounds/parks than would be needed in less-developed areas of the island. It is also possible that an island-wide standard would emphasize the importance of having access to woodland and coastal trails to a higher degree than in mainland communities simply because there is so much opportunity and interest here in this type of park resource.

E. Adopt a land-dedication standard to create parks
The Winslow Park Task Force studied the Colorado land-dedication system and recommends it to the City of Bainbridge Island. Task Force members recommend that decision-makers adopt a land-dedication standard for the Winslow Study Area in order to ensure orderly, predictable benefits/costs for developers and parks for people in the Winslow area.

Land-dedication standards require that new development pay for or otherwise dedicate a specific number of acres per a specific number of new residents. A land-dedication standard provides certainty to both the public and to private developers about the benefits and costs of new development, and ensures the steady increase of parks commensurate with increase in population. Colorado’s standard of 14 acres per 1000 new residents may or may not be the appropriate ratio for Winslow and Bainbridge Island, but this provides a starting place to consider potential applications of this land planning tool on the island. (See Appendix B.) Analysis of the City of Bainbridge land-use policies was not within the scope of the Park Task Force study. However, the Task Force strongly recommends that City policy include mandatory measures to require that future development in the Winslow Study Area set aside and transfer open space and parkland to the City or Park District.

F. Preserve existing publicly accessible green space in Winslow
The Park District and City should preserve from development all publicly owned or accessible green space in Winslow, such as the Farmer’s Market and Winslow Green.
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APPENDIX B

Gap Analysis and Standards

Assessment of Winslow’s Present and Projected Park Needs

A. Gap analysis

To determine if there is a quantifiable gap between existing and needed parkland now and by 2025, the Winslow Park Task Force employed a “gap analysis”. Gap analysis is a common tool for evaluating and quantifying resource needs in many policy and natural resource disciplines. When a gap is identified, decision makers and resource managers can focus on bridging the gap through new policies and management strategies. In this case, a gap would indicate a deficit in a specific type or size of parkland within the overall Winslow Study Area, or deficit of parkland in a specific region of the overall area.

Some analysis criteria use specific quantitative formulas, while others employ more general qualitative approaches. For example, under some guidelines, the amount of parkland currently needed is determined by comparing the ratio of existing park acreage per 1,000 people to the community’s desired park acreage per 1,000 residents. The gap between the two ratios – what they have vs. what they want – is the amount of total parkland currently needed. If the community’s population is projected to grow, additional land would have to be obtained to maintain the desired ratio of park acreage per 1,000 population.

To perform its gap analysis, the Winslow Park Task Force used three different criteria, general to specific:

- National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) Level of Service guidelines
- State of Washington Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation Outdoor Active Recreation Level of Service draft, and
- State of Colorado’s Small Community Park & Recreation Planning Standards

B. National Recreation and Park Association guidelines

1. Background of guidelines

The National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) is both a trade association and advocacy group dedicated to the advancement of "parks, recreation and environmental conservation efforts that enhance the quality of life for all people". Established in its current form in 1965 through a merger of several similar associations, NRPA combines the concerns of two prominent 19th century civic movements: the "recreation" movement focused on providing safe playgrounds, especially in urban areas; and the "parks" movement that initially focused on preserving pristine wilderness areas.
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Starting in 1934, the precursors of NRPA created guidelines for "Level of Service" that became the foundation of park planning for many municipalities across the country. The guiding document is the NRPA "yellow book": *Recreation, Park, and Open Space Standards and Guidelines* (1983). Under this system, the Level of Service is expressed by quantifying and correlating park types, acreage compared to population, and travel distance for park users. Using these standards, park systems are evaluated based on idealized levels of service for various categories of park type. The list of NRPA guidelines follows this section.

2. **Guidelines Applied to Winslow’s Park Assets in 2007**

   Under NRPA’s quantitative guidelines in the yellow book, the Winslow Study Area may currently have adequate amounts of Mini-parks or only a slight deficit of up to 1.1 acres. Likewise, Neighborhood Park/Playground acreage is currently in excess of the quantity recommended by NRPA. However, in the category of Community Park, Winslow has either a moderate surplus or a significant deficit of up to 13 acres. (See Chart 1 - *Recreation and Open Space Standards Suggested by the National Recreation and Park Association*; and Chart 2 – *Recreation and Open Space Standards Suggested by the National Recreation and Park Association (not including Harbor Square).*

   This wide range indicates the difficulty of applying NRPA standards to parks of varying size and use.

   Chart 1 shows the quantity of parkland including the 1-acre park at Harbor Square condominiums. Because the Park District doesn’t count land it doesn’t own and maintain, the task force also calculated the quantity without Harbor Square (Chart 2). There is little significant impact on the aggregate amount of parkland except for the "Mini-park" category.

   The task force also reviewed aerial maps of the Winslow Study Area to see whether residents have access to different types of park within NRPA-defined distances of their homes. The task force found that while large parts of Winslow are well served by Mini-parks or Community Parks, certain areas – most notably on the east side – were underserved using NRPA standards.

3. **Guidelines applied to Winslow’s park assets in 2025**

   Applying NRPA’s guidelines to the projected population in the 2025 Report, Winslow will be seriously deficient in Mini-park and Community Park acreage if no further parkland is created. Neighborhood Park/Playground acreage may be either in a modest surplus or a mild deficit.

   The Winslow Park Task Force questioned the applicability of NRPA standards in communities with varied development patterns, but agreed on the importance of citizen surveys to understand community desires for parks. For example, do residents with large yards on Winslow’s east side want more Tot-lots or access to Neighborhood Parks, or are they content with the amount of recreation locally available given that some homes have small playgrounds that take the place of public Mini-parks? Do residents of more intensively developed downtown Winslow have a higher demand for Mini-parks or courtyard parks because they lack individual yards? Are the two sides of Winslow sufficiently different from each other to require different park planning? Certainly a citizen survey will be crucial to understanding the true desire for different types of parkland in different parts of Winslow.
Reading through NRPA’s definitions of park types and comparing the quantitative analysis will no doubt lead many readers to conclude – as task force members did – that it’s hard to apply a one-size-fits-all standard to any community because conditions and expectations vary so widely. Also, the definitions for NPRA park categories are nebulous: What’s the real difference in size between a Community Park and a Neighborhood Park? Can Mini-parks be larger than 1 acre or Community Parks smaller than 25 acres?

NRPA itself came to the realization a few years ago that while a clear standard with easily quantifiable measures is useful, broader guidelines are also needed because each community has unique desires, values and physical conditions. So in 1995 NRPA published *Park, Recreation, Open Space, and Greenway Guidelines*, which moved away from specific universal standards, and instead provides an approach for inventorizing existing parks and facilities. The Washington State and Colorado State guidelines in the next sections are examples of the new approach.

Furthermore, innovative level-of-service (LOS) measurement tools have evolved with greater emphasis on specific park components and how the components are inter-related to successfully serve their community. As one example, since 2001 a revised methodology called “composite-values LOS analysis” has been employed across the country. This method establishes a ranking of park system components plotted on a map (see below for potential components).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Components for Parks, Recreation and Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Passive lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor pools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open turf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife habitat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using this method, the area served by selected park components is demonstrated on the map by a shaded area. When the ranking has been done for all components, the result is a composite showing the cumulative LOS at any location. Lighter shading indicates locations with lower cumulative levels of service. Darker shades exist where higher values are present, including, for example, areas served by multiple components and the places where shaded areas overlap.

Once a thorough, reliable perspective has been gained, it can be analyzed in a number of ways. Because the shades on the map represent numerical values, it is possible to determine such measures as “average” LOS values for an entire area or any number of sub-areas. Target values for LOS also can be assigned, and the geography can be analyzed to determine the percentage of an area or its population that falls above or below the target values.
The following steps are suggested to complete a reliable composite-values LOS analysis:

a. Identify the key components of the system being studied. It is important to discern which components are most relevant at any given time.

b. Identify the location of those components being analyzed. Using GIS, locate the relevant components for digital mapping purposes.

c. Identify a quality-ranking scale and assess the status of each component. (For example, a 1-3 scale, with "1" being below expectations, "2" indicating that the component can meet its intended function for a given time period, and "3" meaning that it exceeds expectations.)

d. Look at other attributes and factors that influence how service is provided by components such as ownership, walkability, barriers, service areas, things that add to the service (restrooms, parking, etc.) – and score and weigh those factors.

e. Incorporate the total scoring into a database that can convert the data into comparison charts and directly to GIS computer analysis. The result is a dynamic, usable, easily interpreted graphic depiction of the system that can be used to create standards for future facilities, capital improvements, and management and maintenance plans.¹

For the limited purposes of the Task Force’s mandate, this detailed analysis was not possible, although it may be beneficial for the Park and Recreation District to employ this method in the future. In addition, The Winslow Park Task Force agreed that NRPA’s guidelines to survey citizens would be important in Winslow.

B. State of Washington guidelines

1. Background of guidelines
Until 2005, Washington State relied on NRPA’s quantitative approach, as described in Level of Service Standards: Measures for Maintaining the Quality of Community Life, Report No. 31. Municipal Research and Services Center of Washington (1994).²

In 2005, the Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development’s Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (Interagency Committee) released an updated guideline entitled, Planning for Parks, Recreation, and Open Space in Your Community.³ This document does include a version of the NRPA’s quantitative approach but its overall approach reflects NRPA’s 1995 emphasis on inventorying parks and surveying citizens.

¹ "Replacing Conventional Park Level of Service (LOS) Analysis with the ‘Composite Values’ Approach", by Teresa Penbrooke, as cited on http://www.planning.org/practicingplanner/print/07fall/values.htm on September 23, 2007, 5:26 pm.


The state’s guideline presents clear steps for planning parks, and recreation and open space, including:

- Overall goals and planning framework
- Community visioning and ongoing citizen participation
- Existing conditions, trends, and resources; problems and opportunities
- Priorities to guide parks, recreation, and open space measures
- Support of local groups, jurisdictions, and departments
- Demand for parks/open space/recreation
- Site selection criteria/priorities based on community goals
- Adoption of preferred alternative
- Tools to implement strategy
- Implementation and public outreach

In 2006, the Washington State Legislature requested development of a statewide method to identify levels of service for local and regional outdoor active recreation facilities, in order to give communities a consistent means of quantifying needs and to help legislators and agencies prioritize state funding.

In 2007, the Interagency Committee released a draft of *Outdoor Active Recreation Level of Service*, which proposes a more generalized approach to evaluating parkland through a rating of 1 (highest) and 5 (lowest) in three broad categories and numerous subcategories. Like the NRPA, the state includes the expectation that certain types of parkland will be available within prescribed distances of residences. But, unlike the NRPA, Washington’s draft also factors in park facility programming and maintenance. (See Chart 3 – *Outdoor Active Recreation Level of Service.*) Because the document is still a work in progress, many details are not yet included, such as definitions for categories of parkland.

The Winslow Park Task Force made educated guesses about the details of state’s rating system and evaluated the Winslow Study Area’s parkland based on the draft document’s approach.

2. Washington state guidelines applied to Winslow’s park assets in 2007

Based on admittedly imprecise guesswork, under the Washington State’s draft guidelines Winslow would currently achieve an overall high rating with an average of 1.9 where 1 is highest and 5 is lowest. (See Chart 4 – *Outdoor Active Recreation Level of Service – Applied to Winslow Study Area.*) The lowest rating was a 3 in the category prescribing a Neighborhood Park within 1/4 mile of each resident. The task force assumed that this category would include small parks and playgrounds. Once again, Winslow’s east side suffered in this category, just as under the NRPA standards. A survey is needed to determine demand for various park types. Or, as suggested in the NRPA section above, perhaps the east and west sides of Winslow are sufficiently different as to warrant separate park plans.

3. Washington state guidelines applied to Winslow’s park assets in 2025

If no more parkland were acquired between 2007 and 2025, the Winslow Study Area would probably still achieve medium to high ratings under the Washington State’s draft guidelines.
C. State of Colorado guidelines

1. Background of guidelines
The State of Colorado’s *Small Community Park & Recreation Planning Standards* (2003) provides parks and recreation planning standards specifically for small communities of 10,000 in population or less. The Winslow Task Force reviewed these guidelines because Colorado’s approach differs in some ways from the NRPA and Washington State approaches discussed above, and because Winslow’s population is estimated to reach 10,000 or beyond by 2025.

The core of the Colorado approach studies what types of parks are desirable in what quantities, and how each park serves small community populations. In a significant departure from NRPA standards, Colorado’s guidelines analyze demand for facility types based on actual use rather than acreage by park type (which may be unrelated to actual community use or desire).

The following table presents a land acreage requirement per 1000 residents for five recreation categories under Colorado’s methodology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Category</th>
<th>Acres required per 1000 residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports Fields</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>soccer</em>, multi/use, baseball/softball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>tennis</em>, basketball, volleyball</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreation</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>skatepark, BMX, paved &amp; dirt trails, fishing access, river put-ins</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>playgrounds, picnic, general park land</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Recreational Facilities</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>swimming pool, hockey, outdoor events venue</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The facility categories reflect the types of recreation that exist in small Colorado communities as expressed through a citizen survey and other data-collection methods. The standard appears to emphasize outdoor sports, such as skate parks, BMX, trails, fishing, etc., to a greater degree than either NRPA or Washington state standards.

The Colorado guidelines also suggest that communities consider a “land dedication standard” of 14 acres per 1000 residents for future community park planning, as well as a standard for all new development, i.e., for each 1,000 new residents generated by a development 14 acres should be dedicated to parkland.

---

2. **Guidelines applied to Winslow’s park assets in 2007**
Under Colorado's guidelines, Winslow currently has small deficits in the categories of Courts, and Other Recreational Facilities. The Outdoor Recreation Category has a large 6.2-acre deficit.

The Winslow Park Task Force recognized that a Bainbridge-specific list of desired park and recreation facilities would no doubt reflect categories and acreage requirements different from those in the Colorado chart above. To be truly meaningful, any standard should be tailored to the unique conditions, values, and goals of the community.

3. **Guidelines applied to Winslow’s park assets in 2025**
Applying Colorado State’s guidelines to the projected population in the 2025 Report, Winslow will need more than 40 additional acres of parkland. If no new parks were created, Winslow would have small-to-serious deficits in all categories except Leisure, which would show a modest surplus of up to 1.8 acres. (See Chart 5 – *The State of Colorado’s Small Community Park & Recreation Planning Standards (2003).*

However, because the Winslow Study Area is largely built-out and is located near other park and recreation assets, the 14 acres-per-1000-residents may be too high a ratio. Whatever the final formula, a land-dedication standard for Winslow would provide certainty to both the public and to private developers about the benefits and costs of new development projects. A land-dedication standard would also ensure the steady increase of parkland commensurate with increase of population.
Recreation and Open Space Standards Suggested by the National Recreation and Park Association

Includes Harbor Square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Type</th>
<th>Ac/1000 pop</th>
<th>Svc. Area</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minipark</td>
<td>.25 - .5</td>
<td>&lt; .25 mile</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood park/ playground</td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>0.25 - 0.5 mile</td>
<td>15+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community park</td>
<td>5 - 8</td>
<td>1 - 2 miles</td>
<td>25+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Gap in Acres 2005</th>
<th>Gap in Acres 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madison Tot Lot</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>Minipark</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Tot Lot</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>Minipark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windrow Green</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>Minipark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nelson</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>Minipark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Square</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minipark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clisdon</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strawberry Plant</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIHS, Ordway, Commodore fields</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeomalt Cabin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPA/City Hall</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>Special Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawley Cove</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Linear Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NPRA's General Standards: In general, 6.25 to 10.5 acres of open space per 1000 population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area Population</th>
<th>Gap in Acres 2005</th>
<th>Gap in Acres 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1 Future Park
2 Privately owned, public access
### CHART 2

**Recreation and Open Space Standards Suggested by the National Recreation and Park Association**

*Does NOT include Harbor Square*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Type</th>
<th>Ac/1000 pop.</th>
<th>Svc. Area</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mini park</td>
<td>25 - 5</td>
<td>&lt; 0.25 mile</td>
<td>0.1 - 1</td>
<td>Mini park</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2005: 5.746 *&lt;br&gt;2025: 9.156 + 3.450 growth (from: <a href="http://www.ci.beaverton.or.us/documents/PCCU_PCU_2025_Report_AppA.pdf">http://www.ci.beaverton.or.us/documents/PCCU_PCU_2025_Report_AppA.pdf</a>) * Steve Morse estimated that population had grown to 8,232 in 2007 + 3,450 = 9,682 in 2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood park/</td>
<td>1 - 2</td>
<td>0.25 - 0.5 mile</td>
<td>15+</td>
<td>Mini park</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2005: 5.746 &lt;br&gt;2025: 9.156 &lt;br&gt;Sub-Total: 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gap in Acres 2005: 8.3 or (1.1) &lt;br&gt;Gap in Acres 2025: 2.3 or (0.6) or (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community park</td>
<td>5 - 8</td>
<td>1 - 2 miles</td>
<td>25+</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2005: 5.746 &lt;br&gt;2025: 9.168 &lt;br&gt;Sub-Total: 10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gap in Acres 2005: 5.2 or (0.9) &lt;br&gt;Gap in Acres 2025: 9.2 or (1.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gap in Acres**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Gap in Acres 2005</th>
<th>Gap in Acres 2025</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madison Tot Lot</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Tot Lot</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winslow Green</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nelson</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strawberry Plant</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS, Ordway,</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodore Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeomalt Cabin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FPAC City Hall</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawley Cove</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NPRA’s General Standards: (parkland aggregated)**

*In general, 6.25 to 10.5 acres of open space per 1000 population*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area Population</th>
<th>Gap in Acres</th>
<th>Gap in Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2005) 5.746 / 1000</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2005) 9.156 / 8ac/1000</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2025) 9.682 / 8ac/1000</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2025) 9.682 / 10.5ac/1000</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>(36.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Future Park
2. Privately owned, public access

---

*N/A: Not Applicable<br>
Not incl. parking*
outdoor active recreation level of service

implementation possibilities

Given the preliminary nature of the outdoor active LOS guidelines, it is proposed that the State encourage communities to use the guidelines for a test period. The following implementation strategy is proposed:

1. Encourage and/or assist several communities in the state in using the preliminary LOS guidelines (Year 1).
2. Revise the preliminary LOS guidelines based on Year 1 implementation.
3. Encourage and/or assist several communities (different from the Year 1 communities) in the state in using the revised preliminary LOS guidelines (Year 2).
4. Complete additional revisions, if needed, to the preliminary LOS guidelines based on Year 2 implementation.
5. Starting in Year 3, encourage all communities in the state to adopt the preliminary LOS guidelines.
6. Periodically revisit the preliminary LOS guidelines and make revisions, if needed. Also, consider mandating the preliminary LOS guidelines in the future based on their implementation success.

At the community level, the preliminary LOS guidelines could be used as:

• Justification for the need for a specific type of facility (e.g., when applying for a grant).
• Goals and objectives for the recreation and open space portions of a comprehensive plan.
• Evaluation criteria (or performance indicators) to periodically assess whether or not the existing supply of park and recreation facilities meets stated needs.

Taken as a whole, the full suite of LOS guidelines may be used to evaluate the overall performance of a park system.

context

The preliminary statewide LOS guidelines for outdoor active park and recreation facilities are an important first step in consistently identifying, quantifying, and meeting the need for outdoor active park and recreation facilities. Based on future implementation (and appropriate testing), the preliminary guidelines may be expanded to include other types of facilities, as well as facilities that are managed by State and Federal agencies.

introduction

In 2008, the Washington State Legislature requested development of a statewide method for identifying levels of service (LOS) for local and regional outdoor active recreation facilities. The ultimate goal of establishing a statewide method for outdoor active LOS is to help prioritize State funding for outdoor active park and recreation facilities, as well as to provide a consistent methodology that communities may use to quantify needs.

testing & development process

The overall steps used to develop preliminary statewide LOS guidelines for active park and recreation facilities include:

1. Defining Key Terms and Project Limitations
2. Developing Potential LOS Options (sets of guidelines)
3. Testing Seven Potential LOS Options on Six Washington Communities
4. Conducting Public Workshops to Elicit Feedback on Potential LOS Options
5. Synthesizing Results

The preliminary approach detailed in this report is the culmination of this process and takes into consideration testing that was performed and public feedback received at workshops around the state in December 2006. Suggested implementation possibilities are presented on Page 4.

preliminary approach

The preliminary statewide approach to LOS for outdoor active park and recreation facilities is comprised of sets of guidelines. This multiple guideline approach reflects the public sentiment (as voiced at the public workshops) that one indicator of need is not enough to adequately capture the complex nature of determining and providing for recreation facility needs in different communities.
## Preliminary Approach: Outdoor Active Recreation Level of Service

### Baseline: Demand-based LOS Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>LOS Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Outdoor Activity Participation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% of population participates in one or more outdoor activities</td>
<td>30% of population participates in one or more outdoor activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Capacity Activity-Specific Participation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing facilities meet 90% of activity-specific demand</td>
<td>Existing facilities meet 75% of activity-specific demand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Enhancement: Service Area/Population-based Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks/Trails</td>
<td>≥ 80% of population within two park and/or trail type service areas</td>
<td>65% of population within two park and/or trail type service areas</td>
<td>50% of population within two park and/or trail type service areas</td>
<td>35% of population within two park and/or trail type service areas</td>
<td>≤ 20% of population within two park and/or trail type service areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Park/Trail</td>
<td>≥ 90% of population within 1/2 mile of a neighborhood park/trail</td>
<td>75% of population within 1/2 mile of a neighborhood park/trail</td>
<td>60% of population within 1/2 mile of a neighborhood park/trail</td>
<td>45% of population within 1/2 mile of a neighborhood park/trail</td>
<td>≤ 30% of population within 1/2 mile of a neighborhood park/trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Park/Trail</td>
<td>≥ 90% of population within 3 miles of a community park/trail</td>
<td>75% of population within 3 miles of a community park/trail</td>
<td>60% of population within 3 miles of a community park/trail</td>
<td>45% of population within 3 miles of a community park/trail</td>
<td>≤ 30% of population within 3 miles of a community park/trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Park/Trail</td>
<td>≥ 90% of population within 25 miles of a regional park/trail</td>
<td>75% of population within 25 miles of a regional park/trail</td>
<td>60% of population within 25 miles of a regional park/trail</td>
<td>45% of population within 25 miles of a regional park/trail</td>
<td>≤ 30% of population within 25 miles of a regional park/trail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### In-depth Enhancement: Function-based Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency-based Assessment</td>
<td>100% of facilities are fully functional per their specific design and safety guidelines (based on manager assessment)</td>
<td>80% of facilities are fully functional per their specific design and safety guidelines</td>
<td>60% of facilities are fully functional per their specific design and safety guidelines</td>
<td>40% of facilities are fully functional per their specific design and safety guidelines</td>
<td>≤ 20% of facilities are fully functional per their specific design and safety guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based Assessment</td>
<td>≥ 90% of population satisfied with the condition (including facility condition, cleanliness, etc.) of existing outdoor parks and recreation facilities</td>
<td>75% of population satisfied with the condition of existing outdoor parks and recreation facilities</td>
<td>60% of population satisfied with the condition of existing outdoor parks and recreation facilities</td>
<td>45% of population satisfied with the condition of existing outdoor parks and recreation facilities</td>
<td>≤ 30% of population satisfied with the condition of existing outdoor parks and recreation facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>On average, routine operations and maintenance funded at 100% of annual need (does not include major capital development)</td>
<td>On average, routine operations and maintenance funded at 80% of annual need</td>
<td>On average, routine operations and maintenance funded at 60% of annual need</td>
<td>On average, routine operations and maintenance funded at 40% of annual need</td>
<td>On average, routine operations and maintenance funded at 20% of annual need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>100% of facilities may be accessed safely via foot, bicycle, or public transportation</td>
<td>Up to 80% of facilities may be accessed safely via foot, bicycle, or public transportation</td>
<td>Up to 60% of facilities may be accessed safely via foot, bicycle, or public transportation</td>
<td>Up to 40% of facilities may be accessed safely via foot, bicycle, or public transportation</td>
<td>Up to 20% of facilities may be accessed safely via foot, bicycle, or public transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHART 4</td>
<td>WA State Outdoor Active Recreation Level of Service [Draft]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WA State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development's Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BASELINE: Demand-based LOS Guidelines

| Overall Outdoor Activity Participation: ≥ 60% of population participates in one or more outdoor activities | 1 |
| Facility Capacity Activity-Specific Participation: Existing facilities meet 60% of activity-specific demand | 3 |

### ENHANCEMENT: Service Area/Population-based Guidelines

| Overall Goal: ≥ 80% of population within two park and/or trail type (e.g., neighborhood park and community park, neighborhood park and community trail, etc.) service areas | 1 |
| Neighborhood Park: ≥ 60% of population within 1/4 mile of a neighborhood park/trail | 3 |
| Madison Tot Lot | Madison Tot Lot |
| Aaron Tot Lot | Aaron Tot Lot |
| John Nelson | John Nelson |
| Harbor Square | Harbor Square |
| Gideon | Gideon |
| Winslow Green | Winslow Green |
| Strawberry Plant | Strawberry Plant |
| Community park: ≥ 90% of population within 3 miles of a community park/trail | 1 |
| Rotary | Rotary |
| Waterfront Park | Waterfront Park |
| BIHS, Ordway, Commodore Fields | BIHS, Ordway, Commodore Fields |
| BPA/City Hall | BPA/City Hall |
| Yerantis Cabin | Yerantis Cabin |
| Aquatic Center | Aquatic Center |
| Hawley Cove | Hawley Cove |
| Regional/Metropolitan Park: ≥ 90% of population within 25 miles of a regional park/trail | 1 |

### IN-DEPTH ENHANCEMENT: Function-based Guidelines

| Agency-based Assessment: 80% of facilities are fully functional per their specific design and safety guidelines | 2 |
| Community-based Assessment: 75% of population satisfied with the condition of existing outdoor parks and recreation facilities | 2 |
| Operations and Maintenance: On average, routine operations and maintenance funded at 80% of annual need | 2 |
| Access: Up to 60% of facilities may be accessed safely via foot, bicycle, or public transportation | 3 |

1 Future Park
2 Privately owned, public access

Notes/Disclaimers:
1) The draft document does not yet have language for definitions of "neighborhood" and "community" parks. What appears is a guess.
2) WA State combines parks and trails as a single standard.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Category</th>
<th>Total acres required per 1000 Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports Fields (soccer, multiuse, baseball/softball)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts (tennis, basketball, volleyball)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreation (skatepark, BMX, paved &amp; dirt trails, fishing access, river put-ins)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure (playgrounds, picnic, general park land)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Recreational Facilities (swimming pool, hockey, outdoor events venue)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Category</th>
<th>Total acres per facility</th>
<th>CO State standards - total acres required per 1000 Residents</th>
<th>2005 - current acres per 1,000 pop. (5,746 pop.)</th>
<th>surplus or deficit</th>
<th>2025 - current acres per 1,000 pop. (projected 9,842)</th>
<th>surplus or deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports Fields (soccer, multiuse, baseball/softball)</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>BSCH, Ordway, Commodore fields</td>
<td>6.1 or 1.7 acres surplus</td>
<td>3.6 or (0.8) acres deficit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acreage subtotal</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts (tennis, basketball, volleyball)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2 courts at Waterfront Park</td>
<td>0.2 or (0.1) acres deficit</td>
<td>0.1 or (0.2) acres deficit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 courts at BSCH</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acreage subtotal</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Recreation (skatepark, BMX, paved &amp; dirt trails, fishing access, river put-ins)</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Hewey Cove</td>
<td>2.3 or (0.2) acres deficit</td>
<td>1.3 or (0.7) acres deficit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeomalt Cabin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acreage subtotal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure (playgrounds, picnic, general park land)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>Madison Tot Lot</td>
<td>3.0 or 2.2 acres surplus</td>
<td>1.8 or 1.0 acres surplus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron Tot Lot</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Nelson</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harbor Square</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strawberry Plant</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Park</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wislow Green</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acreage subtotal</td>
<td>17.34</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Recreational Facilities (swimming pool, hockey, outdoor events venue)</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Aquatic Center</td>
<td>0.2 or (1.3) acres deficit</td>
<td>0.1 or (1.4) acres deficit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acreage subtotal</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHART 5, page 2

Notes:

1) These standards are for a small community, meaning any jurisdiction with roughly 10,000 residents or less.

2) General Park Land Planning & Dedication Standard: 14 acres per 1000 residents

3) Measures usage / demand.

4) Includes sample survey.

5) Calculates a Park Land Standard (total acres required per 1000 Residents by facility) based on:
   Facility Types, Demand (Number of Facilities Needed per 1000 Residents), Acres required to accommodate 1 facility

6) Includes sample calculation to determine desired land dedication from subdivision requests and annexation proposals:
   Number of Units Proposed In Subdivision X 2.5 = Projected Population
   (Projected Population / 1000) * 14 = Land Dedication Requirement
APPENDIX C

Means of Financing/Acquiring Open Space and Parkland

A. Impact fees
Impact fees are charges assessed against newly developing property that attempt to recover the cost incurred by a local government in providing the public facilities required to serve the new development. For counties and cities planning under the Growth Management Act, impact fees are specifically authorized under RCW 82.02.090(7) only for: "(1) public streets and roads; (2) publically owned parks, open space, and recreation facilities; (3) school facilities; and (4) fire protection facilities in jurisdictions that are not part of a fire district." (emphasis added) Typically, if impact fees are imposed, these take the place of a fee-in-lieu program (see below). Impact fees are also authorized under SEPA. The Washington State Environmental Policy Act, Ch.43.21C RCW grants broad authority to impose mitigating conditions relating to a project's environmental impacts. Some cities have interpreted SEPA's authority to mitigate environmental impacts to include authority to impose impact fees. A municipality pursuing this course must establish a proper foundation. Local SEPA policies authorizing the exercise of SEPA substantive authority must be adopted and fees imposed must be rationally related to impacts identified in threshold determination documents (primarily environmental checklists) or environmental impact statements. Fees collected under SEPA may not duplicate fees collected under other sources of authority. Also see the MRSC Web page on Impact Fees. <http://www.mrsc.org/subjects/planning/impactpg.aspx>

B. Real estate excise tax
A real estate excise tax (REET) is levied on all real estate sales measured by the full selling price, including the amount of any liens, mortgages, and other debts given to secure the purchase. (See Ch. 82.46 RCW. Also see the discussion of the "Real Estate Excise Tax," in A Revenue Guide for Washington Counties <http://www.mrsc.org/Publications/textcntyrev.aspx#realestatetax>.

- First Quarter Percent Real Estate Excise Tax (REET 1). These funds can only be used for capital projects identified in the capital facilities plan element of a comprehensive plan and housing relocation assistance in GMA counties and counties with a population greater than 5,000.
- Second Quarter Percent Additional Real Estate Excise Tax (REET 2). The legislative authority of any GMA county may impose an additional excise tax on each sale of real property at a rate not exceeding 0.25 percent of the selling price. These revenues are also restricted to capital projects identified in a capital facilities plan.
• One Half Percent Real Estate Excise Tax in lieu of Optional Sales Tax. This may be used for any governmental purpose and can only be levied in unincorporated areas.
• One Percent Real Estate Excise Tax for Conservation Areas. A county legislative authority may submit a ballot proposition to the voters for an additional real estate excise tax on each sale of real property in the county at a rate not to exceed 1 percent of the selling price (see RCW 82.46.070). The revenue is restricted to the acquisition and maintenance of conservation areas. Only San Juan County has authorized the one percent REET for conservation areas.

C. Conservation futures tax
See RCW 84.34.200 - 84.34.250
<http://www.mrsc.org/mc/rcw/RCW%20%2084%20%20TITLE/RCW%20%2084%20%2034%20%20CHAPTER/RCW%20%2084%20%2034%20%20chapter.htm>. This levy money may be used solely for the purpose of acquiring rights and interests (such as easements) in real property. Counties that have adopted this tax levy include Clark, Ferry, Island, Jefferson, King, Kitsap, Pierce, San Juan, Skagit, Snohomish, Spokane, Thurston, and Whatcom.

D. Open space bond
These would be general obligation bonds, either limited tax general obligation – also called councilmanic bonds – which may be issued by a vote of the county commissioners or unlimited general obligation bonds, which must be approved by 60 percent of the voters, with a voter turnout that is at least 40 percent of those voting in the most recent general election. The county would need to hire a bond counsel if the county decides to issue bonds. If the county decided to authorize the one-percent real estate excise tax for conservation areas, the county would probably want to issue councilmanic bonds, pledging the tax receipts for debt service. It would also have to pledge to use general fund monies as a backup, in case the real estate excise tax receipts were insufficient. For more information, the state of Washington’s Municipal Research and Services Center’s (MRSC) public finance consultant, Judy Cox.

E. Fee-in-lieu of parks and open space
This option must be voluntary and is authorized in RCW 82.02.020
<http://www.mrsc.org/mc/rcw/RCW%20%2082%20%20TITLE/RCW%20%2082%20%2002%20%20CHAPTER/RCW%20%2082%20%2002%20%2002.htm>. In Washington, local governments have two basic sources of authority for requiring developers to dedicate land for parks: Ch. 58.17 RCW
<http://www.mrsc.org/mc/rcw/RCW%20%2058%20%20TITLE/RCW%20%2058%20%2017%20%20CHAPTER/RCW%20%2058%20%2017%20%20chapter.htm>, the State Subdivision Law, and Ch. 43.21C RCW
<http://www.mrsc.org/mc/rcw/RCW%20%2043%20%20TITLE/RCW%20%2043%20%2021C%20%20CHAPTER/RCW%20%2043%20%2021C%20%20chapter.htm>, the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). Under the state subdivision law, cities and towns can insure that developers install appropriate improvements, including parks, recreation, and playground improvements, through their power to approve or disapprove proposed subdivisions. When the dedication of land is not practical or feasible, some cities and counties have provided for the collection of fees from developers in lieu of land dedications pursuant to "voluntary agreements" adopted under RCW 82.02.020
Under RCW 82.02.020, a county or city may enter into a voluntary agreement with a subdivision developer to allow a payment in lieu of a dedication of land or to mitigate any direct impacts that have been identified as a consequence of the proposed development or subdivision. The permitting agency must be able to establish that an impact fee collected pursuant to a voluntary agreement is "reasonably necessary as a direct result of the proposed development or plat." Funds collected under voluntary agreements must be held in a reserve account and expended on agreed upon capital improvements. Fees must also be expended within five years or be refunded with interest. Court decisions, such as *Vintage Construction Company, Inc. v. City of Bothell*<http://www.mrsc.org/mc/courts/appellate/083wnapp/083wnapp0605.htm>, 83 Wn. App. 605 (1996), have required cities to demonstrate that the fee be related to the value of the land that might otherwise be dedicated.

You may also be interested in the Washington Supreme Court decision, *Isla Verde v. Camas*, 146 Wn.2d (7/11/02) (majority opinion<http://www.mrsc.org/mc/courts/slip/supreme/694753MAJ.htm>) (dissenting opinions<http://www.mrsc.org/mc/courts/slip/supreme/694753IP1.htm>). This decision addresses the nexus between an open space requirement for a subdivision and the impacts of a particular development.

F. Grants

See these two links for potential grants for acquisition of parkland and open space:

- State of Washington's Infrastructure Database<http://www.infrafunding.wa.gov/>. You can use the database to find potential grant funding resources for park acquisition.

G. Purchase of development rights

Many purchase-of-development-rights programs (as well as transfer of development rights programs) have been used to preserve farmlands. Bainbridge Island and San Juan County have developed programs to purchase open space, which may include environmentally critical areas such as wetlands. A funding source, such as a bond issue, would need to be identified for a purchase of development rights program.

H. Park or open space dedication requirement

The dedication of land for parks or open space is a typical requirement of subdivisions, as noted above under "Fee in-lieu-of parks." King County requires open space for residential developments of more than four lots, and Sultan requires open space for more than 10 lots.
I. Density bonus and clustering
A density bonus allows the granting of additional dwelling units or floor area beyond the maximum allowed under the zoning in exchange for preserving an amenity at the same or a separate site. Density bonuses are used for many purposes including the preservation of open space and protection of critical areas as well as to promote affordable housing. Density bonuses are built into planned unit development, planned residential development, and cluster subdivision provisions. Cluster provisions in rural areas may focus on conserving resource lands and promoting larger open space areas consistent with rural character.

J. Density transfer
Density transfer involves the transfer of all or part of the permitted density on a parcel to another parcel. Density transfer is also used to protect critical areas and preserve sensitive areas in a natural state.

K. Development agreements
Developers may also enter into other agreements with cities that do not involve the payment of money in lieu of open space. Such SEPA mitigation agreements might include deferral of subdivision improvements and possibly involve future dedication of land. MRSC legal consultants have advised that these voluntary agreements are not subject to the five-year limitation in RCW 82.02.020

K. Conservation easements
A conservation easement is a legal agreement between a landowner and a land trust or government agency that permanently limits uses of the land in order to protect its conservation values, typically preserving the land as open space or resource land. Conservation easements may be acquired through a purchase or transfer of development rights program or donated on a voluntary basis to a land trust or government agency.

M. Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Program
TDR involves the removal of the right to develop from land in one area or zoning district and the transfer of that right to land in another area or district, where development is permitted. This is somewhat similar to the density transfer (which is usually limited to a specific adjacent site or development project), although typically TDR involves transferring development rights to other sites (receiving sites), which are sometimes distant from the sending site. TDR programs are commonly used to preserve agricultural lands but may also apply to open space preservation, historic sites, and affordable housing. King County, Spokane County, Bainbridge Island, and Redmond have TDR programs.

N. King County four-to-one program
King County's four-to-one greenway is an innovative program that allows, via a development agreement, the development of one acre of land as urban for every four acres donated as open space. For further information, contact Kim Claussen, King County Department of Development and Environmental Services, 206-296-7167 or E-mail: Kimberly.Claussen@metrokc.gov.
O. Current Use Assessment - Open Space
The Washington Open Space Taxation Act (Ch. 84.34 RCW <http://www.mrsc.org/mc/rcw/RCW%20%2084%20%2084%20%20%2034%20%20CHAPTER/RCW%20%2084%20%2084%20%2034%20%20chapter.htm>) allows property owners to have their open space, farm and agricultural, and timber lands valued at their current use rather than at their highest and best use. The current use assessment program helps to preserve private land in open space, farm and timber use.

P. Additional web resources:
- Urban Parks Online - Funding <http://www.pps.org/topics/funding/>
- Trust for Public Land - Examples of local park funding <http://tpl.org/tier3_cdl.cfm?content_item_id=1072>&amp;folder_id=825>

Also, the following items are available on loan from the MRSC library <http://www.mrsc.org/library/loanrqst.aspx>:
- Protecting Open Space: A Review of Successful Programs and Landowner Perspectives, Portland (OR) Metro, 1999
- "An Open Space Framework for Pend Oreille County," by Lee Nellis for Pend Oreille County, 1995
- Growing Greener: Putting Conservation into Local Plans and Ordinances, by Randall G. Arendt, Island Press, 1999 (see pp. 48 - 49 regarding density bonuses)
- "Parks & Recreation: One way to pay for the places we play," by Nancy Gladwell and James Sellers, American City & County, October 1997
- "Funding Plan," from Edmonds Parks, Recreation and Open Space Comprehensive Plan, 2001
- "Park Funding and Land Acquisition," from City of Puyallup, Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan, 2002
• "Appendix B, Funding Strategies," from Kirkland, Comprehensive Park, Open Space, and Recreation Plan, 2001
• Open Ground: Effective Local Strategies for Protecting Natural Resources, by John R. Nolon, Environmental Law Institute, 2003 (see "Part Four: Strategic Acquisition of Open Lands")

Q. Park foundations
MRSC includes information on park foundations <http://www.mrsc.org/askmrsc/Parks.aspx>. This includes links to several park foundations in Washington cities and counties.

Park foundations and friends groups:
Project for Public Spaces - Public/Private Partnerships <http://www.pps.org/upo/info/pubpriv> (includes general information on roles of nonprofits)
• "It all starts with citizens - citizen involvement in public parks crucial for their existence <http://www.findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1145/is_n7_v33/ai_21024330>, "Parks & Recreation, July, 1998, by Ted Flickinger (addresses "friends" groups and foundations)
• Greater Everett Community Foundation <http://www.greatereverettcf.org/parks.htm> (successor to Everett Parks Foundation)
• Whatcom Parks & Recreation Foundation (Tennant Lake) <http://www.co.whatcom.wa.us/parks/tennantlake/index.jsp>
• Seattle Resolution No. 29781 <http://clerk.ci.seattle.wa.us/~scripts/nph-brs.exe?s1=&amp;s2=&amp;s3=29781&amp;s4=&amp;sect4=AND&amp;I=20&amp;sect1=image&amp;sect2=theson&amp;sect3=pluron&amp;sect5=resn1&amp;sect6=HITOFF&amp;d=resn1&amp;p=1&amp;u=/%7Epublic/resn1.htm&amp;r=1&amp;f=G>, 1998 (regarding establishment of an independent Park and Recreation Foundation)
• Vancouver-Clark County Parks Foundation <http://www.parksfoundation.us/>
• San Juan County Parks Foundation <http://www.co.san-juan.wa.us/parks/board.html#foundation>

King County:
• King County Parks Division Business Plan, 2002 Revenue Enhancement Strategies <http://dnr.metrokc.gov/parks/transition-plan/pdf/revenue-enhancement.pdf> (see "R-6: Creation of a Parks Foundation," on p. 15)
• Northwest Parks Foundation <http://nwparks.org/> (formerly Friends of King County Parks) (Also see Volunteering <http://www.volunteersolutions.org/uwkc.org/1105039.html>) - Supports park and recreation facilities in King County and the Pacific Northwest
• Seattle Parks Foundation <http://www.seattleparksfoundation.org/>
Out of State:
- Loveland, CO – Parks and Recreation Foundation
  <http://www.ci.loveland.co.us/parksrec/Foundation.htm>
- Boulder, CO – Parks and Recreation Foundation
  <http://bcn.boulder.co.us/community/boulderpfr/>

"Friends" groups and park foundations are becoming increasingly common, as park departments seek additional financial support and advocates for their programs and services. In Washington, cities and counties with park foundations or friends groups include Everett, King County, Seattle, San Juan County, Skagit County, Spokane, Vancouver-Clark County, and Whatcom County. Apparently Edmonds and Kent also have park foundations, but we do not have specific information on their organizations. Other cities that have considered establishing their own local foundations are Enumclaw and Lynnwood and may be worth contacting. Most park foundations are found in larger cities and counties. It may be possible to work with an existing foundation, such as the Northwest Parks Foundation, since it covers the Northwest (mostly Washington State). Kristen Bush is executive director; (206) 838-7550; E-mail: krisb@nwparks.org. The Northwest Parks Foundation is working with Mercer Island, Kirkland, Woodinville, and other Washington cities.

Some "friends" organizations are established for specific parks or types of parks, such as Seattle's Friends of Seattle's Olmsted Parks <http://www.ci.seattle.wa.us/friendsofolmstedparks/>. The King County Parks Division Business Plan includes discussion of creating a parks foundation and includes names of additional foundations.
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Introduction

From May 31, 2019 through June 30, 2019, the Bainbridge Island Metropolitan Park & Recreation District (Park District) invited those who utilize Bainbridge Island park and recreation facilities and programs to become involved in updating its *Comprehensive Plan—Parks, Recreation & Open Space (2014)*. The Plan is updated every six years, which sets the due date for the next update in 2020.

To gain public perspectives on the Plan update, the Park District hosted two public meetings on June 1 and 4, 2019, and hosted an online forum that extended from May 31 to June 30, 2019. The length of the appendices to this summary attest to the substantial public response to the Park District’s request for comments. This report is a high-level synthesis of the key themes discerned from the Park District’s public involvement outcomes. Because it is high-level summary, comments or topics specific to just a few people may not be included in this summary—they are, however, still contained in the project record, and easily accessible to the Park District’s staff as they continue through the planning process.

This report is organized as follows:

Section 1. Key Themes

Section 2: “Place-based” Feedback

Section 3. Activity Priorities

Section 4. Program priorities

Section 5. Proposed Aquatic Center Capital Improvement Project

Section 6. Proposed Sakai Park Capital Improvement Project

Attachments:

A. Compiled notes from the June 1 and June 4, 2019 public meetings
B. Compiled online interactive map feedback
C. Compiled data from the online forum’s Activity Priorities survey
D. Compiled data from the online forum’s Program Priorities survey
E. Compiled data from the online Proposed Aquatic Center capital improvement project survey
F. Compiled data from the Proposed Sakai Park capital improvement project

Section 1: Key Themes

Bainbridge Island residents are passionate about their park and recreation activities, programs, and facilities. Participants provided a substantial number of detailed and insightful comments at public meetings and through the online forum.
Key themes qualitatively distilled from the comments are noted below. A concept was interpreted as a “theme” when it was reflected in three or more comments, or if it received a high/majority percentage of affirmation in survey responses. Though individual insights may not appear in this thematic description, they are no less important. Park District staff and residents are encouraged to review the attachments for the complete set of unfiltered comments.

- The two most commented topics included the proposed capital improvement projects for a replacement pool at the Aquatic Center, and development of Sakai Park.
  - While there were dissenting voices with compelling reasons, the majority of those who commented on the proposed Aquatic Center capital improvement project preferred the proposal for the 52-meter pool, and said it was a personal priority for them.
  - Respondents differed in their opinions regarding the degree of development for the proposed Sakai Park capital improvement project. Many expressed a desire for a more passive, “natural” look and feel, while others advocated for additional indoor and outdoor recreation facilities. Respondents were nearly evenly divided in terms of the project being a personal priority for them.
- Water-based and trail-based recreation are the greatest priorities for participants.
- Indoor/outdoor tennis and pickleball courts are of high interest to many.
- Mountain biking use is increasing on island trails, potentially increasing conflicts between hikers and bikers; not only from direct contact, but from the types of trails that each prefers (shared use may not always be possible or desirable).
- Dog-owners on Bainbridge advocate for their dogs. Many expressed interest in increased opportunities for off-leash trail and park use, with interesting, engaging “play features” available at dog parks.
- Non-dog owners are not always supportive about dog use on trails and within parks. Trail conflicts between hikers, mountain bikers, and dog owners surfaced in the comments, as did those using parks who did not want to encounter evidence of dogs in park lawns, or dogs not under the direct control of their people.
- While there was substantial acknowledgement of the breadth and depth of Park District programs, many requested expanded hours to accommodate more people, and work and life schedules.

Section 2. “Place-Based” Feedback (organized by location)

Both during the public meetings and through the online forum, participants responded to the invitation to provide “place-based” feedback by identifying 1) places where they currently recreated and the activities they enjoyed doing there, 2) new recreational activities and opportunities they sought for the future, and 3) other feedback about the place.
The place-based feedback captured below results from the synthesis of public comment provided from the June 1 and 4, 2019 public workshops (Appendix A contains the meeting summaries and flip chart notes from the public workshops), and the May 31-June 30, 2019 online forum (Appendix B contains information submitted through the interactive feedback map). Both Appendix A and B provide important context for the synthesized comments, and includes input from individual users that, while not necessarily repeated by other participants, is still valuable information. Readers are encouraged to examine these appendices.

The parks and facilities listed below received multiple public comments. They are organized alphabetically, and in no priority order.

2.1 Aquatic Center

**Activities Enjoyed:** Lap swimming, water/fitness classes, masters swimming, swimming lessons, diving tank, water polo, competitive swimming, special needs accommodation, and entertaining families and friends (particularly in Nakata Pool). The two pools at the Aquatic Center are an important component of many participants’ recreational experience on Bainbridge.

**New Activities:** Replace the Ray Williamson pool with a larger, 50 or 52-meter pool to expand opportunities for competitive swimming, improve swimmer safety, and ease congestion and competition for lane space among the many interests that utilize the pool. Add a retractable roof installed to create an indoor/outdoor pool option. Expand open swim hours on weekends and in evenings.

**Other feedback:** The Ray Williamson Pool has exceeded its operational lifetime. Different age groups compete for space due to limited usage hours; there are training limitations due to the size and depth of the pool. Interest in upgrading the Aquatic Center overall to a level consistent with its importance to the water sports and greater Bainbridge community.

2.2 Battle Point Park

**Activities enjoyed:** Field/turf sports, tennis, pickleball, disc golf, basketball, the pump track, walking, running, picnicking, summer concerts, movies, the observatory, and the pea patch.

**New Activities:** Add conditional lighting to extend hours and enable expanded use of fields during winter months. Add tennis, pickleball, a couple volleyball nets (add sand in flat grass spaces, like Fay Bainbridge Park’s volleyball net) and basketball courts. Enhance the pump track for more advanced riders, and/or add a jump line. Add an outdoor climbing structure.

**Other feedback:** Tennis courts appear to be in need of resurfacing. Pump track accommodates a wide variety of age groups.
2.3 Blakely Harbor Park

Activities enjoyed: Water access for swimming, kayaking, and paddle boarding. Some utilize the kayak storage area at the park. Hiking the connecting trail between Blakely Harbor Park and Old Mill/Fort Ward. Walking the connecting trail and quiet road between Port Blakely and Eagle Harbor.

New activities: None identified.

Other feedback: Move kayak storage closer to the concrete building (or clear some of the brush behind the kayaks and move them further off the beach). The kayak storage is positive for some, but others feel it has a negative impact on use of the beach, and is unsightly.

2.4 Cave Ave Park (proposed)

New activities: Propose creating and naming a park in the Cave parcels area in honor of a local citizen/professional arborist whom proponents feel has been an inspiration to them and a great source of knowledge on the island. Propose creating a shaded park with benches for quiet, passive enjoyment.

2.5 Fay Bainbridge Park

Activities enjoyed: Water views, picnicking, walking/hiking the beach (with or without a dog), camping, hosting family events, beachcombing, and observing wildlife.

New activities: Wildlife interpretive signage, guided interpretive walks, and beach outlook points at both the main and south beaches.

Other feedback: None provided.

2.6 Fort Ward Park

Activities enjoyed: Observing wildlife, hiking, walking their dog, picnicking, beachcombing, boat launch, enjoying kayaking, paddle boarding, and motor boating.

New activities: Wildlife/naturalist interpretive walks and signage, increased number of benches, beach outlook points. Play structure (like Schel Chelb) in northernmost section of Fort Ward parade grounds.

Other feedback: Park is particularly accessible to all ages and abilities. Add gravel to sections of trails prone to bogginess during the rainy season.

2.7 Gazzam Lake Nature Preserve

Activities enjoyed: Observing wildlife, enjoying conservation of area, hiking, walking, trail running, mountain biking.
New activities: Dock built into the lake (with/without fishing), trail connections to facilitate walking/biking from the Grand Forest to Gazzam via Strawberry Hill. Add a new trail to connect Knudson and Westwood Trails.

Other feedback: Some conflicts experienced between park walkers and mountain bikers on trails (especially blind corners). Concerns regarding off-leash dogs, and user-created mountain bike trails. Parking is difficult to find at trailhead off Marshall Road.

2.8 Grand Forest

Activities enjoyed: Trail hiking/running, hiking/walking with dogs (some use trails daily, all sections of the Grand Forest). Experiencing the big trees. Observe wildlife and birds, enjoy nature and birdsong. Weekly horseback trail riding (Grand Forest-East to Battle Point) is easily accessed from equestrian barns. The Forest-to-Sky Trail noted as especially scenic and enjoyable.

New activities: Mountain biking in Grand Forest-North (less-used section of the Grand Forest and may be suitable for this use). Off-leash dog use in Grand Forest-North. Interpretive trails and signage, additional benches, naturalist tours/walks, access to information about the history and natural history of the different forest regime areas within the Grand Forest (e.g. triggered by GPS coordinates as they are passed on the trails).

Other feedback: Potentially significant wildland urban interface wildfire hazards--hazard mitigation efforts will be required to reduce wildfire hazards.

2.9 Hawley Cove Park

Activities enjoyed: Water access, water views, beachcombing (especially enjoyable during negative tides, when one can hike to the Wing Point gravel spit).

New activities: Involve youth/teens in park cleanup.

Other feedback: Walkable from downtown. Experiences some litter problems.

2.10 Madison Tot Lot

Activities enjoyed: Children playing, quiet spot in otherwise busy Winslow—convenient and walkable.

New activities: Expand and improve the existing park. Create similar “pocket parks” in other neighborhoods.

Other feedback: This park is valuable to Winslow neighbors who use it (and many do). If possible, expand and improve the park. Parking lot for the park often seems co-opted by nearby residents—improved signage would be beneficial.
2.11 Manzanita Park

Activities enjoyed: Horse trails, equestrian cross-country jumping course, walking.

New activities: Jump improvements.

Other feedback: None provided.

2.12 Sakai Park

Current uses: Hiking

Future uses: RV park, fieldhouse, indoor tennis and indoor/all-season pickleball courts

Other feedback: See synthesis of feedback regarding the proposed Sakai Park capital improvement project, page 10.

3. Activity Priorities Survey Results

The Park District surveyed those participating in the online forum regarding their priorities for categories of activities. Participants were asked to select their first and second priorities from a list of related activities. In those instances where an activity was within 3% of the top first or second priority, that activity is noted parenthetically. If an activity was chosen by 50% or more of the participants, it is listed in BOLD:

Table 3.1: Activity Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Activities</th>
<th>Highest First Priority (within 3% of highest priority)</th>
<th>Highest Second Priority (numerically close to highest second priority)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water access</td>
<td>Beach combing/walking</td>
<td>Kayaking/canoeing/paddle boarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports facilities</td>
<td>Tennis courts (soccer fields)</td>
<td>Pickleball courts (baseball/softball/kickball fields)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>Hiking/walking</td>
<td>Bicycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor facilities</td>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational opportunities</td>
<td>Aquatic activities</td>
<td>Outdoor programming (community events)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Segments</td>
<td>Adult programs (youth, teen programs)</td>
<td>Active adult, adult, teen programs (youth programs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category of Activities</td>
<td>Highest First Priority (within 3% of highest priority)</td>
<td>Highest Second Priority (numerically close to highest second priority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation/wildlife</td>
<td>Natural area restoration</td>
<td>Environmental education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special use facilities</td>
<td>Aquatic Center</td>
<td>Aquatic Center, Teen Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest priorities were for activities that generally could be accessed by the widest audiences, required less specialized training, and were connected in some way to water and natural resources.

Attachment C contains the complete, compiled report of the priority activities survey responses.

4. Programs Survey Results

Seventy-eight people responded through the online forum, and programs were a discussion point during the public meetings. While most responded regarding organized programs, many repeated uses they enjoy independently (non-organized). Only responses related to organized programs are noted below.

4.1 Program participation and feedback

Respondents noted participation in the following programs:

- Discover Bainbridge
- Fitness programs
- Tai Chi Chin
- Mountain-biking programs
- Youth Sports (tennis, soccer, basketball, gymnastics (traditional and non-traditional), yoga, dance)
- Swim Lessons
- Summer Camps (Fairy Camp, Lego Camp, paddling camps)
- Art programs (painting, pottery, creative writing)
- Aquatic programs (Masters, Aqua Fitness)
- Walking groups
- Dog classes
- Outdoor programs (hiking, canoeing, kayaking)

Feedback: People commented on the wide variety of programs offered by the Park District, with complimented staff who are responsive and experienced.

For families, participation often follows with the seasons (i.e. youth sports, youth camps). Those with children growing up on Bainbridge Island commented that they regularly used park programs
until their children reached 12 years old and beyond. Generally, families would like to see more teen/older teen programs available as children mature.

Adults have participated for years in swimming and fitness programs that have become central to meeting their personal fitness goals. And new residents make friends and learn about Bainbridge Island and the Kitsap and Olympic Peninsulas through evening and weekend outdoor sports and exploration programs. Some mentioned the need for more advanced skill programs (e.g. mountain biking).

Where programs depend on facilities, some identified areas of needed improvement, e.g. tennis courts in need of maintenance, overcrowding at the gymnastics facility and Aquatic Center and the opportunity to expand these programs through enlarged facilities.

Comments also included the inability of people to participate in park programs due to the associated costs and/or the times programs are offered (e.g. commuters are generally limited to weekends.

4.2 Future parks and recreation programs of interest:

- Partnering with Ovation to offer theatre classes
- More technically advanced mountain biking programs
- Voluntary bike license program to fund bike trails
- Co-ed softball program
- Expanded art program offerings and expanded hours
- Language classes
- Meditation classes
- Outdoor swimming program
- Strengthening and stretching classes for seniors
- After-school programming that extends throughout the school year

Some commented on the interest in having expanded program times in the future (for those working during the day/commuting), in addition to requests for new programs. And some comments were received asking the Park District to scale back some programs due to conflicts with other uses (e.g. kayaking in Eagle Harbor)

Attachment D contains the complete results of the online forum Programs survey.

5. Proposed Aquatic Center Capital Improvement Project

During the June 1 and 4, 2019 public meetings, participants received a presentation from Park District Staff regarding the proposal to replace the Ray Williamson pool with the same or larger-sized pool and associated updated Aquatic Center facilities. Meeting participants were encouraged
to go to the online forum and indicate their preferences through this mechanism. In total, 165 people completed the Aquatic Center Capital Improvement Project survey:

**Figure 5.1 Preferred Pool Alternative**

As part of the survey, participants were asked to identify which size of replacement pool they preferred:

- 82% preferred the 52-meter pool
- 8% preferred the 33-meter pool
- 10% preferred the 25-meter pool

**Figure 5.2 Personal Priority for Pool Replacement**
Participants were also asked to identify how high of a priority the replacement of the pool was for them:

- Very high priority = 59%
- High priority = 14%
- Equal priority with other capital improvements = 9%
- Low priority = 6%
- Not a priority = 12%

**52-meter pool:** Most of those who favor pool replacement stated they preferred the 52-meter pool to accommodate a greater number of simultaneous uses (e.g. lap swimming with water polo), both from a capacity and from a safety perspective, and/or to allow for competitive uses.

**33-meter pool:** Most who favor the 33-meter pool spoke from the perspective of available budget. They were not in favor of spending the additional tax dollars/other funding that would be required for the 52-meter pool.

**25-meter pool:** Those who favored the 25-meter pool (existing size) generally didn’t feel the reasons for a larger pool warranted the additional cost, though several supported the need to financially support maintaining the existing pool in a safe condition. Others preferring the 25-meter pool expressed that this was not a priority for them or (from their perspective) the community and they did not wish to publicly finance such a project. Some mentioned that the park budget needs to serve many interests, and feel the larger, 52-meter pool would serve a fairly narrow set of interests.

**Not a priority:** There are those who did not view any of the above pool options as a priority. Some respondents stated the Sakai Park development is a higher priority for them since it provides a greater diversity of uses, and that they would prefer to see financial resources support that capital improvement project first, rather than a replacement pool.

Attachment E contains the complete report of the proposed Aquatic Center Capital Improvement Project survey responses.

### 6. Proposed Sakai Park Capital Improvement Project

During the June 1 and 4, 2019 public meetings, participants received a presentation from Park District Staff regarding the proposal to develop Sakai Park. Meeting participants were encouraged to go to the online forum and indicate their responses to four questions through this mechanism. In total, 215 people completed the Sakai Park Capital Improvement Project survey.
Figure 6.1 Potential Sakai Park Elements of Greatest Personal Interest

![Bar chart showing percent interest in different park elements]

Figure 6.2 Level of Interest for Implementing the Sakai Park Concept Plan

![Pie chart showing level of interest]
As part of the survey, participants were asked to identify how high of a priority the development of Sakai Park was for them:

**Figure 6.3: Personal Priority for Park Development**

Those who favored moving forward with Sakai seemed interested in the wide variety of uses that could be accommodated under the proposed concept plan (or variations of it). The location of Sakai in proximity to numerous schools and downtown would provide convenient, walkable access.

The opportunity to add indoor recreation space (tennis courts, pickleball courts, gymnastics, table tennis, etc.) to the existing plethora of outdoor facilities is an important consideration for many, as is lessening the congestion at existing facilities. Some noted that a competition pool would be a good addition here (if not at the Aquatic Center across the street), as would an outdoor pool.

Many noted the need for more indoor spaces to facilitate recreation during the cold, wet, dark months. Some noted the need to provide more recreation facilities for tweens and teens, and current development concepts could accommodate this.

Some emphasized there is no need to duplicate facilities already within proximity to Sakai; for instance, outdoor play structures (unless “naturalized” using rocks and wood), picnic shelters, outdoor fields (with or without lighting).

Others would like to see a less developed, more “rural” feel to the park, and believe its proximity to already developed/overdeveloped areas on the island is a compelling reason to focus on trails, benches, and the ecosystem services (aquifer regeneration, wildlife habitat, etc.) this area could provide. There are not a lot of walkable trails in the Winslow area.

Collaboration with the Suquamish and Japanese-American community on park development would provide an opportunity to honor those important island cultures. Interpretive signs and artwork would contribute to this.

Several mentioned the need for more public meeting space, and that Sakai could accommodate that need.
And still others would like to see the park left as is—no further development.

Attachment F contains the complete report of the proposed Sakai Park Capital Improvement Project survey responses.

Conclusion

As previously stated, this report is a high-level synthesis of the key themes discerned from the Park District’s public involvement outcomes. Because it is high-level summary, comments or topics specific to just a few people may not be included in this summary—they are, however, still contained in the project record, and accessible to Park District staff as they continue through the planning process.
The June 1, 2019 public meeting for the 2020 Comprehensive Plan update began at 10:08 am.
The meeting was attended by approximately 14 members of the public, Park Commissioners Tom Swolgaard, Jay Kinney, and Dawn Janow. Also attending were Executive Director Terry Lande and approximately 15 staff members

INTRODUCTION & OVERVIEW OF MEETING

Facilitator/Consultant Susan Hayman with EnviroIssues welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the public process for the 2020 Comprehensive Plan update.

Introductions of Park Commissioners and management staff were made. The Commissioners thanked everyone for coming, mentioned some Park District accomplishments since the last comprehensive plan was done, and encouraged everyone to share their ideas.

Susan Hayman said there are four objectives for the comprehensive plan’s public process: 1) Update the comprehensive plan; 2) Identify interests; 3) Identify unmet needs; and 4) Share information on two major projects. She also introduced the online forum and survey.

Senior Planner Perry Barrett asked participants to think long term and ask what direction they’d like the Park District to move in. He said the comprehensive plan update is a requirement of WA State, is needed for grant eligibility, and provides an opportunity to touch base with public. He mentioned a few Park District highlights, saying currently underway is a State clean-up effort at Blakely Harbor Park and the renovation of the KidsUp Playground at Battle Point Park. He also noted several projects completed in recent years such as the Rotary Park renovation, Owen’s Playground, Hidden Cove Dock, and the Hawley Cove Park boardwalk.

Recreation Division Director Mark Benishek highlighted some of the recreation programs that have expanded. Some of these include active adult classes and aging seminars, sailing program growth with a new fleet of sailboats, and new all-day camps. Opportunities for people with special needs are also increasing.

Senior Planner Perry Barrett went over the timeline for the comprehensive plan update.
BREAKOUT GROUPS

Staff served as notetakers for the breakout groups. Additional comments made during the larger group discussion that followed included:

- Go out after it rains and fill in the puddles on trails so you know where the trails need work.
- Meigs Park is being used as an off-leash trail system.
- Meigs Park trails are not being maintained.
- Want more cooperation between public entities.
- Gideon Park is an unusable grass area because it’s not flat, or put a pickleball court etc.

It was noted that these above comments pertain primarily to operations.

All comments provided will be passed on to the facilitator for inclusion in the final report consolidating public input.

PROJECT PRESENTATIONS

Recreation Division Director Mark Benishek spoke briefly about the Aquatic Center project, saying the Ray Williamson Pool was built back in the 1960’s. The pool is unable to meet program needs and its infrastructure is past its lifetime. One item that came out of the Sakai Park public process was the need to replace the Ray Williamson Pool. Since then a consultant has been hired to assess the pool’s condition and provide options related to it. The three pool options can be viewed on slides when accessing the online forum. Several questions were asked about parking, the location of any new building, and repurposing the Ray Williamson Pool.

Senior Planner Perry Barrett reviewed the public process conducted in 2016 for Sakai Park, and the initial design work of Jones & Jones included in the concept plan adopted by the board in June 2018. He said the feasibility study for the concept plan is near completion and will be presented at the June 6 board meeting. He provided an overview of project elements/proposed facilities for Sakai Park, as well as an update on the Park District’s efforts to get trails permitted and built at the park.

WRAP UP

Consultant Susan Hayman showed participants how to access the online forum/survey and provide input. Executive Director Lande encouraged people to go online to indicate their preferences related to parks and recreation programs. It was noted the online forum will run through June 30, 2019.

Meeting adjourned at 12:05 pm.

Notes prepared by:
Amy Swenson
Elizabeth Shepherd
### Flip Chart Notes, June 1

*Scribes: Shannon Buxton; Jason Balague*

#### DISCUSSION ROUND ONE (“Where” pins added to map)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Battle Point</td>
<td>Jogging on path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Blakely Harbor Park</td>
<td>Walking trail, history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Fort Ward</td>
<td>Motorized/non-motorized, boat launch, trail connection (\rightarrow) Blakley, boat camping, (water trails)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Nakata Pool</td>
<td>Lap swim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Fort Ward</td>
<td>Motorized/non-motorized, boat launch, trails, bird watching, shore access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Hidden Cove Park</td>
<td>Dock, paddleboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Grand Forest</td>
<td>Walk, commute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2-Mile Walks</td>
<td>Walk, socialize, history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Moritani Preserve</td>
<td>Walking &amp; dog walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Gymnastics Room at Bainbridge High School</td>
<td>Gymnastics &amp; gymnastics related programs/activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>General non-specified location</td>
<td>Forested areas used for walking &amp; biking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Blakely</td>
<td>Walking &amp; swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Grand Forest Main Trail</td>
<td>Walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>North Grand Forest</td>
<td>Walking &amp; dog walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Fort Ward Park to Blakely (long trail connection)</td>
<td>Dog walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Aquatics Center</td>
<td>Masters program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Pritchard Park</td>
<td>Dog walking &amp; picnicking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Hawley Cove Boardwalk, Fort Ward, Fay Bainbridge</td>
<td>General statement of the impressive work done by Parks at each of these locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Strawberry Hill Center</td>
<td>Watercolor classes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
156 Hawley Cove...Low tide excursions
179 Battle Point Park...Trails, playground, fields, gymnastics at Transmitter Building
184 Williams-Olson, Strawberry Cove, Hidden Cove...Access to Manzanita, kayaking, Dog walking
180 Aquatics Center...Large # of participants and lots of programs
-- General Non-Specified locations...ALL parks are great for photography

DISCUSSION ROUND TWO  (“Why” P&R is important to them, discussion only)

• Proximity...to Gazzam, Fort Ward, trails within walking distance, trails and partners, connections, maintained, multiple uses
• Battle Point Fields...multiple fields in one place, turf option for rainy weather, near home
• Battle Point Fields...soccer
• Intentional “Senior” Programs...for those transitioning older

• Hawley Cove...community member was married at that location
• Pickle Ball...great social group, strong community building, joy & exercise
• Hawley Cove Park...satisfaction of completion of boardwalk, overlooking harbor, great appreciation for Terry, Perry and Dan for their roles
• Parks, Trails, Rec Programs...all enhance quality of life, so much growth, community building, partnering & working together with other organizations
• Gymnastics...So much to offer with classes, birthdays, camps, etc, Bring up kids in a family-style environment, Supportive of kids and keeping them active

DISCUSSION ROUND THREE  (“Now What?” lettered stickers placed on map as input for the future)

A  Lights at Battle Point...for active use after dark, double the opportunity v/BHS
A2 Fitness Stations ...reinstalled at Battle Point park, “I miss them”
• Larger Pool 50m...accommodate more user groups, allows flexibility w/bulkhead, increase safety – not crowding, better time of day for teams, free up Nakata Pool for rec use
• Other Boat Launches...real ramp, motorized, etc, westside – Fay Bainbridge?, north end – Port Madison, something to tie too
• Kayak/Board rental available
B Grand Forest West...connector to Meigs Park

F New Pool...Current facility is used greatly, community needs to come together to increase space

X All Forest Areas...Forest management plan, forest health, arborist, coordinating with other entities

AG Non-Specified Location...Stronger neighborhood groups to help with parks

BN City Core – Recreation...No facilities to walk to for recreation (basketball, tennis, etc)

H Lynwood Center – Recreation...No facilities to walk to for recreation (basketball, tennis, etc)

P Pickleball Courts...Indoor courts (priority), Outdoor courts (long term)

* Parks...Do more to show how the wishes of property owners gifting land is fulfilled, because the city fails

* Meigs...Develop more of the unused space

* General...Interagency cooperation between schools, parks and city
The June 4, 2019 public meeting for the 2020 Comprehensive Plan update began at 7:10 pm.

The meeting was attended by approximately 8 members of the public, Park Commissioners Ken DeWitt, Jay Kinney, and Dawn Janow with Commissioner Michael Pollock arriving late. Also attending were Executive Director Terry Lande and approximately 15 staff members.

**INTRODUCTION & OVERVIEW OF MEETING**

Facilitator/Consultant Susan Hayman with Envirolissues provided a brief overview of the meeting and comprehensive plan public process including the online forum and survey.

Introductions of Park Commissioners and management staff were made. The Commissioners welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming. They reminded people of the importance of public input when a major project is undertaken and encouraged everyone to take the survey and invite their friends to do so as well.

Senior Planner Perry Barrett explained why a comprehensive plan is done and why public input is needed. Accomplishments since 2014 were reviewed which included among others the following: Hilltop and other trail connections; John Nelson Park trail, cabins at Fay Bainbridge Park; development of Williams Olson Park concept plan, Sakai Park purchase and public process; additions to Gazzam Lake Nature Preserve; the donations of Moritani Preserve and Red Pine Park; the renovation of Rotary Park including the addition of Owen’s Playground; installation of Hidden Cove dock; Hawley Cove Park improvements; and the addition of trails.

**BREAKOUT GROUPS**

Staff served as notetakers for the breakout group. Additional comments made during the larger group discussion that followed included:

- It would be nice to have a boat launch off the Port Madison area for motor boats.
- Has issues with the Blakely Harbor Park kayak storage area and would like a place to tie off at Fort Ward Park.

All comments provided will be passed on to the facilitator to include in the final report that will consolidate all public input received.
PROJECT PRESENTATIONS

Recreation Division Director Mark Benishek spoke briefly about the Aquatic Center project, saying the Ray Williamson Pool was built back in the 1960’s. The pool is unable to meet program needs and there isn’t enough room to meet demand. It has many maintenance issues that need addressing. The desire to replace the Ray Williamson Pool came out of the Sakai Park public process. Since then a consultant has been hired to assess the pool’s condition and provide options related to it. Mark Benishek reviewed the three possible pool options.

Senior Planner Perry Barrett provided a review of the Sakai Park capital project. The Park District held a public process in 2016 which generated community recommendations for the park that were incorporated into the concept plan developed by Jones & Jones and adopted by the board in June 2018. The related feasibility study will be presented by Jones & Jones at the June 6, 2019 board meeting. Perry Barrett mentioned the City lot next to the park, saying discussions about the City transferring this lot to the Park District have been held. This would help the Park District meet required impervious to pervious surface ratios.

A member of the public asked if these projects would be done in tandem or separately. Perry Barrett said no decisions have been made which is why public input is needed. It was noted both projects will need public funding.

Another member of the public commented on how much he appreciated the Park District’s process for looking at these projects.

WRAP UP

Facilitator Susan Hayman went over the online forum and mentioned the questions on the site pertaining to the above two capital projects. Everyone was encouraged to participate. The online forum will run through June 30, 2019.

Meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

Notes prepared by:
Amy Swenson
Elizabeth Shepherd
Flip Chart Notes, June 4
Scribe: Shannon Buxton

DISCUSSION ROUND ONE (“Where” pins added to map)

32  Battle Point… Jogging on path
46  Blakely Harbor Park… walking trail, history
37  Fort Ward… motorized/non-motorized, boat launch, trail connection -> Blakley, boat camping, (water trails)
34  Nakata Pool… lap swim
38  Fort Ward… motorized/non-motorized, boat launch, trails, bird watching, shore access
55  Hidden Cove Park… dock, paddleboard
53  Grand Forest… walk, commute
None  2-Mile Walks… walk, socialize, history

DISCUSSION ROUND TWO (“Why” P&R is important to them, discussion only)

• Proximity... to Gazzam, Fort Ward, trails within walking distance, trails and partners, connections, maintained, multiple uses
• Battle Point Fields... multiple fields in one place, turf option for rainy weather, near home
• Battle Point Fields... soccer
• Intentional “Senior” Programs... for those transitioning older

DISCUSSION ROUND THREE (“Now What?” lettered stickers placed on map as input for the future)

A  Lights at Battle Point... for active use after dark, double the opportunity v/BHS
A2  Fitness Stations... reinstalled at Battle Point park, “I miss them”

• Larger Pool  50m... accommodate more user groups, allows flexibility w/bulkhead, increase safety – not crowding, better time of day for teams, free up Nakata Pool for rec use
• Other Boat Launches... real ramp, motorized, etc, westside – Fay Bainbridge?, north end – Port Madison, something to tie too
• Kayak/Board rental available

B  Grand Forest West... connector to Meigs Park
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Aquatic Center</td>
<td>New pool--Aquatic Center</td>
<td>The Aquatic Center is a tremendous boon to the community. It services residents of all ages, and is in constant use. A 50 meter pool would be a fantastic addition for all user groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Aquatic Center</td>
<td>New pool--Aquatic Center</td>
<td>A 50 Meter pool would be a huge asset to our community. So many residents from all age groups use the aquatic center. Bainbridge would make such good use of a larger facility to meet the needs of both our regular swimmers/aquatic center customers and competitive high school swim and water polo teams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Aquatic Center</td>
<td>Swimming--Aquatic Center</td>
<td>Love the aquatic center and am there 3-4 times a week doing water classes, esp boot camp and river fitness. My son with special needs also loves swimming laps at the aquatic center. We just recently moved here and this place has become a central part of our new lives on Bainbridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Aquatic Center</td>
<td>Swimming--Aquatic Center</td>
<td>Swimming, aqua fit, masters swim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Aquatic Center</td>
<td>Swimming--Aquatic Center</td>
<td>My family uses the aquatic center extensively. My wife and I are both masters swimmers and participate on the BAM team. Both of my children are on BISC. My older child has participated on the water polo team. We have held birthday, scout group, and school celebrations at the facility. My wife is a volunteer coach for the girls BHS swim team. The aquatic center facility is integral to our day to day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Aquatic Center</td>
<td>Swimming--Aquatic Center</td>
<td>Nakata pool. Lead fitness classes there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Aquatic Center</td>
<td>Swimming--Aquatic Center</td>
<td>I use the diving tank in the Nakata pool three times a week for one hour in the early morning for deep water running and exercises using a float belt. Thank you for providing the belts. There are often at least 3-4 others using the diving tank at around the same time. None of us like the Ray pool because it is too cold for our old bodies. We are all over 70. Occasionally we are pushed aside by the HS water polo team or other HS swimming team activities or by diving team members wanting to dive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Aquatic Center</td>
<td>Swimming--Aquatic Center</td>
<td>The Ray Williamson pool has served the community well. However, it has far exceeded its projected operational lifetime, yet has continued to support repeat State championship swims teams, locally, regionally and nationally recognized coaches and a myriad of team sports, recreational swimmers and community aquatic programs. WSF personnel and emergency first responders also train in this pool. It is important not to wait until the pool completely fails to replace it. A 52 M pool is needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Other feedback** Aquatic Center New pool--Aquatic Center

A new, larger 50m pool is desperately needed. The current Ray pool is falling apart and there is not sufficient space/time for the activities currently programmed at the Aquatic Center. Unique among public recreation activities, pools provide recreation, exercise, and therapy for *every* age and ability. The Aquatic Center is the most used - both in sheer numbers and in diverse users - among parks properties year-round. It should be a priority.

**New activity ideas** Aquatic Center Outdoor pool--Aquatic Center

What about an outdoor pool

**Other feedback** Aquatic Center Swimming--Aquatic Center

The pool facility is used by many, many islanders and is overused. We desperately need a larger competition pool - preferably 52 meter. The user need will go substantially in the future and will easily fill an enlarged facility.

**Other feedback** Aquatic Center Swimming--Aquatic Center

I would like to see more and longer open swim hours in the evenings and on weekends. My kids are not passionate about swimming competitively but would love more opportunities to swim for fun with their friends. And I’d love to see more informal opportunities for them to be active and social in a less-structured setting. The current open swim times also do not allow for working family members to join in.

**Other feedback** Aquatic Center Swimming--Aquatic Center

I second that well thought out sentiment. Lap swimmers often end up all over each other if they get to swim at all. Water polo is huge and growing bigger and to have one end be shallow is frankly a bit embarrassing and bush league. Investing in the aquatic center, where fitness and learning can happen rain or shine, seems like the highest utilization idea.

**Other feedback** Aquatic Center Swimming--Aquatic Center

Some age group programs use the current competition facility until 10pm year-round, and are not able to train effectively due to the size and depth of the current facility. A 50-meter facility would allow for more usage during peak hours and for our aquatics programs to stay locally and nationally competitive as more students look to join.

**Other feedback** Aquatic Center Swimming--Aquatic Center

A 50 meter pool with a retractable roof. There are no public outdoor pools in the vicinity of Bainbridge and this could be a year round 50 meter pool that could easily adapt as the weather allows.

**Activities you enjoy** Aquatic center Swimming--Aquatic Center

Providing a 50-meter pool to replace the outdated competition pool at the Aquatic Facility is the highest Park District priority to meet the needs of our community, young to old! The old Ray pool was built 50 years ago and usage demands have long exceeded its capacity.

**Other feedback** Aquatic center New pool--Aquatic Center

**New activity ideas** Battle Point Off-leash agility--Battlepoint

Add area for off leash agility course
| New activity ideas | Battle Point | Conditional Lighting/Basketball | 1) add conditional usage lighting for fields 4 & 5 (similar to what is in place at Strawberry Hill Park) so youth sports can practice after school during the dark months of Nov - Mar
2) add a couple basketball courts

| New activity ideas | Battle Point | Conditional Lighting–Battlepoint | I would love to see lights for the turf fields at Battlepoint

| New activity ideas | Battle Point | Conditional Lighting–Battlepoint | Would love to see limited lights at the turf fields, especially during the darker months so that the kids can practice soccer when it’s dark but still before bedtime!

| New activity ideas | Battle Point | Pump track–Battlepoint | The pump track is cool, but with the current size of the rollers it is most suited to small kids on strider bikes. To really make it effective for what it is meant for it would need to be built up quite a bit. It would be cool to see either the pump track made more rideable for more advanced riders or maybe a jump line put in somewhere.

| New activity ideas | Battle Point | Volleyball–Battlepoint | add a couple volleyball nets in a flat grass spaces, add sand volleyball court - like the one at Faye Bainbridge but without thorny weeds.

| New activity ideas | Battle Point | Outdoor climbing structure–Battlepoint | A real outdoor climbing structure!! I would love to not have to go inside and/or take the ferry to climb outside!

| New activity ideas | Battle Point | Pickleball–Battlepoint | We should have dedicated Pickleball courts.

| Activities you enjoy | Battlepoint | Disc golf–Battlepoint | The disc golf has been a GREAT addition! Thanks.

| Activities you enjoy | Battlepoint | Pickleball–Battlepoint | Thank you for moving ahead with the new Pickleball courts at Battle Point! It is a great community of people and the new courts will provide a legacy for the origins of the game right here on BI!

| Activities you enjoy | Battlepoint | Pump track–Battlepoint | The pump track was a great addition to the park. We love it.

| Activities you enjoy | Battlepoint | Pump track–Battlepoint | The pump track is fabulous! From toddlers riding balance bikes to kids, teens, and grownups, it’s used by a really wide swath of age groups. And most of them manage to share use well together.

| Activities you enjoy | Battlepoint | Soccer–Battlepoint | love playing soccer

| Activities you enjoy | Battlepoint | Tennis courts–Battlepoint | Thank you for preserving the tennis courts. They are always in quite good repair, compared to Strawberry Park, and have a back board which is helpful for solo practice. I have used it frequently. Also love to walk in the park

| Activities you enjoy | Battlepoint | Tennis courts–Battlepoint | Love that we’ve kept these tennis courts. Would love it even more of we resurfaced them and even expanded them by adding a couple more.

| Activities you enjoy | Battlepoint | Trails-running–Battlepoint | Excellent trails for running

| Activities you enjoy | Battlepoint | Walking, viewing, picnics, tennis | Walking, viewing, picnics, tennis

| Activities you enjoy | Battlepoint | Walk-Tennis-Battlepoint | walk, tennis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities you enjoy</th>
<th>Battlepoint Park</th>
<th>Connecting trails</th>
<th>Old Mill to Blakely - fabulous connecting trail.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Blakely Harbor</td>
<td>Connecting trails--Blakely Harbor</td>
<td>Connect on trails and quiet road walking from Port Blakely to Eagle Harbor!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf</td>
<td>I agree with this proposal as suggested by Mary Clare! It would be a fitting tribute to Olaf and a great way to memorialize all the contributions he has made toward preserving our precious natural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf</td>
<td>I find this impossible to locate my site of interest. It is Cave Ave and Ferncliff - the one acre parcels. This would be an ideal site to honor local trees and our committed tree expert Olaf Ribiero.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf</td>
<td>I really like the idea of the Olaf Ribiero Tree Park here that someone suggested. He is our island's and county's foremost aborist. This would be a great way to acknowledge his lifelong dedication to preserving trees. He truly is a &quot;tree evangelist,&quot; and he more than anyone I can think of on this island deserves to have a park named for him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf</td>
<td>It think the park proposed is on Cave Avenue. If I am correct, you may want to add your excellent comment to that string for Parks to look at.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really like the idea of the Olaf Ribiero Tree Park here that someone suggested. He is our island’s and county’s foremost aborist. This would be a great way to acknowledge his lifelong dedication to preserving trees. He truly is a &quot;tree evangelist,&quot; and he more than anyone I can think of on this island deserves to have a park named for him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I love this idea! Let’s honor the delightful preservation that Olaf has given us - the way to honor the future is indeed to plant a tree and to garden.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The list of contributions which Olaf Ribeiro has contributed to our community is long. He has protected and moved significant trees in Winslow and surrounding areas - including trees at the High School, Harbor Steps, BPA and most recently Blackely. These are big trees, and Olaf had to raise support funds and big equipment to carry this out. Next time you see a beautiful tree on bloom in Winslow there is a good chance it is due to Olaf. He also gives tours of these trees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few people have done more to preserve trees on Bainbridge than Olaf. Actually no one has done more. I strongly urge you to turn the 1-acre park into Olaf’s park with trees Olaf selects as well as picnic tables that allow for the enjoyment of this potential oasis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a great idea! What a great way to honor Olaf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is an outstanding idea! Honoring the incredible work, passion and caring brought by Olaf Ribeiro to our island and its future is long overdue, and what better way to do it than a tree park! Olaf has, for decades, reminded us of the life-supporting services of trees to humans; the reality of climate change is hopefully bringing this fact home to more and more island residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support this brilliant idea to name this park after Olaf. His contribution to our Island is priceless!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But for Olaf Ribeiro’s multi-decade commitment to Bainbridge tree &amp; understory preservation, our treasured landscape &amp; many of our most valued &amp; vulnerable areas would be much more sterile. Olaf has repeatedly stepped up to help our city live up to its “tree city” designation-saving trees near schools, city lands, on proposed developments, etc. and helping landowners optimally care for trees on their own properties. YES, let’s honor Olaf - name an island park after him. A great idea!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf</td>
<td>Naming this for Olaf would be a wonderful recognition for this world famous tree pathologist. Olaf has led our community for years in his work for trees. He led tree walks in downtown for years showing folks the amazing heritage trees in downtown. He worked tirelessly with the City to preserve and protect our native trees and has been invaluable to me and many others, educating us about the importance of trees. He is wonderful, brilliant, funny and a true friend. Let's honor him. Debbie Vann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf</td>
<td>But for Olaf Ribeiro's multi-decade commitment to Bainbridge tree &amp; understory preservation, our treasured landscape &amp; many of our most valued &amp; vulnerable areas would be much more sterile. Olaf has repeatedly stepped up to help our city live up to its &quot;tree city&quot; designation-saving/moving trees on private &amp; public lands. YES, let's honor Olaf - name an island park after him &amp; let him choose the trees. A great idea!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf</td>
<td>Brilliant idea! I support naming this the Olaf Ribeiro Tree Park, with trees selected by Olaf and passive seating. A lovely way to recognize his many caring and sharing contributions to the preservation of trees in our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf</td>
<td>What a wonderful idea for recognizing a longtime community member known internationally for his lifelong efforts to recognize the importance of trees in our human environment. His work reflects Park District values and efforts to create a variety of opportunities in our parks for recreation, exploration, and appreciation of nature. Honoring Olaf Ribeiro for his work to protect and restore trees in urban environments to enhance quality of life is a strong statement of stewardship for parks!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf</td>
<td>A new Cave Ave. park named after Olaf Ribiero. A park with picnic tables and loaded with trees of Olaf's choice. This park would honor a man who has contributed greatly to the livability of Bainbridge Island: saving citadel trees, keeping trees healthy, planting trees that maintain our forestry heritage and providing a place for people to meet and enjoy the beautiful trees. Thank you for considering my comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf</td>
<td>Known for saving trees, Olaf instead helped me to convince COBI to remove a diseased eucalyptus, planted too close to my garage and leaning severely in its direction. &quot;It's a tree&quot;, he said, &quot;that should never be planted near a structure due to its shallow roots and heavy dense wood.&quot; He asked that I donate it to the BARN. We are lucky to have this scholarly, gentleman for whom to name the treed park on Cave Ave., Marilyn McLauchlan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf</td>
<td>I think this park should be named Olaf Ribiero Tree Park, in honor of all the trees Olaf has preserved and the education he has provided to many of us about the species we have here. The City could consult with Mr. Ribiero about trees he would like to see planted in the park, add some picnic tables and create a lovely outdoor space for us all. Thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf</td>
<td>Olaf Ribeiro is known for saving trees, but in my case helped me to wade through the COBI procedures to obtain a permit to remove a diseased eucalyptus tree, planted too close to my garage and severely leaning in that direction. It is a shallow rooted, very heavy dense tree, he told me, that should never be planted near a structure. Thank you Olaf. By all mean, we are fortunate to have this scholarly gentleman here on BI and for whom to name the park at Cave Ave. Marilyn McLauchlan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf</td>
<td>A great tribute and wonderful idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf</td>
<td>I propose that the Cave Family Property become &quot;The Olaf Ribiero Tree Park.&quot; I envision a passive space with trees selected by Olaf and picnic tables where folks can sit, picnic and commune in a cooler, oxygenated setting that Olaf championed tirelessly. It will be a needed space as we develop the area to oblivion, and it honors our most earnest activist and advocate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf</td>
<td>I also agree with Mary Clare's proposal “an Olaf Ribiero Park at Hawley &amp; Ferncliff! The park not only would be a meaningful way to honor this treasured arborist and ambassador of nature but also a beautiful reminder how imperative it is that we preserve and protect this island's invaluable trees and natural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf/passive sitting</td>
<td>Agreed. Passive sitting areas under large trees are almost completely absent on this Island, especially downtown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>Olaf--Cave Parcels Park</td>
<td>I wholeheartedly endorse this proposal. What better way to thank Olaf Ribeiro for so generously sharing his knowledge, wisdom and tenacity with our community. He has set an unrivalled example for all of us - to do whatever we can, and whatever it takes, to change the way our community and our representatives deal with natural systems for the betterment of the environment in general, and our island in particular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>Eagledale Park</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>This is an unsafe place to walk. It would make a wonderful loop from New Sweden along Old Mill trail to HeyDay Trail to Rose, but walking with a baby is very unsafe. I recognize that this is city right of way, but coordination between park facilities and where people live is critical so that people are not forced to drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Fay Bainbridge</td>
<td>Park value</td>
<td>Fay Bainbridge is a wonderful place and we have enjoyed it for years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| New activity ideas     | Fay Bainbridge      | Interpretive Trails--Fay Bainbridge | 1 - Wildlife Interpretive signs  
2- beach Outlook points  
3- Naturalist / interpretive walks |
| Activities you enjoy   | Fay Bainbridge      | Picnic-Water--Fay       | Family loves the picnic opportunities and beach views.                       |
| Activities you enjoy   | Fay Bainbridge      | Walk dog, picnic--Fay Bainbridge | Walk dog, observe wildlife, picnic                                           |
| Activities you enjoy   | Fay Bainbridge      | Walk dog, picnic--Fay Bainbridge | observe wildlife, picnic, walk on beach                                     |
| Activities you enjoy   | Fay Bainbridge      | Walking, beachcombing--Fay Bainbridge | Walking, beachcombing                                                        |
| Activities you enjoy   | Fay Bainbridge      | Walking, hiking--Fay    | Walking, hiking                                                              |
| Activities you enjoy   | Fay Bainbridge      | Walking, viewing--Fay   | Walking, viewing                                                             |
| New activity ideas     | Fay Bainbridge (south) | Interpretive Trails--Fay Bainbridge | 1 - Wildlife Interpretive walks /signs  
2- beach Outlook points, more benches  
3- Naturalist tours |
| New activity ideas     | Fort Ward            | Interpretive Trails--Fort Ward | 1 - Wildlife Interpretive walks /signs  
2- beach Outlook points, more benches  
3- Naturalist tours / interpretive walks |
| New activity ideas     | Fort Ward            | Play structure--Fort Ward | A play structure in the northern most section of the Fort Ward Parade Grounds would create a space for residents to gather. It would create community and vibrancy in the open public space. Situating the play structure in the northernmost section would maintain the integrity of the historic southern half of the Parade Grounds, and would position the structure furthest from residential properties bordering the space. It could be a natural structure like Schel Chelb or some other small playground. |
### Activities you enjoy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity 1</th>
<th>Activity 2</th>
<th>Additional Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Ward Trails--Fort Ward</td>
<td>Fort Ward is a joy. We're wondering if gravel will be added to sections that get boggy during the rainy season. We've noticed gravel added to Gazzam and The Grand Forest trails. Totally great! Keep up the good work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Ward Walk dog, wildlife--Fort Ward</td>
<td>observe wildlife, walk dog, hike, enjoy nature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Ward Walking--Fort Ward</td>
<td>Fort Ward is a great community resource! It provides walking and biking access to all ages and abilities. I walk there weekly and always see others enjoying it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Ward Connecting Trails--Fort Ward to The trail from Blakely to Fort ward is my favorite on the island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazzam Boat dock-Gazzam</td>
<td>It's a great lake, too bad we can't get closer to it. Could there be a dock built out onto the lake? Any chance to allow fishing, assuming there are fish in it?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazzam Connectivity</td>
<td>Would be great if you could one day walk/bike from GF all the way to Gazzam via Strawberry Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazzam MTB--Safety, Gazzam</td>
<td>As a daily park walker, I am continually overtaken by bikers going very fast around blind corners and down hills in several of the parks on the island. We don't need more infrastructure. We do need some education of bikers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazzam Trails--Gazzam</td>
<td>This is a fantastic trail that was a great addition to the park system.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazzam Trails--Gazzam</td>
<td>Fantastic place to hike or run: beautiful forest, quiet, from hills to beach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazzam MTB--Gazzam</td>
<td>Thank you to the Veterane family for donating this land for &quot;recreation.&quot; Because of that, we have a wonderful bike trail, a wonderful combination of conservation and use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazzam Trails--Gazzam</td>
<td>Gazaam Lake is an island treasure. My family uses it for hiking/walking/trail running.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazzam Trails--Gazzam</td>
<td>Agreed. More trails for mountain biking and hiking are in need. There can be directional trails, or bike specific and hike specific trails too.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazzam Parking--Gazzam</td>
<td>Can't get this to move to the right location. Just wanted to note that all too often when I arrive at the trailhead to Gazam lake (the one off Marshall rd, there are no places to park, so either I leave or park inappropriately. I find this frustrating. Especially happens on weekends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gazzam MTB--Gazzam</td>
<td>As one of the larger parks on this island, this seems like a great opportunity to increase mountain biking infrastructure in a way that coexists well with other uses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Gazzam</td>
<td>MTB--Gazzam</td>
<td>I don't know what &quot;education of bikers&quot; means. Our desire to go fast is not something that &quot;education&quot; would fix; trails that allow use other than slow walking would address the issue/conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>Gazzam</td>
<td>Problems--Gazzam</td>
<td>I love hiking and biking in and through Gazzam Lake park and have visited throughout the year during all my 25 years on Bainbridge. I am concerned that 1) pet leash rules are completely ignored by 99% of dog walkers and not enforced by COBI, and 2) there are bootleg bike trails all over the place. Both have negative impacts on wildlife. I would love to see less of both of these problems. Thanks,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>Gazzam</td>
<td>Off-leash--Gazzam</td>
<td>This is not depraved chaos. 99% of dogs are off leash and 99% of that time there is no problem... which is my experience. Enjoyment also comes from exploring a new route, many of which are legacy animal paths that are &gt;25 years old. The 'back' of the lake is awesome and alternative lake access points mean my off-leash happy dog can cool down and really enjoy it. It is not a problem. Feel free to reduce personal wildlife impact by staying home. Why do you criminalize your community? Peace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Gazzam</td>
<td>MTB--Knudsen-Westwood-Cry</td>
<td>Maybe another bike trail between the Knudsen trail and the westwood trail? It could go down to Crystal Springs Drive, then bikers could look back up Knudsen? Also, improve the uphill bike potential on Knudsen!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Park maintenance--Gideon Park</td>
<td>I picked my home in part due to the proximity Gideon Park, as well as being walking distance to the ferries and schools. I expected my children to play there at least weekly. But alas they rarely did, due solely to the condition of the grass field. They call it &quot;unusable&quot; for soccer and prefer trekking up to the High School or Commodore fields rather than the much shorter walk to Gideon. I suggest either ripping up and redoing the grass to make this more usable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Gideon</td>
<td>Tennis/Pickleball--Gideon</td>
<td>Downtown Winslow lost its one tennis court years ago at Waterfront park, and then its one pickleball court. Gideon's grass is rarely used and could be a good location for these activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Grand Forest</td>
<td>Interpretive Trails--Grand Forest</td>
<td>1 - Wildlife Interpretive walks /signs 2- more benches 3- Naturalist tours / interpretive walks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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New activity ideas
Activities you enjoy
Activities you enjoy
Activities you enjoy

Grand Forest
Grand Forest
Grand Forest
Grand Forest

There are different "forest regimes" to be seen along the trails, due to differences in
wetness, harvest history, etc. It would be great if there were information about the
history and natural history of these different areas, either on a web site, and/or
Interpretive Trails‐‐Grand Fore triggered by GPS coordinates as one is passing through different areas.
great trail system for hikes, bikes, dogs and horses.
Trails‐‐Grand Forest
Quiet short hike with the dog. Love the big trees and bird song.
Trails‐‐Grand Forest
Daily running on trails!
Trails‐‐Grand Forest

Activities you enjoy

I think that the Grand Forest trails in general are quite good, but when I discovered
this trail it seemed even more amazing than the others. Good job!
Grand Forest
Trails‐Grand Forest (F2Sky)
Grand Forest
Trails‐‐Running, Grand Forest Love the running trails and use them weekly!!
It would be cool to see some mountain bike specific trails be put in somewhere on
the island, and it seems like this could be an option.
Grand Forest
MTB‐Grand Forest
I think we need more spots for MTB on the island, especially trails like Veterane, but
will more features. I would love to feel as though I don't have to drive off the island
to have fun on a bike.
Grand Forest North MTB‐Grand North
Absolutely love this Forest to Sky trail connecting the Grand Forest to Battlepoint!
Grand Forest (Forest Trails‐‐Grand Forest (Forest to Our family runs/hikes/bikes it all the time!

Activities you enjoy

Grand Forest East

Activities you enjoy
Activities you enjoy
Activities you enjoy
Activities you enjoy

Grand Forest East
Grand Forest East
Grand Forest East
Grand Forest East

Activities you enjoy
Activities you enjoy
Other feedback

New activity ideas

Equestrian‐‐Grand Forest East love the direct access from surrounding equestrian barns for weekly trail riding.
love to go on a long horseback ride with daughter and friends from Grand Forest
Equestrian‐‐Grand Forest East East all the way to Battle Point
Walking trails
Trails‐‐Grand Forest East
Walk dog, wildlife‐‐Grand Fore observe wildlife, walk dog, enjoy nature
Walking‐‐Grand Forest East walk the forest
Significant wildland urban interface wildfire hazards. Hazard mitigation efforts
required to reduce wildfire hazards. This location I assessed wildfire fuel loads for
while working for BIPRD in 2016 and found significant accumulation of wildfire fuel
loads. US Fire Administration grant funding available for hazard mitigation efforts.
Additionally, coordination and responder training necessary to provide response
capacity in conjunction with BIFD to provide wildfire response capacity.
Seems like a good spot for increased mountain biking opportunities

Activities you enjoy
New activity ideas

Grand Forest East
WUI‐‐Grand Forest East
Grand Forest North MTB‐‐Grand Forest North

New activity ideas
Activities you enjoy
Activities you enjoy

Grand Forest North Off‐leash‐‐Grand Forest North This is a low use part of the GF. Would be great for one designated off‐leash trails
Walking, hiking
Grand Forest West Hiking‐‐Grand Forest West
We enjoy running almost daily on the trails!
Grand Forest West Trails‐Grand Forest West
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New activity ideas</th>
<th>Grand Forest-Gazzam</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Trails connecting the GF and Gazzam would open up a ton of biking/walking options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>Grand Forest North</td>
<td>MTB--Grand Forest North</td>
<td>I disagree. This is a prime spot to increase MTB development. It’s relatively separate from walking trails and could enhance riding opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>Hawley Cove</td>
<td>Teen programs--Hawley Cove</td>
<td>Hawley Cove is a wonderful little beach. It does have some litter problems. It would be wonderful if Parks had more programs for youth/teens to get involved with park cleanup.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Hawley Cove</td>
<td>Trails--waterfront, Hawley Cove</td>
<td>NOTE: Your map mislabels this as &quot;Hidden Cove Park&quot;. It is in fact &quot;Hawley Cove Park&quot;. Fay Bainbridge is arguably the best beach on the island, but Hawley Cove is far more cozy, more interesting, and walkable from downtown. Plus in the Spring and Fall, when the tide goes negative, the hike from Hawley Cove to the Wing Point gravel spit can’t be beat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Hidden Cove</td>
<td>Boat Launch--Hidden Cove</td>
<td>Would it be possible to add a boat launch (like Fort Ward) here?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Hidden Cove</td>
<td>Picnic-viewing--Hidden Cove</td>
<td>Picnic, viewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>Island-wide</td>
<td>Dog-free areas--General</td>
<td>I would like to have dog-free areas in many of our parks. Even the on-leash areas of our parks have lots of poop on them. These dog-free areas would be good for having a picnic in the grass, foraging for edible plants along the trail, and having kids crawl around â€” without getting covered in poop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Island-wide</td>
<td>Interpretive trails--Gazzam</td>
<td>1 - Wildlife Interpretive walks /signs 2- benches 3- Naturalist tours / interpretive walks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Island-wide</td>
<td>kayaks--Crystal Springs park</td>
<td>If this piece of waterfront is city property it would be nice to have steps down to the shore. Right now it's not acceptable. I'd love to have kayak put in access at this spot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>Island-wide</td>
<td>MTB--Gazzam</td>
<td>The reason that there are bootleg bike trails at Gazzam is because there is a new for more mtb trails on the island. LOTS of folks are mtbing now, and the parks need to do a better job allowing bike trails to be made...then bootleg trails wouldn’t need to happen and bikers and hikers wouldn’t run into one another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>Island-wide</td>
<td>Park boundary-Blakely</td>
<td>Strange that the park boundary on this map includes private land of the Brainerds? Why? Have they donated all the land between island wood and Taylor? It’s not what is reflected on Kitsap Parcel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>Island-wide</td>
<td>Pea Patch--Battlepoint</td>
<td>Love the Pea Patch. Wish there were more on the island like the ones at BattlePoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>Island-wide</td>
<td>Sarcasm--Not included in summary</td>
<td>Others might like a horse-free park or area, or bicycle free area, or even child free (the loud ones) area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>Island-wide</td>
<td>Volunteer Stewardship--general</td>
<td>2 general comments: 1) this interactive map was a good idea, but the user interface has problems that will discourage people from using it. 2) there are volunteer stewardship groups in Kitsap County for the different parks. There is no mechanism I know of for these volunteers to communicate with people from other parks or from Bainbridge. I think that kind of broad sharing of ideas could be very beneficial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Island-wide</td>
<td>MTB</td>
<td>What if you build some Downhill bike trails that could be used? What if they used the frontside of Gazzam?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Lost Valley</td>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>I hiked the early trails in the Lost Valley when the city first acquired the property, and am looking forward to seeing the Lost Valley Park when it is finally passed along to BI Parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Lynwood Center</td>
<td>Park Development--Lynwood</td>
<td>The abandoned property behind the chain link fence- the corner street side portion could be turned into a Lynwood Center Greens/Park as an anchor green space for the growing commercial and residential density being developed there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Lynwood Center</td>
<td>New park-Lynwood Center</td>
<td>Agreed. That fenced in, paved area is private and on the market from what I understand. Would be a great area for the community. Grass area, play structure, additional parking (could turn into farmers market area), new skate park, etc. Great use of space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>Madison Tot Lot</td>
<td>Parking--Madison Tot Lot</td>
<td>Is the parking at this location part of the tot lot park? It seems to be used as overflow parking for nearby residences. Signage might be necessary to dictate that it is for park use only if this is the case.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Madison Tot Lot</td>
<td>Children--Madison Tot Lot</td>
<td>The Tot Lot is a wonderful neighborhood pocket park. With all the development currently occurring along Madison Ave south of HS Road, it is more important that ever that this park be maintained for the enjoyment of all. I urge the Parks District to take any necessary steps to ensure that the Tot Lot is retained into perpetuity, and if possible, expanded and improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Madison Tot Lot</td>
<td>Pocket Park--Madison Tot Lot</td>
<td>My family has used the Madison Tot Lot literally, and not exaggerating, thousands of times. It’s not the best playground by any measure, but it is convenient, walkable, and far enough off of Madison, Winslow Way, Bijune, and Ericksen to be a respite from the constant road noise living in Winslow. Thank you for not going forward with the land trade with the neighboring developer. This pocket park is a wonderful value for the Winslow residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Madison Tot Lot</td>
<td>Pocket Park--Madison Tot Lot</td>
<td>Agreed! And for those of us who live at the far ends of BI, it’s really nice to break up a chunk of errands with play at the Tot Lot. It also encourages us to walk up and down Madison rather than drive between errands. For such a tiny playground, we nearly always see someone else there when we arrive and another family arriving as we leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>Horse Trails--Manzanita</td>
<td>love the horse trails at Manzanita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>Walking--Manzanita</td>
<td>Walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Manzanita</td>
<td>Equestrian--Manzanita</td>
<td>Love riding the equestrian trails and jumping the cross-country course. Looking forward to the jump improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Meadowmeer</td>
<td>Golf--Meadowmeer</td>
<td>Golf!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>Meigs park</td>
<td>Cleanup--Offleash--Meigs Park</td>
<td>Needs lots of cleanup and a boardwalk in wet areas. Also good for a designated off-leash dog area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Moritani Park</td>
<td>Trail--waterfront, Moritani Park</td>
<td>The tiny public waterfront trail between Shepard and Winslow Way is a great example of Bainbridge Island at its best. I don't know if this was BI Parks or COBI or the developers doing, but short connections like this make Bainbridge Island unique in its walkability vs. other suburbs. The more we can continue creating these, the better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Nutes Pond</td>
<td>Trails--Nutes Pond</td>
<td>Lovely trails, serene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Owens Park</td>
<td>Children--Owens Park</td>
<td>My kids love Owens park but I hate the water feature. It’s their favorite part but they’re always soaking wet after. I often avoid the park entirely for lack of a spare change of clothes, unless we’re going straight home after.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Owens Park</td>
<td>Connectivity--Owens Park</td>
<td>Owens Park is a great playground. But what makes Bainbridge Island so great are the bits and pieces of trails that make parks like this walkable and bike-able rather than having to always drive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point White</td>
<td>Children safety--Point White</td>
<td>We love this park! I would suggest adding a low fence or bushes along the road (with an opening or gate) to prevent children from running out into the busy street. Young children chasing balls, or wanting to head to the beach ahead of their parents can easily run right into the street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Interpretation--Point White</td>
<td>A great place to learn about wetlands, shoreline, and interactions between land and water.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pritchard Park</td>
<td>Off-leash--Pritchard Park</td>
<td>We would love to see Prichard Park area left in a natural state with off-leash dogs allowed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Water views--Pritchard Park</td>
<td>A favorite place for walking and water views</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other feedback</td>
<td>ParkMaintenance--Red Pine Park</td>
<td>Red Pine Park is a jewel, enjoyed by many walkers and visitors seeking a lovely place to sit. It is, however, in need of TLC. Some of the shrubs have become thuggish and weeds abound in spite of neighbors’ attempts to keep things under control.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Scuba--Rockaway</td>
<td>This is one of the best SCUBA diving spots in Puget Sound, and a great place to explore on foot at low tide, a great place to view birds, the water, the cityscape, the sunrise, etc. What a treasure!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Pickleball--Sakai</td>
<td>We should have an indoor Pickleball facility built here. Minimum of 8 courts, with a minimum of a roof and preferably completely indoor for all-season use. Pickleball was invented here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakai</td>
<td>RV Park--Sakai</td>
<td>As a small RV owner I have enjoyed several city RV parks across the country. Usually they are small, approx. 20-30 or so spaces with a bath house, water, electric and sewer hookups. Saikai park’s close proximity to our downtown is a perfect location for travelers to stay while producing revenue to support our parks. Generating $30-40 per space per night, limiting length of stays to a week and if necessary placing restrictions on the size of the RVs. It would compliment our current RV facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New activity ideas</td>
<td>Tennis Courts--Sakai</td>
<td>Two tennis courts-one which can be bubbled for winter use and make it fee-based for income.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Trails--Sakai</td>
<td>My husband and our two sons live in Sakai Village and we walk through Sakai Park every single day. I’m very enthusiastic about the development of this park, and I LOVED the presentation provided to the community on June 6th. I thought the plan was really great. I would love better trails throughout the park and near the pond/lake feature.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Trail--STO</td>
<td>The loss of trees at the beginning of the STO trail is a disgrace, but this little loop off that trail is a wonderful addition to the trails of Bainbridge Island.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Dog Park--Strawberry hill</td>
<td>Dog park and classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities you enjoy</td>
<td>Waterfront Park</td>
<td>Boat Launch--waterfront park</td>
<td>boat launch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New activity ideas</th>
<th>Williams-Olson</th>
<th>Boat launch--Manzanita Bay (S)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seems like part of the appeal of this park is that it's relatively primitive. There are plenty of options for parks with more established infrastructure. What about this staying more like and enhanced road end as opposed to more development. Also, the hill down is pretty steep for a concrete ramp and the tides are so dramatic that the ramp would go far into the sound.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New activity ideas</th>
<th>Winslow</th>
<th>Tennis Court--Winslow</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased density within the &quot;Walkable Winslow Core&quot; will in turn increase the need for at least one tennis court where our island's density is the greatest. A closed-campus policy, high school tennis program, BIMPRD all-day summer programming, and a pickleball tournament have precluded public use of the six BHS courts weekdays all year long, weekdays and evenings in March through mid-May, and one prime-season weekend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Water Access

(1497 responses—790 for first priority, 707 for second priority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>First Priority (# respondents / percentage of total by column)</th>
<th>Second Priority (# respondents / percentage of total by column)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beachcombing/Walking</td>
<td>423 (53.5%)</td>
<td>131 (18.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach activities, including swimming</td>
<td>140 (17.7%)</td>
<td>180 (25.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking/canoeing/paddle boarding</td>
<td>132 (16.7%)</td>
<td>291 (41.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>22 (2.8%)</td>
<td>37 (5.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>20 (2.5%)</td>
<td>38 (5.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing in this category is a priority for me</td>
<td>22 (2.8%)</td>
<td>18 (2.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Other first priority Water Access activities identified by cumulatively less than 4% of respondents: Dog access to water, leash-free dog access to water, dog beach-walking, birding, shoreline access, open-water swimming, trailer boaters, scuba diving, rowing, public dock/boat ramp/boat launch, habitat restoration, bicycling/mountain biking, horseback riding, pickleball, considering how sea-level rise will affect access and infrastructure, tennis, arboretum in Olaf’s honor.

- Other second priority Water Access activities identified by cumulatively less than 2% of respondents: Dog access to water, dog beach-walking, water park play, shoreline access, board sailing, walking, picnicking/camping, boating, motorboating, soccer, walking to ferry or town, soccer
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Sports Facilities

(1268 responses—786 for first priority, 482 for second priority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>First Priority (# respondents / percentage of total by column)</th>
<th>Second Priority (# respondents / percentage of total by column)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soccer fields</td>
<td>124 (15.8%)</td>
<td>53 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball/softball fields/kickball</td>
<td>31 (3.9%)</td>
<td>52 (10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>135 (17.2%)</td>
<td>52 (10.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickleball courts</td>
<td>87 (11.1%)</td>
<td>60 (12.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
<td>23 (2.9%)</td>
<td>32 (6.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboard parks</td>
<td>10 (1.3%)</td>
<td>34 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football fields</td>
<td>2 (0.3%)</td>
<td>4 (0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse fields</td>
<td>8 (1.0%)</td>
<td>19 (3.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller hockey</td>
<td>10 (1.3%)</td>
<td>22 (4.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volleyball courts/badminton</td>
<td>14 (1.8%)</td>
<td>36 (7.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc golf/ultimate frisbee/spikeball</td>
<td>28 (3.6%)</td>
<td>56 (11.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing in this category is a priority for me</td>
<td>192 (24.4%)</td>
<td>41 (8.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Other first priority Sports Facilities identified by cumulatively less than 16% of respondents: Amphitheater, swimming (10% of the 16% “other” respondents: lap, master, outdoor, competitive, etc. – also addressed in Question 8), pump track, mountain bike trails, table tennis, ice skating rink, dog off-leash areas, dog events/agility area, equine area, covered and indoor activity space, covered roller hockey, gymnastics facility, outdoor yoga or Tai Chee court/field, bike lanes, playgrounds with picnic tables and seating, racquetball, hiking, horse riding trails, dance hall, illuminated fields, squash court, considering how climate change will affect access and use of sports facilities.

- Other second priority Sports Facilities identified by cumulatively less than 5% of respondents: Ice skating, indoor tennis courts, swimming, jogging trails, open-air/outdoor game fields, pump
Attachment C: Activity Priorities Survey Responses

track, indoor gym, climbing structure, volleyball, running track, climbing/bouldering, lighted soccer/lacrosse fields, baseball fields, mountain biking.

Trails

(1514 responses—805 for first priority, 709 for second priority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>First Priority (# respondents / percentage of total by column)</th>
<th>Second Priority (# respondents / percentage of total by column)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiking/walking</td>
<td>558 (69.3%)</td>
<td>143 (20.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>69 (8.6%)</td>
<td>224 (31.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain biking</td>
<td>42 (5.2%)</td>
<td>36 (5.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horseback riding</td>
<td>15 (1.9%)</td>
<td>23 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard surface trails</td>
<td>23 (2.9%)</td>
<td>75 (10.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogging/running trails</td>
<td>65 (8.1%)</td>
<td>161 (22.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump track</td>
<td>3 (0.4%)</td>
<td>21 (3.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing in this category is a priority for me</td>
<td>14 (1.7%)</td>
<td>21 (3.0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Other first priority Trails identified by cumulatively less than 2% of respondents: Off-leash dog, dog walking, dog park, dog-free nature walks, ADA/wheelchair accessible, swimming, water polo, cross-island connectivity, considering how to increase connectivity and decrease greenhouse gas emissions with non-motorized trails, roller blading hard surface trails.

- Other second priority Trails identified by cumulatively less than 1% of respondents: ADA accessible trails, dog park, hiking with dog, mountain biking, bicycle, hiking.
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#### Outdoor Facilities

(1557 responses—803 for first priority, 754 for second priority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>First Priority (# respondents / percentage of total by column)</th>
<th>Second Priority (# respondents / percentage of total by column)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife/wetland viewing areas</td>
<td>113 (14.1%)</td>
<td>133 (17.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small watercraft shore access</td>
<td>73 (9.1%)</td>
<td>79 (10.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic areas</td>
<td>41 (5.1%)</td>
<td>67 (8.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>305 (38%)</td>
<td>192 (25.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play areas (natural and traditional playground)</td>
<td>62 (7.7%)</td>
<td>81 (10.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping</td>
<td>16 (2%)</td>
<td>29 (3.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-leash dog areas</td>
<td>83 (10.3%)</td>
<td>87 (11.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports/active use</td>
<td>90 (11.2%)</td>
<td>74 (9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing in this category is a priority for me</td>
<td>8 (1%)</td>
<td>8 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Other **first priority** Outdoor Facilities identified by cumulatively less than 2% of respondents: Dog beach access, swimming pool (indoor/outdoor), dog-free areas, considering how these resources will be used in a changing climate, splash park, sprinklers for kids, event space.

- Other **second priority** Outdoor Facilities identified by cumulatively less than 1% of respondents: Boat launch, outdoor swimming pool, lighted fields.
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Recreational Opportunities

(1494 responses—797 for first priority, 697 for second priority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>First Priority (# respondents / percentage of total by column)</th>
<th>Second Priority (# respondents / percentage of total by column)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community events (concerts, hayrides)</td>
<td>149 (18.7%)</td>
<td>104 (14.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor programming (hiking, biking, boating)</td>
<td>100 (12.5%)</td>
<td>119 (17.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-day camps (non-school day camps)</td>
<td>20 (2.5%)</td>
<td>38 (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; culture (pottery, painting, language, dance)</td>
<td>55 (6.9%)</td>
<td>77 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness activities (yoga, Tai Chi, Zumba)</td>
<td>43 (5.4%)</td>
<td>65 (9.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized sports (sport leagues)</td>
<td>48 (6%)</td>
<td>46 (6.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports activities (racquet sports, disc golf, lessons)</td>
<td>61 (7.7%)</td>
<td>44 (6.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic activities (lap swim, swim lessons, teams)</td>
<td>225 (28.2%)</td>
<td>76 (10.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics/Parkour/Ninja programming</td>
<td>26 (3.3%)</td>
<td>22 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active adult (intergenerational, dynamic aging)</td>
<td>29 (3.6%)</td>
<td>87 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing in this category is a priority for me</td>
<td>23 (2.9%)</td>
<td>13 (1.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Other first priority Recreational Opportunities identified by cumulatively less than 3% of respondents: Pickleball courts, dog agility course, swimming pool, doggie day care, adventure playground (natural freeform play area for children), educational walks, water polo, dog classes, how will climate change affect the cost of managing these facilities and ability of attendees to participate, something for teenagers, soccer, bowling, water polo pool.

- Other second priority Recreational Opportunities identified by cumulatively less than 1% of respondents: Table tennis, dog activity, dog classes, tennis, larger swimming pool, meditation.
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Recreational Segments

(1423 responses—783 for first priority, 640 for second priority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>First Priority (# respondents / percentage of total by column)</th>
<th>Second Priority (# respondents / percentage of total by column)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After school programs</td>
<td>68 (8.7%)</td>
<td>55 (8.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-school days programming (camps)</td>
<td>39 (5.0%)</td>
<td>62 (9.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth programs</td>
<td>121 (15.5%)</td>
<td>90 (14.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen programs</td>
<td>113 (14.4%)</td>
<td>100 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult programs</td>
<td>148 (18.9%)</td>
<td>100 (15.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family programs</td>
<td>38 (4.9%)</td>
<td>62 (9.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active adult (50+) programming</td>
<td>153 (19.5%)</td>
<td>101 (15.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic recreational programs (special needs)</td>
<td>17 (2.2%)</td>
<td>55 (8.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing in this category is a priority for me</td>
<td>78 (10%)</td>
<td>15 (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Other **first priority** Recreational Segments identified by cumulatively less than 1% of respondents: Swimming, high school teams, dog training, aquatic activities.

- Other **second priority** Recreational Segments identified by respondents: None.
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#### Conservation/Wildlife Category

(1476 responses—787 for first priority, 689 for second priority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th><strong>First Priority</strong> (# respondents / percentage of total by column)</th>
<th><strong>Second Priority</strong> (# respondents / percentage of total by column)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife viewing</td>
<td>108 (13.7%)</td>
<td>120 (17.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive or contemplative walks</td>
<td>122 (15.5%)</td>
<td>105 (15.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlook points, benches</td>
<td>138 (17.5%)</td>
<td>125 (18.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural area restoration</td>
<td>255 (32.4%)</td>
<td>126 (18.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalist tours</td>
<td>30 (3.8%)</td>
<td>50 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental education (e.g. SCC)</td>
<td>77 (9.8%)</td>
<td>152 (22.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing in this category is a priority for me</td>
<td>52 (6.6%)</td>
<td>9 (1.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Other first priority** Conservation/Wildlife Category identified by cumulatively less than 1% of respondents: Swimming pool, open up overgrown parks, consider how climate change will affect our conservation and wildlife resources.

- **Other second priority** Conservation/Wildlife Category identified by cumulatively less than 1% of respondents: Shoreline purchase, open space acquisition.
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Special Use Facilities

(1302 responses—774 for first priority, 528 for second priority)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>First Priority (# respondents / percentage of total by column)</th>
<th>Second Priority (# respondents / percentage of total by column)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gymnastics buildings</td>
<td>44 (5.7%)</td>
<td>66 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen center</td>
<td>65 (8.4%)</td>
<td>87 (16.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagledale Pottery Center</td>
<td>29 (3.7%)</td>
<td>59 (11.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seabold Hall</td>
<td>14 (1.8%)</td>
<td>35 (6.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Yeomalt</td>
<td>24 (3.1%)</td>
<td>37 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Center Hall</td>
<td>58 (7.5%)</td>
<td>68 (12.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strawberry Hill Center</td>
<td>26 (3.4%)</td>
<td>53 (10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Center</td>
<td>393 (50.8%)</td>
<td>93 (17.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing in this category is a priority for me</td>
<td>102 (13.2%)</td>
<td>20 (3.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Other first priority Special Use Facilities identified by cumulatively less than 3% of respondents: Fay Bainbridge cabins, mountain bike trails, bubble-covered tennis court for winter, swimming pool (indoor/outdoor/competition), dog events/agility center, Battlepoint Park, competitive aquatic center, bike lanes, lighted sport fields, indoor baseball facility, gym space, downtown Parks office.

- Other second priority Special Use Facilities identified by cumulatively less than 2% of respondents: House at Grand Forest, ice skating, swimming/competition pool, tennis courts, additional crafts, woodworking, metalworks, etc., observatory/telescope, bike park.
Report for Bainbridge Parks - programs

Response Counts

Completion Rate: 100%

Complete: 78

Totals: 78
**Attachment D: Program Priorities Survey Responses**

1. What programs do you participate in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ResponseID</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Discover Bainbridge walks Aqua exercise classes Tai chi chin class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Aquatic center swim lesson registration to earn swim licenses. Gymnastics (Rec Opt Team) Tennis @ BAC Summer camps (paddle camp, science, and forts) Adult Creative Writing with Margaret Nevinski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Aquatic center swim lesson registration to earn swim licenses. Gymnastics (Rec Opt Team) Tennis @ BAC Summer camps (paddle camp, science, and forts) Adult Creative Writing with Margaret Nevinski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Employee-Assistant MTB instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Avid mountainbiker and has done many mountain biking programs with park in the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Volleyball Basketball Summer camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Tennis, hiking, and mountain biking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mountain Biking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>We utilize our local parks, the pool, have rented various facilities and have utilized various park district programs especially for our daughter as she was growing up. Our most heavily utilized program is the gymnastic program which our daughter has been involved in since pre-school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Our family participates in Hiking/Running/mountain biking on trails, tennis, basketball, softball, soccer, swimming in the Puget Sound off of the docks, beachcombing/hiking, and use of park boat ramps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Youth Tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Tennis, swimming, sailing, golf, nature walks, biking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Concerts in the park Adult education Youth education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>pickle ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Swim lessons, Family swim, open swim, lap swimming Gymnastics lessons Recreational soccer Kayaking Mountain biking Summer camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pickleball - almost daily and I am 69!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Pickleball open play at Battle Point Park 6-10 hours/week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Pickle ball at Battle Point. Watch my granddaughter's soccer games.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Kids gymnastics, fairy camp, LEGO club at Blakely, swimming for kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Weekly four mile group walks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Aquatic center (boot camp, river fitness, weekday core), also lap swimming and masters swimming. Bainbridge 2 and 4 mile weekly hikes, social paddle, day hikes and weekend hiking/backpacking trips, dog training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kids' camps; pool lap swimming; sports practices; dog walking; trail running</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Community programs, fitness classes, organized sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Concerts in the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Watercolor painting currently. I have participated in Tai Chi classes and pottery classes in the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Kid Camps Swim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Masters Swimming at Pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Bainbridge Aquatic Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Bainbridge Aquatics Masters Program - Three times a week/52 weeks a year (unless traveling). It is a wonderful program in so many ways and a new pool would just enhance and increase involvement in all aspects of the aquatics center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Kids and adults classes, swim club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>None at this time. My two experiences in attempting to participate in Parks &amp; Recs programs since moving here 5 years ago unfortunately didn't go well. When we first moved here, I signed up myself, husband, adult son &amp; his wife to do a large canoe tour of the perimeter of BI but it was cancelled due to not enough participants. My second attempt was a dog training program last summer which went VERY poorly; turns out my dog is highly anxious and couldn't tolerate the group format - would have asked for a refund but the trainer stated she would meet with me individually for a couple sessions to make up my investment in the class. Despite having several email exchanges with her over the course of 2-3 months, she never followed through, never did commit to a meeting time, so I did not receive the service I paid for and lost about $200 - not at all satisfied with this outcome :/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>walking on trails (and using them for my commute) particularly like the new Hawley Park boardwalk I now leave my car at home an walk to the ferry or to town (I live in old Wing Point)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Master's swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Bisc Lap swim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Adult education, adult fitness and sports, youth education, youth camps, special events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Bainbridge Island 4-mile walks (have been doing them for eight years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>I don't. Primarily because of the expense. I cannot afford the hiking, skiing or biking groups costs so I go one my own. I'd like to find people to do activities with as I am a single senior, but I just cannot afford the cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>I have used the parks department classes/programs for 15 years--from drawing to pottery to concerts and performances at Battlepoint Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Sports Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>My children have participated in swim lessons for years, and my son is currently playing club water polo. He has also taken gymnastics, basketball, and writing classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>The aquatic center is the highest use our family has gotten and it is too busy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Zumba at Island Center; My husband does the Tuesday 4 mile walking group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Dog classes most recently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>ddd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>None at present. Not living on BI right now. Plan to participate in water aerobics in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>4-mile walks, kayaking, hiking/snowshoeing, naturalist programs, birding outings, boating, etc...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Pottery and racket sports mostly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Help lead a program under the BIMPRD umbrella.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Love the park'kour classes, especially those geared towards young professionals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>soccer fields, we need more lighted fields for fall and winter usage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Throughout the year we participate in youth soccer, youth dance and gymnastics, yoga and swimming lessons. We also enjoy summer camps and the opportunity to try out new sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>summer camps, aquatic camps, paddle camps, coed softball (until they got rid of it), walking group once or twice, pottery camp once, sports at various times, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Swim/diving lessons, pottery, outdoor concerts, egg hunt, hayride, winter festival, trail running, pickleball, gymnastics, children’s paddling camp, release your inner child, sewing... (there’s so many more that I always eye!!!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>I don’t currently take any classes because of my work schedule. I do enjoy hearing about others experiences and look forward to someday being able to participate. The programming done by the park department is what makes this island a great place to live. There seems to be something for everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>I do not formally participate in any BI Park Rec program. But I am a heavy user of the assets. What I do use: * parks like Grand Forest, Gazzam, Battle Point where I run and take walks * Battle Point park where I play pickup soccer * members of my family participate in youth athletics that practice and play at Battle Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Tennis for kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Swimming, tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Dog walking, friend walking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Dog walking, friend walking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Bainbridge Tennis Association. Sunday Concerts Trail walking Lap swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Bainbridge Tennis Association. Sunday Concerts Trail walking Lap swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Master’s, self supported. Occasional classes but difficult to attend as I still work and many are offered during the day. Would love more weekend, beginner activity in things like hiking, skiing, kayaking etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Please provide specific feedback on each program you mentioned above:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ResponseID</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I'm impressed by the range and variety of activities offered. Both the Discover Bainbridge walks and the aqua exercise classes have become an important part of my life and my personal fitness program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>We've been pleased with all the programs we participated in and found staff to be responsive. Our programming needs change as the kids get older and now that I have teens - we don't use it as much. It was fantastic until they were each about 11 or 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>We've been pleased with all the programs we participated in and found staff to be responsive. Our programming needs change as the kids get older and now that I have teens - we don't use it as much. It was fantastic until they were each about 11 or 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Very fun activity, people have fun doing it, brings people into the outdoors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Good. Should make more advanced mountain bike camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Basketball: Schedule should be set in advance if the season-not weekly Adequate facilities should be available so kids aren't practicing so late. Scoreboards should be visible to all. Volleyball: Schedule should be set before season. Games shouldn't start so late Scoreboards should be visible to all Uniforms should be ordered and available before games begin. Honestly, the scheduling is the biggest sticking point. Why is this a problem? It's laughable. Camps are not well run. My son suffered a serious injury at mountain bike camp and the teenagers running the camp put a bandaid on it and told me it was ok. It wasn't. He fractured his finger as well as it was almost severed. Incompetent. The person in charge also brushed it off. You can contact me on this if you'd like. My name is Martine Domenick. I would NEVER trust my kids on an overnight camp or adventure camp with Bl again bc of this. Ninja camp was a joke. Basketball camp got cancelled due to poor attendance-the week before it was supposed to start.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I would like to see more tennis courts on the island as well as improved care of the current facilities. A lighted court would be very popular especially in the winter when it is dark at 4pm, long before many people get home from work. In addition I would like to see mountain bike specific trails on the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Need mountain bike specific trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Parks - they're great - we regularly use Fay Bainbridge and the Grand Forest trails. We also used Battlepoint Park regularly especially when our daughter was young. The pool - great swim programs and its crowded - definitely an issue with the growth on the island Facilities - (like Island Center Hall) - these are great to have access to for large gatherings and a great asset to the island Park District Programs - wonderful, diverse options for the community - we relied heavily on the summer programs for our daughter and loved it. Gymnastic Program - has been a great place for our daughter to grow up. It is currently out grown it's space and is inadequate for community needs. Seeing how crowded the space is and how much of the day/evenings it is utilized, it is definitely one of the programs that could use improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Trails have seen some nice improvements with signage and good maintenance after storms. Tennis has been less available noticeably so and there aren't many public options to play on the island even at the BHS courts because they are reserved for specific use by paying lesson-subscribers or the high school team. Basketball nets aren't well kept at BPP, so we often go to the elementary schools covered play grounds instead. Softball fields are poorly constructed with regard to moisture management and need better drainage overall if they can be counted on for practice/games when we have heavy spring rains. Soccer fields are excellent. For tennis, basketball, softball and soccer, it would be ideal to have lights available for all these sports in order to maximize number of hours of use. Could use more options for open water swimming. We have many beautiful beaches, but not enough parking at beach access points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>lessons for youth, beginners and pre teens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Why are you phasing away tennis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Concerts in the park - great! Keep doing them. Keep them free. Adult education - classes fill up fast and are starting to get really expensive. And keep offering evening opportunities for those that work. Youth education - can never have enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>A thank-you to the Parks for pursuing dedicated pickle ball courts at Battlepoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I wish there were Saturday morning swim lessons in the summer. The summer lesson times make it really hard for working families. I would also love more open swim times. Recreational soccer is extremely disorganized and overpriced. Charging $100 for 4 weeks of soccer and no staff support seems ridiculous when Poulsbo charges $35. If the program didn't depend on volunteer coaches, then the price tag might be justified, but it does. If it's the turf fields that create the huge price disparity, then can we move rec soccer to grass fields?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Thank you for the new courts to go in at Battle Point Park! It is a great sport and a great community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Pickleball players need dedicated courts for our rapidly growing sport. Pickleball courts encourage residents from surrounding communities to come to Bainbridge Island and spend money within the Bainbridge community. A big thank you to the Parks and Rec board for moving forward on plans for dedicated courts at Battle Point Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>My only feedback is that instructors need more training in how to handle discipline of children who are acting out. Instructors seem afraid to address problem behavior and that ruins the class for all The other children who are there to learn. I have felt that courses seem more like babysitting than opportunities to really learn skills. This was most apparent in the gymnastics classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Enjoy very much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Being new to Bainbridge, the parks and rec opportunities have become our primary way to meet people in the community while participating in activities we enjoy. We love how much parks and rec has to offer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Bainbridge Aquatic Masters is one of the treasures of BI Parks - an outstanding program for adults that is one of the best in the entire country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>They're great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>I really enjoy the watercolor classes. The instructor, John Adams, is a good asset to the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>A few of the camps are really solid, full of take-homes, we'll organi, etc but more are not and feel flimsy on comparison. If the latter, the price of the camp feels difficult to swallow. If the former the price feels less dear. More recreational swim times, bigger facility, outdoor pool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Outstanding vital Masters swim program for health, water safety, fitness, and competition, with increasing membership every year under the management of USMS/Speedo National Coach of the Year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>I might be more inclined if they were't so expensive and were offered closer to home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>BAM currently has the nation's top US Masters coach (April Cheadle) and BAM-- like other aquatic programs-- is growing fast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>It is a wonderful program in so many ways and a new pool would just enhance and increase involvement in all aspects of the aquatics center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Fantastic - couldn't be happier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>See comments above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>I also take my dog to the beach by Hawley Park. Please cut a pathway in the logs - I am 68 and it is hard for me to step over the logs, particularly when my dog is on leash. This needs to be done once or twice a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>April is amazing and the program is great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Bisc is a strong program but has space issues and can't move kids to more advanced groups. Lap swim: it's a struggle to find time with lap swim time available in evening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Excellent selection of quality programs offered, especially for our youth. Can be expensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Some more benches or chairs in the dog park at Strawberry Hill. Maybe even a tarp set up for some shelter on drizzly days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>The program has deteriorated greatly in the past few years. We sometimes have no leader for the walks (this is unacceptable). The maps for the walks are inadequate, with not enough detail. New walks are not being developed; the walks are the same old ones that we have been doing for years, despite the fact that new trails are being developed. I don't expect every walk to be a new experience, but no attention is being paid to creating new walks that use the trails. The Sunday program is so bad that I have dropped out of it; the leader does not even know the walks (not his fault; he probably does not get paid for becoming familiar with the walk beforehand, and, as I have said, the maps are inadequate). Please--you have a large and loyal walking group that is being neglected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>The figure drawing class is unique and important to the artistic development of artists on the island. The pottery class, too, provides a great resource to skilled and new potters. Love the Battlepoint concerts in the summer--great family treat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>We do not need anymore fields or buildings/structures for all of the sports and activities we participate in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>The water polo club experience has been great. We love the coaches and have see him progress as an athlete while loving it. We don't love that he isn't practicing in an all deep water pool and that practices end so late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>My sons waterpolo team practices until 9:30 some nights as they can't get pool hours before 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>My favorite exercise class ever! Pam is thoroughly prepared, warm-hearted, enthusiastic. The group has a sense of community that I appreciate. He enjoys the variety of trails, the friendliness of the group and the fact that it is &quot;doable.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Good classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>ddd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>All are very good. Please keep them coming!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>I would like to see sculpture offered in the evening or on Sundays at Eagledale. Also, an intermediate class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>It's been an excellent partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>we could use more indoor facilities, multi purpose for sports use, indoor soccer, futsol, batting cages, sports courts both outdoors and indoors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>We've especially enjoyed the soccer programs and swimming lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>They were all great!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Have always loved the swim/dive lessons. Great quality, great price. Pottery--AMAZING experiences provided. Outdoor concerts--lots of fun, great way to see friends and enjoy the spectacular summers. Egg hunt--lots of fun! Hayride--very unique experience, love it. Winter festival--keeps getting bigger and bigger, thank you for offering so many activities at this event, great thing to do while the days are short and rainy. Trail running--really enjoyed it, great group of nice ladies, Robin is so helpful and knowledgeable Pickleball--intro course, LOVED it, learned a lot, love the open pickleball sessions as well, we are hooked Gymnastics--child LOVED the classes Paddling camp--nothing but good things to say about this, the leaders made this so accessible for the kids Release inner child--husband really enjoyed this, Jason is so much fun...unfortunately, his body couldn't keep up, so he has not been able to continue Sewing--what a useful skill! Lindsey made it easy for us to learn and came up with some great projects for us to cut and sew, really enjoyed it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>I would like more connector trails. Forest to Sky trail is fabulous and my family uses it often. This is aspirational, but I would like to be able to get from Battle Point to Gazzam Lake park with a heavy use of connector trails and parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>8-12 tennis instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Off leash park on Rose is wonderful. However, the gates for the mower doesn't always close, unless someone brings wire or such. I have used logs to block it. The loss of the road up to the circle impacted me as I am disabled and when it was chained closed it severely limits when I can go. They used to leave it closed and those of us with legs or heart etcetera problems are cut off. Why is this? Thanks wendy smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Off leash park on Rose is wonderful. However, the gates for the mower doesn't always close, unless someone brings wire or such. I have used logs to block it. The loss of the road up to the circle impacted me as I am disabled and when it was chained closed it severely limits when I can go. They used to leave it closed and those of us with legs or heart etcetera problems are cut off. Why is this? Thanks wendy smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>My concern here is to be counted as advocating for more tennis courts. Also let's acknowledge the commitment and service people provide for community tennis. I love our community support for trails and the arts. The pools are fabulous for my 64 year fitness needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>My concern here is to be counted as advocating for more tennis courts. Also let's acknowledge the commitment and service people provide for community tennis. I love our community support for trails and the arts. The pools are fabulous for my 64 year fitness needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. What other parks and recreation programs would you like to see us pursue? At any particular location?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ResponseID</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I would love to have the option of aquatic exercise classes in the late afternoon, at say 5 pm or so. 7:30 is too late.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Maybe partner with Ovation to offer theatre classes. More job opportunities for teens with more accessible information about the hiring process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Maybe partner with Ovation to offer theatre classes. More job opportunities for teens with more accessible information about the hiring process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>We would like parks to stay out of kayaking in eagle harbor. Stop trying to be everything to everybody. Us the facilities you have and do a better job. We need a sanican at Rockaway beach. Its a heavily used beach park and we’ve asked for a sanican with negative responses. When groups come in, they literally have their own sanican delivered. Its crazy that such a popular park for divers around the puget sound, islanders, and island visitors have to pee in the bushes at a public park, which is what happens now. Also please do a better job of maintaining pritchard park and rockaway. Blackberry bushes are overgrowing the parking areas on the east side of prithard park parking and rockaway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A small fenced dog area on Ferncliff as part of the new park land next to the new construction apartment building adjacent to Harbor Square. Possibly with artificial turf which would require less maintenance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I would like to see more mtb specific trails on the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mountain bike specific trails, especially downhill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Try and get the basics right before you add anything. Properly train your staff. Figure out your facilities and scheduling before adding other things. I'm really disappointed in the offerings as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mountain biking specific trails. For 11 years I have ridden flattened walking trails very polite to walkers slowing down moving over, making polite warnings and greetings. Always the same thing the walkers give dirty looks, make comments to not ride on &quot;walking&quot; trails. Even the trails put in by the gear grinders have been converted to walking trails using large machine hauling in unnatural amounts of pea gravel instead of putting in actual drainage that works. I see the parks workers working harder at destroying bike features than actually building and maintaining trails. It has been a disappointment of a life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mountain biking specific trails. For 11 years I have ridden flattened walking trails very polite to walkers slowing down moving over, making polite warnings and greetings. Always the same thing the walkers give dirty looks, make comments to not ride on &quot;walking&quot; trails. Even the trails put in by the gear grinders have been converted to walking trails using large machine hauling in unnatural amounts of pea gravel instead of putting in actual drainage that works. I see the parks workers working harder at destroying bike features than actually building and maintaining trails. It has been a disappointment of a lifetime living here where are youth are state champs at mountain biking and there isn't one bike specific trail. I speak to people visiting from the Seattle area who cannot believe the island is so cold to mountain biking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>There should be some mountain bike flow trails put in at Gazzam and forward. The walkers don't like sharing the trails with bikers and the bikers need trails where we can recreate in a fun and safe manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Mountain Bike specific trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>The multi-use rec facility on the Sakai Property should be a high priority for future development. This would be the best broad range addition to existing facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Sakai property seems like an ideal place to include more tennis, pickleball and basketball courts. It is very important to maintain and/or improve current facilities so that people continue to use them over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>What happened to the tennis courts at Battle Point? What are all the lines for? I was also told that I can't play at the high school. I know of a court out past Eagledale. Any others?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Wish the pottery classes at Eagledale wouldn't fill up so quickly or that more evening slots were offered. For 13 years I have been trying to get in!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ping pong, although the senior center supports a program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>After school programming that lasts more than a few weeks a session, like from September to December. With the idea of helping working parents plan consistent after school care for children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>The least disturbance as possible with the &quot;development&quot; of the Sakai property. Wonderful owls and eagles now live there!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I would love to see developed safe biking trails. As an active senior I would love to ride my bike but do not feel safe sharing the roads with cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Need a new and bigger pool!! More space for off leash dog exercise - and not the junky, dirty tiny spaces we have now where people and dogs are unhealthily crowded together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Table tennis, naturalist tours, dog-free areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>What if Parks began a voluntary bike licence program to fund bike trails? Island bikers to put their money towards projects they have been so diligently working for. Starting a petition for it could be a way, (the City could administer it), no enforcement necessary, just issuance of renewals (voluntary) each year, set a minimum licence fee. Kinda like an ongoing donation, but targeted to defray the costs for building new trails and repairs. Strictly voluntary, but you could issue a participation report quarterly, and compare the licences with the # of bicycles riders (based upon existing club memberships - several on the island). Perhaps you'd see how really serious folks are in committing their own money, instead of ALL property owners; maybe that might inspire others to fund in the future (with tab fees or other funding mechanism other than property taxes/lid lift)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Intuitive art = painting, more tennis, more language classes, more art classes for adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>We're having a new grandchild soon. How about offering &quot;baby and me&quot; programs!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Outdoor swimming Gear rental - cross country skis, kayaks, paddle boards, snow shoes, etc Foreign language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Yoga and ???</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I would like to see even more collaboration with the Bainbridge Island Land Trust with the aim of protecting more usable parkland and trail corridors. Our parks are one of the top 2-3 things that make Bainbridge unique. In the face of rampant growth we need to protect more land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>I would LOVE to take some of the drawing &amp; painting classes that have been offered but I'm younger than retirement age, still work full time (off island, so I have a significant commute) and therefore am not available during weekdays when most of these classes seem to take place. I would love to see weekday evening courses in fine art, specifically basic drawing, nature drawing, watercolor, pastels, or possibly other types of painting offered after 6 p.m. on Mondays through Fridays or Saturday mornings. Also, please keep offering beginning and basic small watercraft courses especially kayaking, canoeing, &amp; stand up paddling - I have yet to try these but hope to some day...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Off leash opportunities is of extreme importance to me now and in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Create more space at pool for swimming of laps by teams or individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Would like to see more one-day and evening class opportunities, for those who are working/commuting. Would be interested in seeing shared resources and joint advertising, between parks &amp; rec and other educational groups on the island (like the history museum educational walks, IslandWood, library talks).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
52 I'd like to see a nicer off-leash area for small dogs. The current one at Strawberry Hill is inadequately small, has no shade, and no features or obstacles for playing like the area for big dogs has. It's rather pathetic. I wouldn't even mind if the park just moved the fence and carved out some of the area from the big dogs and added it to the current small dog area, but I'd rather see a more purposeful area specifically designed for smaller dogs and their owners.

58 Evening options for T'a Chi--not just for seniors...

59 None.

61 Pool, Pool and more pool

62 None

63 Keep your eyes open for trails as the island grows.

64 stretching and strengthening classes for seniors - evening class I have thought about swimming but have not found time or motivation to pursue

65 There isn't really space for this comment but as more people are dog owners there should be more attention paid to dog park areas. The Strawberry Hill Park is overcrowded, dusty and boring. In many other places activities are made available for active dogs like doggie hurdles and jumps. These are not expensive to add. These would be great to have in Eagledale. an off leash hiking area would also be appreciated as many dog owners simply let their dogs off leash to allow them to run.

66 ddd

68 ??

70 Pickleball and tennis

71 I think you're doing great and the staff has consistently added new and interesting programs, many that I'd like to try but just haven't yet.

73 more lighted fields for playing and practicing, Lights on Battle Point which could stay on until 9pm.

74 Outdoor meditation classes for all ages. Tween and youth yoga.

75 Bring coed softball back please!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ResponseID</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>You guys are doing such a great job in offering so many diverse things. There's so many things I'd like to register for, but just haven't had the time yet! I personally would love to see hula classes. Do you think there could be demand for kids' running? I'm thinking the All-comers meets in the summer are popular. There's a running group for 4-6 grade girls in the spring that is really popular, Ordway has had after-school running clubs for the past few years, usually 4th grade. I think this year, it expanded to 2 &amp; 3 grades. Seemed really popular. I wonder if Parks/Rec could sponsor something. Not necessarily the track day camp in the summer, but just pure running? 3rd grade and up?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>More tennis courts in Bainbridge public parks. There are many tennis players. During the school year it is hard to use the courts at the high school. The courts at Waterfront Park are gone - unfortunately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Additional tennis courts at sekai park and battle point park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>I firmly believe we need more tennis courts. Over the past twenty years Bainbridge has built up a youth; adult; and senior program with much grassroots volunteerism. The program is extremely inclusive. As a limited income person, tennis provides a fabulous amount of fitness for a small about of cost. While club members and competitors my invest more, I play 2-3 times a week. It is a physical, mental health and community asset which needs some new infrastructure. Also the competition for space with the Pickle Ball Craze is frustrating. We are having to share old courts with dozens of new players. Let's look at the hours of recreation per capita (participant) that the combined pickle/and tennis use. We racket players need availability for our respective games; As we are playing outdoors in dry enough weather. Hopefully I will be playing for 20 more years. That would be into my 80's as tennis is lauded as a healthy senior activity. My age is the peak Baby boom demographic-64. So there are many who benefit. So maybe reducing the EMT budget! Hooray. racket players need new tennis courts. I think anywhere you can find a place is great. Though I think the North end of the island could reduce driving miles for players.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>I firmly believe we need more tennis courts. Over the past twenty years Bainbridge has built up a youth; adult; and senior program with much grassroots volunteerism. The program is extremely inclusive. As a limited income person, tennis provides a fabulous amount of fitness for a small about of cost. While club members and competitors my invest more, I play 2-3 times a week. It is a physical, mental health and community asset which needs some new infrastructure. Also the competition for space with the Pickle Ball Craze is frustrating. We are having to share old courts with dozens of new players. Let's look at the hours of recreation per capita (participant) that the combined pickle/and tennis use. We racket players need availability for our respective games; As we are playing outdoors in dry enough weather. Hopefully I will be playing for 20 more years. That would be into my 80's as tennis is lauded as a healthy senior activity. My age is the peak Baby boom demographic-64. So there are many who benefit. So maybe reducing the EMT budget! Hooray. racket players need new tennis courts. I think anywhere you can find a place is great. Though I think the North end of the island could reduce driving miles for players.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>See above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attachment D: Program Priorities Survey Responses
Response Counts

Completion Rate: 100%
Complete: 165

Totals: 165

1. Please indicate which pool alternative you prefer, and tell us why:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 Meter Pool</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Meter Pool</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 Meter Pool</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 142
2. The pool replacement project would require funding from various public and private sources. Funding sources would include public grants, private fundraising, and most likely a voter approved bond. The full build-out of the largest pool option is estimated to cost up to $40 million to develop. We are interested in learning how high of a priority this project is to the Bainbridge Island community. Within the context of other Park District capital investment priorities and potential need for tradeoffs, please indicate how high of a priority the replacement of the Ray Williamson Pool is to you:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high priority</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High priority</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal priority with other capital improvements</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low priority</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a priority</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 162

3. Why?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ResponseID</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Because I use the pool regularly and my use will probably only increase when I retire. It is the one thing I use most regularly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>While many neighbors use the existing pools, I'd rather see the Sakai buildings built first, and I'd rather have my taxes spent on those wide variety of activities vs. lap swimming and water polo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Need to balance the need for more pool space with other broad reaching projects - the island is diverse and the park district needs to develop programs that serve a wide variety of interests.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Safety is a high priority. I don't know if that is an issue here, but if it is, let's maintain the pool. I understand that some groups want to hold more swim events here on the island. That is not something I'm willing to pay a lot of extra for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>While we have a lot of great swimmers and a lot of pool users, I would emphasize being sure the pool and facility is good for all ages, not just master or competitive swimmers. I'm concerned that the pool improvements being suggested really serve a smaller amount of overall pool users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>The pool is very highly utilized by lots of families, and all ages. The schedule at both pools is already packed. More capacity will allow for more use as swim team moves to the Ray Williamson Pool, and then the Nakata pool can accommodate more rec swim, lessons, family swim, open swim, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We need to increase capacity of our aquatic center to allow people of all ages throughout our community to engage in a healthy, lifelong activity. Particularly in our climate where the dark, wet winter months have many Islanders looking for indoor areas to stay active and fit. The Bainbridge Island community has grown and today the aquatic center is in use 17 hours per day and serves dozens of different groups. The pool is literally overflowing with users and is becoming unsafe in some instances (i.e. difficult to get lane space, wait list for BISC, polo practicing at 10 pm, overcrowded lanes, etc.) Our community loves the pool; there is growing demand for aquatic groups and activities for every age group and ability.

It seems to me to be the district asset that is most lacking and in need of (vast) improvement. And selfishly, I swim regularly and would love the island to have a better pool.

This is a very high priority. This is the most important thing the Park District has done since its inception. The community has grown and now is the time to make this happen. We can support this and it should be built.

My response to the question above answers this question as well. We are an island with a huge and dynamic swim community. Swimming is a needed skill, a fantastic way to exercise, and just plain fun. The Aquatic center is always packed - people come from far and wide to enjoy it. The amount of use of the current pool speaks for itself. Let's step up and build this 52 meter pool for the health and well being of all Islanders!

This building is the park districts most visited year around facility/park on the the island. It's also the park districts responsibility to see that it is properly replaced and maintained. This should be the agencies #1 priority to address before the older facility fails. I would support a bond to pay for this project as it serves islanders of all ages.

Can be used by people of all ages in our community. It's the highest use facility on the Island!

Needed

This should be the highest priority for the Park District. The existing pool has served for the past 50 years, and now we need a pool for the next 50 years. The cost differential between pool sizes is small, and the great flexibility and large capacity of the 52-meter pool makes it an easy decision to support.

There is no other resource like this around. The current pool is falling apart. The potential for growth of pool programming is outstanding. This is an inter-generational, incredibly valuable community resource. We need to build this well - with an excellent design that sets high standards for green building standards and non-motorized transportation connections.

This is the And only recreational facility available to all ages from Burke to 99 open 5 AM to 10 PM 363 days a year
Demand for competitive and recreational lap swim facilities already outstrips capacity of Ray pool and continues to grow. Ray is well beyond its useful life and requires costly maintenance just to maintain current (inadequate) level of service. Kitsap (and Seattle) desperately need a long course facility other than King County Aquatic in Federal Way. This investment addresses needs for next 50 years.

The aquatic center benefits the community in ways that no other parks and rec facility does. Families and people from off-island also depend on these facilities for many activities. The Ray pool is at the end of its life span and presents safety and maintenance issues that make this the highest priority for the community - much higher than developing the Sakai property.

Replacement of the Ray Williamson pool is on the verge of becoming a health and safety imperative. Lanes are so crowded with swimmers from age group to Master’s that it can be dangerous. Our community is incredibly active with water sports; our facility should meet the needs.

Again - affordable housing.

Yes, my son is on swim team, so that plays a part in it. But, I am also there often and see the ailing environment our community is using. It’s often packed to the brim with activities, and there never seems to be enough time in the day for everything to get done. Let alone the state of both pools. They are used everyday, by all kinds of people. Seems like a no brainer to me.

The current facility is falling apart - it is not going to get better. The use from the community is clear. Building an undersized pool when we have the opportunity to build an Olympic sized one will be a regret for generations to come.

The Ray Williamson Pool is heavily used by the various teams (high school swim, BISC, BAM, water polo, etc.) as well as the general public. In fact, it is often difficult for members of the general public to find an open lane in the pool during lap swim. Given the strong demand as well as the facts that the Ray Pool has outlived its useful life and no longer meets the community’s programming needs, replacement of the Ray Pool must be a top priority.

Because the current Ray pool is not meeting needs and it has met it’s life span.

Because the current pool has reached capacity and has reached it’s end of life.

Ray is obsolete and cannot be repaired or renovated in a cost effective manner. Ray does not currently accommodate current demands by users.

It is at the end of its useful life and heavily used.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ResponseID</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Sooooo many people on the island use the pool—all ages, backgrounds and abilities—and it is a form of exercise accessible to all, from the youngest to the oldest, from competitors to people needing the gentle support of water for aqua-therapy. Done right, with good gathering spots, the pool facility also serves as a community center for socializing. I don't know of any other sport activity that serves such a wide swath and is so good for people. Everyone leaves the pool happy!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>I swim at the pool all the time, both with my kids and the Masters team. We often have 5-8 adults per lane at Masters. Many activities would like pool time for lessons, teams, activities, but it's so crowded all the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>See comments above - the best possible pool should be BI Parks #1 priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>This investment in the pool will be wise rather than continuing to dump money into a system that is just going to fail in the long run anyways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Reasons stated above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>See above - so many groups use this pool and it is SO crowded each and every day. Despite the high cost, so many folks on the island interact with this pool and would benefit from the larger size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>The Ray Williamson Pool is well beyond its intended, safe operating life. Failure to replace and expand aquatic facilities on Bainbridge Island would severely impact the health and wellbeing of several user groups of all ages, from children learning to swim for the first time (a significant lifelong safety issue), youth competition teams that provide a healthy and character building experiences as mind and bodies develop, to adults who use the aquatic facilities for fitness, stress management, or rehabilitation following injury. On a personal note, I grew up in a community that had a strong aquatic infrastructure, and I can say without hesitation that access to pool facilities for various activities and recreation shaped the community and had a profound impact on the person I am today.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Pool feels oversubscribed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>As a active family user of the pool we see all of the positives the pool provides to so many different user groups. As a parent we have learned that a busy kid is more likely to stay out of trouble. So the more programs and pool time we can have for all types of kids the better it is for our community. Our island is growing and we need to plan for the growth of the aquatic needs over the net decades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>I am a swimmer and I have seen how improved facilities bring others into the sport.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Ray cannot be repaired. We are already under capacity. Replacing costs &quot;X&quot; which really cannot be avoided and leaves the Island under served. The 33 meter pool would cost &quot;Y&quot; which is the least that can meet the current use So why not spend &quot;y&quot; through the parks department plus &quot;Z&quot; which can be a campaign to raise funds in the county and the community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>The current ray Williamson pool is outdated and is too small for the growing community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>The 52 Meter pool makes the most financial sense, long term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>See comments above. I would like to see our water polo program given greater support, along with the benefits for all the pool users.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>The aquatic center is a key aspect of our community, but unfortunately the current system does not allow for all those interested to use it. This expansion would solve that problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>The idea of building a &quot;regional&quot; pool complex on this island is absurd. Why would you build something on the scale of the King Co. Aquatic Center in a city (Bainbridge Isl.) with the lowest population density in the state? It makes no sense, financially or operationally. A &quot;regional&quot; complex should be built where the people are, i.e. Bremerton/Silverdale. All a big complex on Bainbridge Island would accomplish is bring more traffic, which is already bad enough. It would also be too expensive to run, as your own studies demonstrate -- creating an escalating effect on the district's operations budget and crowding out other programs and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>It is a vital role in the success of young athletes and can help earn more money in the long run instead of continuing to pay for repairs to the Ray Williamson pool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Current situation is very crowded. Pool is used year round by every age and includes people with physical and mental disabilities so captures a large percentage of our population. We are living on an island so teaching all ages to swim is of vital importance. Bring athletes to our island to compete so brings dollars into community as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Aquatic facilities serve young as well as older residence in the community. This community has demonstrated that an aquatic facility is of high value to them by producing very successful water sport youth teams as well as a very active adult aquatic community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>I would rather see more general use indoor rec facilities built instead of specialized aquatic center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>The aquatic center is one of the most consistently used park facilities on the island. It is of use to, in used by people of all ages, all year round. The programs housed at the aquatic center are some of the most successful on the island (BHS Swimming, BISC, BAM, the Dive team, etc). Beyond that, as an island community it is essential to have swim lessons readily available to people of all ages. While the course currently offered are amazing, they are frequently full. There is clearly unsatisfied demand. We don't need to guess what people what, we need to spend where they already are!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>The old pool is near the end of its life. Let's replace it with something that reflects current programs and island growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>The pool is in great need of renovation but the facility is not up to date with what it is needed for more than any other area I am aware of. As a water polo player I have very late practice times that I have to balance with getting enough sleep for school and I also know that our team can't host tournaments which would be an amazing experience for our team. I think the aquatic center would greatly benefit from this investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>If the Ray Williamson pool is aging, please fix it and do not propose a ludicrous 40 million project. The current facility is good enough and if need be, remodel it, and add a little bit on to it but do not move these activities off that property. NO POOL AT SAKAI PARK!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>BHS is known for its swim program--would like to support that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>I am an adult swimmer and use the pool facilities on a regular basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>I don't use it and I don't have kids who might use it. I'd be interested in hearing what percentage of the Island population this serves. I guess I'd say, do what's needed to keep the swim programs going for local kids, seniors, and the high school swim team, but keep it within bounds. It should be nice, but not Ritchie Rich, country club nice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>A large pool would draw regionally for swim meets and water polo tournaments which help me as a small business owner. Also my son played water polo and had practices ending at 9:30 - too late. If we want this to be a sport where students participate there needs to be enough time for all swimmers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Can't afford private pool options abs public pool is very tired and limited availability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>So many kids, families, adults and disabled people use the aquatic center and all the swim and water polo teams, lessons and special programs. Building a new pool will be a huge investment but one that should payoff for the whole community as well as fks in Poulsbo, Suquamish, etc. Also economic opportunity for hosting swim meets, water polo matches, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>So many kids, families, adults and disabled people use the aquatic center and all the swim and water polo teams, lessons and special programs. Building a new pool will be a huge investment but one that should payoff for the whole community as well as fks in Poulsbo, Suquamish, etc. Also economic opportunity for hosting swim meets, water polo matches, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>We already have two pools. We do not want a new pool and will not use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>We already have two pools. We do not want a new pool and will not use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Sorry..... I am an elder and don't swim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Would the current pool need to be replaced? Could the current facility be built on to for an aquatic center similar to those in Canada or Olympic Centers like KCAC? It seems that an additional pool would facilitate all teams, clubs and families/public use as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ray Williamson pool is too old and too small to house all the swimming and pool activities going on right now. Scheduling seems hard for the pool as the need is high.

Same as above.

You can swim in the Sound, I do.

For the reasons stated above, but mainly the overcrowding and overuse of the pool and the lack of space to grow the island’s swimming programs. We already have newer soccer fields, baseball fields, balls courts, parks, etc., and the current old pool has reached the end of its viable life, a new 52 meter pool will bring Bainbridge Island up to speed with the new pools that are cropping up over in Seattle.

There are already plenty of pools in Kitsap County -- at least twelve. The two major users of the Ray (BISC and water polo) are too lazy and consider themselves to be privileged to drive off the Island to use other pools. There are also three private pools on Bainbridge that could probably be rented to those two groups -- if there was a willingness to negotiate.....

Yet another tax increase for luxury

The pool is well used by the community.

The Ray Pool is on its last legs. Further delay risks a catastrophic pool failure that would deprive our High School State Championship teams a place to prepare to be State Champs. It would deprive nearly 150 BAM Masters swimmers from being able to train for year-round competitions in both pool and open-water events. It would deprive highly recognized and awarded coaches from being able to prepare their athletes to compete and excel at their chosen sport. It would deny a large community of young club and general lap swimmers who aspire to become better swimmers, better competitors, more fit athletes, and engaged members of our active community. The Ray Pool is heavily used from early morning to late at night. A 52 M pool would provide more space, to serve more people, at more reasonable times. While this would be an expensive undertaking, the potential to serve more community members is great.

My 84 year old mother attends classes at the pool - in addition to keeping her healthy physically, it keeps her healthy mentally and connected to our community. Both of my children grew up learning to swim with lessons that were terribly difficult to get into - the demand is/was far greater than the availability. My daughter is now in high school swimming with BISC and on the high school swim team. There is never enough pool time or space to meet their needs. So many people on our island benefit from the aquatic center - it's just not big enough and something needs to be done now to address the current/future structural issues.

I am a big supporter of the Aquatic Center and a Masters Swimmer

I would rather see the current pool/swimming lessons run more efficiently.
The high use and impact on diverse user groups that cross every generation on Bl means that this will positively impact a high percentage of residents on Bl. It also impacts many current users of the aquatic center that would be negatively impacted if the current pool were to become inoperable.

It is TIME! let's actually solve this.

Do not care will never use it

At some point, we all need to learn to make due with what we have. Reduce, reuse and recycle should be part of the mission statement of all aspects of our community.

People of all ages on Bainbridge use the pool. It's especially important for physical fitness in the inclement winter months. It offers something for literally everyone: lessons for kids, swim teams for kids & adolescents, masters swimming, physical therapy alternatives for people with disabilities and recovering from surgery or injuries, physical fitness options for special needs people, and lastly, geriatric people with joint & other body issues.

Replacing the pool is a high priority if and when the current Ray Williamson pool fails. I think it is outrageous the estimated costs for the project. I would like some explanation why two private developments (The Pool and Pleasant Beach and The Bainbridge Athletic Club) were both able to fund and construct their pools at a significantly lower cost. I am also concerned about the feasibility study being performed by The Coates Design Group. When viewing their previous projects on their website I do not feel that they have the experience or expertise to be conducting such a feasibility study. I am also concerned about the level of which their current buildings have performed - the soon to be police station has obvious signs of failure on the siding which makes me concerned about their level of commercial experience and the longevity of the buildings they produce.

Critical to all ages and growing programs for swimming and water polo. The Sakai property build out is just not needed in the same way (we already have parks and picnic facilities, and fields and meeting spaces). Building a proper pool will bring community revenue when events can be held here, and provide athletic opportunity for swimmers of all ages.

Enjoy going there with the grandkids and not much other public pool access

Enjoy going there with the grandkids and not much other public pool access

I think most families use the pool in some fashion. It's one of the few places anyone of any age can have fun recreationally. These types of places that serve multi-generations are slowly going extinct (e.g. Pavilion, Skateland). My kids love going to birthday parties there. I enjoy classes there and the availability of the pool for organizations like the Cub Scouts and Boy Scouts.

Demand is high for more available time and space for large numbers of programs.
128 We have a lot of quality athletes on the island that deserve a state of art facility

130 The "new" pool was a huge community investment what 20 years ago? It seems other areas of recreation deserve the large investment now.

131 Read previous. It is not needed.

134 The Ray Williamson pool is very old and outdated. There are more and more people doing competitive swimming (clubs, teams, Masters) and a new facility would be great for these activities.

135 We really need a 50 meter pool for ALL of our aquatic sports needs and given how many families regularly use the pools and have such success with their teams, I think it should take priority to the other needs at this time. In order to accommodate all the programs AND provide the opportunity to host events, we need a 50 meter pool for Swim and Water Polo competitions. Having the ability to split the pool for practice times will aid significantly in healthier practice times for our players/swimmers. Also, please consider that the community will benefit YEAR ROUND from hosting Swim and Water Polo tournaments. (for which a bigger pool is necessary for splitting into 2 WP courts too.) Our kids have to travel quite far for tournaments, as do the Seattle teams, and being able to host tournaments will boost our off season Restaurant and Hotel business too.

136 We really need a 50 meter pool for ALL of our aquatic sports needs and given how many families regularly use the pools and have such success with their teams, I think it should take priority to the other needs at this time. In order to accommodate all the programs AND provide the opportunity to host events, we need a 50 meter pool for Swim and Water Polo competitions. Having the ability to split the pool for practice times will aid significantly in healthier practice times for our players/swimmers. Also, please consider that the community will benefit YEAR ROUND from hosting Swim and Water Polo tournaments. (for which a bigger pool is necessary for splitting into 2 WP courts too.) Our kids have to travel quite far for tournaments, as do the Seattle teams, and being able to host tournaments will boost our off season Restaurant and Hotel business too.

138 This is so much money, and it makes no sense. The current pool might not be perfect, but it's still a very high quality facility that serves our community well.

139 I currently have two swimmers and one son playing water polo. Our current facilities are insufficient for the level of aquatic sports I'd like to see available on the island.

140 This is a huge expense for a limited number of people. At some point we make do with what we've got. With the amount of money we could do so many important things - solar panels on buildings, more biking and walking trails, make building more energy efficient.

141 The current facility seems to meet the community needs. If the old pool need to be enhanced in some was - do it on the current site. I will NOT vote for additional funds to pay for this and I further will join any group that arises to campaign against it.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ResponseID</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Useless, as we could never have access to this pool. It will be full of those who sign up or live near it. Why does such a small City need two pools? The road to Gazzam is still unpaved, causing a dusty, choking mess every summer, only getting worse with dryer climate and more tourists (multiple cars holding people who obviously don't live here), and yet you want to spend millions on another pool?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Despite the demand, it can't be top priority as there are other users of BIMPRD resources also and their needs must continue to be met.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Swimmers seem to need the pool, and it provides a lot of programming for our island. Would be nice to wait until construction market cools though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>This project would allow Bainbridge Island to host high-caliber swimming events that would draw more daytime and overnight visitors to our island thus boosting the restaurant, shopping, and hotel industries without causing serious permanent resident over-crowding. We already have a repeat state Champion High School swimming and diving team and the Speedo US Masters Swimming coach of the year (April Cheadle), a thriving high school water polo team, etc...So swimming is part of this island's heritage and one of our highest performing high school sports. Lets bolster our support for these groups to help them continue to improve while giving a boost to our local economy at the same time. Please note that a 33M pool is a non-standard pool length and a 25M pool is very little different from the existing 25yard pool. So, both smaller pool options actually seem like a waste of resources to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>This is an investment in a healthy young and aging community. Swimming is a life time fitness sport - age 2 to 102! Swimming, water polo, boating safety - play - is all important for a community. Also - having a year round indoor sports area is key to mental fitness in the dark winter as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>I'm a swimmer who participates in the Masters program. The multi-use complex planned for Sakai Park is laudable, but much of those facilities already exist on the island and their replacement/expansion doesn't seem as urgent nor the audience for them as great as the aquatic center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>An expanded Aquatic Center would support programming for the public and allow the swimming programs to grow. Living near water means that swimming is not only a recreation, but a safety issue. Having a facility that encourages swimming and safety/experience around water will contribute to the fitness of the community as well as the safety of community members. Swimming/water programs are accessible to a wide range of age groups and ability levels and are a great way to meet others in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>as above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>It is absolutely necessary. Our community is very water centric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>As a master swimmer I see how busy the pool is from 5 in the morning until late at night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Needed for our top notch swimmers to compete and practice!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>We love the current aquatic center and would love to see it even better!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>The current Ray pool either needs to be updated or replaced. It seems best at this time to replace it with a larger pool that can serve our growing population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>The existing Nakata pool has outlasted its projected lifespan by several decades. It could fail at any time. It is also completely inadequate to meet the needs of Islanders of all ages, not only for lap swimming but also for water polo, swim meets, water aerobics, hydro-therapy, etc. The aquatic center is the most intensively used recreational facility in the park district. It is used year-round. I believe that building a replacement pool for the Nakata pool has a higher priority than any other capital project currently under consideration by the Park District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Do not use the lap pool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>$40 m can provide for numerous other opportunities, both developed and dispersed, including furthering acquisition of open space and continuing to improve the existing trail system, not to mention adding to and improving the great selection of programs the District offers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>I would most likely not use this pool but I'm not against building it for others that find it important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>We do not have competitive and or lap swimmers in our household.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Because it is part of my health and wellness care plan..... Also the pool situation provides a multiage community which builds a resilient integrated society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Since I am a swimmer it is of course the highest priority to me. The Masters Swimming program is extremely successful and boasts this year's National Coach of the Year, April Cheadle. Due to the success of the program we often have 6 or 7 swimmers in each available lane which is certainly less than ideal. In addition the available lanes for freelance lap swimmers is severely diminished during Masters workout times, and no space is available during those times for other aquatic programs and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Like it but not more than other projects on the table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>The community already has public places for gymnastics, basketball, etc. But when the pool fails there is no place else on Bainbridge for people to swim indoors.. Also, Bainbridge is an Island and every child should know how to swim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>I played a large part in the creation and funding of the newest pool some years ago. At the time, it was promised that the old pool would be redone and receive the highest priority shortly after. That never happened and we now have a decrepit sub-par facility, supported by adults who have no other place to go. The current pool facility is a health hazard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>While the cost may be higher now, the investment will pay itself in community opportunities, health and recreation programs, pride and sporting tourism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Bainbridge has such a strong swimming culture, the new pool would allow for more users to enjoy the pool. Kids swimming lessons are so hard to get into, which is a shame since living on Bainbridge offers so much water activity and getting kids to be competent swimmers is extremely important for safety. Masters swim practices are for all ages and those practices are sometimes so crowded. The High School teams are fantastic and the larger pool would help create more sports support and meets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report for Bainbridge Parks - Sakai

Response Counts

Completion Rate: 100%

Complete 215

Totals: 215

1. Please indicate which elements most interest you:

- Playground, nature playground concept: 30%
- Picnic shelter: 20%
- Outdoor court: 40%
- Multi-use indoor recreation complex including indoor court(s), gymnastics, gymnasium indoor turf field(s), and elevated track: 50%
- Multi-generational spaces, e.g. meeting room, digital computer lab, teen center, educational training space: 10%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playground, nature playground concept</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic shelter</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor court</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use indoor recreation complex including indoor court(s), gymnastics, gymnasium indoor turf field(s), and elevated track</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-generational spaces, e.g. meeting room, digital computer lab, teen center, educational training space</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Why do these elements interest you?

29 I would like to see a skate park. Focus seems to be placed on younger children but tweens and teens need a safe place where they can get together and be kids too. Many children who live on the island love to skateboard but there are not very many places on the island for them to do so. They are often turned away from parking lots and other areas with smoother surfaces. Strawberry Hill is nice but that is for more advanced skaters and usually attracts older teens.

30 test
32 We have beautiful outdoor areas to enjoy nature -- the Grand Forest- Battle Point Park etc. But we DO NOT HAVE ENOUGH TENNIS COURTS. There are many seniors who play tennis and who don’t belong to BAC. For people living on a limited income public courts are important. They provide key health components of providing both exercise and socialization.

36 The brilliance of acquiring the Sakai property is that we need all these various elements as our community grows, and locating them across the street from the BISD main campus, within walking distance of Sakai and Woodwood schools, within walking distance of downtown Winslow makes this the best location to put these activities.

37 I actually prefer a more rural setting with plenty of trails and places to sit and be with nature. I’d love a place that attracts birds with native plant species, water sources as well as shrub like plants for birds to raise their young. I’d love to see deciduous, native trees planted to provide homes for squirrels. Our wildlife need safe zones on our island. I don’t like the idea of bringing more activity to this very tranquil area such as indicated in your plan because it discourages wildlife and takes up valuable space for trees and plants and soft ground surfaces for aquifer regeneration. We need a balance. We already have the High School courts and Battlepoint. Downtown Winslow is already so over developed. This new plan will only add more congestion to Madison, and bring new traffic issues to this already busy street where the schools are.

38 I actually prefer a more rural setting with plenty of trails and places to sit and be with nature. I’d love a place that attracts birds with native plant species, water sources as well as shrub like plants for birds to raise their young. I’d love to see deciduous, native trees planted to provide homes for squirrels. Our wildlife need safe zones on our island. I don’t like the idea of bringing more activity to this very tranquil area such as indicated in your plan because it discourages wildlife and takes up valuable space for trees and plants and soft ground surfaces for aquifer regeneration. We need a balance. We already have the High School courts and Battlepoint. Downtown Winslow is already so over developed. This new plan will only add more congestion to Madison, and bring new traffic issues to this already busy street where the schools are.

40 There is currently no indoor rec/sports facility available on BI other than the pool, Transmitter Building and various high school buildings that have restrictions on accessibility. Given the Pacific Northwest weather, there needs to be a community space for indoor recreation especially for the youth that appeals to a broad diversity of interests. We have wonderful parks and trails which are a precious asset on this island but they barely utilized in inclement weather. A multi-use facility that is centrally located in Winslow would be well utilized and a huge addition to the parks and rec program on BI. The rest of the Sakai development is also a tremendous idea for the core of Winslow given that this is the highest area of growth on the island and it could be accessed by walking and bicycling.
There is currently no indoor rec/sports facility available on BI other than the pool, Transmitter Building and various high school buildings that have restrictions on accessibility. Given the Pacific Northwest weather, there needs to be a community space for indoor recreation especially for the youth that appeals to a broad diversity of interests. We have wonderful parks and trails which are a precious asset on this island but they barely utilized in inclement weather. A multi-use facility that is centrally located in Winslow would be well utilized and a huge addition to the parks and rec program on BI. The rest of the Sakai development is also a tremendous idea for the core of Winslow given that this is the highest area of growth on the island and it could be accessed by walking and bicycling.

1. I am most interested in trails and preserving, and even improving, the ecological habitat, as well as paying attention to water flow (e.g., use pervious pavement, whenever possible, like in the library parking lot). 2. As a parent with small children, I enjoy our playgrounds very much. However, we do not need another regular playground in the Winslow area (swings, slides, etc.) -- the Ordway playground is great, and right there. Madison Tot Lot, Waterfront, Owens are also all great. (If you do add a playground, we could use a universal design like Owens, but with the cover of trees like in Madison Tot lot -- the trees protect from rain as well as sun, making it excellent year-round. The "natural play" area on pg 21 is great, and reminds me of Schel Chelm Park in Lynnwood. I'm not sure if the two are compatible) 3. We do need woods that children can play in!! So having a space where it is okay for kids to go "off trail" and explore nature safely would be amazing! If the "natural play" area could be wooden play elements among trees, rocks, and other elements of nature, that could work really well, and especially if there is a way to incorporate some wheelchair access for our kids in wheelchairs. (The term "playground" is misleading, then.) 4. The island really needs a place for teens to go, especially in the evenings and at night. It is a matter of safety and well-being for our teens. If we could create that space in Sakai Park, I'm willing to support that. 5. I also understand that people want more tennis courts and pickle ball courts. I'm willing to go along with that. 6. (Personally, I would still love to have a roller skating rink and/or a bowling alley on the island, but I'm guessing this isn't the right place for it). 7. We don't need picnic shelters or "Multi-Use Outdoor Complex, with Lighting." We have enough of those on the island already. Nicely spaced benches are enough (and are necessary). 8. I'm sure you are doing this, but honoring the history of the Island on this space is important to me: both the Suquamish history, and the rich history of the Japanese community. You could partner with the Historical Society to place signs describing the history, add a statue or artwork, and murals or information on the new buildings themselves. The "Cultural Resources Discussion" on pg 12 of the report addresses this nicely. I think preserving the house itself is probably not necessary, but some tribute to the Sakai family is essential.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ResponseID</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>As many indoor multi-use, multi-aged spaces that can be available on BI - especially covered ones - the better. My understanding is that the current indoor areas (including the high school) are fully booked/subscription. If cost is a factor (which is likely) then look to partner with entities such as the Boys and Girls Club who also have fast experience in the state running (and finding funding for) indoor sports complexes. Also, it is a shame the senior center is no longer a part of the BIMPRD inventory of community services. There are models throughout the NW as to how park district and senior centers can work so well together to be vibrant places for multi-generational gathering. So... it seems odd that BIMPRD would be suggesting this at Sakai when there was already a facility on the island that was supposed to serve this purpose. However, I still checked this box because it is a need. However, I don't want BIMPRD to &quot;compete&quot; with the senior center so the caveat to my checking this box is to coordinate closely with the senior center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Outdoor tennis courts are under-represented in BI. Parks only has 4; the school district courts are off-limits during school hours and over subscribed at other times. More room at Sakai Park should be created for park uses by eliminating the planning of park district offices. We already have adequate park offices, but lack park facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Always important for a place for child to play. Sports facilities serve multi-generations. Additional pickle ball courts, easy for children thru senior citizens, one of the fastest growing sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Would like to see more public dedicated tennis courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>The current gymnastics facilities are really old and also extremely heavily utilized. It would be really great to allow the program to grow in a new space. The closest indoor soccer complex is in Bremerton, and soccer has a large following on BI. It seems like there are plenty of alternatives for meeting spaces and that you could find a much better location for a computer lab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>An outdoor or indoor pickleball court would be great! The game is not just for a certain segment of the population. It's for all ages! We thank you for the new courts to be built at Battle Point!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>I am not sure the community will vote for more taxes to support a lot of building on the Sakai Property so I hope most of it will be passive natural landscaping with trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>I would love to have a place to play tennis on Bainbridge Island. There is less court availability at Bainbridge High School and Battlepoint Park than ever before. We can only play at BHS after 6:00pm and at Battlepoint after 12:00pm. It would be wonderful to have an indoor tennis court facility at Sakai Park, so that we would play tennis in bad weather. What a concept!!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>I am wanting to see indoor Pickleball courts here on Bainbridge Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Space for our kids to play, space for table tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Keep nature in place - minimal to no buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>This community needs a centrally located recreation facility to meet the islands growing recreational and educational needs. Developing the sakai park is the right decision for a number of factors; location near schools, located near Winslow city center, Walkable/bike friendly location, meet the the needs of number of recreational user groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>I would like to see pickleball included in the indoor courts. Also, I would like to have an indoor track for fast walking when the weather is bad outside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Used by most people with an exercise / sport in mind. Why are there no pickle ball courts - even in lieu of tennis which gets very little play compared to pickleball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>There is nothing like this on the island. It rains a lot. Indoor exercise spaces would be really valuable and a great outlet for kids. Somewhere to go and something to do other than the Safeway parking lot. Also, this is WALKABLE from the schools, ferry, downtown. We should be investing in a walkable community. Please add in connections to other sidewalks, trails, and add bike lanes!! Make a huge bike parking lot. We do not need more passive walking trails. We need bike lanes, a bike park, and indoor places for kids to hang out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>None of these interest me because all of them are already available on the island. The only building Parks should be spending money on building is a pool. Sakai Park should be developed only as open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Believe this type of complex would benefit and be used by the most people, including all ages, year round. This is the right part of the island to be building and developing such a facility. People, including students, can walk to this facility from downtown and from schools. Most of the affordable housing is in this area which is important for equity to develop here. There are lots of other playgrounds and outdoor spaces on the island. There are also other places for meeting rooms, teen areas, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Plus a competition pool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>The current number and quality of these facilities on the island is not sufficient to meet demands now and into the future. Additionally, a multiuse complex would serve the needs of a diverse population on the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>As the father of a very active 13 year old daughter who has very varied interests including swimming (yes she is a member of BISC) diving water polo and gymnastics having a centralized location will gift us with much less time spent in the car driving from one place to another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>We need more gym space on the island, especially during the winter season.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>I do not want this area developed with buildings. Period. Paths, maybe restrooms, a few parking spots (not to be used by HS students or parents) and maybe a small playground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>There is NO access to courts in the downtown core during day time hours/school hours and limited at all times due to court scheduling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>I view Sakai as a great spot for natural outdoor space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>We need places for people to stay active during the short winter days that are dark and raining!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>I'm less interested in the others, although there may be a need for them that I am unaware of. I fully support having the space be a combination of outdoor space and needed facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>I'm headed toward older age (in my late 50s) &amp; look forward to enjoying community spaces suited to older individuals but also integrated with younger people’s activities. I particularly hope to see continuing development of more trails, would love a “playground” adapted to older people’s outdoor participation in fitness activities, and natural playgrounds that encourage young children to explore the physical world in ways that promote development (i.e. let them get out &amp; experience their physical limits in the ways children used to be able to just run freely and explore!)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>I don't think that more developed recreational areas are needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>I am not convinced that we need to do more than that at Sakai at this point in time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>No they Do not interest me with regard to how much more impervious elements are planned. Some of this could be built on the old Ray Foot print.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>No they Do not interest me with regard to how much more impervious elements are planned. Some of this could be built on the old Ray Foot print.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>I am interested in seeing outdoor tennis courts at Sakai Park. In the interest of saving money, I support keeping the Sakai Park natural. Undeveloped natural space is a great way to save the community money on building and maintaining facilities. Nature trails for walking, running, biking, and wildlife viewing would require minimal resources. Natural spaces are increasingly in demand as development increases in the area. I would give up my special interest (tennis courts) to keep the entire area natural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>It seems like the least expensive option. There are other more pressing needs like a new, bigger pool that would be a much better use of our funds. The island’s playgrounds, picnic shelters, sports courts, and indoor spaces are rarely at capacity. The pool is often at capacity, with wait lists, too many swimmers in one lane, and practices for young kids held very late on school nights due to lack of pool space earlier in the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Use of outdoor space in nature is important to any community. We need a nice indoor facility where we can have sports available to community members year round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>They’re probably the least intrusive on the park property, but make sense given proximity to the schools complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>All of these elements would be an addition, or at least an upgrade, to facilities that currently exist on the island and could obviously have a significant improvement to the quality of life here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>The gymnastics program is a large part of the Parks District offerings. The current space is inadequate for the growing program. If the Sakai property housed a sufficient gymnastics facility, it could be used during the school day by a broad range of participants. With the current, small location at the HS, use of the facility during the school day isn’t possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>In our active community it would be great to have more free or affordable indoor options for the rainy season. I think centering the teen and multi-generational spaces together (instead of trying to cram various bits into the available corners of the Aquatic center and library) would be great for family use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>A good place to picnic is very satisfying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>As a parent of children who are involved in after school sports we are constantly battling field use and light issues from fall til Springtime. We need a place for our kids to remain active under safe conditions year round.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>I'd like to have outdoor tennis courts within walking distance of the Winslow core. The idea of a grassy play area for general activities such as frisbee, catch, reading on a grassy knoll are also good ideas. Perhaps a picnic area/shelter/bbq would also be nice, I'm not sure how much it would be used, but perhaps. I think the idea of a large indoor recreational complex, park offices, teen center would be best built on already built environments such as Strawberry or across the street where the old Commodore school is located. There is adequate parking available and green space need not be destroyed with more buildings and parking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>None of the above interests me. I want to see more parks where horses can be taken out for walks or rides. Enough of recreation for people on this island. Traffic is already unacceptable, lets not make it worse. Absolutely no ball courts at all. Some picnic shelters and benches for people to see are ok, the rest must be trails for people and horses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>More in-town place for kids to play outside!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Love the public Rec spaces so that folks don't have to compete with school programs at the schools gyms, etc. Hoping there will be an indoor space for rent that will hold 200-250 people, since there is a shortage of those on the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Preserve nature for us and wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Outdoor use is primary!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>It is very clear you are not listening to us given the map below. *DO NOTHING but create trails. We do NOT need any facilities, centers, or any large buildings of any kind. DO NOTHING but create a few trails. Your offices can be renovated or rebuilt on the current Strawberry Park property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Given our weather I would like an indoor sheltered space for physical activity. Also it is so close to the three different schools that it makes sense to focus on indoor physical activities for both youth and adult - kids can walk to classes from schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Would enjoy tennis courts close to Winslow; indoor courts for things like pick up basketball would also be great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Do nothing! Leave the property the way it is naturally for us to enjoy. NO BUILDINGS or sports fields/pools, etc.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Being able to access outdoor facilities during winter/bad weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>DO NOTHING.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Indoor rec complex will afford sport events for youth throughout the entire year..... The idea of having a teen center within the multi-generational spaces will hopefully afford our teens a spot to gather and socialize safely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>I would like to see the Sakai Park remain natural and not developed except for nature trails. I do not want my property taxes raised for this &quot;Taj Mahal&quot; type project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>I think this will be a destination park for those who live downtown or who have visitors to the island. It will be a place to walk or bike to. It would be nice to have picnic shelters to have outdoor meals at - to protect people from rain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Shelter on rainy days. Otherwise keep as open space with trails. Fenced off leash area for dogs. Put the proposed buildings at Strawberry hill or combine them with BISD.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>None of these. Leave it as is. No asphalt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>with so many small children on the island, playgrounds get a ton of use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>FAMILY CAN ALL USE THEM.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>The location is perfect for a youth gathering space, as it is within walking distance of most of the island’s schools. The indoor sports facilities would fulfill a need, replacing current overused and outdated facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>We have considerable open space on the island, but since it used to rain here 9 months of the year, I think more accessible INDOOR spaces should be a priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Least impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>I do not believe that the features included in the indoor recreational complex exist for community members anywhere else on the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>A new swimming pool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>The proximity to the schools and neighborhoods support the need for the playground and picnic areas. However, having someplace that can be used during the winter and on rainy days would be ideal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>As I am older now my interests have shifted from a family with small children to seniors. Occasionally grandchildren will come to visit and we use the parks. Otherwise I am looking for exercise classes for seniors and other classes that I might attend after I retire from work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Increased option for year-round recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Clean trails, nice parks interest me the most. Simple is better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>We need more spaces for activities. Our winter weather makes it very difficult to find space for sports and recreation for much of the year. We need this space because our other indoor facilities are bursting at the seams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>We need more spaces for activities. Our winter weather makes it very difficult to find space for sports and recreation for much of the year. We need this space because our other indoor facilities are bursting at the seams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>How about a dog park?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Would like to see it less like a facility and more like a natural park. I would renovate the facilities across the road before I would add additional one to this area. Also I feel that complexes like gyms, indoor turf should be placed in areas like copper top or places that are already hardscape (the indoor climbing gym is a good example of using existing hardscape for facilities), I would create the Sakai property to retain as much of the natural appeal as possible verses filling it with buildings. The park off of Point White is a nice example of adding places for families to meet with younger kids while having activities for older kids and adults to do like use the hiking paths that connect or walk to the public beach access. I think the Sakai property should be treated the same and not built up but left natural for many generations to enjoy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>I believe that this property would best serve the community if as much of it as possible is kept as green space. Low impact structures like a playground and a picnic shelter would support enjoying green space as its main function. Facilities like a recreation complex, a track, or “multi-generational spaces” all seem redundant for the community - especially in light of the recent library renovation and the Sakai property’s vicinity to the high school. It also seems logical to invest in low impact, low cost development on this property before jumping into a huge construction project that is, to my knowledge, not yet funded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Really, none of the above. Just put in some trails, and preserve the land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>The recreation complex should include a pool facility. This is a desperate need for swimmers of all ages - we have competitive swimmers, water polo, crew, sailing teams and need all year (all week) pool facilities. If this complex can't include a pool, having proper gymnastics facilities would take some pressure off the existing pool plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Our island needs more meeting room. This is an excellent location that is accessible both from the nearby schools and Winslow. This would be the highest and best use of this property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Pickleball, tennis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>We already have lots of trails, places to picnic, walk the dog and playgrounds. We need more places for kids to play, kids of all ages, especially with Skateland closing and the Pavilion giving way to residential housing, it is becoming more dearth for kids, especially older kids to have a place to go and have fun. This property is just across the street from Ordway, Commodore, Eagle Harbor HS and BHS. It should, it must be developed to focus on kids as its first priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>I do not want to see the Sakai property developed beyond trails!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>We have a toddler and are always looking for outdoor activities, especially playgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Important for the general good of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Kids, teens, and adults need a place to play other than school facilities that have limited access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>I am not especially interested in large buildings at the Sakai Park. I think its best to keep the large facilities across the street, and keep the park as green as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>I think a teen center with more space would be a great benefit to the community. Teens have trouble finding a group to belong to. I've heard from older parents on the island that the teen center really benefited their children (who are now adults). Though my teen will be a senior next year and has never used the teen center (he's a band kid and was lucky enough to find his &quot;tribe&quot; there), the concept of the teen center is an interest to me. It could be used for art classes, music performance, gardening or farming classes (possibly using some of the land on at Sakai) or other activities or interests that are arguably underserved on the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>There has been much discussion about leaving this a natural space. I agree, we need to preserve as much as we can. However, there are limited options for spaces for kids to hang out on the island. The local YMCA in many towns serves this purpose, encouraging recreation and socializing. Also, our gymnastics program is bursting at the seams in desperate need of a new home. This central location is perfect as it is near the schools. Plenty of natural habitat can still be retained and this multipurpose building would add a much needed element to island life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>A Competition Pool 50 meters would bring aquatic revenue with swimming lessons, swim teams, Master swimmers, Bainbridge High School sports swim team and water polo, and to the community business owners. Please consider this as the Aquatic center only has a certain capacity and doesn't provide enough space for multiple teams to compete.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>There are few places on the island outside of the library to hold community meetings and gatherings. I think this is most important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>More outdoor space and space for grandchildren to play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Cannot find empty tennis courts in the summer. We need a dog park at the north end of the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>The population of Bainbridge Island has increased and more public meeting facilities are needed. I believe we need a dedicated Teen Center as well, not a couple of rooms attached to the Aquatics Center so that regular programming and a &quot;hang out&quot; space could be provided to our youth. (I have worked with incarcerated youth for 8 years and believe that community support and programming would have helped them avoid some of the situations they got into.). With many days of rainy weather an indoor recreation facility would be a great addition to our outdoor parks and trails. A picnic shelter close to town and the pool would be a good addition for events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Preserve and enhance maximum natural outdoor environment. Provide additional, lighted, indoor-activity space for cold/dark season. Less empty buildings, more frequently visited trails and outdoor experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Want trails to walk my dog and places to sit down and enjoy the birds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>The park district should be exploring outdoor pool options for the community. Summer pool swimming outdoors shouldn't be limited to those who can afford fancy memberships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>More indoor recreational facilities - we can use these year round, and we don't have enough of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Keep the property natural.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>When I voted in support of the bond to purchase the Sakai property, I never envisioned that the Board would be in favor of paving it over!! I do believe I am in the majority. I have seen it cited that there are lots of trails - BUT not many in walking distance of where most people live in the core of the town. One needs to get in a car and drive to Grand Forest. Please leave this space unpaved. That is trails for walking and perhaps mountain biking. Picnic areas and perhaps some play fields. Do not pave it over - including no fancy new office for Parks - remodel Strawberry Hill. AND - who in the heck do you think it going to pay for it. Those of us who are middle class homeowners are in danger of being taxed off the island. I hope the Board cares about that. There is plenty of paved over space nearby that can be used more efficiently. The other real concern is the traffic congestion this will add to an already difficult situation. At times, turning on to this street is a nightmare. This insane plan will further add to that mess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>None of the above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Kids that play baseball have continuously suffered game cancellations due to poor drainage issues at Rotary ballfields, it would be so nice to have an indoor or outdoor turf field with adjustable base paths to accommodate play for all ages of baseball. It would also give BILL and Mavericks and the High School the ability to host off island teams more often, which brings local businesses traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Bainbridge lacks a &quot;YMCA&quot;-like facility, where many people can come to workout together, and be social. I think a community facility that includes both meeting space for large groups, for both fitness and socializing would be an excellent multifaceted health approach. Bainbridge also lacks a neutral, non-church or -school, youth gathering spot. This facility might provide this across many ages and throughout the day. Again, the YMCA impresses with programs for seniors, adolescents, families, and single people. For example, the Silverdale YMCA hosted a youth area, open til midnight or so on weekends. Bainbridge Parks and Rec is well-organized, fiscally responsible and does a great job with the current range of programs. I think BIMPRD could do well to have facilities to expand to serve our community in this way! P.S. PLEASE INCLUDE A LOOP TRAIL OF AT LEAST 400 m, and ideally longer, for walkers and runners!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Tennis courts are sorely needed, and so are community spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>We already have these facilities other places on the island. It seems like a duplicitave effort and not worth the cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>A better use of the current school structure and parking could support the teen technology center. There should be a buffer from 305 to inner ring. A walking and biking bath is critical in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Lack of current facilities for these activities on the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Lack of current facilities for these activities on the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Lack of current facilities for these activities on the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>No buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>None of the above! This park is located in an area that already has an abundance of meeting places...the entire school district plus three churches and the Library. I don't think that the natural landscape has to be &quot;developed&quot; to be useful. Since Sakai Park is located within one of the more intensely developed part of town...an open space would offer some relief from these buildings which are dedicated to other specific usage would be welcome. With all the schools in the immediate area, I'm not sure there is a need for more playground equipment, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Please keep most of this property in a natural state of field and forest...I live close to the park!!! Playground and limited picnic space is ok...can draw in families to the open space as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>As Your map shows there are MANY places and parks for walking and enjoying nature as well as picnicking. I believe the population of Bainbridge is aging and while there is a vibrant Senior Center it is INSIDE. There are too few outdoor spaces for physical activities which seniors can enjoy with other seniors. TENNIS IS ONE OF THE FEW ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE. The Bainbridge Community Tennis Association has many members in their 80ties and even above age 90. It plays tennis OUTSIDE all year long which is important for people who don't have the financial ability to join BAC. And yet the tennis facilities on Bainbridge are minimal--especially compared to other places of comparable wealth--such as Mercer Island which has many outdoor courts. Sakai has the space for two tennis courts- and the places for picnicking could be on the trails and not taking up precious space. Also Is there REALLY a need for so many buildings for meetings? As someone mentioned at one of the public meetings--there is MUCH empty space available in Winslow which could be used for meetings. A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>I am not very computer literate but think I already responded to this. If I have filled out forms incorrectly I would appreciate feedback and the opportunity to correct my mistakes. As before I said there are many parks providing a playground and nature concept. Also many places to picnic. Building in Winslow which are underused could be a centralized place for digital labs, educational training space. Those activities DO NOT NEED TO BE IN A PRECIOUS PARCEL OF LAND WHICH SHOULD BE FOCUSED ON OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>I am not very computer literate but think I already responded to this. If I have filled out forms incorrectly I would appreciate feedback and the opportunity to correct my mistakes. As before I said there are many parks providing a playground and nature concept. Also many places to picnic. Building in Winslow which are underused could be a centralized place for digital labs, educational training space. Those activities DO NOT NEED TO BE IN A PRECIOUS PARCEL OF LAND WHICH SHOULD BE FOCUSED ON OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>I am not very computer literate but think I already responded to this. If I have filled out forms incorrectly I would appreciate feedback and the opportunity to correct my mistakes. As before I said there are many parks providing a playground and nature concept. Also many places to picnic. Building in Winslow which are underused could be a centralized place for digital labs, educational training space. Those activities DO NOT NEED TO BE IN A PRECIOUS PARCEL OF LAND WHICH SHOULD BE FOCUSED ON OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>I am not very computer literate but think I already responded to this. If I have filled out forms incorrectly I would appreciate feedback and the opportunity to correct my mistakes. As before I said there are many parks providing a playground and nature concept. Also many places to picnic. Building in Winslow which are underused could be a centralized place for digital labs, educational training space. Those activities DO NOT NEED TO BE IN A PRECIOUS PARCEL OF LAND WHICH SHOULD BE FOCUSED ON OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>I am not very computer literate but think I already responded to this. If I have filled out forms incorrectly I would appreciate feedback and the opportunity to correct my mistakes. As before I said there are many parks providing a playground and nature concept. Also many places to picnic. Building in Winslow which are underused could be a centralized place for digital labs, educational training space. Those activities DO NOT NEED TO BE IN A PRECIOUS PARCEL OF LAND WHICH SHOULD BE FOCUSED ON OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>The current gymnastics gym is not large enough to adequately cover the amount of classes happening there. I would love to see a larger gym space with more updated equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Gymnastics programs serve youth year round, and the existing facilities are inadequate for future growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>We need more indoor space for our kids! It should be the Parks highest priority as it is the only thing on the list that we do not currently have on the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>As a family of 5 with 3 children, we really appreciate many opportunities to play and exercise inside and outside. Spaces that encourage family connection, healthy activities throughout the seasons, would be a top priority for us. There are currently not that many places to recreate indoors on Bainbridge for youth and cross-generational age groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Would love to have summer and winter recreational area. But most interested in pickleball courts!! I realize Battle Point will have courts, but we really could use courts closer to town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>First priority is to have a space for teens. There is a desperate need for this!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>We need more space for active participation in sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Build less! Hoping the current aquatic center stays and/or gets updated to house the indoor stuff mentioned above. And if so, then keep Sakai Park more &quot;natural.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>We currently do not have enough recreation opportunities in the most densely populated area of the island. With the addition of more multiplex housing units the population will soon be greatly increased. I think that it is extremely important to offer recreation facilities within walking distance for these people as well as offering indoor facilities for the entire island. The young people need a space to grow in healthy ways and it is time to address this issue on the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>These are the elements we mostly use as sports groups and a family. The other elements are available already in the Aquatic center, Prue’s house and Strawberry Hill and usually available when we need to use them with enough advanced planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Having a court, which is near downtown, and is available during school hours is important. Especially since the HS courts are closed during school hours (for good reason).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Love to stay in shape playing racket sports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>dedicated Tennis only courts in the Winslow core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Outside of the Aquatic Center we have no public places for kids and folks in general to burn lots of energy and have fun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Two tennis courts would be wonderful if possible. The multi-use indoor recreation complex is greatly needed. Using a surface that could accommodate a multitude of uses would be most beneficial. Not only soccer, but tennis, lacrosse, football, field hockey, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Existing gymnastics facilities are overcrowded!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>The number of usable outdoor tennis courts continues to diminish and yet the interest in the sport continues to grow. There are too few options to play outside in downtown Winslow especially since the high school courts are off limits to the public during school hours. In summer, the Parks and Rec program commandeers the high school courts for their use. If Sakai Park had 2-6 tennis courts this would accommodate more of the budding tennis players and enable those players who do not belong to one of the local clubs more playing time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Gymnastics facility is really too small for the level of interest and safety of the gymnasts. A nature playground in the city core is important to lay a foundation of awareness in our children. A picnic shelter would be a nice varied destination for my family to use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>More indoor activities are needed, especially for teens. A bowling alley would be used by all ages and provide a profit back to Parks and Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>It would be great to have good facilities for indoor sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>I would like good facilities for indoor sports. All three of my children are involved in athletics and could benefit from this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Our kids need safe places to go when it gets dark early in the long winter months. There are not enough places for our teenagers to hang out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Not really interested in any of these options, most interested in trails and natural areas. Would like to see more pea patches like at Battle Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>I believe these areas will be used the most by the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Insufficient facilities currently exist for adult outdoor recreation. Would like to see a competition pool incorporated into any space here or elsewhere. The current lap pool is disgusting; peeling paint in shower, rust and mold on walls etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>We have had 3 children participate in gymnastics classes and 2 on gymnastics team. We have helped the gymnastics club host 8 different gymnastics meets, 3 of them State Meets for gymnasts from all over Washington. We would love to see a new space for the gymnastics team and gymnastics program that provides a safer, larger space for the gymnasts and coaches to work, with less opportunity for injury. We spend a lot of time in this central area of the island coming and going from activities, and would love a place for eating and gathering while we are away from our home on the north end of the island during the busy afternoon and commuter hours that cause congestion on the highway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>The outdoor court and trails are the only outdoor uses in this &quot;park.&quot; It was supposed to be purchased as a park, not a development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please select your level of interest for implementing the Sakai Park Concept Plan:
4. The development of Sakai Park will require funding from various public and private sources. Funding sources would include public grants, private fundraising, and most likely a voter approved bond. While cost estimates are reflected in the feasibility study, no formal funding plan has been adopted. We are interested in learning how high of a priority this project is to the Bainbridge Island community. Within the context of other Park District capital investment priorities and potential need for tradeoffs, please indicate how high of a priority the development of Sakai Park is to you:
### Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very high priority</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High priority</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal priority with other capital improvements</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low priority</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a priority</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals: 204**

5. Why?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ResponseID</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>I think there are other things such as widening the shoulders on some of the roads (especially Sportsman Club where children are walking to school and other main roads where children have to walk to school).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>It is a beautiful property with so much potential and I would be glad to participate in private fundraising opportunities to assure more tennis courts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I am supportive because I think that it would be a very nice community amenity; however it is best for families and I am solo here. I don't imagine personally using it that much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>When finalizing the design, please put function over form. Let's not spend an extra $10 million making this the most beautiful set of civic buildings. If they look like the High School or Aquatic Center, that is sufficient. We don't need Mithun's designs skills to draw people to come use the buildings. They'll get used if they are grey, concrete boxes and any architect can do better than that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>I would support a much more scaled back development of Sakai property, beginning with adding clearly marked trails, more deciduous trees and native species to attract butterflies, hummingbirds, and other birdlife. I'd add a few picnic tables and park benches. Bark the trails and provide doggie poop bags and call it good. I hope you will first consider the impact on the school community environment, and the traffic problems a busy athletic sight you are proposing will create before you invest money into this location. If you did go ahead with this rather busy plan, I foresee you will need to widen Madison to become a 4 lane road in front of the school zones. Also the more hard surfaces you create the less aquifer recharge you will have as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 38
I would support a much more scaled back development of Sakai property, beginning with adding clearly marked trails, more deciduous trees and native species to attract butterflies, hummingbirds, and other birdlife. I'd add a few picnic tables and park benches. Bark the trails and provide doggie poop bags and call it good. I hope you will first consider the impact on the school community environment, and the traffic problems a busy athletic sight you are proposing will create before you invest money into this location. If you did go ahead with this rather busy plan, I foresee you will need to widen Madison to become a 4 lane road in front of the school zones. Also the more hard surfaces you create the less aquifer recharge you will have as well.

### 40
This project gives the park district a centrally located multi-purpose rec area that would serve a wide diversity of recreational options for the community. Also it is centrally located and would serve the core of the community well.

### 41
This project gives the park district a centrally located multi-purpose rec area that would serve a wide diversity of recreational options for the community. Also it is centrally located and would serve the core of the community well.

### 42
1) Nice plan overall. I love the forested buffer, the natural habitat, and the "natural play" area. Connecting with a cross-island trail or bike trail would be fantastic. 2) I hate the lawn. We have enough lawns on the island already, and lawns require maintenance and deplete the ecosystem, rather than add to it, when they require water, mowing, fertilizer, and herbicides. Instead, put here: a new, restored ecosystem, or a pea-patch garden, or an orchard. Or more "natural play" areas. Or Invite Friends of the Farm to put in an edible food forest, like they are doing near Day Road. 3) Although we do need lots of benches for people to rest, we don't need covered picnic areas, and more concrete, etc. 4) Parking: Page 27 mentions sharing parking with St. Cecilia's and the School District. This is an excellent idea, and I hope it can work. Use the impervious spaces that are already built, rather than adding more! (Pool parking is already tight, but Ordway has space, and even The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has parking and they have been very generous in the past for community events.) 5) Regarding the buildings, we don't need expensive, fancy looking buildings. I'm not willing to pay for something that "looks nice." But I am willing to invest in environmentally sustainable practices, such as solar panels, passive solar heating, or a living building, such as McI Jennan's Heron Hall here on Bainbridge. These sustainable buildings save money in the long-run and preserve priceless eco-system functioning. (I'm still frustrating that Wilkes and Blakely put so much money into making pretty buildings rather than paying teachers more or investing in sustainable building practices, and I'm frustrated with how fancy and expensive the new Fire Station is. Yes, it needs to be able to serve its function safely and comfortably, but no more.) I trust Parks to be more responsible with money and to respect that many Bainbridge Islanders are struggling with high property taxes.

### 43
The need for indoor space is a community need. One of the spaces needs to be large enough to host large gatherings. The BIMPRD needs a new office...their existing one smells of mold and is not healthy. Having their office near the pool and town will make it more convenient.

### 44
Sakai park is the perfect opportunity to create some major park facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ResponseID</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>an enhancement to all types of activities for all age levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Parks are important, but I'm not sure what other projects are being considered that would share funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>we are on a fixed income and so we are worried about tax increases!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>TAXES are TOO HIGH now! We voted to buy this property NOT knowing how little of it could be built. Carts and horses were not in the correct order for this property purchase. We should have known about the building options or lack thereof before we all voted to buy it. Most of it should be passive park land for future use now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Like I said above, I want to be able to play tennis on Bainbridge Island. We visit other communities around the country and are amazed at the Parks and Rec tennis facilities available to all residents. I would love to see that here on Bainbridge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Maintaining existing facilities is a higher priority. I am not interested in shifting resources or paying more to complete this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>I believe the indoor rec complex is needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>I believe we have many open, outdoor spaces already on the Island. I feel we should prioritize the new aquatic center over the Sakai property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Our taxes are already quite high on the island. I would like for the community to utilize current funding and phase in development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>We are working with the Park Department to develop new pickleball courts at Battlepoint park. While the Sakai project looks great, I wouldn't want it to have a higher priority than that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Cost seems to be a big issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>It is far away from where I live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>I know there is a need for a replacement and expanded Ray Pool. That resource is VITAL to so many interests on this island, and should come first. PLEASE at least tie both projects to one bond ask. Be sure they are linked to each other by trails and non-motorized connections. Design them to be really energy efficient, have solar panels, and green roofs. DESIGN for climate change. Make them both green demonstration projects - that our community can be proud of and will be resilient to climate change in the future. PLEASE make them over-the-top in terms of your pedestrian and multi-modal access and connections. We should be embarrassed to build anything else. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>There is nothing in the concept plan that I would use (that is not already available so me elsewhere).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1) Sakai Park could be a wonderful open space with trails. Bainbridge does not need any of the capital projects currently being considered because they all already exist and are not at capacity. 2) The Parks district should be focused on a pool, the only public-use capital project desperately needed on the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Believe a new competition pool is the highest priority and don’t want to see it not get support due to Sakai property. Don’t believe community will be supportive of both simultaneously. A new pool is desperately needed for safety and capacity reasons. It doesn’t make sense to invest in a new facility when an existing facility that is more than used than any other on the island has reached the end of its lifespan and is inadequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Although a high priority, the needs to be a focus on building a new competition pool. These are the two most important capital projects for the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>We need affordable housing first. If people can’t live here they don’t need parks. Do we want people using the park to come from off Island because that’s what will happen if we don’t have more affordable housing. I would be happy to support a bond to pay for housing before I would support a bond for more park amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>I don’t see it giving us anything we need RIGHT NOW. Where as the aquatic center is limping along and could definitely use the improvement/expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Low because there are sufficient facilities currently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>This sounds like a worthwhile project, but I think it is lower priority than replacing and modernizing the pool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Because we didn’t buy it to develop it. The wetlands are already protected by State law so leaving them untouched except for trails was already going to happen regardless of whether it was privately or publicly owned. The facilities being considered should be located on BISD property under an agreement similar to that of the aquatic center. The Commodore building will be torn down relatively soon and that frees up land. Please find ways to better collaborate with BISD to use land that already has a footprint of concrete and development- leave Sakai Park in as natural a state as possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>This park needs to stay looking natural. There’s enough development around the downtown area already. We can attach this proposed sports complex to school grounds or other already developed areas that aren’t destroying this beautifully preserved land! Many people in the United States live in a concrete jungle and have very little interaction with nature, this natural land give us lucky islanders one more excuse to get outside and experiences nature. I vote for keeping walking trails, having a small playground that is not invading the natural beauty, and a place for families to picnic on warm sunny days. I enjoy this preserved land and passing by it from time to time on my route into town. My wish is for this land, that we have a privilege to experience, stays as natural and beautiful as it is now.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>I am opposed to developing the property. It was purchased because it was lovely and parklike. Put the buildings in places where there are already buildings...where the Commodore school is, for example. Strawberry Hill park, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I live within walking distance of Sakai Park and want a place to play.

If the park district is going to fund a capital facility, I'd like to see it start with an upgrade to the pool complex.

We need to do this project right to start. Invest in future activities for all!


There's always so much to be done and probably limited resources to do it all, even in an affluent community like BI. I definitely want to see continuing preservation of natural spaces and development of some like Sakai into parks to be used by all but I am concerned about not over-burdening "average" earners like myself with unbearable taxes (especially as I move toward retirement & a fixed income!)

It would be great to have such a large park close to town. More accessible than Battle Point. For us it would be walking distance.

I don't think that more developed recreational areas are needed. On the contrary, I think that preserving more natural areas is essential.

It seems like we have those resources in other areas. And it seems like a luxury.

The Pool is far more important

The Pool is far more important

Natural spaces require the least money for development of trails and maintenance. Preserving natural spaces should be a priority of Parks and Rec. The time to save this natural space is now. Keeping the space low maintenance is good planning for the future.

We have lots of parks and they are never at capacity.

Sakai Park is centrally located with access to many community residents. It could serve as a central location for so many important sport and community activities. Plus, the park district is in dire need of new offices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ResponseID</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>The Sakai plan should be implemented within existing resources and budgets -- no more bond issues! There’s poor bond coordination between the various agencies anyway, and escalating property taxes on this island are driving a lot of long time residents away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>The island has a diverse portfolio of teams and clubs that are in desperate need of athletic facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Facilities on the island are outdated or overused. So an expansion/upgrade needs to be considered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Having an indoor recreation area that can be utilized by all age groups would be a tremendous resource to our community. I worry parking will become an issue there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Any time we give the youth in our community a place to learn and play is a good investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Don't get in a hurry!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>A multi sports complex is needed on this island that is home to so many children!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>We would most likely never use it. It is very far away from where we live on the south end of the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>The priority depends on what is decided to go where. I will not support the full development of Sakai as outlined in the feasibility study. I will give high support to low impact recreational activities at Sakai as outlined above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>We do not need something elaborate. Trails, lots of trees and some lawn areas would be ok. No buildings, definitely not ball courts or more playgrounds at all. Again trails for horses and people to walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Teens need a place to go. This has been a common statement for the last 20 years and there is nothing on this island for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Prefer its undeveloped state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>While I am grateful for the preservation of this land, preventing it from going to the developer chopping block, I will probably not make use of it myself as I prefer more natural spaces like Gazzam and the Grand Forest. So I think this would be the perfect place to develop whatever activities would keep teens and pre-teens occupied, especially given it’s location so near the schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>We need more outdoor use spaces. Tennis courts and soccer fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Leave the precious, valuable land AS IS for humans and wildlife to enjoy. Renovate the current BIMPRD offices at Strawberry Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>I would like to see primary funds go to an updated pool. There is no other pool options in the region. Right now for my son to play on a water polo team means he has to practice until 9:30 at night as there is not enough swim time for all interested parties. The demand in there - the facility is not adequate. I am actually discouraging my daughter from swimming as the option for times do not suit students - they have to work out too late at night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>A 22 acre park and rec space so close to downtown Winslow is a wonderful amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>LEAVE it as is for wildlife and humans to enjoy. It is beautiful in it's current state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Bike lanes, trails connecting the island is more important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>It is very clear you are not listening to us given the map above. *DO NOTHING but create trails. We do NOT need any facilities, centers, or any large buildings of any kind. DO NOTHING but create a few trails. Your offices can be renovated or rebuilt on the current Strawberry Park property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Bainbridge is an expensive place to live, and it seems to be getting more expensive with each year. It seems to be growing without much concern being considered given to how traffic will be handled.....parking is ALWAYS a concern here., Our officials don't seem to be hearing folks when the subject of traffic and parking are brought up. It's pretty costly to live here, and pay taxes and utilities......many of us just don't have the money to cough up for projects. It's hard to get excited about how one will dig deeper into his or her pockets these days.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Taxes on Bainbridge are too high already. We should be living within our means and not continuing to raise taxes to fund a &quot;resort&quot; type facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>It's an important investment because of its central location and accessibility (geography and cost). I would also love to see a playground at Fort Ward, so admittedly, I have other priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Because it is close to downtown Winslow, and it could be a destination for all the newcomers on the island during the summer. They can walk up from the ferry. it would be a nice place for them to walk to, have a picnic, and then leave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Combine with capital projects for BISD and COBI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Gym and multi-generational facilities are inadequate now and would be a great addition at Sakai Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>I voted for this project to preserve the land. I did not vote for play gyms and buildings. Paths built with permeable material to walk and explore. A large pea patch would be nice and beneficial for the area if there is water access. Low impact educational areas. Thanks for listening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>The comp plan says that our population will be most dense in the Winslow area, so that's where the facilities need to be. More people can WALK to Sakai than to most of the other parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Other options are already available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Too costly and one more levy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>I think this is a golden opportunity to expand the recreational services provided by the Parks Department to the community. However, I believe the aquatic center project is a much higher priority project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Voted to buy the property to preserve open space on BI, not to develop it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>We need a new pool and have plenty of trails and parks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>I think it will be a great place for the number of people that live in close proximity to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Funds need to be placed in maintaining the parks that you have. If the public shows an interest then use fundraising methods to earn funds for the new area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Given the high use of the current aquatic center and the current state of it, I feel money needs to be put into the new aquatic center first, before this project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>When we voted to approve funding to purchase this piece of land for parks, it was under the impression it would basically be left wild for quiet space, and allowed to remain natural. I am ashamed to see what plans are now on the table.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Even though the concept is nice, we have a lot of athletic clubs on the island. Our outdoor parks are amazing and I don't feel that developing Sakai Park is needed at this time. I would rather see it developed similar to the Grand Forest with paths and trails and sitting areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>These things are what make living here great. We need to fund this kind of thing to make this the kind of place we all want to live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>These things are what make living here great. We need to fund this kind of thing to make this the kind of place we all want to live.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>there are plenty of outdoor spaces already available. Use the available funding to continue improvements on parks already in use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>I think the buildings should not be developed, and it should just remain a park with a possible grass area and playground. I think having everything updated to the latest and greatest is missing the point. There does not need to be state of the art gym or indoor turf. Let there be natural areas for kids to wonder and explore and adults to find a restful space. I will not be voting to approve a bond for the buildings but I would vote to approve a simpler plan that has a great park and trails.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I do not feel that building a recreation complex is something this community is interested in or needs. The only people I have spoken to in favor of this project work at the Parks Department. Funds that would be allocated to this project would better serve the community if allocated to obtaining more properties around the island. Our island is at huge risk of losing its wild spaces - we all live with this reality every day. I would love to see the Parks District prioritize obtaining more undeveloped property and keeping it undeveloped, for the enjoyment of the public. I recognize that these community buildings would be valuable and useful, but they do not feel critical, especially when weighed against the preservation of natural spaces.

No one can answer a question like this without seeing what else is on that list of possible projects.

Proximity to Winslow

My household has a middle schooler and a high schooler. BI is becoming more and more expensive to live with facilities that interest kids getting replaced with housing and storage needs for the middle aged and elderly. While I understand that demographics are shifting, we really must focus on ways to try to make BI more welcoming to families -- affordable housing is only one element; strong schools and recreation are just as important. The Park District does a great job with younger kids, but I really would like the Park District to think about older kids too, and with the location of this property so close to all of BISD schools except Wilkes and Blakely, it makes the most sense to use this property in such a way that prioritizes kids especially for after school activities which would really help out us working parents.

Leave the green space alone!

I would like to see another finished park in area if it had a playground.

I think it is better to remodel or build additions to existing infrastructure, within budget constraints. After all of these school levy’s I will not be supporting money to build at Sakai Park. I would support investment in the pool though.

I’m not knowledgeable about the other capital improvements that might have to wait due to this project. I just think for all the reasons I highlighted above that this project would be a significant enhancement to island life particularly for kids of all ages.

A larger pool is important to support the community with aquatic services and the growing programs that utilize the pool space.

The park district needs a new office! This is the most important use of this space and a perfect spot. Beyond that, trails and community meeting space would be great. The sports courts are unnecessary and the pool seems like too much to ask for approval of the project but may be necessary. Ray Williamson is very important to many in the community so if it desperately needs to be replaced then perhaps this would be a great place. So nice to have it attached to Nakata right now though.
There are many worthwhile projects that would enhance life on Bainbridge Island. I hope that most of them could be funded and built over time. This project is close to the center of the city and other facilities as well as the schools so it would likely get high usage. Having the Teen Center close to the High School is important for kids who aren't driving yet or don't have cars to get to other facilities. There are several playground facilities around the Island but there is nothing for teens except the library and sports if they participate in them. Many do not so an alternative facility is needed.

May not be able to raise all the money necessary to fund all the best solutions.

Looks like the building out of the facilities are going to cost a lot. I am more supportive of a lower impact footprint. There is quite a bit of impermeable surfaces in your current plan. I want open space, maybe a tennis court, swings for kids in a small simple playground, trails for walkers with dogs and good hard trail surface like gravel for strollers to use. Keep it simple and low cost as possible. Plant beautiful trees and a native plants. Put in an area for people to grow their own vegetables like at Battlepoint. I'd love to see more of a focus on green space and less on structures. Thanks for allowing input.

More interested in seeing an improved aquatic center situation.

Keep it natural.

I will NOT vote for bonds for the exorbitant buildings included in this plan. Further, I will assist in whichever group comes forward to mount a vigorous defense AGAINST this. Do not pave over this property. When I voted in support of the acquisition of the property, preserving a nice green space close to the population center of this island is what I had in mind, Not this exorbitant, costly and unnecessary building.

People living in or near the core need a natural environment to walk in. Developing with buildings, parking places, and noise crowds out those looking for a walk in nature.

I've been following all surveys. I've volunteered a lot of time to baseball here on the island for the past 3 years. Seems soccer has access to turf fields, swimmers are taken care of with the Aquatic center, and there are multiple pools on the island, but baseball kids often have their ability to play jeopardized by rain. District All Stars requires players play in 60% of games in a season to be eligible for All Star play. Rain luckily was not an issue this past season but last year the rain destroyed Rotary fields with standing water games were cancelled weekly, making the players play 3 plus games per week, for arm health and injury prevention in younger boys...this is not ideal.

It's in a centralized area that could use a park. It provides an island of green nature in a quickly developing community. It's a natural link for the planned off-road 305 trail. The nearby grass BISD fields and playgrounds need some assistance in providing open space for playing, athletics, recreation and socializing outside.

I think it would be an important addition to the island; however, it would be nice to wait a little bit until the construction market cools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ResponseID</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>I live in Virginia Villa now but even if I didn't, I don't think it is necessary to 'develop' a park space with buildings. The Sakai property is located so close to the school district offices and two schools, three active church campuses and lots of commercial activity and a huge shopping center. In this context, some mid-town grassy open space for walking and picnicking and other socializing would be an asset...not every space has to be developed...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Just because we can doesn't mean we should &quot;develop&quot; open space. It's a relief to have this forested area in mid-town (adjacent to and part of this park. A limited picnic area and grassy space for play would be enough.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>interested I moderate development, eg picnic tables near HS road and retain some open space for play...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>It is a precious parcel of land. While I will be away from Bainbridge more in the coming year, I could still contribute to a fund raising effort and would do so. Of course if it has tennis facilities- which is a sport I love and a concern for me- I would be inclined to donate more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>As I said before- the Sakai land provides a unique opportunity to create outdoor activities CLOSE TO WINSLOW. And indoor activities could be located in areas of higher density, like Winslow itself, and not taking up precious land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>As I said before- the Sakai land provides a unique opportunity to create outdoor activities CLOSE TO WINSLOW. And indoor activities could be located in areas of higher density, like Winslow itself, and not taking up precious land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>As I said before- the Sakai land provides a unique opportunity to create outdoor activities CLOSE TO WINSLOW. And indoor activities could be located in areas of higher density, like Winslow itself, and not taking up precious land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>As I said before- the Sakai land provides a unique opportunity to create outdoor activities CLOSE TO WINSLOW. And indoor activities could be located in areas of higher density, like Winslow itself, and not taking up precious land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>As I said before- the Sakai land provides a unique opportunity to create outdoor activities CLOSE TO WINSLOW. And indoor activities could be located in areas of higher density, like Winslow itself, and not taking up precious land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>I would like to see our community needs met by providing more useable spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Existing facilites are inadequate for intended uses at Sakai.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>The concept map doesn't specifically call out pickleball courts, but if that is included, then I believe this is a high priority. Pickleball is one of the fastest growing sports in the world right now, and it all started here on Bainbridge! The pickleball community on Bainbridge is growing rapidly and it would be amazing to have Sakai Park be another location other than Battle Point park where people can gather and play.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResponseID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>It is centrally located on the island and thus more accessible to the greatest majority of people on the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Would love to see a new park added to our island for the enjoyment of islanders and visitors, especially so close to the downtown core.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>There are other facilities that need improvement and these investments should be maintained before new facilities are built. Many facilities can be built at a lower costs such as covered outdoor recreational court, picnic shelters (there ones at Faye Bainbridge are always in use). What about improving the buildings in Fort Ward park for use? And, the aging Ray Pool needs to be replaced and the swim community is very large and currently crowded in the existing pool. The Nakata Pool is great for free swim and play, but the fitness, competitive swimmers and water polo teams need a larger and updated pool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>I worked for years and years to build my home on Bainbridge Island. My property taxes are now TWICE my mortgage, in large part due to silly ideas presented by local government agencies. In my opinion, having 3 indoor soccer fields when there are six within a few hundred meters across the street is obscene, ostentatious and frankly quite arrogant. To anyone who thinks the proposed Sakai Park project is a high priority, then charge the users to use the facilities, not people on fixed incomes, not people who are not physically capable of using the facilities, not people who work but still can't afford to pay for a $52 MILLION snowflake project. Contrary to what people at the Parks Department think, there are many of us on Bainbridge that don't want to become Mercer Island, the standard proposed by the project designers. I will vote No on this and all other thoughtless ideas proposed or supported by the idle rich on Bainbridge. And, if there's a lawsuit, well that's another decision down the road. Repeat, let the people who use the proposed facilities pay for them; then you will see how much support you get.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Relieve pressure on the existing facilities/parks. Need for more public space within walking distance for the highest density area of the island. It is time to have a new space for the offices of Park &amp; Rec. - I might even suggest that this would be priority number one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>If it is a phased plan where in the less expensive investments and structure is started first and the public begins to use the park and space, I believe long term, the rest of the plan will take shape and have support. It is a vision, and our community has seen larger projects like this one through before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Developing community space near civic centers is very important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Need more recreational facilities as Island population continues to grow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Loss of 12 useable tennis courts in the Winslow core over the past 12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>90% of the future growth of Bainbridge Island is project to occur in Winslow. Waterfront park is inadequate to handle the current needs and future needs of Winslow and the island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>A great community builder!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>The cost of the project is above and beyond what I would be willing to support with a voter approved bond for what they are proposing to do on this property. Fifty three million is a lot to swallow when taxes are already extremely high on this Island. I appreciate the &quot;if you build it, they will come&quot; approach but I'm not convinced of the necessity to build such a grandiose field house. I am concerned that parking will be an issue if the field house is in constant use. I would be in favor of more &quot;natural&quot; development of the park and fewer buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Many reasons. It would help tourism, which helps our local economy. It will be a city core &quot;nature&quot; destination which is a rarity in urban design these days. It will help the development of our young people for future generations, which should be a priority for us all. It could be incorporated as an extension in educational opportunities with it's proximity to existing schools, think field work/trips.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>If there were a nicer facility for my daughter to do gymnastics we wouldn't need to drive to Silverdale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>I would love to see a new gymnastics gym on the island. We currently drive to Silverdale for better facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>I am very interested if this plan includes space for recreational opportunities inside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Important park due to it's proximity to our downtown. It could offer activities that help support our park system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Doesn't offer something that I need that I can't currently get on the island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>The community continues to grow and we need to create spaces for everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>So many other priorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>Recreation and are central to our community and identity. Having a centralized space for these activities strengthen our community and provide a valuable resource to educate and nurture our children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>This location is the best possible site for the suggested development, across from the schools and centrally located with easy access for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>I would like to see it left as a natural area with minimal trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>There are no outdoor uses. It is supposed to be a park so I don't want to see it &quot;developed.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Biologist References for Wildlife Sections


Washington Department of Natural Resources (WDNR). 2018. *Washington Natural Heritage Rare Plants and Nonvasculars, County Lists-Kitsap County.*  

APPENDIX G

HISTORIC SITES
APPENDIX G  HISTORIC SITES

Historic sites or features can be found in several parks and in other local locations. These sites are significant in that they provide an important historical context for the island. The protection of these sites is needed in order to retain and preserve archeological and cultural features of the island’s history.

Historical sites may include Native American remnants, original homesteads or buildings, former industrial sites, and other culturally important locations.

To the extent possible and practical, historic buildings, structures or features will be retained on their original sites. In some instances, they may be relocated to other public properties in order to better conserve, display, or provide interpretation.

EXISTING HISTORICAL SITES OF SIGNIFICANCE

The following places contain significant archaeological, cultural, or architectural conservancy potentials and may be appropriate for interpretation.

BIMPRD Parks & Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Battle Point Park</td>
<td>Regional multiuse park on site of WWII US Navy Radio Transmitting Station with adaptive reuse of historic Helix House (Antenna Base) and Transmitter Building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Blakely Harbor</td>
<td>Community park with waterfront on former site of 1863-1925 Port Blakely Mill with original mill pond and other related remnants from this era. Links to Blakely Cemetery and Fort Ward Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Camp Yeomalt</td>
<td>Neighborhood park including historic log cabin built for Boy Scouts in 1930’s through federal program, Works Progress Administration (WPA), and restored in 2009. Listed on National Historic Register in 2005.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cave Family Heritage Park</td>
<td>Special use park with historic Cave family home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Eagledale Park</td>
<td>Community park on former site of 1950’s U.S. Army Nike missile site and radar station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fairy Dell Trail</td>
<td>Trail north of Battle Point Park with remnants of “Billy Taft Fir”, once the largest fir tree in the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fort Ward Historic Bakery</td>
<td>Special use facility in historic Fort Ward Bakery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Fort Ward Parade Grounds</td>
<td>Neighborhood park on site of parade grounds of U.S. Army (1900-1928) and Navy (1939-1958) military installations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Fort Ward Park</td>
<td>Historic regional multiuse park overlooking Rich Passage with gun batteries and vestiges of the coastal defense system for the 1900s designed to protect the Bremerton Naval Shipyard. The park is part of a national historic district with remnants from 19th and 20th century war efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Island Center Hall</td>
<td>Special use park with historic community hall originating in early 1900’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Point White Pier</td>
<td>Community park at one of the last remaining historic Mosquito Fleet sites (1910-1930’s) and subsequent auto ferry dock (1940-1950’s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pritchard Park</td>
<td>Regional park on Eagle Harbor owned in part with COBI and at the site of previous town of Creosote which grew up around the Wyckoff wood preservation business operation, also on site. Park also includes National Park site of World War II BI Japanese American Exclusion Memorial describing war-time internment. Park is also location of previous Mosquito Fleet docks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Schel Chelb</td>
<td>Neighborhood park with estuary and saltwater beach. Site has Native American significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Seabold Hall</td>
<td>Special use park with historic community hall also used as one room schoolhouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Strawberry Hill Park</td>
<td>Community park on former site of 1950’s U.S. Army Nike Ajax missile installation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>West Port Madison Nature Preserve</td>
<td>Community park and nature preserve including rustic shelters and stone cooking stoves built for Cub Scouts in 1930’s through the federal WPA program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Yama</td>
<td>Open space natural area acquired for archaeological conservancy purposes at site of former Japanese hillside village of Port Blakely Mill workers and families (1885-1925).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COBI Properties**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strawberry Park Plant (Cannery Cove)</td>
<td>Site and surrounding area of significance due to prior berry farming settlements and commercial berry processing operation. (John Nelson Park at Strawberry Cannery Cove)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Waterfront Park</td>
<td>Regional waterfront park in Eagle Harbor at site of former Native American fishing camp and in proximity to surrounding 19th and early 20th century maritime operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above City of Bainbridge Island properties have historic resources associated with parks and consequently are listed in this section. For more COBI historic properties, refer to following pages for:

1) Historic Register from the COBI website indicating local, state, and national historic site nominations. (http://www.bainbridgewa.gov/234/Historic-Registers).

2) Map of Bainbridge Island indicating historic Native American sites/names. (Provided by Suquamish Tribe)

**Other Organizations**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bainbridge Island Historical Museum</td>
<td>Island historical museum and artifacts housed in renovated historical structure in Winslow. Indoor and outdoor exhibits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POSSIBLE OTHER HISTORICAL SITES OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The following are other possible sites that could contain significant archaeological, cultural, or architectural conservancy potentials and may be appropriate for interpretation.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Head of the Bay</td>
<td>Site of extensive berry farmlands at head of Eagle Harbor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Port Madison</td>
<td>Site of 1800s era saw mill and company town at the head of Port Madison Bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Native American Petroglyph</td>
<td>Rock carving located overlooking the beach off Agate Passage on a privately owned property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Frog Rock</td>
<td>Funky island rock painting located near the Hidden Cove Park trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wyatt House</td>
<td>Historic early settler’s house in Winslow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Restoration Point</td>
<td>Site of early Native American settlement and shipping navigation beacons at end of Restoration Point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Francis Nash Gun Battery</td>
<td>Fort Ward era gun battery and lookout tunnel incorporated into hillside overlooking Rich Passage, now site of private residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Thornburgh Gun Battery</td>
<td>Fort Ward era gun battery and embankment near Fort Ward Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eyeglass Hill</td>
<td>Lookout site used by Fort Ward era military defense system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mosquito Fleet Landings</td>
<td>Numerous landing and dock sites located around the island that were used by the Mosquito Fleet steamboats during the early development of Puget Sound navigation. (Point White Pier is BIMPRD property).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXISTING OR POSSIBLE INTERPRETATIVE EXHIBIT SITES

The following sites have been or could be developed on the island to provide educational exhibits pertaining to the environment, history, wildlife, or other areas of interest.

These sites are in addition to the existing sites of historic significance previously listed that could also provide opportunities for interpretation.

**BIMPRD Parks & Properties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fay Bainbridge Park</td>
<td>Regional park site and location of Port Madison bell and marker.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gazzam Lake</td>
<td>Regional park and natural area with 14 acre lake, extensive wetlands, woodlands, and saltwater access.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grand Forest</td>
<td>Community park and natural area with trail system through woodlands, wetlands, and wildlife habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Manzanita Park</td>
<td>Community park and natural area with wetlands and trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moritani Preserve</td>
<td>Open space and natural area in Winslow on site of Moritani family berry farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Meigs Park</td>
<td>Open space park on former dairy farm with complex system of ponds and bogs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rotary Centennial Park</td>
<td>Special use gateway park on WSDOT property commemorating centennial of Rotary Club of Bl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sakai Park</td>
<td>Regional park on site of Sakai family farm in Winslow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ted Olson Nature Preserve</td>
<td>Open space park with natural area including woodlands and wetlands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Waypoint</td>
<td>Special use pedestrian linear park serving as gateway to island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>West Port Madison Nature Preserve</td>
<td>Community park and natural area with nature trail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Non-Profit Organizations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IslandWood</td>
<td>A non-profit outdoor learning center providing programs for schools, children and families, and adults.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bloedel Reserve</td>
<td>Private reserve with extensive grounds and trails and multiuse interpretive visitor center.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Properties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Port Madison</td>
<td>Neighborhood community on site of 1800’s era saw mill, company town, and first Kitsap County seat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For additional information and research on the history of Bainbridge Island, contact the Bainbridge Island Historical Museum and Suquamish Museum.
## Historic Registers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCAL REGISTRY</th>
<th>STATE &amp; NATIONAL REGISTRY</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date Constructed</strong></td>
<td><strong>Historic Property</strong></td>
<td><strong>Property Address</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Camp Major Hopkins</td>
<td>900 Park Avenue NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Williams House</td>
<td>112 Eagle Place NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Eagle Harbor Church</td>
<td>105 Winslow Way W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Soderlund House</td>
<td>5571 Welfare Avenue NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>Captain Welfare House</td>
<td>13045 N Madison Avenue NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Fort Ward Hastings House</td>
<td>1676/1690 Parkview Drive NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Married Enlisted Quarters</td>
<td>2232 Sound View Drive NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Lovett House</td>
<td>10292 Ronald Court NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Comstock House</td>
<td>15268 Washington Avenue NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Reese Duplex</td>
<td>1632 Parkview Drive NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Fort Ward Post Exchange</td>
<td>1948 Parkview Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Island Schoolhouse</td>
<td>215 Ericksen Avenue NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Eugene Day House</td>
<td>12851 Madison Avenue NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Pratt/Hoskinson Water Tower</td>
<td>Day Road Farms Complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Constructed</td>
<td>Historic Property</td>
<td>Property Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Dr. Shepard House/Clinic</td>
<td>241 Madison Avenue N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>Bainbridge Island Sportsman Clinic</td>
<td>8023 Sportsman Club Road NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Yates House</td>
<td>6551 Wing Point Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Fort Ward Fire House</td>
<td>1857 Hilltop Drive NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Lynwood Center</td>
<td>4569 Lynwood Center Road NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Rodal Store</td>
<td>10355 NE Valley Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Captain Farnum House</td>
<td>9276 NE Meigs Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Bucklin House</td>
<td>15311 Washington Avenue NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Captain Lovell House</td>
<td>321 Lovell Avenue SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Whalley Cabin</td>
<td>10444 NE South Beach Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Christiansen House</td>
<td>7799 Hansen Road NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Quitslund Barn</td>
<td>14012 Sunrise Drive NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>Endter House</td>
<td>15300 Washington Avenue NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Fort Ward Bakery Building</td>
<td>9705 NE Evergreen Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Suyematsu Farm</td>
<td>9229 NE Day Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>McRedmond Cabin</td>
<td>8737 NE McRedmond Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Saint Barnabas Church</td>
<td>1187 Wyatt Way NW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Henry Groos House</td>
<td>568 Ericksen Avenue NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Bainbridge Island Lumber</td>
<td>4566 Point White Drive NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Anton Suttora House</td>
<td>317 Cave Avenue NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>William Grow House</td>
<td>481 Madison Avenue N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Bucklin Farmhouse</td>
<td>7861 NE Bucklin Hill Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Constructed</td>
<td>Historic Property</td>
<td>Property Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>Agate Pass Bridge</td>
<td>State Route 305, Spanning Agate Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Grow Barn</td>
<td>8176 NE Paulanna Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Bainbridge Island Filipino Community Hall</td>
<td>7566 NE High School Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>Fort Ward Historic District</td>
<td>Fort Ward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Yama &amp; Nagaya Village</td>
<td>Port Blakely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>Bucklin House (Hyla Middle School)</td>
<td>7861 NE Bucklin Hill Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Constructed</td>
<td>Historic Property</td>
<td>Property Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>Eagledale Ferry Dock at Taylor Avenue</td>
<td>Taylor Avenue NE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional information on the [Washington State Historic Register](http://www.bainbridgewa.gov/234/Historic-Registers)

Additional information on the [National Historic Register](http://www.bainbridgewa.gov/234/Historic-Registers)
APPENDIX H

SPORTS PARTICIPATION DATA

Sports & Fitness Industry Association

2019 Sports, Fitness and Leisure Activities

Topline Participation Report
# A Breakdown of Sports Participation

**U.S. Population, Ages 6+**

All participation figures are in 000s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aerobic Activities</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>1 year change</th>
<th>3 year AAG</th>
<th>5 year AAG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aquatic Exercise</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>1+ times</td>
<td>8,483</td>
<td>9,122</td>
<td>9,226</td>
<td>10,575</td>
<td>10,459</td>
<td>10,518</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boot Camp Style Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>1+ times</td>
<td>6,911</td>
<td>6,774</td>
<td>6,722</td>
<td>6,583</td>
<td>6,651</td>
<td>6,695</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-Training Style Workouts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>1+ times</td>
<td>11,265</td>
<td>11,710</td>
<td>12,914</td>
<td>13,622</td>
<td>13,338</td>
<td>13,338</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dance, Step, and Other Choreographed Exercise to Music</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>1+ times</td>
<td>21,455</td>
<td>21,487</td>
<td>21,839</td>
<td>22,616</td>
<td>22,391</td>
<td>22,391</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Impact/Intensity Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>1+ times</td>
<td>17,323</td>
<td>19,746</td>
<td>20,464</td>
<td>21,390</td>
<td>21,476</td>
<td>21,611</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Running/Jogging</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>1+ times</td>
<td>54,188</td>
<td>51,127</td>
<td>48,496</td>
<td>47,384</td>
<td>50,770</td>
<td>49,459</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aerobic Activities</strong></td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1 year change</td>
<td>3 year AAG</td>
<td>5 year AAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Swimming for Fitness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>1+ times</td>
<td>26,354</td>
<td>25,304</td>
<td>26,319</td>
<td>26,601</td>
<td>27,135</td>
<td>27,575</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Walking for Fitness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>1+ times</td>
<td>117,351</td>
<td>112,583</td>
<td>109,829</td>
<td>107,895</td>
<td>110,805</td>
<td>111,001</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conditioning Activities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bodyweight Exercise &amp; Bodyweight Accessory-Assisted Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>1+ times</td>
<td>22,390</td>
<td>22,146</td>
<td>25,110</td>
<td>24,454</td>
<td>24,183</td>
<td>24,183</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pilates Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>1+ times</td>
<td>8,069</td>
<td>8,504</td>
<td>8,594</td>
<td>8,893</td>
<td>9,047</td>
<td>9,084</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tai Chi</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>1+ times</td>
<td>3,469</td>
<td>3,446</td>
<td>3,651</td>
<td>3,706</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>3,761</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yoga</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>1+ times</td>
<td>24,310</td>
<td>25,262</td>
<td>25,289</td>
<td>26,268</td>
<td>26,754</td>
<td>28,745</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Free Weights (Barbells)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>1+ times</td>
<td>25,641</td>
<td>25,623</td>
<td>25,381</td>
<td>26,473</td>
<td>27,444</td>
<td>27,834</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Free Weights (Dumbbells/Hand Weights)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>1+ times</td>
<td>58,267</td>
<td>56,124</td>
<td>54,716</td>
<td>51,513</td>
<td>52,217</td>
<td>51,291</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Racquet Sports</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Badminton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>1+ times</td>
<td>7,150</td>
<td>7,176</td>
<td>7,198</td>
<td>7,354</td>
<td>6,430</td>
<td>6,337</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cardio Tennis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>1+ times</td>
<td>1,539</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>1,821</td>
<td>2,125</td>
<td>2,223</td>
<td>2,499</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pickleball</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
<td>1+ times</td>
<td>2,462</td>
<td>2,506</td>
<td>2,815</td>
<td>3,132</td>
<td>3,301</td>
<td>3,301</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AAG= Average Annual Growth
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Tennis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tennis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Golf on a 9 or 18-hole golf course</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skateboarding</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trail Running</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Sports</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseball</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basketball</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cheerleading</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Football (Flag)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Football (Touch)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gymnastics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lacrosse</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roller Hockey</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soccer (Indoor)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Soccer (Outdoor)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Softball (Fast-Pitch)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Softball (Slow-Pitch)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Swimming on a Team</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Backpacking Overnight - More Than 1/4 Mile From Vehicle/Home</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycling (BMX)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycling (Mountain/Non-Paved Surface)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bicycling (Road/Paved Surface)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birdwatching More Than 1/4 Mile From Home/Vehicle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camping (RV)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Camping (Within 1/4 Mile of Vehicle/Home)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climbing (Sport/Boulder)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climbing (Indoor)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fishing (Fly)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fishing (Freshwater/Other)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fishing (Saltwater)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hiking (Day)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildlife Viewing More Than 1/4 Mile From Home/Vehicle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking (Recreational)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking (Sea/Touring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayaking (White Water)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scuba Diving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snorkeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand Up Paddling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing (Alpine/Downhill/Freeski/Telemark)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skiing (Cross-country)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sledding/Saucer Riding/Snow Tubing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowboarding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowshoeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat Winter Biking*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*New category to 2018 PAC survey
**Category definition changed in 2018 PAC survey
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Executive Summary

The Bainbridge Island Land Trust (BILT) is a non-profit land trust that serves the people and wildlife of Bainbridge Island, Washington. Over the last 29 years, BILT has protected and helped restore some of the most special places on Bainbridge Island, including forestlands, wetlands, shorelines, streams and riparian corridors, agricultural lands, recreational lands and trails, open spaces, and scenic vistas. BILT protects natural and working lands with high conservation values largely through land acquisition and conservation easements. Since its inception in 1989, BILT has worked cooperatively with willing landowners, other conservation organizations, and governmental/tribal entities to help preserve more than 1330 acres on Bainbridge Island, with over 1000 of those acres being open to the public.

The 2018 Conservation Plan Update is designed to build upon, not replace the 2012 BILT Conservation Plan, and refine our strategic initiatives for protection and restoration endeavors. In the 2012 plan, BILT recognized that the supply of conservation lands and habitats on Bainbridge Island was diminishing due to the continued press of development and land use patterns. In 2018, these concerns remain and are heightened due to population growth in the Puget Sound area and on Bainbridge Island. With a sense of urgency and the need to focus our efforts, the 2012 Plan identified two priority ecological systems worthy of our increased attention and action. As BILT worked to update our conservation priorities for now and the future, these priorities remain our focus:

Wildlife Networks: Systems of large ecologically functioning habitat blocks and wildlife connectors that support sustainable populations of diverse and abundant wildlife species and provide opportunities for wildlife to move between large habitat blocks. These areas contain valuable critical habitats, including forests, wetlands, streams, and riparian areas. These networks also provide watershed protection and can provide public access, when compatible with conservation objectives, via well planned trails and other amenities. Much work during the 2018 Conservation Plan Update went towards the examination of existing data to help define these Networks and habitat connectors.

Shorelines: Dynamic habitat systems that contain highly valuable critical habitats, including tidelands, estuaries, lagoons, nearshore, marine riparian and adjoining upland areas, important to a high diversity of aquatic and terrestrial species. Shorelines can provide public access, when compatible with conservation objectives, via well planned trails and other amenities. We recognize the Island’s 58 miles of shoreline are integral to the larger Puget Sound ecosystem which gives added significance and importance to our shoreline conservation and restoration efforts.

Some significant events have occurred since 2012 which inform BILT’s 2018 Conservation Plan update.

Since adoption of the 2012 Conservation Plan, Bainbridge Island Land Trust has successfully completed or is currently engaged in completing a number of strategic protection and restoration efforts which demonstrate our commitment towards implementation of the plan:
We’ve acquired, through fee ownership and conservation easements, land within the mid-section of the Island, in an effort to secure and connect large blocks of habitats in the core area of Bainbridge Island.

We’ve expanded protected lands in the Gazzam Lake Nature Preserve by acquiring interest in 14 acres adjacent to the Preserve and engaging actively in discussions with surrounding property owners.

We completed the largest shoreline restoration project on private property in Puget Sound by removing shoreline armor and restoring riparian and intertidal function with the Powel Shoreline Restoration Project. We also have acquired the Agate Passage Preserve – the largest undeveloped shoreline and tideland parcels on Bainbridge Island.

BILT has become a member of the Washington Association of Land Trust’s Shoreline Collaboration with a focus on protecting and restoring more shorelines. This has led to being engaged with a number of shoreline landowners.

The 2012 Plan identified the unique realization that the amount of open space being set aside through development permits was equal to the amount of acres being protected by the actions of the BILT (or our partners), but “open space” lands rarely provide ecological function (i.e. storm water retention ponds rather than cared for conservation lands). With the inevitable development taking place, BILT has reached out to developers to identify lands where conservation opportunities can go hand in hand with well planned development. The BILT/Quitslund/Jefferson Fine Home Builders project, where over 19 acres will become BILT conservation lands while 8 acres are developed for housing illustrates progress on this front and has helped shape this model of conservation for the future.

The economies of Bainbridge Island and the Puget Sound area have rebounded significantly since the recession of 2007, placing increased urgency on protection efforts. In 2012, Bainbridge Island’s population was 23,090 and based on 2017 data from the Puget Sound Regional Council has grown to 23,950 (a 4% change). Approximately 531* new residential structures have been permitted on Bainbridge Island since 2012 (according to the City of Bainbridge Island * October and December 2017 data missing). According to the City of Bainbridge Island Comprehensive Plan 2017 “Navigate Bainbridge,” by the year 2036, the Island’s population is projected to each 28,660. The median price of a home on Bainbridge Island in 2012 was $663,214 while at the end of 2017 the median price was $836,000. It is estimated that 1,000 people a week move into the Salish Sea geographic area.

Another significant event that has occurred is increased awareness of the natural resource attributes of Bainbridge Island and the functions they provide to the community not only for habitat, but also water resource protection, storm water control, carbon sequestration, and contributing to a healthy and vibrant community. This awareness has been built from a number of efforts that have taken place since the BILT 2012 Conservation Plan, involving public processes, such as the City of Bainbridge Island Comprehensive Plan update in 2016, field assessment and data collection, such as Wild Fish
Recognizing the depth and breadth of information and datasets generated since our 2012 plan was developed (See Appendix B for a list of data and the Reference Section for studies, and prioritization processes) BILT has chosen to update their conservation plan to integrate this information, increasing our knowledge and focus to protect ecological values, in concert with other organizational priorities.

The 2018 Conservation Plan Update does not substitute our 2012 plan, but builds upon it and provides more tools and information for our consideration as we continue protection and restoration efforts. The update also addresses to-do’s or tasks identified in the 2012 plan. This phase of the update includes the following activities:

- Recognize the work that has taken place since 2012 (including studies that have been performed and the plans that have been completed) and integrate, rather than duplicate, priority actions identified through these efforts into our thinking and knowledge base. These efforts, plans and resources are identified in the Resources Section of the plan.

- Collect the latest generation of data and science available related to the natural resources of Bainbridge Island, Kitsap County and Puget Sound, with a focus on data connected to supporting natural systems, aquatic and terrestrial species, water resources, and priority habitats. Appendix B identifies the data sources collected for this update. These attributes include not only natural resources but also infrastructure such as culverts blocking fish passage in streams and shoreline modifications, thus helping to identify potential restoration actions (see Maps 6 and 9C).

- Develop a technique to identify Wildlife Networks on the island and connections between them. Much work has been done in the past, and continues, to evaluate our shorelands and their importance in supporting Chinook salmon, forage fish, and more but creating a methodology to identify attributes important to protect in the interior of the island was necessary. See the Conservation Values Index discussion on page 27 which explains the methodology used to identify a potential system of connectors.

- Create a Conservation Values Index in order to visualize with maps and underlying data where priority habitats and natural resources connect with each other on the Island, providing an opportunity to identify regional priorities for our work. For instance, protection efforts have progressed over the years in the mid-core section of the Island from Battle Point Spit, through the Hilltop/Grand Forest complex and, BILT’s Wildlife Corridor to Murden Cove. Applying this strategy to other areas of the island will help identify areas where conservation easements, acquisitions, or restoration projects might achieve ecological goals, generate partnerships, excite the community around a conservation strategy, and focus fundraising efforts. Additionally, this information can be used for BILT’s day to day interactions with landowners, providing easy access to the types of conservation values properties host. See Appendix B for the Conservation Values Index and page 27 for the narrative.
Community Conservation Survey. This on-line survey was created and made available to anyone who wanted to complete it between January 2018 to April 2018. 502 respondents provided their thoughts, spending over 140 hours collectively to provide insights and ideas to BILT. Generally the feedback from BILT’s Community Conservation Survey is consistent with other community visioning exercises like 2017 City of Bainbridge Island Comprehensive Plan “Navigate Bainbridge” where residents express support for protection of vulnerable/threatened resources, natural resources that provide many community functions and values (water resource protection, trails, etc.). The Community Conservation Survey takers also conveyed an understanding of the need to create Wildlife Networks, and they supported this concept. See Appendix D for the print out of the survey results and more discussion.

The Conservation Plan Update is divided into a number of key sections.

- The opening sections lay out the mission and vision of BILT and review BILT’s history and current snapshot of conservation efforts to date and underway.

- The next section describes the status and trends of development and various habitat and landscape types on Bainbridge Island.

- The Plan then talks about the Conservation Values Index, and how it can be used to create a Conservation Priority Index which can focus attention to key regional areas on the Island for protection work, inform landowner outreach endeavors, pursuit of funding options, and much more.

- A number of Maps and Appendices support the narrative and are attached at the end of the document.

Updates to the Conservation Plan will continue through 2018. These update efforts will include:

- **Utilization of the Conservation Values Index (CVI):** Through the remainder of the year, BILT will use the CVI on a day to day basis to help provide information about lands and natural resource values attached to these lands. This use will help identify potential geographic focus areas, and also lead to the integration of other community values, such as proximity to neighborhood centers, public access and scenic values.

- **Correct and update data:** While the large majority of the datasets BILT has used with this update are very new and reflect existing conditions, there are some which require additional work. Specifically the Shoreline Impact data from the 2008 Bainbridge Island Nearshore Assessment needs to be updated to reflect restoration efforts that have taken place on the shoreline in addition to shoreline which has been impacted or armored since 2008.

- **Stakeholder Outreach/Community Conversation:** With a conservation values index being created, what is the feedback about this index and our methodology and what else should we be considering? Reaching out to both traditional partners (natural resource professionals and
entities, partners in conservation work) and non-traditional land trust partners (health care professionals, interfaith community members, business/professional organizations, developers, real estate agents, etc.) will take place using a moderator. This important step will assist with the interpretation/crosswalk that will need to occur between natural resource values and community values.

- **Integration of Climate Change.** There has been much work performed by others, including the City of Bainbridge Island Climate Adaptation Assessment of 2017, UW Climate Change Study and other regional efforts to help inform protection, and likely restoration, endeavors resilient to climate change.

- **Further refinement of Action Plan/Regional Priorities.** By performing the above tasks, BILT’s goal will be, by the end of 2018, to have an integrated plan with a refined CVI, expanded stakeholder feedback and climate change data in order to guide work over the next 10 years.
Mission & Vision

BAINBRIDGE ISLAND LAND TRUST MISSION STATEMENT:
To preserve and steward the diverse natural environment of Bainbridge Island for the benefit of all.

VISION STATEMENT:
Bainbridge Island Land Trust (BILT) envisions a future:

• In which the rural character and scenic beauty of our island endure and enrich the lives of all
• Where the island’s natural systems sustain the interconnected life that inhabits this special place in Puget Sound
• Where our level and pattern of development conserve important natural resources for future generations
• Where biologically diverse communities of native plants flourish in a natural landscape, and wildlife has enough contiguous natural habitat to roam and thrive
• Where public natural areas and trails form an extensive, interconnected system which is well cared for and valued by the community
• Where the well-being of the community is supported by natural areas and trails
• Where working farms remain strong and valued contributors to our economy and way of life
• Where water is pure and plentiful
• Where, with all of this, Bainbridge Island remains a wonderful place to live, work, and play for generations to come
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A history of BILT and its work

For more than 29 years, Bainbridge Island Land Trust (BILT) has worked to protect and steward vulnerable forestlands, wetlands, shoreline, stream and riparian corridors, agricultural lands, and scenic vistas on Bainbridge Island. Of the Island’s 17,394 acres, more than 1330 acres have been permanently protected due to BILT’s efforts. The organization has been integral in changing the “conservation lands” map of the Island over the decades from a few parcels of land, to larger networks of conserved lands. The change of protected lands on the Island is illustrated in Map 4.

Of the lands we have protected, more than 1000 acres are open to the public and host some of the most intact contiguous natural habitat parcels and the most beautiful non-motorized trails in the region. BILT currently holds 47 conservation easements (42 private and 5 public) on over 763.30 acres and we own over 101 acres of land outright. All BILT held conservation easements have been donated. Another 484 acres have been preserved on the Island through acquisition with Land Trust assistance, and most of those acres are open to the public. We have done this through support from landowners, our members, fundraising in our community, acquiring grants from public and private funding sources, and building a network of community and regional partners. The lands we protect through conservation easements and those we own become our obligation to steward – forever.

Stewardship is a growing part of BILT’s work. Each property acquired, whether by fee or conservation easement, receives focused attention to maintain or improve conservation values. On conservation easement properties, stewardship work ranges from active interaction with private landowners to managing invasive plants, to cost share programs, volunteer work parties, or applying for grants to help support large scale restoration efforts such as the Powel Shoreline Restoration project. On lands we own, a management plan is developed to guide maintenance or restoration efforts. BILT has identified projects that range from invasive weed removal to culvert fish passage improvement projects on property owned by BILT.

Bainbridge Island Land Trust is fortunate to work on an Island where there is strong community support for conservation and land protection. This support has been indicated by the number of people who are members of our organization (over 800 families) and the contribution of over 2300 hours annually in service to BILT. There is a strong history of support for natural areas and open space. The voters of the Island created two significant public funding sources used to protect open space and park lands: the City of Bainbridge Island (COBI) Open Space Bond in 2001 and the Bainbridge Island Metropolitan Park and Recreation District (BIMPRD) expansion of the levy lid in 2008. The two local funding sources matched with state and federal grants, contributions from area partners, plus significant BILT private fund raising endeavors have resulted in the success of land protection to date.

In 2017 BILT embarked on its largest multi-year capital campaign ever which has a multi-property acquisition goal. The campaign focuses on properties that hopefully will expand the Habitat Network in the Gazzam Lake Nature Preserve (in the Island’s largest undisturbed forest core) to over 550 acres of contiguous preserved lands, acquiring highly valued properties such as the Cougar Creek Preserve which
provides a critical link to building new Habitat Networks (and was identified using the Conservation Values Index developed in the 2018 Conservation Plan Update), and valuable undeveloped shoreline properties. Launching this campaign is reliant not only on the financial support of Islanders and others, but is also reliant on the good will and cooperation of landowners who have a desire to protect the special qualities of their property by working with BILT.

In the mid-section of our island, we have been mindful of building a network of conservation properties. That concentrated effort has resulted in the protection of over 200 acres of habitat and open space, illustrating the benefits of implementing a plan that focuses on a specific geographic area or conservation system priority. It is that same kind of concentrated effort – more from an ecosystem based approach rather than a parcel by parcel approach - that BILT intends to apply to the resources we have identified as priorities in this plan (and in the work of others).

Other important actions BILT has performed will help shape future preservation and stewardship work:

- We completed the largest shoreline restoration project on private property in Puget Sound by removing shoreline armor and restoring riparian and intertidal function with the Powel Shoreline Restoration Project. This action sets the stage for BILT involvement and engagement with shoreline landowners to improve the condition of this critical habitat. We also have acquired the Agate Passage Preserve – the largest undeveloped shoreline and tideland parcels on Bainbridge Island – to protect tidelands, feeder bluffs and intact riparian habitat.

- BILT has become a member of the Washington Association of Land Trust’s Shoreline Collaboration with a focus on increased protections and restoration of Puget Sound shorelines. This has led to increased interaction with policymakers and a number of shoreline landowners.

- The 2012 Plan identified the unique realization that the amount of open space being set aside through development permits was equal to the amount of acres being protected by the actions of the BILT (or our partners), but “open space” lands as permitted rarely provide ecological functions and are more likely to be storm water retention ponds or other structures rather than conservation lands. With inevitable development taking place, BILT has reached out to developers to identify lands where conservation opportunities can go hand in hand with well planned development. The BILT/Quitslund/Jefferson Fine Home Builders project, where over 19 acres will become BILT conservation lands while 8 acres are developed for housing, illustrates progress on this front and has helped shape this model of conservation for the future.

- Helping to collect data such as stream type data through the support of Wild Fish Conservancy has helped us be better informed about our natural resources.

- The Springbrook Creek Watershed Assessment and Feasibility project led by BILT takes a watershed scale approach to landowner outreach, land preservation and restoration actions.
Status & Trends of Landscapes on Bainbridge Island

How has land use changed and what might the future look like?

The land use status\(^1\) of properties on Bainbridge Island were analyzed for the 22-year period ranging from June 1996\(^2\) to March 2018. Each land use status was assigned one of four broad categories:

- **Undeveloped & Unprotected**
  - Includes many land use types including active farms and forest lands without some type of protection in place. Because some of these lands are working resource lands; some of these properties may include some level of development such as a residence or barn/shed;
  - This is the primary category where opportunities with a high level of conservation gain can be made;
  - This is a category where restoration opportunities may provide valuable long-term conservation gains;

- **Some Level of Development**
  - The level of development ranges from very low density to commercial/industrial;
  - There still may be good conservation opportunities among properties with lower-densities of development in this category;
  - This is a category where restoration opportunities may provide valuable long-term conservation gains;

- **Some Level of Protection**
  - The level of protection ranges from permanent (e.g. conservation easement) to less-than-permanent (e.g. unrestricted park land, current use (open space) tax status, perhaps a subdivision’s open space tract). A detailed parcel-specific review is necessary to determine the exact nature and durability of the protections affecting each property;
  - This category includes all park lands and private reserves (i.e. IslandWood, Bloedel);
  - This category includes properties that have some development if they also have some type of protection in place (e.g. open space farm land, parks with recreation facilities);
  - This category does not include properties affected by regulatory protections (e.g. critical areas & buffers or required open space required by subdivision if the lands are not functioning as open space (i.e. storm water retention ponds);
  - This is the category where opportunities may exist to upgrade protections for strategically important resource lands from a less-than-permanent to permanent status;
  - Ongoing stewardship (maintenance, restoration/enhancement) of properties in this category may be necessary to maintain and improve conservation values;

- **N/A or Unknown**

---

\(^1\) Land use status codes are defined and managed by the Kitsap County Assessor’s Office. BILT reviewed these codes, made modifications as necessary, and categorized them for our analysis.

\(^2\) June 1996 was the earliest GIS tax parcel data readily available from the City of Bainbridge Island. Older GIS data may be available from the Kitsap County Assessor’s Office. Non-GIS analysis of older data could be derived from paper-based records or digital tabular data from the Kitsap County Assessor’s Office, if available and resources exist to conduct the analysis. March 2018 data was the closest data available.
What are some of the important trends over the last 22 years?

Figure 1: Highlighted here are some of the more significant trends that have occurred over the past 22 years (1996-2018) between the categories of land use BILT has assigned.

Figure 2: Annualized Change in Property Status Island-Wide (1996-2018). Average annual change in acres over a historic 22 year period. Does not include tidelands.
**Figure 3: Island-Wide Property Status Change** *(all tables do not include tidelands)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some Level of Development</td>
<td>8,224</td>
<td>8,957</td>
<td>9,652</td>
<td>9,857</td>
<td>9,754</td>
<td>9,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped &amp; Unprotected</td>
<td>5,824</td>
<td>4,749</td>
<td>3,596</td>
<td>3,176</td>
<td>2,994</td>
<td>2,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Level of Protection</td>
<td>2,134</td>
<td>2,533</td>
<td>2,934</td>
<td>3,186</td>
<td>3,478</td>
<td>3,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A, Unknown &amp; Right-of-Way</td>
<td>1,213</td>
<td>1,156</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>1,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Upland Acreage</td>
<td>17,394</td>
<td>17,394</td>
<td>17,394</td>
<td>17,394</td>
<td>17,394</td>
<td>17,394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Island-Wide Status (% of Total Acres)</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some Level of Development</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped &amp; Unprotected</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Level of Protection</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A, Unknown &amp; Right-of-Way</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Doesn’t include tidelands.*
How much time is left before all the “Undeveloped and Unprotected” land may be gone?

In 2012, BILT calculated a simple linear projection based on the average rate of change over the past 15 years was used to estimate future changes in property status. That projection was updated in 2014 (see below Figure 4). The projection takes our experience over the years and carries it forward for the next 12 years.³ Accordingly, this projection estimates that the inventory of “Undeveloped & Unprotected” land may be exhausted by 2030, either having received “Some Level of Protection” or having been converted to “Some Level of Development.” This horizon is an approximation, market forces and community support will significantly affect the pace of both conservation and development. However, this information points to the relevant task of identifying specific areas of focus in order to achieve protection of “significant” ecological processes and functions before it is too late. We did not update this projection for the 2018 Conservation Plan update but the 2014 projection provides relevant guidance in addition to population and development records for Bainbridge Island and Puget Sound.

The economies of Bainbridge Island and the Puget Sound area have rebounded significantly since the recession of 2007, placing increased urgency on protection efforts. In 2012, Bainbridge Island’s population was 23,090 and based on 2017 data from the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) has grown to 23,950 (a 4% change). Approximately 531* new residential structures have been permitted on Bainbridge Island since 2012 (City of Bainbridge Island * October and December 2017 data missing). According to the City of Bainbridge Island Comprehensive Plan 2017 “Navigate Bainbridge,” by the year 2036, the Island’s population is projected to each 28,660. The Puget Sound experienced a 25% population boom in 2015 and is estimated to be growing by 1,000 people a week. Areas like Kirkland, WA have experienced up to 74% growth in population between 2016 and 2017 according to PSRC. With Bainbridge Island a mere 35-minute pleasant ferry ride away from Seattle, the likely pressures of increased housing and population is projected to continue.

The median price of a home on Bainbridge Island in 2012 was $663,214 while at the end of 2017 the median price was $836,000. The median home price in Seattle in March of 2018 was $819,500. Given the rural lifestyle of Bainbridge Island, access to good schools, natural areas and recreational opportunities, the attractiveness of Bainbridge Island will continue to grow. In our 2018 Community Conservation Survey, one of the primary reasons survey takers indicated they choose to live on Bainbridge Island was its attractive open spaces (See Appendix D).

Island-wide population and development history and projections provide BILT a strong indication of the rate of protection that needs to occur to keep pace with development. This information provides guidance for BILT to be open to pursuing protection/development partnerships similar to the Quitslund Family Farm/Jefferson Fine Home Building and Land Trust project. Under this transaction, Jefferson Fine Home Builders purchased lands from the Quitslund Family - a multi-generation family with an interest in

³ While any model will not precisely predict the future, this projection is informed by the historic record and provides us with a working target, which can be improved through periodic comparisons of the prediction to actual changes over time. All models are based on assumptions, and this model uses the average rate of change derived from 19 years (June 1996 - April 2014) of historic data.
both land preservation and achieving financial return on their land holdings - with the intent that a portion of the land would be donated to BILT, while another much smaller portion would be developed for housing (at less than the density allowed under current zoning). This ensures the BILT portion of the land will be stewarded and cared for (and hopefully improved over time through the removal of fish passage barriers on Dripping Water Creek and invasive plant removal).

**Figure 4: Island-Wide Property Status Change & Projection**

Note: Does not include tidelands.

Notes: Does not include rights-of-way or tidelands. May not add to 100% due to rounding. Linear projection based on historic 15-year average.

The number of undeveloped and unprotected acres on the island has diminished significantly on the island since 1996. Of the Island’s 17,394 acres, 2,925 remain undeveloped and unprotected. Only 35 parcels over 10 acres in size remain in this classification. This diminishing resource brings heightened focus to BILT’s protection strategies as protection of undeveloped and unprotected properties is a key strategy to achieving conservation, watershed protection, habitat connectivity and community open space priorities.

Large blocks of strategically located land, interconnected with other protected properties, can act as the anchors of the Wildlife Networks illustrated in Figure 6. Large-sized undeveloped properties support a number of ecological processes better than smaller sized properties. Staff and financial resources needed to steward large properties owned by a single landowner, in the case of a conservation easement, are typically less than stewarding a number of small conservation easements owned by separate landowners. For these reasons, it is important to evaluate property size and future stewardship obligations in connection with acquired properties and easements.

Figure 5. Changes in acreage and number of Undeveloped and Unprotected parcels by size class.
Specific Natural Resource Types Status and Analysis

Understanding the condition of Bainbridge Island natural resources was the focus of the 2018 BILT Conservation Plan Update. Significant work took place in collecting natural resource information that has been updated or improved over the past years. These resources were then folded in to create Conservation Values Index to help identify natural resource rich areas on Bainbridge Island reflecting a weighted value of importance.

Appendix B summarizes the data resources collected to better guide our understanding of the natural resources of the Island. Outreach to local experts in various resources helped to directly inform our understanding of the Island’s resources and to help direct our efforts to find the documents and GIS data that are currently available.

The Resources and Reference Section of the plan identifies the existing plans assessing resources and prioritizing conservation, habitat protection, and restoration efforts that were used in the development of the Conservation Values Index. These plans range from the very large scale efforts of the Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda of 2016 (currently being updated), to the City of Bainbridge Comprehensive Plan adopted in 2017.

Shorelines – Map 8
Bainbridge Island contains 53 miles of shoreline. All of Bainbridge Island is classified as critical habitat for threatened Puget Sound populations of Chinook and Puget Sound rockfish.

Shorelines that have not been modified contain highly valuable critical habitats (e.g. riparian forest, tidelands, pocket estuaries, eelgrass, etc.) and contribute significantly to shoreline ecological processes (e.g. feeder bluffs, alongshore transport, water quality, etc.). Advanced ecosystem health analysis indicates that the Island’s shoreline is at significant risk of not being able to maintain properly functioning conditions unless protection measures continue, and restoration efforts are pursued.

Map 8 illustrates only 3.1% of the Islands 53 miles of shoreline is categorized as “no-impact”, according to City of Bainbridge Island Nearshore Assessment performed in 2008. This dataset has not been updated since 2008 (except for edits performed by BILT to recognize the removal of 1500 linear feet of armor at the Powel Shoreline Restoration project site) and requires attention to capture both positive gains that have taken place, such as shoreline restoration, or negative impacts that have taken place as a result of shoreline modification and development.

In 2016, BILT participated in the West Sound Watersheds Nearshore Integration Analysis, which looked closely at important nearshore processes such as feeder bluffs, undeveloped land, intersection with stream and estuarine areas, and many other factors. The result of this work was a prioritization of protection and restoration actions within the Kitsap Peninsula area, including Bainbridge Island. This guidance as to highest priority restoration and protection actions was integrated into the Conservation Values Index developed in this plan update.
Very few opportunities exist for protection efforts along undeveloped or unmodified shoreline, but the Conservation Value Index identifies these areas.

The majority of the future opportunities along the shoreline will be working on properties with “Some Level of Development” to protect and restore/enhance critical habitats and components of shoreline ecological processes that are essential for maintaining shoreline habitats into the future. Due to the high level of modification along the shoreline, this work will require significant resources, coordinated strategies and partnerships with other organizations and agencies, and decades of effort.

The Reference Section and Appendix B identify the many plans and data sources utilized in this planning effort. New data on eelgrass populations (important in supporting many populations of forage fish), forage fish utilization, and the integration of priority drift cells and reaches have become available since previous planning efforts and have been integrated here.

**Wildlife Networks and Forest Cores**

Wildlife Networks are an integral component of implementing BILT’s conservation priorities. The systematic linking of large functioning habitats with perhaps smaller strategically located lands (connectors) will likely result in more acres being identified as needing to be protected, and include areas of focus, or regional priorities. Key inland wildlife habitats on the Island are streams, riparian (streamside) areas, wetlands, and forests. Trees are very abundant on the Island, covering 70% of Bainbridge Island or 12,233 acres according to the latest data available from 2015, and are obvious while traveling around most of the Island and in aerial photos (Maps 2 and 7). However, roads and a semi-rural development pattern across most of the Island has caused fragmentation of forest habitats. Thus there can be a misperception that high-quality habitat is secure, when in truth the abundance and diversity of wildlife species will be diminished if an interconnected network of interior forest habitats, streams, and wetlands are not maintained.

The tools developed as part of this update are an important step for BILT’s development of a system for an improved Island-landscape-wide understanding of conservation values.

**Streams – Map 5**

Bainbridge Island’s small streams support a number of native fishes. The Wildlife Fish Conservancy (WFC), with assistance of BILT, conducted an intensive water typing assessment project on the Island in 2014-2015, resulting in substantial changes in stream typing as well as a wealth of information on fish passage barriers on the Island. The length of stream classified as fish-bearing increased from around 9 stream miles to nearly 40 stream miles through these efforts, increasing the protective regulatory buffer. In 2017 COBI personnel worked to combine WFC’s data with new LIDAR (high-precision surface relief data) to further improve accuracy of stream locations.

In addition to collecting better information about stream resources, the WFC survey, as well as Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife culvert inventories performed in 2016, identified fish passage barriers, helping identify where restoration opportunities exist, perhaps in hand with protection
opportunities (Map 6). For instance, Map 9C illustrates where there are high conservation values in the Blakely Harbor area (as exhibited through the use of the Conservation Values Index) but a number of fish passage barriers are impeding stream resources from providing full ecological functions.

**Agricultural Lands**

Continued work with Friends of The Farms (FOTF), a local non-profit dedicated to protecting and growing working landscapes on Bainbridge Island is an organizational priority for BILT. The two organizations signed a Memorandum of Agreement to work collectively together to identify projects where conservation and working landscapes can exist together.

A Farmland Prioritization Plan for Bainbridge Island was developed for Friends of the Farms in 2013 and continued work to identify the next priorities for working landscape protection is planned for the future. The 2018 BILT Conservation Plan did not dive deep into working landscapes analysis as we believe this discussion is best reserved for a collective effort between FOTF and BILT.

**Wetlands – See Map 5.**

In 2017 the City of Bainbridge Island worked to digitize wetland delineations and fold those into their GIS Wetlands layer. As a result of this work, and on the ground work by BILT, the wetlands data for the island is more accurate. This, along with potential development in wetland areas, has resulted in a net loss of wetland area since the 2012 plan.

Wetlands, a unique habitat for plant and animal species and a valuable system that contribute to clean water and healthy watersheds, make up a valuable habitat type within a mosaic of habitats protected as part of Wildlife Network. While current regulatory protections exist, a number of wetlands have been altered, compromised or removed.

**Recreational Trails**

Recreational trails are a public use resource of importance on Bainbridge Island. Trails provide the opportunity for the public to enjoy some of the most beautiful places on Bainbridge Island. In recent years, trail inventories have been completed and trail networks have begun to be pieced together.

The 2018 Conservation Plan Update and the Conservation Values Index does not tie in proximity to trails or the ability for a property or area to support trails. An analysis of this resource (existing trails, growth of trails) was not possible during this phase of planning. Future phases of BILT conservation planning effort will include consultation with existing trail plans and partners to examine ways to optimize trail development with conservation values and identify where compatible (with BILT priorities) trail development could occur, as well as the examination of status and trends of trails.

BILT has employed the use of camera traps to help study the use of trails by humans, and effects of trails on wildlife. Generally, the diversity of species utilizing habitat where trails exist is less than in areas where habitat is intact. Additionally, the times of day animals use undeveloped lands is 24 hours a day, versus restricted hours of use where there are trails. Locating trails to not bisect habitat functions (such as bird nesting areas), can provide access to humans while protecting conservation resources.
Taking a closer look at proximity of trails to protected spaces, and management recommendations needed to guide some areas as protected preserves without trails, will be pursued as part of implementing use of the Conservation Values Index.

Leaders in trail efforts on the Island have been the Bainbridge Island Metro Park and Recreation District, the Bainbridge Island Parks Foundation, and the City of Bainbridge Island. Each of these organizations:

- Supports their own committee specifically focused on this topic;
- Has prepared their own comprehensive plan for recreational trails and other non-motorized facilities;
- Acquires property or easements; and
- Builds recreational trails and other non-motorized facilities.

**Scenic Vistas**

This resource has not been defined and there is no inventory. Therefore, no analysis was possible. Status and trends are unknown. We recognize Highway 305, which bisects the Island, as a State scenic byway that provides those traveling with a visually pleasing, tree lined transportation route. Additionally, we realize there are key scenic views from the ferry to the Island as well as along local roadways.
Plan Update Development and Prioritization

The Conservation Plan was developed through a process that included the following steps:

- Review of the existing BILT Five-Year Strategic Plan (2016-2020) (see Appendix E);
- Review of prior BILT actions;
- Review of local and regional comprehensive plans as well as conservation and restoration plans (see Resources and References);
- Review and integration of available resource inventories and assessments;
- Historic analysis of land use to evaluate general trends and risks; and
- Creation of the Conservation Values Index
- Internal BILT presentations, discussions, and review; and
- Conducting a Community Conservation Survey (see Appendix D).

How were priorities identified?

The priorities in this Conservation Plan must be read in concert with BILT’s 5 year Strategic Plan (see Appendix E), understanding the history of the organization, looking closely and the condition of natural resources on the island, and examining partnerships and community values.

The Strategic Plan outlines our organization’s commitment to steward and grow the Island’s magnificent natural environment, including the utilization of innovative methods to identify, prioritize and complete new conservation projects (Strategy A). The development of a Conservation Values Index is a way BILT is moving forward to meet the goals of Strategy A.

Additionally, this Conservation Plan provides the framework for helping guide BILT’s efforts to achieve its mission and vision. There are no criteria more critical in defining action steps, designing new projects, and allocating resources than the conservation priorities that BILT selects.

Geographic Information System (GIS) work began in ESRI ArcGIS with research into available local and regional planning efforts for assessing and managing inland and shoreline resources and current available natural resources and land management geographic data. The amount of information developed or obtained since the last data updates in 2014 was extensive (Appendix B). This included revised mapping of some very important resources. For instance, in 2017 the City of Bainbridge Island undertook an effort to revise a badly outdated wetlands layer, incorporating all of the delineations that had taken place since 2008. Likewise, The Wildlife Fish Conservancy conducted an intensive water typing assessment project on the Island in 2014-2015, resulting in substantial changes in stream typing as well as a wealth of information on fish passage barriers on the Island. The length of stream classified as fish-bearing increased from around 9 stream miles to nearly 40 stream miles through these efforts. In 2017 COBI personnel worked to combine WFC’s data with new LIDAR (high-precision surface relief data) to further improve accuracy of stream locations. All of the updated information have been compiled into maps allowing for rapid evaluation of parcel values, by displaying where high-value resources such as wetlands and Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas occur.
The analyses also extended beyond previously available information by utilizing new tools to model current distribution of interior forest core areas and connections between these core areas. Although Bainbridge Island did perform a Wildlife Corridor Network mapping in 2000 (Self 2000), these corridors were not protected in any way and habitat alteration has rendered many of these ineffective. Also, new mapping software tools for use with ArcGIS have come available since that time, allowing for mapping of habitat cores and connections based on species’ biological needs and behaviors. These new tools were used to model forest habitats in particular, because stream and wetland habitat networks are already incorporated through inclusion of these naturally interconnected habitats and their buffers.

**Forest Habitat Networks Modeling – Figure 6**

We began by modeling interior forest habitats utilizing Gnarly Landscape Utilities Resistance and Habitat Calculator tools (McRae et al. 2013). This software was developed in support of the Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Working Group’s efforts to model statewide habitats and connections for multiple species (WHCWG 2010). This software assigned a habitat value and a “resistance” value to each land cover type. Resistance in this context refers to the difficulty a species would have in traversing an area (e.g. an amphibian would be reluctant to cross an open, dry area). It then uses a moving window analysis to find large blocks of contiguous habitat forming habitat core areas.

We used northern flying squirrels as our focal species, as this is a species known to occur on the Island that requires forested habitat and is reluctant to travel across openings or roads. It is therefore a good species to represent the intact, interconnected forest habitats that many species depend upon. Parameters used to model the core habitat areas were based loosely on those used by the WHCWG in their state-wide efforts, but tailored to fit our data and the much smaller landscape area (reducing the minimum core area size from a scale appropriate for statewide analysis to about 6 acres for the Island). A 1m-resolution mapping of Bainbridge Island land cover (derived from LIDAR in 2015) was used as our primary input. The forest cover data lacked information on tree size or density, so it was not possible to select only those areas with high canopy closure favored by flying squirrels. However, if we are planning for the long-term, areas currently in forests that may be a bit small or open for flying squirrels are highly likely to develop into suitable habitat if left undisturbed. We then set the tool to use a 500m$^2$ moving window (vs the 1000 m$^2$ for the statewide analysis), such that it would select a window areas as a habitat area if it was 80% habitat, amass all of the contiguous habitat areas, then drop out those encompassing less than 6 acres. The result was a map of areas on the Island that provide good contiguous blocks of forest with relatively few road divisions or openings (Figure 6).

**Connectors**

The next step was to utilize the ArcMap 10.5.1 Map Connector tool to find connections between these core areas for a species reluctant to cross developed areas. This process uses the resistance layer, with resistance by cover type again beginning with the values used by the WHCWG in the statewide analysis, but tailoring to local data. Thus trees were set to be very easy to traverse through, then in increasing order of resistance: shrubs and trees over buildings or roads; low ground cover or buildings; bare ground
or water; roads; and beach and shoreline areas. These parameters were set such that the Island’s sole highway would be very difficult to cross, followed by secondary arterials, then smaller roads.

Because the Map Connector tool would not run on all cores over the island-wide resistance layer at once, clusters of core areas were selected and the tool was used to find least-cost-paths between them. Least-cost-paths calculate the difficulty of crossing from one place to another in terms of movement cost. That is, crossing over 1m of forest is a 1m cost for a flying squirrel, but crossing over 1m of a residential road would be a 100m cost. This is a method for modeling how a habitat-sensitive animal actually moves across a landscape to avoid unsuitable habitats. The process was repeated to find 62 connective paths between the 33 forest core areas. These paths were buffered to 100’ on each side to form preliminary 200’-wide corridors, to be evaluated individually to ensure these do not encompass roads and other unsuitable areas. Together, the cores and connections form a reasonable draft Island-wide forest Wildlife Network, which combine with the naturally interconnecting stream and wetlands networks to add an invaluable landscape perspective to evaluation of most valuable areas for conservation.

Figure 6 below illustrates the Island-wide forest core and connector network island while Figure 7 illustrates how the connectors are formed along least cost paths between the habitat core areas in a particular area of the Island. The pink lines are connectors, with a darker background indicating better habitat (trees) and lighter shades where openings, buildings, and impervious surfaces are more resistant to animal movement. BILT does not intend to define narrow lines of “connectivity” but instead build broader and larger areas surrounding the connectors to support the connector function.
Figure 6. Modeled Forest Habitat Network.
Figure 7. Modeled Forest Habitat Network Detail.
Conservation Values Index – Table 1 and Map Series 9 and Map 10

Evaluation of the relative conservation value of a parcel or an area is a very complicated process. Visual inspection of maps showing all known (and mappable) conservation values is helpful, but with so many types of resource values mapped, how does one weigh the value of one parcel against another? The idea behind the Conservation Value Index (CVI) is to divide the island into a very fine grid, and assign each grid cell points based on each of the resource values that fall within it. Then the points for each of these resource layers can be added to give a cumulative score for each cell. A place with a high concentration of resources, such as wetlands, streams, rare species’ nests, and adjacent to an already-protected area, will show as a cluster of cells with high scores. For a parcel, the cell values could be summed across the area, or an average could be used to compare the value of one vs. another.

The value assigned to each resource was generally scaled from 1-4, with 4 representing the highest value in that category. For instance, riparian areas were scored so that those around streams that flow only seasonally and do not bear fish were given a 1, and values ranged up to 4 for year-round fish-bearing streams. In the case of land cover, areas with buildings, pavement, etc. received a -1, so that points would actually be deducted from the total to reflect poor habitat conditions. But the maximum number of points a cell would receive from each layer is usually 4, and the maximum possible score is therefore about 4 multiplied times the number of layers.

Figure 8. Basic sum analysis (from Joseph K. Berry, InnovativeGIS, GeoWorld, July 2004, pg. 20-21)
### Water Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Riparian (streamside) areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Riparian buffer: Ns stream not connected to F or Np buffer (50')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Riparian buffer: Ns stream connected to F or Np buffer (75')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Riparian buffer: Np non-fish-bearing perennial stream buffer (100')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Riparian buffer: F fish-bearing stream buffer (200')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fish Critical Habitat

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Critical habitat (200' buffer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spawning reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Known occurrence of coho, steelhead, cutthroat, or other fish of concern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wetlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wetland Category I or II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wetland Category III, IV, or unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wetland buffer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Wetland Buffer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (CARAs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CARA1 (Highest value and vulnerability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CARA2, Vashon aquifer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CARA2, other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Upland Habitats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Land cover: upland types + emergent vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Trees, shrubs (also macroalgae and intertidal bare)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Emergent veg, water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tree over building or road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Groundcover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Bare ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>Impervious surface, road, or building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Forest habitat network: core area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Large interior forest (&gt;100 ac.) patch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Med interior forest (&lt;100 ac.) patch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Forest habitat network: connections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Falls in a connective corridor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Rare bird spp nest sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Within 330' of bald eagle, great blue heron, osprey, pileated woodpecker, or purple martin nest sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Priority birding area

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Priority bird area (tbd by local birders)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adjacency: Some Level of Protection parcels >=4 ac.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50-ft buffer of undeveloped protected parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,000-ft buffer of undeveloped protected parcels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adjacency: Undeveloped, protected or unprotected >= 4 ac

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50-ft buffer of undeveloped unprotected parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,000-ft buffer of undeveloped unprotected parcels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parcel Size

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&gt;= 25 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10 - &lt;25 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 - &lt;10 ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 - &lt;5 ac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parcel Protection/Development status

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Undeveloped/Unprotected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not permanently protected (identification in progress)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Shorelines

#### Priority Feeder Bluff

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Protect or Restore Priority 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Protect or Restore Priority 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Protect or Restore Priority 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NISP Priority Drift Cells

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Priority protect and/or restore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### NISP Priority Drift Reaches

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Priority protect and/or restore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Shoreline vegetation: Eelgrass

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Eelgrass survey areas: eelgrass present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Shoreline vegetation: Land cover data

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Macroalgae or Intertidal Bare (in Land Cover, above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Forage fish and shellfish habitat

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Smelt spawning area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sand lance spawning area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Herring spawning area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Shellfish breeding area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Priority Habitats and Species Marine Wetland Habitats

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Waterfowl concentration areas, coastal salt marshes, PHS lagoons and estuaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### COBI Aquatic Conservancy

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aquatic Conservancy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### COBI Shoreline Designation
Furthermore, the tallying of total conservation value can be conducted as a *weighted* sum, because not all resource values may be prioritized as highly as others. Some values are more important based on the Land Trust’s mission, values expressed by the Island public, and biological significance. The way relative value of parcels is considered may also change depending on specific objectives, such as competing for a grant aimed at improving salmonid habitat. A weighted sum allows for some layers to contribute less to the overall scoring. The weighting can be adjusted and sums recalculated to make these adjustments at any time. The initial runs of the model are on unweighted sums, meaning that every layer was given equal weighting. The areas emphasized will change as appropriate weightings are applied.

There are additional factors to consider in prioritizing efforts that have to do with issues such as development risk, existing regulatory protections. These factors will also be mapped and rated to the extent possible, and combining these with the Conservation Values Index will improve conservation prioritization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aquatic conservancy, Island Conservancy, Natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Shoreline Residential Conservancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Shoreline Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nearshore Prioritization Parcel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusions

While this Conservation Plan will guide the Bainbridge Island Land Trust in fulfilling its conservation goals, and provide new tools to achieve these goals, this plan does not make decisions for the Land Trust or any of its partner organizations. Each new Bainbridge Island Land Trust project and program inspired by this Conservation Plan will be subject to approval by the board of directors and the principles of sound governance.

The CVI will be used day to day for evaluating projects. Wildlife Networks and Shorelines continue to be primary focus area for BILT. However, using the CVI and natural resource data, and integrating other community values, the development of Regional Priorities is the next step.

The table below (adopted from Table three of the 2012 Conservation Plan) still guides priority work on the Island.

Table 1: BILT Priorities for Protecting Bainbridge Island Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Summary Evaluation and Prioritization Considerations</th>
<th>Proposed Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Wildlife Networks | ▪ Wildlife Networks are systems of large ecologically functioning habitat blocks and are connected via strategically identified areas using the modeling contained in the 2018 Conservation Plan and the Conservation Values Index in order to support sustainable populations of diverse and abundant wildlife species and provide opportunities for wildlife to move between large habitat blocks. Provides watershed protection and at times, public access via well planned trails;  
▪ Many resource types (forests, wetlands, streams, riparian areas) work together to provide high ecological values. A combination of all these resources types within a network increases the conservation values of the network;  
▪ Without a large amount of conservation (and perhaps some restoration actions), there is moderate-to-high risk that large portions of important wildlife networks will go unprotected, become significantly impacted and be unable to provide properly functioning conditions at a landscape-scale;  
▪ Opportunities exist for partnerships with a number of resource agencies and organizations to work together to identify key priority systems worthy of protection. The leveraging of resources is an important component of future potential campaigns or areas of focused work. | Primary           |
The following habitat types will be considered to the extent which they optimize the ecosystem function of an identified Habitat Network (isolated resources outside of an identified network will not be considered).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTIES WITH STREAMS and ASSOCIATED RIPARIAN AREAS</th>
<th>First</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Stream and riparian habitats, that support both aquatic and terrestrial species, are important supporting factors in selecting priority geographical areas, especially for completing wildlife networks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Critical Habitat for one Federally-listed Threatened species (Puget Sound steelhead) has been designated on two Bainbridge Island streams and 3 additional Threatened species (coho, chinook, and chum) are associated with fish-bearing streams on Bainbridge Island;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Using information available regarding ecosystem health; the most actionable includes fish passage barriers; however, additional ecosystem evaluations are necessary to understand ecosystem conditions such as the Springbrook Creek Watershed Feasibility and Assessment;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTIES WITH WETLANDS</th>
<th>Second</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Wetlands are a unique habitat for plant and animal species, and contribute to clean water and healthy watersheds;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wetland and riparian habitats will be an important supporting factor in selecting priority geographical areas, especially for completing wildlife networks;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- While current regulatory protections exist, a number of wetlands have been altered, compromised or removed;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTIES WITH FORESTS</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Highly abundant, forests cover 70.3% of Bainbridge Island;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Forest habitat will be an important supporting factor in selecting priority regional geographical areas and preparing project plans, especially for completing wildlife networks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shorelines</th>
<th>Primary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Because we are an Island, surrounded by the waters of Puget Sound, our shorelines and associated uplands is a habitat system that defines the geographical area we serve;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Shorelines are dynamic habitat systems that contain highly valuable critical habitats, including tidelands, estuaries, lagoons, nearshore, marine riparian and adjoining upland areas, important to a high diversity of aquatic and terrestrial species;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Undeveloped shorelines are scarce;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Updated inventories of shoreline conditions are needed;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 8 threatened and endangered species and 1 species of concern are associated with the shorelines of Bainbridge Island;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comprehensive ecosystem analyses (Williams, et al. 2003) indicate that the shoreline is moderately impacted and at risk of not being able to maintain properly functioning conditions; this analysis can be used to identify priority geographical areas as well as model the ecological benefits from undertaking restoration actions and the ecological impacts from development on a landscape-basis; Without some additional conservation actions and a large number of restoration actions, there may be a moderate-to-high risk that large portions of the shoreline ecosystem could become significantly impacted and unable to maintain properly functioning conditions at a landscape-scale; Shoreline habitat will be a primary factor in selecting priority geographical areas and preparing project plans, including wildlife networks since a significant percent of terrestrial species have important associations with shoreline habitats.

### Recreation

**20% of Bainbridge Island acres have some level of protection and these acres include parks (active and passive), trails and open space;**
- BILT has assisted in significant passive open space acquisitions by teaming up with numerous island entities;
- Future parkland and open space additions that focus on adding to existing properties to expand preservation and recreation provide leverage to past efforts;
- Trail corridors can provide access to open space and connect neighborhoods and parks. Careful development of trail corridors also can help retain conservation values. When appropriate, park and open space expansion can overlap with wildlife network systems;
- Evaluation and assessment of existing trail and shoreline access network needed and is identified in the previous section. A number of community groups exist that work on trails, providing momentum for further development of trail connections including the Sound to Olympics Greenway trail.

### Agricultural Lands

- Agricultural soils cover 90.3% of Bainbridge Island;
- No baseline regulatory protections exist;
- BILT and Friends of the Farms are in the initial stages of developing a framework for agricultural easements that may help guide future expansion of this tool for protection of working landscapes.
- Opportunities exist with partnering organizations to identify priority properties for agricultural land protection. Further analysis will be necessary to identify the best agricultural lands to protect;
- Many agricultural soils exist in areas with forest resources.
and other habitat types. Conservation of some areas for active agricultural use may result in the conversion of habitat to agricultural use. This shift in land use requires careful consideration;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenic Vistas</th>
<th>Tertiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ No information was available for this resource to evaluate;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Lacking an inventory, this resource cannot be used as a supporting factor to select priority geographical areas;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Scenic vistas might be identified during the process of preparing project plans and could then be used as a factor in final property selections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Steps and Implementation**

Updates to the Conservation Plan will continue through 2018. These update efforts will include:

- **Utilization of the Conservation Values Index (CVI):** Through the remainder of the year, BILT will use the CVI on a day to day basis to help provide information about lands and natural resource values attached to these lands. This use will help identify potential geographic focus areas, and also lead to the integration of other community values, such as proximity to neighborhood centers, public access and scenic values. Indicators of development risk (such as regulatory restrictions, zoning, available infrastructure, etc.) will also be factored in to modeling for improved prioritization.

- **Correct and update data:** While the large majority of the datasets BILT has used with this update are very new and reflect existing conditions, there are some which require additional work. Specifically the Shoreline Impact data from the 2008 Bainbridge Island Nearshore Assessment needs to be updated to reflect restoration efforts that have taken place on the shoreline in addition to shoreline which has been impacted or armored since 2008.

- **Stakeholder Outreach/Community Conversation:** With a conservation values index being created, what is the feedback about this index and our methodology and what else should we be considering? Reaching out to both traditional partners (natural resource professionals and entities, partners in conservation work) and non-traditional land trust partners (health care professionals, interfaith community members, business/professional organizations, developers, real estate agents, etc.) will take place using a moderator. This important step will assist with the interpretation/crosswalk that will need to occur between natural resource values and community values.

- **Integration of Climate Change.** There has been much work performed by others, including the City of Bainbridge Island Climate Adaptation Assessment of 2017, UW Climate Change Study and other regional efforts to help inform protection, and likely restoration, endeavors resilient to climate change.
• **Further refinement of Action Plan/Regional Priorities.** By performing the above tasks, BILT’s goal will be, by the end of 2018, to have an integrated plan with a refined CVI, expanded stakeholder feedback and climate change data in order to guide work over the next 10 years.
Conservation Tools

A number of conservation tools are necessary to implement a successful conservation plan within a given period of time. Below are the tools actively used today and the identification of tools that could be pursued in the future to assist with conservation efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>How The Tool Can Be Applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Values Index</td>
<td>Day to day in regards to examining natural resource data aligned with specific parcels and identification of Regional Priorities in the development of larger Habitat Networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation easements, including resource lands, agricultural lands, and trails</td>
<td>Primary tool for permanent protection. Includes both donated and purchased easements. To date, BILT has not purchased a conservation easement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition</td>
<td>Use where significant threat of conversion to high priority ranked property exists and where conservation easements are not a viable option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Swaps/ Land Sales</td>
<td>Trading/Selling/Swapping a non-conservation property or partner property for a priority conservation property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation</td>
<td>Land can be protected as part of a mitigation need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a Revolving Fund</td>
<td>Through BILT’s Legacy Program, develop a fund available for strategic property purchases, including acquisitions for the purpose of resale with conservation easement protections added.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current use tax assessment</td>
<td>Low cost tool for medium-to-high priority ranked properties. Typically not permanent (see Leadership section)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restoration</td>
<td>In a highly developed landscape like BI, restoration could be an important tool to achieve long-term goals and vision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Leadership on public policy that supports conservation projects | ▪ Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)  
▪ Public Support of Open Space Purchases (such as bond, excise tax on property sales, levy lid lifts)  
▪ Updates to land protection regulations: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leveraging</th>
<th>Area partners and their endeavors can be linked with the endeavors of BILT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Plan/SMP, Zoning, Critical Areas, Shorelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Capital projects (COBI, WSDOT, Utilities)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Storm water utility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Current use tax assessment program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Could be improved for more urban use, joint/adjacent designations for small parcels, shoreline riparian areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Partners

Growing and maintaining partnerships with a number of organizations and entities have led to many past successes of the Bainbridge Island Land Trust, and partnerships will continue to be important as we work to achieve our strategic conservation goals. Our partners provide support in a number of important ways, including fundraising, strategic support, scientific expertise and/or technical support in specific natural resource focus areas. Others provide education and outreach capacity and support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnering Organization Entity</th>
<th>Partnering Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends of the Farm</td>
<td>Farm preservation and agricultural land management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainbridge Island Metropolitan Park and Recreation District</td>
<td>Recreational lands and trails, including acquisitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Bainbridge Island</td>
<td>Connecting resource protection with public policy, such as shoreline protection and restoration, critical areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-motorized Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past supporter (and financial leader) for open space bond initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fee owner of agricultural lands acquired through Open Space Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Has jurisdiction over culvert improvement projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistance with Springbrook Creek Feasibility project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suquamish Tribe</td>
<td>Scientific and technical expertise in fisheries, timber, wildlife and cultural resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past financial supporter of some acquisition and restoration projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainbridge Island Watershed Council</td>
<td>Watershed planning, assistance with watershed assessments such as Springbrook Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sound Watersheds Council (Salmon Recovery Lead Entity for WRIA 15)</td>
<td>Connecting resource protection with public policy and funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Bainbridge Communities</td>
<td>Public advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainbridge Island Weed Warriors</td>
<td>Public involvement in improving natural landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IslandWood</td>
<td>Environmental education (primary and adult) and technical/scientific expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Sound Wildlife Shelter</td>
<td>Species abundance and diversity and linkages with wildlife resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloedel Reserve</td>
<td>Open space preservation and community outreach/education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget Sound Restoration Fund</td>
<td>Community involvement in shellfish issues, commercial shellfish interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Landscapes Project</td>
<td>Local backyard wildlife habitat development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBI Non-Motorized Transportation Advisory Committee</td>
<td>Networking with local, regional and state non-motorized endeavors to connect existing trails/recreation lands with future endeavors (water and land trails)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Bainbridge</td>
<td>Community outreach and partnership development in local ag, energy, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainbridge Parks Foundation</td>
<td>Trails and public space supporter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap – Puget Sound Region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Sea Grant</td>
<td>Science technical assistance, citizen science, baseline data collection for sites, monitoring of restoration projects such as the Powel Shoreline Restoration Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSU Beach Watchers</td>
<td>Citizen Science, baseline data collection, and monitoring of restoration sites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust for Public Lands</td>
<td>Real Estate technical expertise, regional scale priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central Local Integrating Organization</td>
<td>Implementor of local stormwater, salmon and shellfish priorities – supported the Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap County</td>
<td>Kitsap County Noxious Weed Board North Kitsap String of Pearls Plan – water and land trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap County Conservation District</td>
<td>Technical assistance, farm planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Kitsap Trails Association</td>
<td>Advocacy and planning for regional land and water trail system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget Sound Partnership</td>
<td>Regional policy guidance, financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puget Sound Shoreline Collaborative</td>
<td>Puget Sound land trusts cohort, data collection and sharing, strategic outreach, working to achieve protection and restoration goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitsap Audubon Society</td>
<td>Technical expertise, citizen science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People for Puget Sound</td>
<td>Technical expertise, partnership leveraging in Puget Sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound to Olympics Greenway Trail</td>
<td>Regional non-motorized plan that involves BI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Water Trails</td>
<td>Regional water trail development and community outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Association of Land Trusts/Land Trust Alliance</td>
<td>Professional organization, training, funding, advocacy, information sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington State Department of Transportation</td>
<td>Highway 305 is a scenic highway, they have jurisdiction over priority culvert improvement projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Department of Natural Resources</td>
<td>Tidelands, water of the state jurisdiction, regulatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife</td>
<td>Technical assistance, science, regulatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Department of Ecology</td>
<td>Technical assistance (Puget Sound Characterization Model), watershed health, funding, regulatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Recreation and Conservation Office</td>
<td>Technical assistance, public involvement, funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossary of Terms and Acronyms

BILT Bainbridge Island Land Trust

COBI City of Bainbridge Island

Conversion The development of land from a relatively natural condition to a built condition that significantly or completely eliminates the natural or community resources.

GIS Geographical Information System, which is cartographic (map) and spatial analysis computer software. BILT used the ArcGIS Desktop software made by ESRI, Inc.

Shorelands For this analysis, shorelands are the area parallel to the shoreline extending 200 feet landward from the ordinary high water mark. Shorelands do not include tidelands or bedlands.

Some Level of Protection: The level of protection ranges in nature from permanent (e.g. conservation easement) to less-than-permanent (e.g. unrestricted park land, current use (open space) tax status, perhaps a subdivision’s open space tract). A detailed parcel-specific review is necessary to determine the exact nature and durability of the protections affecting each property. This category includes all park lands and private reserves (i.e. IslandWood, Bloedel) and properties that have some development if they also have some type of protection in place (e.g. open space farm land, parks with recreation facilities). This category does not include properties affected by regulatory protections (e.g. critical areas & buffers).

Some level of Development: The level of development ranges from very low density to commercial/industrial.

Undeveloped and Unprotected: Includes many land use types including active farms and forest lands without some type of protection in place. Because some of these lands are working resource lands, some of these properties may include a limited level of development such as a small residence or barn/shed.

WFC: Wild Fish Conservancy

WDFW: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
References (indicates new information and data since 2012 Conservation Plan)


City of Bainbridge Island 2014 Shoreline Master Plan Update restoration and conservation plan.

City of Bainbridge Island Wetlands Inventory/GIS Data Update, 2017


Puget Sound Ecosystem Monitoring Program and Washington State Dept of Natural Resources. 2017. Eelgrass abundance and depth distribution on Bainbridge Island: Final report to the City of Bainbridge Island, DNR IAA 16-239; June 30, 2017


Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Bainbridge Island Culvert Inventory. 2014

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitats and Bird Nesting Sites. 2016

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Fish Distributions: coho, chum, cutthroat, and steelhead. 2017


Appendix A: Maps – see attached separately

Map Index

Map 1: Location in Puget Sound
Map 2: Bainbridge Island Aerial View
Map 3: Bainbridge Island Conservation Lands
Map 4: Bainbridge Island Protected Areas and Neighborhood Centers
Map 5: Updated Streams and Wetlands
Map 6: Streams and Culverts by Passability
Map 7: Bainbridge Island Land Cover 2015
Map 8: Nearshore Reach Impact Rating
Map 9: Conservation Value Index
Map 9A: Conservation Value Index Manzanita Vicinity
Map 9B: Conservation Value Index Gazzam/Islandwood Vicinity
Map 9C: Conservation Value Index and Culverts Blakely Harbor Vicinity
Map 10: Conservation Value Index Sum by Parcel Blakely Harbor Vicinity

Appendix B: GIS Data Sources used for 2018 Conservation Plan Update - see attached separately
Appendix C: BILT Capital Investment 2018-2028

The BILT Conservation Plan underscores the significant opportunities available for protection and restoration actions, and with that comes the realization that significant investment by BILT and its multiple partners must continue to grow and the funding sources need to diversify. What is achieved in the next ten years will have critical importance in the conservation of important resource values on Bainbridge Island.

BILT has had reasonable success obtaining grant funds to help support restoration and acquisition when the properties of focus specifically address a threatened natural resource or provide a unique opportunity to improve a critical resource, such as shoreline restoration.

Realizing the opportunity is now to act on acquiring large undeveloped parcels with high ecological values such as streams, wetlands, shoreline and large forest core areas, BILT has launched a multi-property, multi-year capital campaign to support the acquisition and stewardship of new conservation lands. The Stand for the Land campaign will involve a diverse set of activities designed to engage the community, have them become aware of the need for natural resource protection, and encourage them to support protection actions through financial support, volunteerism, and community action. The goal of the campaign and BILT’s capital investment strategy will be to raise over $5 million in the next three years to support properties that have been identified for protection through the use of our Conservation Values Index and where landowners are willing to work with BILT on land protections.

Equally important will be capital-intensive restoration projects that come about through partnerships with land owners who wish to improve the condition of their properties. These restoration endeavors will include everything from invasive plant removal, culvert improvements for fish passage, and shoreline restoration, to removing derelict structures – allowing nature to regain valuable ground. In addition to working on private conservation easement lands, the same restoration endeavors are scheduled to take place on preserves owned by BILT.

In most instances, the fundraising efforts of BILT provide considerable leverage for public and private grants. And importantly, by maintaining a financially healthy BILT organization, those costs ABOVE acquisition and restoration can be supported by general funds, helping insure protected and restored lands are cared for far into the future.

Examining other sustainable funding sources such a conservation futures or transfer of development rights will be important to develop over the next 10 years in order to support the needs of retaining and growing the nature of Bainbridge Island.

Based on past efforts and 29 years of history, it is appropriate to project that BILT will be able to secure up to $7,905,000 in the next 10 years and receive an additional $12,615,000 in support from grant and other sources.
### Appendix C Capital Investment Strategy Bainbridge Island Land Trust Conservation Plan (April 2018)

#### Bainbridge Island - BILT Land Protection & Restoration Projects Resource Investments

**10 YEAR PROJECTIONS (2018-2027)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Acquisitions</th>
<th>Restoration</th>
<th>Cons Esmts**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated For 2018-2020</td>
<td>4,000,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated For 2021-2023</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated For 2024-2027</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated 10-year TOTAL</td>
<td>7,500,000</td>
<td>405,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**10-year PROJECTION TOTALS:**

- **AVG PER YEAR TOTAL**: 2,052,000
- **10-year TOTAL for Acquisition, Restoration, CE's**: 20,520,000
- **BILT-Only 1 AVG PER YEAR TOTAL**: 790,500
- **BILT-Only 10-year TOTAL**: 7,905,000

**10-year HISTORY:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4,949,522</th>
<th>8,742,324</th>
<th>47,000</th>
<th>1,260,000</th>
<th>25,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AVG PER YEAR TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1,002,732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10-year TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10,027,324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BILT-Only AVG PER YEAR TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>499,652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BILT-Only 10-year TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>4,996,522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cons Esmts** - These numbers do not include actual appraised value of donated cons esmts.
Appendix D: Public & Stakeholder Comments Received During Plan Development

In connection with the 2018 Conservation Plan Update, BILT sought feedback from natural resource practitioners and the public from December 2017 through April 2018. This initial round of feedback provided a pulse from the public about the work and activities BILT has been involved with to help guide our plans for the future.

BILT recognizes the importance of getting feedback from the community and region we work in. During this phase of our update, our main outreach component involved creating a Community Conservation Survey via an on-line Survey Monkey.

The survey was advertised in the Bainbridge Review and Bainbridge Islander, was made available via live link on the BILT website, and was the subject of a number of e-letters sent to both members and prospect members. 502 people (our 2012 community survey received 138 responses) completed the survey, which took approximately 17 minutes for each person to complete, therefore providing over 140 hours of volunteer feedback to BILT.

This feedback is entirely contained in the separately Appendix D. Some highlights of the survey results are:

In future phases of the Conservation Plan update in 2018, BILT will be reaching out to a broader network of stakeholders to share with them the results of our natural resources data work and the Community Conservation Survey. This effort will take place so we can refine our strategies moving forward, hopefully define new partners, and identify prospective new supporters and funding sources.

It should be noted that in 2018 BILT has embarking on a large multi-year, multi-property acquisition capital campaign (see Appendix C for the Capital Investment Plan) which also involves the engagement of the public and multiple audiences, including one to one interviews with the public, presentations to service clubs and professional organizations, as well as reaching out to new stakeholders and our current partners.
APPENDIX J
CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION PLAN

See City of Bainbridge Island website
https://www.bainbridgewa.gov/523/Nonmotorized-Transportation-Plan