


PUGET SOUND
REGIONAL OPEN SPACE STRATEGY
ROSS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MAY 3, 2012
8:30 - 10:30am

REPORT FROM
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

WORKING DRAFT



University of Washington
Northwest Center for
Livable Communities

University of Washington
Green Futures Research &
Design Lab

National Park Service:
Rivers, Trails, & Conservation
Assistance Program

Generously funded by The Bullitt Foundation

ROSS LEADERSHIP

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Ron Sims (Chair), Puget Sound Partnership Leadership Council

Samuel Anderson, Master Builder’s Association of King & Snohomish Counties
Thatcher Bailey, Seattle Parks Foundation
Bryan Boyle, University of Washington School of Forest Resources
Dennis Canty, American Farmland Trust
Executive Dow Constantine, King County
Kaleen Cottingham, Washington Recreation & Conservation Office
Barb Culp, Bicycle Alliance of Washington
Mike Deller, The Trust for Public Land
Bob Drewel, Puget Sound Regional Council
Gene Duvernoy, Forterra
Dr. David Fleming, Public Health Seattle-King County
Dean Howie Frumkin, University of Washington School of Public Health
Commissioner Charlotte Garrido, Kitsap County
Commissioner Peter Goldmark, Washington State Department of Natural Resources
Joanna Grist, Washington Wildlife & Recreation Coalition
Joe Kane, Washington Association of Land Trusts
Terry Lavender, King County Conservation Futures Citizen Advisory Committee
Michael Linde, National Park Service Rivers, Trails, & Conservation Assistance Program
Kjristine Lund, King County Flood Control District
Rod Mace, United States Forest Service – Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie Forest
Kelly Mann, Urban Land Institute Seattle
Executive Pat McCarthy, Pierce County
Scott Miller, The Russell Family Foundation
Gerry O’Keefe, Puget Sound Partnership
Rob Purser, The Suquamish Tribe
Ron Shultz, Washington State Conservation Commission
Jeannie Summerhays, Washington State Department of Ecology
Doug Walker, Seattle Parks Foundation
Cynthia Welti, Mountains-to-Sound Greenway
Scott Wyatt, The Nature Conservancy

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE CO-LEADS

ECOSYSTEMS

Bob Fuerstenberg, King County DNRP – Retired
Crittter Thompson, University of Washington
Decision Commons

RECREATION & TRAILS

Jennifer Knauer, Hook Knauer LLC
Amy Shumann, Public Health - Seattle & King County

RURAL & RESOURCE LANDS

Lauren Smith, King County Executive’s Office
Skip Swenson, Forterra

URBAN & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Ben Bakkenta, Puget Sound Regional Council
Joe Tovar, Inova Planning, Communications & Design LLC

ROSS PROJECT TEAM

LEADS

John Owen, Makers Architecture & Urban Design
Nancy Rottle, Green Futures Research & Design Lab, Director
Fritz Wagner, Northwest Center for Livable Communities

PARTNERS

Steve Whitney, The Bullitt Foundation
Bryan Bowden
NPS Rivers, Trails, & Conservation Assistance Program

STAFF

Jeffrey W. Raker, Green Futures Research & Design Lab
ROSS Lead Planner
Ginger Daniel, Green Futures Research & Design Lab
ROSS Assistant Planner


PUGET SOUND REGIONAL OPEN SPACE STRATEGY ROSS

MATERIALS FOR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
MAY 3, 2012

REPORT FROM
TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS

WORKING DRAFT

ROSS VISION + TAC SUB-VISIONS	5
TAC SUMMARIES	
Ecosystems	7
Rural + Resource Lands	11
Recreation + Trails	15
Urban + Community Development	19
CROSS-TAC SUMMARY	
Shared Priorities + Challenges	24
Working Conceptual Tools	26
WORK PLAN	29
WHAT WE NEED FROM YOU	31



TIMELINE OF TAC WORK SESSIONS





An interconnected network of public and private lands that represents the full suite of natural ecosystems and habitats of a size and character that maintains and enhances biodiversity; provides the essential benefits of nature and ecosystem services; and sustains the crucial ecological processes, structures, and functions upon which healthy ecosystems depend.

ECOSYSTEMS

URBAN + COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

A complete, connected, diverse, financially viable, publicly embraced and well managed open space system of appropriately scaled spaces that accommodates the needs of the environment and assures community health, personal well-being, and provides access for all members of the community regardless of their exact geographic location or income



A diverse and resilient landscape of rural and resource lands owned and operated by those that live in or are connected to the region. This landscape provides the food, resources, and ecosystem services we need; supports active resource-based economies; fosters rural communities; contributes to the identity and health of the region; and preserves our legacy for future generations.

RURAL + RESOURCE LANDS

RECREATION + TRAILS

A complete, context-sensitive, well-managed and maintained system of land and water resources that promotes the full spectrum of human recreational activity, offering opportunities for all people and contributing to the health and vitality of current and future generations. This system provides for the full continuum of communities urban to rural, alpine to marine, land and water.



A ROBUST,
CONNECTED,
MULTI-FUNCTIONAL
REGIONAL
OPEN SPACE
SYSTEM





WE ENVISION:

An interconnected network of public and private lands that represents the full suite of natural ecosystems and habitats of a size and character that maintains and enhances biodiversity; provides the essential benefits of nature and ecosystem services; and sustains the crucial ecological processes, structures, and functions upon which healthy ecosystems depend.

This network actively manages natural and resource lands to:

- Maintain and restore resilience to ecosystems and habitats at multiple scales in the face of a changing climate;
- Integrate human activities more closely with natural processes;
- Support and enhance ecosystem services;
- Convey the indispensable value of our natural ecosystem and the interdependence among humans and nature; and
- Contextually align human and natural activities through the use of landscape ecology principles, providing gradients of public access and other context specific approaches that provide for rest, recreation, and educational opportunities for people; and secure refuge and safe travel for wildlife.

A ROBUST,
CONNECTED,
MULTI-FUNCTIONAL
REGIONAL
OPEN SPACE
SYSTEM

ECOSYSTEMS TAC CO-LEADS

Bob Fuerstenberg, King County DNRP – Retired
Crittter Thompson, UW Decision Commons

TAC PARTICIPANTS

George Blomberg, Port of Seattle
Gordon Bradley, UW School of Forest Resources
Taylor Carroll, Forterra
Dave Cook, Geoengineers
Nicole Faghin, Faghin Consulting
Keith Folkerts, Kitsap County Natural Resources Division
Abby Hook, Hook Knauer LLP
Peter Hummel, Anchor QEA
Mark Isaacson, King County Water & Land Resources Division
Gino Luschetti, King County DNRP
Tom Murdoch, Adopt-A-Stream Foundation
Susan O'neil, Puget Sound Partnership
Doug Osterman, Puget Sound Partnership
James Rasmussen, Duwamish River Cleanup Coalition
Elaine Somers, USEPA Region 10
Kari Stiles, Puget Sound Institute
Jennifer Thomas, Parametrix
Chris Townsend, Puget Sound Partnership

MEETING DATES

Session #1 | March 23, 2012
Session #2 | April 13, 2012

The region has secured a number of important **natural habitat areas** which include conserved areas to sustain water and food supply (large municipal watersheds, designated agriculture areas), others by which the land has multiple purposes and involves a diversity of interests (park/recreation resources, Mountains to Sound Greenway), public-private partnerships (conservation easements, TDR/PDR) and even sites explicitly acquired as a means to protect ecological habitat (wilderness areas, wildlife reserves).

All undeveloped land is an asset and the region is not built out to the level that some other communities are. There are remaining opportunities to ensure that all public lands, accessible shoreline, and existing natural lands can be connected to other (potentially more marginal) lands or linear systems to build a system of open space that contributes to wider ecosystem needs.

Urban biodiversity is a critical part of the strategy and we are increasingly employing diverse and innovative urban LID techniques, as well as improving the quality of ecosystems in already developed areas. Better coordination of these projects and a strategy to knit them together at the regional scale can make a big impact.

We can align sites prioritized for ecological habitat with those that address the wider array of ecosystem services and support community development such as health, equity, and economic development. Such efforts can help justify investments by clarifying the role of specific ecosystem services as well as health and access disparities so that we can position expenditures on habitat as investments with dividends in the community.



REGIONALLY SCALED CHALLENGES

How much is enough?

There are significant uncertainties regarding the types of habitat that are the most important to conserve in order to maintain a healthy network of ecosystems resilient to unpredictable disturbances such as climate change. This requires a level of ongoing, coordinated management and monitoring that is responsive to eco-regional context/characteristics, provides geographical and functional linkages across all landscapes, and addresses landscape successional patterns. This level of coordination and data alignment does not currently exist in the region.

Linking human and natural systems, urban and rural

Our nation's cultural emphasis on the distinction between nature and city, rural and urban, has made it difficult to communicate the value of open space and that humans are part of the ecosystem. Regulatory frameworks such as the GMA have been essential in conserving large habitat areas and ensuring that jurisdictions have an emphasis on environmental dimensions in planning. However, the tools we use to conserve our critical areas and delineate between city, country, and nature make it difficult for our region to focus on the critical functions that span these different environments.

Integrating urban ecology tools

Numerous urban green infrastructure innovations are being utilized to address urban ecology (i.e. LID, complete streets, daylighting creeks, tree canopy assessments). However, regulatory frameworks, methods of analysis, land management approaches, and project implementation vary dramatically across jurisdictions. This piecemeal implementation suffers from limited coordination and communication of best practices at a regional scale.

Public access among different landscapes

There is little to no public access on lands that might be appropriate for recreation while other easily accessible areas contain particularly fragile habitat that is vulnerable to human activity. There are gaps in understanding the varying levels of vulnerability and only limited guidance regarding appropriate gradients of public access.

PARTNERS + RESOURCES

Key organized regional efforts to work from include:

The Puget Sound Watershed Characterization Project, organized by the Puget Sound Partnership and Washington State Department of Ecology, highlights the most important areas to protect, and restore, and those most suitable for development. In addition, salmon recovery plans have been developed for each watershed and groups have already organized themselves around ecological considerations regarding the protection of Puget Sound.

ROSS will support implementation of the Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda and Local Integrating Organization (LIO) objectives by closely working with Salmon & Ecosystem Recovery Coordinators and supplementing rather than replicating activities underway as part of the PSP Biennial Science Workplan.

Additional efforts and data include:

National Marine Fisheries Service | salmon recovery issues
People for Puget Sound | CSOs and pollution prevention
Washington Biodiversity Council | conservation incentives
Washington Wildlife Habitat Connectivity Working Group | habitat connectivity

Ecosystem Mapping:

Mapping has been conducted by a number of organizations to identify key habitat for conservation including The Nature Conservancy, local land trusts, and the EPA, as well as the Washington State Department of Natural Resources, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, and Washington State Department of Ecology. Each county has established its own maps of key habitat areas and Trust for Public Land's work on the Greenprint for King County provides a detailed look at priority investments in open space beyond solely ecological demands.

Ecosystem Services:

Earth Economics has conducted mapping of ecosystem services explicit to certain communities in the region as well as conducting an assessment for the Puget Sound Basin. Departments at the University of Washington and other institutions will be queried for complementary research efforts.

STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

Incorporate & link current efforts such as Puget Sound Partnership Watershed Characterization & WRIAs; TNC and state/county habitat assessments; and Biodiversity Strategies.

.....

Evaluate varying contributions of open space landscape types and assess values derived from a regional open space strategy.

.....

Recognize that ecosystems extend beyond the four counties, occur at a variety of scales, and incorporate all lands, not just open space.


.....

Consult existing science identifying habitat priorities and outline appropriate management and gradients of public access.

.....

For more detailed information and proceedings from the Ecosystems Technical Advisory Committee, please see our website: <http://rossgfl.wordpress.com/>





WE ENVISION:

A diverse and resilient landscape of rural and resource lands owned and operated by those that live in or are connected to the region. This landscape provides the food, resources, and ecosystem services we need; supports active resource-based economies; fosters rural communities; contributes to the identity and health of the region; and preserves our legacy for future generations.

This landscape is supported by the full array of public and private tools to:

- Foster & support a culture of stewardship and active land management for those currently working the land;
- Cultivate and assist the next generation of farmers and foresters;
- Acknowledge and highlight the interdependence of rural and urban communities; and
- Promote understanding about the varying contributions of these lands.

A ROBUST,
CONNECTED,
MULTI-FUNCTIONAL
REGIONAL
OPEN SPACE
SYSTEM

RURAL + RESOURCE LANDS TAC CO-LEADS

Lauren Smith, King County Executive's Office
Skip Swenson, Forterra

TAC PARTICIPANTS

Melissa Campbell, PCC Farmland Trust
Ryan Dicks, Pierce County
Mary Embleton, Cascade Harvest Coalition
Leif Fixen, Snohomish Conservation District
Joy Garitone, Kitsap Conservation District
Brock Howell, Futurewise
Joe Kane, Nisqually Land Trust
Kirk Kirkland, Pierce County Open Space Taskforce
Joan Lee, King County Rural & Regional Services Section
Bobbi Lindemulder, Snohomish Conservation District
Doug McClelland, Washington State Department of Natural Resources & Mountains to Sound Greenway
Jay Mirro, King Conservation District
Linda Neunzig, Snohomish County Agricultural Services
Rene Skaggs, Pierce Conservation District
Sandra Staples-Bortne, Great Peninsula Conservancy
Dan Stonington, Northwest Natural Resource Group

MEETING DATES


Session #1 | March 30, 2012
Session #2 | April 16, 2012

REGIONAL ASSETS AND OPPORTUNITIES

The region has productive timber resources, large intact agricultural valleys with good soils, mineral resources, abundant water resources and protected watersheds, with some resource lands in public ownership. The region also has a large grouping of valuable resource lands under private ownership. Our climate affords us some of the best year-round timber and food harvesting with limited irrigation. A healthy local economy, healthy and functioning ecosystems, as well as a 'buy local' ethos ensures support for the agricultural industry. The GMA and Vision 2040 highlight how rural and resource lands need to be conserved to ensure resources are available to future generations.

Conservation tools are being used effectively in the region. There are existing tax incentive programs and funding programs that support resource land conservation and a regional TDR Marketplace is in its early stages of development (Regional TDR Alliance). Additional innovations could support local forest management (i.e. community forest bonds). Opportunities may also be available to ensure the healthy working of forest lands and a regional strategy could additionally increase brand awareness of local geographies producing different foods.

Existing labeling of agricultural lands and water resources ("salmon bearing stream") helps elevate the value of resource lands. This can be expanded by utilizing heavily travelled corridors as a forum to educate the public about the importance of resource lands and educate consumers and residents about working lands within their watershed through ecotourism and fun events that get people out onto forests and farms. The region is beginning to understand the true benefits of conserving resource lands by establishing stonger forest/farm-city connections and tapping into the rising sense of environmental responsibility among business interests (e.g. CSR, reductions to carbon footprint by illuminating the value of open space) through ecosystem service analysis.



REGIONALLY SCALED CHALLENGES

Conversion & fragmentation of rural & resource lands

Vested development rights contribute to the conversion and fragmentation of our resource lands. Growth management objectives are not being realized as smaller acreage farms and forests are converted to residential uses. Additional political support for land conservation is needed and there is only a limited window of opportunity to secure a number of specific large lots up for sale before they are likely to be parcelled out into more fragmented patterns of ownership.

Catalysts are not available to support repopulating active farming and working of land

Many of our agricultural lands are surrounded by urban and suburban areas, resulting in various conflicts of use. There are many competing demands in the region's river valleys: accommodating flood management, agriculture, and ecology within the same footprint. In addition, infrastructure that supports our resource industries such as mills and food processing facilities are often inaccessible to smaller farm and forestry operators. Erosion, degraded soils, fallow land, pollution, and other significant impacts have resulted from inactive and poorly managed farm and forest lands in rural areas.

There is a poor recognition of the potential fragmentation of our land assets with many large at-risk lands in private ownership. It also remains challenging to highlight open space as an investment and create markets for ecosystem services that are currently freely available.



PARTNERS + RESOURCES

Key organized regional efforts to work from include:

Regional TDR Alliance (DOC, PSRC, Forterra)

Landscape Conservation and Local Infrastructure Program (Forterra)

Tailored conservation approaches by landscape type (Forterra)

County level assessments of land ownership in rural and resource lands (Greenprint for King County)

Agriculture and rural land surveys (Conservation Districts and counties - Kitsap County, Strategic Plan for Agriculture (2011))

USDA report prioritizing agricultural zoned lands, evaluating level of risk to loss

Communicating alternatives (UW Decision Commons)

STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

Identify key lands that need protection by mapping rural land use, resource lands and current trends to highlight key conditions and threats.

.....

Outline gaps in research, monitoring, and protection strategies.

.....

Support rural communities and economies

- Seek better link to “rural” residents
- Inform future policy development through improved region-wide analysis of the diversity of communities and their needs within the unincorporated area and the rural landscape
- Conduct research on resource lands and resources/ infrastructure necessary to support localized market for food and resource production
- Develop incentives to cultivate the next generation of farmers and foresters and improve resources and knowledge among small forest and farm property owners
- Improve land management to ensure future resource production and avoid major environmental detriment from erosion, fallow, and flooded out land.
- Explore benefits to developing common agricultural areas and community forests

.....

Position major land acquisitions as community investments

- Highlight the potential economic return of land acquisitions that have a community benefit through ecosystem service analysis
- Express urgency to the public regarding the limited window of opportunity to secure large resource lands that will likely become parcelled out into a fragmented pattern of ownership.
- Conduct a review of past acquisition costs and outline 10 year strategy to acquire such lands.

For more detailed information and proceedings from the Rural + Resource Lands Technical Advisory Committee, please see our website: <http://rossgfl.wordpress.com/>







WE ENVISION:

A complete, context-sensitive, well managed and maintained system of land and water resources that promotes the full spectrum of human recreational activity, offering opportunities for all people and contributing to the health and vitality of current & future generations. This system provides for the full continuum of communities urban to rural, alpine to marine, land and water. This system fosters a network of recreation and trails that:

- Offers equal opportunities for all people to enjoy natural and other open spaces;
- Creates accessible opportunities for recreation and supports better mobility by linking parks, open spaces, and community destinations;
- Reaches underserved communities and addresses health inequities by providing people with facilities to become more physically active;
- Accommodates a variety of activities and fosters places that inspire stewardship and encourage diverse community engagement;
- Facilitates the strategic use of resources and builds a system that can adapt to changing conditions, helps conserve energy and reduce green house gas emissions, and maintains biodiversity through habitat conservation and restoration.

A ROBUST,
CONNECTED,
MULTI-FUNCTIONAL
REGIONAL
OPEN SPACE
SYSTEM

RECREATION + TRAILS TAC CO-LEADS

Amy Shumann, Public Health - Seattle & King County
Jennifer Knauer, Hook Knauer LLC

TAC PARTICIPANTS

Don Benson, URS Corporation
Amy Brockhaus, Mountains to Sound Greenway
Kevin Brown, King County Parks Division
Karen Daubert, Washington Trails Association
Martha Droge, National Park Service Pacific West Region
Jessica Emerson, King County DNRP
Robert Foxworthy, King County DNRP
Deborah Hinchey, UW School of Public Health
John Hoey, Trust for Public Land
Amalia Leighton, SVR Design
Ian Macek, Washington State Department of Transportation
Josh Miller, Bicycle Alliance of Washington
Jane Moore, WA Coalition for Promoting Physical Activity
Thomas O'Keefe, American Whitewater
Dennis Oost, Kitsap County
Chris Overdorf, Elm
Lisa Quinn, Feet First
Kimberley Scrivner, Puget Sound Regional Council
Tom Teigen, Snohomish County Parks Director
Diane Wiatr, City of Tacoma
Don Willott, North Kitsap Trails Association
James Yap, Snohomish County Parks & Recreation

MEETING DATES

Session #1 | March 26, 2012
Session #2 | April 6, 2012

REGIONAL ASSETS AND OPPORTUNITIES

The region is blessed with a diversity of recreation spaces that respond to daily lives on a local level as well as a select group of parks, trails, and other recreational facilities that can be elevated as cultural icons. The existing and proposed network of trails, abandoned rail corridors, utility lines and major infrastructure proposals serve as an organizing framework for future trail expansions and an opportunity to better link recreational assets. Our waterways are beginning to serve as “water trails” with a network of public shoreline access points. The region also has many local level plans for recreation with facility inventories, other supportive data, and basic standards of service.

There are existing inventories and plans to address trail system development. There are also existing approaches and standards that can be used to support urban trail system development and the use of streets as part of the trail network.

Active recreation and mobility can support community development. There is a growing emphasis among public health agencies on planning for equitable access to parks, recreation, and mobility in a manner that results in more positive health outcomes. The region has an opportunity to clarify how recreation and trails development influences health inequities by forming stronger links between health agencies and counterparts in planning for recreation at all scales. Stronger links can also be made between recreation and ecology interests by ensuring recreational investments recognize the complexity and fragility of ecological systems and planning for intentional points of access and restriction. In addition, the region can develop upon the recognized potential of recreation facilities to support workforce retention and recruitment, tourism, and “Trail-Oriented Development”.



REGIONALLY SCALED CHALLENGES

Priorities for recreation are not fully reflected in how the region develops its trail system

The approach we use to define regionally significant facilities is oriented heavily toward transportation objectives associated with available funding streams and existing policy frameworks. Our region does not currently have a robust system of trails in urban areas and there are deficiencies in regionally connected trails in many of our communities. In addition, our approach to wayfinding on the trail system and navigating to regionally significant parks and recreational facilities is highly fragmented in its quantity & quality.

Uncoordinated investment in regional-scale recreational facilities

It is easier to build a constituency around trail corridors, but the region needs to come up with a larger plan for recreational facilities and then fund projects in stages to elevate the value of a regional approach and ensure that the system is developed in a manner that links local recreation for families to broader regional assets. The region also needs to identify a more consistent and robust method of prioritizing investments in recreational facilities. Finally, the region needs to link recreation with other objectives to complement and coordinate efforts (e.g. linking flood management and trail development or identifying where there are recreational assets but health issues remain to ensure the system is more effective in addressing underserved communities).

Poor public access to link people to open spaces of the region

Public land ownership is very limited and there is little regulatory guidance on how to address limitations set by existing agreements associated with public access on easement properties as well as military and tribal lands. Little direction is provided to confront the encroachment of adjacent private uses on publicly-owned shoreline properties such as “street-ends” and only a third of the Puget Sound shoreline is in public ownership. In addition, the region is limited in its institutional capacities and awareness regarding water trails and planning for water-based recreation.



PARTNERS + RESOURCES

Key organized regional efforts to work from include:

PSRC has established a shared regional typology for bicycle facilities, completed an inventory of regional bicycle facilities and some pedestrian facilities, and initiated the development of a Draft Regional Bicycle Network as part of an upcoming Regional Active Transportation Plan. This work can be used as an example as to how a shared understanding of the typology of recreational facilities could be developed.

Additional resources such as reports from bicycle & pedestrian advocacy organizations (e.g. Cascade Bicycle Club Left By The Side of the Road) will need to be reviewed alongside city, county, and state trails and parks/recreation plans. Collective groupings of local jurisdictions such as the Suburban Cities Association, AWC, and Forterra's Green Cities Partnership will be important contacts in assessing existing efforts to link projects and investments for recreation and trails across political boundaries. The National Park Service, the National Parks Conservation Association, and the Washington Recreation and Parks Association can help link regional scale investments in recreation to broader systems and it will be important to clarify the role of the Trust for Public Land.

As the ROSS assesses how to improve public access to recreation it will be important to work with the Washington State Department of Natural Resources as well as other large public land owners. Lessons from the Mountains to Sound Greenway and its strategic plan will help set out approaches to public access on the region's lands. It will also be important to contact the Washington Water Trails Association and partners in other counties (e.g. San Juan and Orcas water trail groups) to evaluate how to improve access to the region's waterways.

Additional efforts and data include:

Regional Opportunity Mapping
PSRC Growing Transit Communities Program
County level health agencies
Private sector partners to affirm the link between recreation, trails, and community/economic development
Agencies that plan for other linear corridors such as railroads and water/sewer/utility districts (e.g. BNSF, PUD, PSE, BPA)

STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

Integrate PSRC's transportation-oriented trail plan with county level recreation-oriented trail planning to create a centralized, accessible database of existing trail plans and recreational/commuter trail maps.

.....

Utilize streets as open space – expand on the “complete streets” approach (e.g. biofiltration of surface runoff, tree canopies, multi-modal transit)

.....

Outline how best to link existing recreational assets by utilizing utility corridors and other linear systems.

.....

Improve regional wayfinding between parks and recreational facilities and within cities and urban areas.

.....

Utilize existing analysis (regional opportunity mapping and county health assessments) to ensure that priority open space investments address health inequities and expand active recreative opportunities for underserved counties and vulnerable populations.

For more detailed information and proceedings from the Recreation + Trails Technical Advisory Committee, please see our website: <http://rossgfl.wordpress.com/>





TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
URBAN + COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

WE ENVISION:

A complete, connected, diverse, financially viable, publicly embraced, and well managed open space system consisting of appropriately scaled spaces that accommodates the needs of the environment and assure community health and personal well-being, and provides access for all members of the community regardless of their exact geographic location or income level.

- People have a right to open space and urban areas should contain a variety of precious places in each community, recognizing that even when open space is not physically accessible its presence still has value.
- Open spaces should serve an economic function by attracting investment decisions, businesses and people to live in concentrated areas of the region and supporting community development efforts as a consideration in all new construction and development.
- Open space investments should protect and enhance ecosystem and wildlife patterns.
- Networks of mobility, such as trails, transit lines, streets, and public rights of way should be considered a key component of the open space system, ensuring a greater level of accessibility & connectivity.
- Open spaces should be designed for optimum use and multi-functionality while remaining compatible with the surrounding environment.
- The open space system should be supported by a sustainable source of region-wide stewardship, maintenance and funding.

A ROBUST,
CONNECTED,
MULTI-FUNCTIONAL
REGIONAL
OPEN SPACE
SYSTEM

URBAN + COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TAC CO-LEADS

Ben Bakkenta, Puget Sound Regional Council
Joe Tovar, Inova Planning, Communications, & Design LLC

TAC PARTICIPANTS

Gordon Bradley, UW School of Envir. & Forest Resources
Vicky Clarke, Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council
Amalia Leighton, SVR Design
Dan Dewald, City of Bellevue
Leif Fixen, Snohomish Conservation District
Eric Hanson, Port of Seattle
Gwendolyn High, Washington Wildlife & Recreation Coalition
John Hoey, Trust for Public Land
Mark Hoppen, Snohomish Health District
Mark Mead, City of Seattle Department of Parks & Recreation
Joshua Monaghan, King Conservation District
Chip Nevins, City of Seattle Parks Division
Rocky Piro, Puget Sound Regional Council
Andrea Platt-Dwyer, Seattle Tilth
Lauren Smith, King County Executive's Office
Sean Sykes, NAIOP Sustainable Development Committee
Chris Townsend, Puget Sound Partnership
Tim Trohimovich, Futurewise
Alison VanGorp, Forterra
Julie West, Public Health - Seattle & King County

MEETING DATES

Session #1 | March 23, 2012
Session #2 | April 3, 2012

REGIONAL ASSETS AND OPPORTUNITIES

The grandeur of the Puget Sound's lands and waterways grant the region with a distinct advantage in enhancing regional identity and building an ethic of stewardship, ownership and a sense of place. A shared interest, vision, and passion for local parks and beaches helps reinforce the system of open space and affirm the linkages between the full continuum of communities, public and private entities, and people and nature. This can be supported by establishing an interconnected hierarchy of open spaces with multiple layers of connection to the community.

A growing understanding of the link between access to open space and community development support the region in its ability to integrate parks and open space into proposed development, guide growth and fulfill both ecological and economic interests, as well as addressing community needs such as health disparities and other inequities.

The region is not built out and there are many opportunities to utilize surplus public lands and other opportunity sites such as vacant lots, public rights of way, and even rooftops to maximize the existing system of open space. Streets and major infrastructure projects present a specific opportunity for green infrastructure, sidewalks/ bike lanes, pocket parks, as well as farmers markets and other community uses (when closed to traffic temporarily). Corridors such as Light Rail, utility lines, trails, and unused railway (BNSF East Corridor) provide the region with a means to organize and link future investments in open space.



REGIONALLY SCALED CHALLENGES

Seeking a balance between different uses

There are many demands on the region's open space system. It must provide for multiple forms of recreation; visual, aesthetic/ artistic, and educational uses; food systems (including urban farming and p-patch networks); as well as ecology and wildlife needs. It is particularly difficult to accommodate the multi-purpose functioning of sites and alleviate conflicts with industrial uses along shorelines.

Incomplete commitments and unintended consequences of existing policy

Unincorporated areas and communities just outside of the UGA boundary are becoming increasingly fragmented and traditional tools are not effective. In addition, our effort to form a regional market for TDR as a tool to conserve open space is impaired by an inequitable distribution of burden and benefit for the sending and receiving of development rights.

Competition with other high order public needs

There is varied guidance among individual communities as to how to establish a balance between the provision of open space and affordable housing. The result is large urban areas that lack regional parks as well as open space "deserts" along transportation corridors where we are trying to focus people and jobs.

How do you foster the notion of stewardship as a cultural value?

The region has not fully realized how to highlight the value of open space and we have only begun the process of engaging & empowering groups to exhibit and enhance the benefits from community space, express pride in ownership, and form an emotional connection to the land.

Underserved communities with few parks and open space within walking distance

The region can utilize open space as a tool to alleviate health disparities and support equitable development objectives, but many communities lack safe routes to walk or bike to parks and there are many areas with low transit service that link underserved communities to open space.



PARTNERS + RESOURCES

Key organized regional efforts to work from include:

Regional Opportunity Mapping at PSRC and analysis among county health agencies and other departments will ensure that the regional open space system can address health disparities and inequity. PSRC Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee regional bicycle network, county trail plans, transit service level maps, Feet First Walking Maps & Safe Routes to School data will help inform how safe connections can be made between open space and community destinations, particularly among undeserved communities.

The Green Cities Partnership and community advocacy work at Forterra will help identify how to engage and empower communities to support open space. Additional county level data (Greenprint for King County, Kitsap County Greenways Plan (1995), Pierce County Open Space Taskforce, water/flood management mapping) will ensure that the ROSS can identify the intersects among a varied grouping of interests. In addition, there may be an opportunity to coordinate between groups working on urban watersheds (e.g. Thornton Creek Alliance).

PSRC's Growing Transit Communities Program is evaluating underutilized properties and opportunity sites along proposed high capacity transit corridors. Agreements are being established for affordable housing and the ROSS will link with these efforts to identify opportunities to address open space "deserts" along these corridors.

Additional partners include:

Puget Sound Partnership Funding Committee
Tribal & Military planners
Land & farmland trusts, home ownerships associations, and key property owners
Developers & Business interests
Key forestry interests
Private/community (HOA) owned parks and plazas
Non-profits
Recreation groups
Local & regional government & quasi-governmental alliances
Research institutions
Funding community & corporations
Utilities

STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

Confront "open space deserts" and utilize major infrastructure corridors to organize regional investments in parks/plazas

- Expand on existing analysis to identify underutilized property and opportunity sites associated with the development of linear systems of infrastructure (such as the proposed light rail system)
- Utilize existing analysis to identify how open space can best address key inequities/health disparities in the region.

.....

Establish regional agreements to ensure open space is provided in tandem with the provision of affordable housing and support large scale redevelopment efforts with open space.

.....

Support water trails and connections to water by utilizing the Puget Sound shoreline, lakes, rivers and creeks to organize open space investments.

For more detailed information and proceedings from the Urban + Community Planning Technical Advisory Committee, please see our website: <http://rossgfl.wordpress.com/>



CROSS - TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE SUMMARY

SHARED PRIORITIES + CHALLENGES
WORKING CONCEPTUAL TOOLS



A ROBUST,
CONNECTED,
MULTI-FUNCTIONAL
REGIONAL
OPEN SPACE
SYSTEM



A ROBUST,
CONNECTED,
MULTI-FUNCTIONAL
REGIONAL
OPEN SPACE
SYSTEM

ROBUST + RESILIENT

CONNECTED

DIVERSE + CONTEXTUAL

MULTI-FUNCTIONAL

STEWARDED

EQUITABLE + ACCESSIBLE

COORDINATED

INTER-DEPENDENT

CHALLENGES

TAC SHARED PRIORITIES + CHALLENGES

conserve, enhance, and manage regional open space assets and systems that are resilient to disturbances and can evolve over time

connect and integrate open space assets in terms of physical access to landscape and habitat types, ecological relationships, rural to urban geographies, and human to natural realms

provide a variety of precious open spaces, marine and terrestrial landscape and ecosystem types, and functional systems tailored to different scales and community needs

layer objectives to address ecological integrity, ecosystem services, human health and well being, resource conservation, and community vitality. Incorporate the benefits of regional open space systems into other efforts such as transportation, economic development, and infrastructure planning

foster a culture of stewardship with an appreciation of the value of regional open space

improve access for all citizens without degrading resources

improve cross-jurisdiction institutional coordination of open space efforts to address landscape scale objectives and upgrade the effectiveness of the system

recognize the mutual interdependence of wilderness, rural and urban lands & the interface between people and the region's land resources & waterways

tax structure

limited funding and prioritization

gaps in analysis


limited public land ownership

vested development rights

political fragmentation

inconsistent and incomplete regulations/incentives

ECOSYSTEM BASED LAND ANALYSIS + VALUATION




GREY TO GREEN + GREEN TO GREY




can densifying urban areas preserve ecological function elsewhere?

can urban greenspace and green infrastructure reinforce growth and development?




can disturbed areas be restored to reclaim ecological function?


LAYERING + OPTIMIZING FUNCTIONS + VALUES



ARTERIES + CAPILLARIES



ROSS WORKPLAN



PHASE 1 | SUMMER 2012


- Complete Preliminary Comprehensive Strategy
- Continue to foster alliances (ongoing)
- Secure funding for Phase 2
- Identify first 2 watersheds (likely based on funding)
- Explore current knowledge regarding ecosystem services and refine methodology for ecosystems approach. (This is the most challenging analytical element.)

THE PRELIMINARY COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY INCLUDES:

- A finalized vision statement for the ROSS
- A description of the elements or components that the ROSS will address
- ROSS objectives associated with each of the four TAC focus areas
- A list of resources, challenges, and opportunities relevant to the ROSS
- A list of key organizations and efforts that should be contacted and coordinated with during the watershed strategy process
- A description of key programmatic strategies to be incorporated into watershed level work
- A visual depiction of how the ROSS will be applied across the landscape such as maps and graphic diagrams
- A detailed scope of work for upcoming phases

PHASE 2 | STARTUP FALL | WINTER 2012-13 FUNDING NEEDED

- Organize with key participants already engaged in regional planning activities (PSP, TNC, Forterra, PSRC, counties, etc.) and obtain base data that they have developed. (i.e.: start with the big analytical pieces that are already underway)
- Begin mapping (This may be a challenge as the mapping protocols and data sets are likely not all congruent.)
- Begin analysis and outreach for first 2 watersheds
- Complete watershed planning for first 2 watersheds





WHAT WE NEED FROM YOU

A ROBUST,
CONNECTED,
MULTI-FUNCTIONAL
REGIONAL
OPEN SPACE
SYSTEM

- WHAT QUESTIONS DO YOU HAVE BASED ON THIS WORKING DRAFT?
- WHAT ELEMENTS AND THEMES ARE MISSING?
- WHAT ADVICE CAN YOU OFFER FOR OUR FUTURE WORK?
- HOW SHOULD THE ROSS APPROACH FUNDING PARTNERSHIPS TO ENSURE THIS WORK IS ADVANCED?

PUGET SOUND
REGIONAL OPEN SPACE STRATEGY

ROSS

A ROBUST,
CONNECTED,
MULTI-FUNCTIONAL
REGIONAL
OPEN SPACE
SYSTEM