1. Regarding the Preferred Plan/synthesis sheet developed at today's workshop; what do you like or don't like? Did we miss anything?

I prefer the Ecosystem Compensation scheme. Liberty Lake has long been a local destination and does not have adequate infrastructure (ex: access road) leading to park, parking lot facilities) to support expansion on a tourism scale. Concessions for increased athletic competitions would strain the resources and prevent access for local trail users. Plus plant too many trees on local road systems.

2. How would you anticipate recreational use for park expansion into the adjacent natural areas i.e. Mackenzie Property, Liberty Lake Conservation Area, Mica Peak etc. Circle Please)

Hiking, biking, equestrian, environmental education, backpacking/backcountry camping, stargazing, multi-use access should be a priority. Regarding backcountry camping, in this Front Country setting, bathrooms would be necessary to avoid contamination of water sources - there is already a lot of human fecal matter being left by day-users; unfortunately, many users don't understand.

3. Do you have concerns about the maintenance and operations of the park and why? No lifeguards on duty, no nighttime security gate, cleanliness, security other?

I have experienced cleanliness problems in park bathrooms, but am not aware of any major security concerns at Liberty Lake.

4. Are there recreational uses existing or discussed today that you feel are inappropriate to be planned for this park (Circle Please). Any uses that we missed and should include?

Hiking, biking, environmental education, fishing, swimming, canoe/kayaking, power boating, RV camping, tent camping, cabin or yurt rentals, backcountry camping, equestrian, disc golf, concession/rentals, weddings, hosting regional events; other?

I have witnessed OHV/illegal access into the park from the adjacent OHV area. The OHV must be closed during fire-danger times and a permanent closure could be considered. On-site rentals are not necessary as there are other local rental options. I have concerns re: backcountry camping & LNT (poop in the woods) - others would be necessary.

5. How do you feel the County should go about implementing these improvements (Circle Please)? Park Admissions, Park Use/Rental Fees, Tax Increase, Bond. Grants and other fundraising?

Grants. Park admission for beach access to help pay lifeguard is good/makes sense. Admission fees for access to the non-motorized trail system does not make sense.
4, cont.: If cabins/yurts/tiny houses are expanded, it should be at the expense of RV sites rather than further impacting the natural areas of the park.

* At one time, I organized local high school camping trips at Liberty Lake. Initially, the park offered a discounted rate for school groups. Eventually, the park ended those discounts & we were therefore unable to afford to return to the park. I would prefer to see expanded camping opportunities for local schools, church groups, boy/girl scout groups, etc., as opposed to a focus on monetizing the park & a focus on it being a tourist destination. The access road to the park would be a better fit for school buses/rvs of kids rather than attempting to attract tourists. An environmental learning center/classroom space makes sense - but again, with a focus on community use as opposed to a rental facility.
1. Regarding the Preferred Plan/synthesis sheet developed at today's workshop; 
what do you like or don't like? Did we miss anything?

I like the plan with the least development.

2. How would you anticipate recreational use for park expansion into the adjacent natural areas i.e. Mackenzie Property, Liberty Lake Conservation Area, Mica Peak etc. Circle Please)
Hiking, biking, equestrian, environmental education, backpacking/backcountry camping, stargazing.
Keep ORV area out where it is.

3. Do you have concerns about the maintenance and operations of the park and why? No lifeguards on duty, no nighttime security gate, cleanliness, security other?
Concerned about impacting lake the quality and drawing so many people that there are traffic circles getting to the park. Also keep to non-motorized non-regulated recreation - in other words - non-organized activities. No disc golf, no concessions. Let people bring their lunch. - NO Ziplines -

4. Are there recreational uses existing or discussed today that you feel are inappropriate to be planned for this park (Circle Please). Any uses that we missed and should include?
Hiking, biking, environmental education, fishing, swimming, canoe/kayaking, power boating, RV camping, tent camping, cabin or yurt rentals, backcountry camping, equestrian, ORV (off road vehicle), disc golf, concession/rentals, weddings, hosting regional events, other?

This area is a gem do not develop into a congested busy overcrowded area. There are no other parks w/just trails, beach access, and camping in this region. It's OKAY to have undeveloped woods & eco system.

5. How do you feel the County should go about implementing these improvements (Circle Please)?
Park Admissions, Park Use/Rental Fees, Tax Increase, Bond, Grants and other fundraising?

If you can't afford to do these "improvements" don't do them.

Please provide any additional comments or thoughts on the back!

Spokane County Parks: Paul Knowles (509) 477-2188 | Bernardo Wills Architects: Bill LaRue (509) 838-4511

Email: PKNOWLES@spokanecounty.org Email: blaru@bwarch.com

there is plenty of grass already. It's a total resource drain (requires fertilize, weed control, water, mowing, etc.)
Activities like Stacking, Obstacles, Frisbee golf - these are so specific, there are places built that nobody even uses. Too much cost, upkeep. Zip line - too commercial.

Do not like the themed playground idea. Let people go to highly developed sites for fancy playgrounds. No vendor association sponsored events. Other than the occasional kayak/ canoe trips.

Dock - I like the minimal spoulin disturbance dock.

Boardwalk - the current boardwalk is sufficient. I am concerned about more intrusion into the wetland.

Concession - If you are going to go all out with concessions, you need to have a full service year round restaurant then! Otherwise just the minimum - but no vending machines. Let people buy their own food - less intrusive, less garbage.

Cabins - this might be ok - but back away from the shoreline.

Camping - I love the idea of remote back country camp spots and a connector trail to Mt. Peck.

Education - I would rather see something like Camp Carson building than a fancy, expensive, high maintenance building.

Thanks for asking!
1. Regarding the Preferred Plan/synthesis sheet developed at todays workshop; what to you like or don't like? Did we miss anything? Could not do the "data" piece, easier to have a plus/minus system for what improvements would be favored and which would not.

2. How would you anticipate recreational use for park expansion into the adjacent natural areas i.e. Mackenzie Property, Liberty Lake Conservation Area, Mica Peak etc. Circle Please) Hiking, biking, equestrian, environmental education, backpacking/backcountry camping, stargazing. Expanding and improving trail systems can be done by volunteers - low cost. Increasing entrance fees/season passes would add funds.

3. Do you have concerns about the maintenance and operations of the park and why? No lifeguards on duty, no nighttime security gate, cleanliness, security other? Have not experienced security issues, lifeguards probab a good idea. Campground hosts.

4. Are there recreational uses existing or discussed today that you feel are in-appropriate to be planned for this park (Circle Please). Any uses that we missed and should include? Hiking, biking, environmental education, fishing, swimming, canoe/kayaking, power boating, RV camping, tent camping, cabin or yurt rentals, backcountry camping, equestrian ORV (off road vehicle), disc golf, concession/rentals, weddings, hosting regional events, other? The area of the park is relatively small and the road access is not meant for large numbers of vehicles. The park's charm is the natural environment should not become commercialized (Not a Riverfront Park)

5. How do you feel the County should go about implementing these improvements (Circle Please)? Park Admissions, Park Use/Rental Fees, Tax Increase, Bond, Grants and other fundraising? Increase Park Admission - offer season passes, bonds, grants if available - local sponsorship? Ducks Unlimited? More cabin rentals - backpack into cabin rentals? Building that could be used both for event rental and school environmental groups & public displays about the park.

Please provide any additional comments or thoughts on the back!

Spokane County Parks: Paul Knowles (509) 477-2188 | Bernardo Wills Architects: Bill LaRue (509) 838-4511

Email: PKNOWLES@spokanecounty.org Email: blarue@bwarch.com
- One extended boardwalk - disturb birds, not much to see
- Remote tent site might be problematic to patrol + maintain

- Activities area is good.
  - Expanded dock is good
  - Concession rentals should be near the beach
  - Need to add extended beach.
Scenario Narrative

In this scenario, the park is designed, improved, and managed to maximize its attractiveness as a destination for tourism and recreation. It is marketed and operated as a host venue for a variety of special events, ranging from concerts to festivals, weddings to corporate picnics. It celebrates and improves its trails network, accommodating enthusiasts who might be new and complete here—such as families who may plan their summer vacations around a week of camping by the lake.

The park might be loud. The park might be crowded. But it would also be an amazing fun and active park, with facilities, activities, music, and food.

Features would focus on summer activities, but winter activities would find plenty to do as well, with things like snowshoe tours and cross-country skiing helping to fill the park’s calendar.

In addition to recreation in assembly, breech, camping, and service facilities, significant upgrades to parking, water and wastewater systems would need to support this approach. But the thought would also help generate more revenue, helping pay for improvements—perhaps even helping the park system as a whole.

Performance Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Build-out Cost</th>
<th>Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Needs</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Footprint</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Intensity</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Potential</td>
<td>Higher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Legend

- **PARKING**
  - Beach
    a. Expansion for increased water frontage
    b. Volleyball, fire courts
    c. Improved restroom facilities/recreational areas
  - Event Space
    a. New Jennie肝脏
    b. New pavilion
  - Expanded Playgrounds

- **BATHROOMS**
  a. New, expanded

- **SPECIAL EVENTS WITH RESTROOMS**
  a. Family-oriented, food, snacks, rentals

- **TENT CAMPGROUND**
  a. Expansion of tent camping

- **RV CAMPGROUND**
  a. Renovated and expanded RV spaces

- **ADDITIONAL TRAILS & CROSS-COUNTRY COURSE**
  a. Access road
  b. Trails

- **FRUIT ENTRY**
  a. Pay Kiosk
  b. Gateway signage

**LIBERTY LAKE REGIONAL PARK**
Master Plan

Alternative Scenario - Tourism & Visitation
+ expanded docks & dock - good

Other rentals should be separated - rentals
mean the beach?

+ Beach rentals/concession is good.

- cabins by the wetlands - impact ecosystem
  plus mosquito/diseases.

+ cross country trail - good

---

missing improved trail to闵溪 pond area
+ west side of lake.

? Is the activities area the same as the family plan?

* Not much more "performance impact" but
  better usability and revenue.
**Scenario Narrative**

This scenario casts the park as a window into the natural world, promoting its improvements only as necessary to enhance the observability and conservation experience. Here, the priority is to provide convenient, direct access to the park's natural areas, with trail loops designed for visual access to the park's sensitive areas. It would include a more robust system of interpretive signs and features, encouraging awareness of the park's unique ecological processes and the biological, hydrologic, geologic, and cultural components that make up what it is. It would implement a multisensory "Conservation Classroom" building with a good fit, providing indoor and outdoor space for meetings, clinics, and exhibits.

This scenario envisions the park providing more diverse sampling experiences that expand existing trails, adding cabins and encouraging cross-seasonal access for campers who seek a less-oriented outdoor experience. New pathways for optimal access could cater to year-round environmental learning for an experience closer to what wilderness might provide. Water access would also see improvements, with high-quality paths for non-motorized craft, allowing access to fish, paddle along the shore, and generally enjoy the park as an exceptional urban retreat.

**Performance Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Metric</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build-out Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological Footprint</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Intensity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key Legend**

- **PARKING**: Recreation
- **BEACH**: Swimming.
- **BASKETBALL**: Beach volleyball.
- **GOLF COURSE**: Hiking.
- **THEATER**: South Shore.
- **BOAT RACKS**: North Shore.
- **BATHROOMS**: Additional Gonzaga.
- **FISHING PIER**: Fishing pier.
- **BICYCLE PATHS**: Bicycling.
- **PLANTATION**: Nature walks.
- **STAND-UP PADDLEBOARDING**: Stand-up paddleboarding.
- **ACCESSIBLE TRAILS**: Accessible trails.
- **TRAILHEADS**: Trailheads.
- **PAY RAMP**: Pay ramp.
- **GATEWAY**: Gateway.

**LIBERTY LAKE REGIONAL PARK**

Master Plan

Alternative Scenario - ECO SYSTEM & CONSERVATION
No
Worksheet Comments

Workshop + Open House: Strategic Alternatives

Thursday, September 21, 2017
Liberty Lake Council Chambers
22710 E. Country Vista Drive

Table 1

- "See comment on Scheme A."
- (Scheme A) "Back-country access > connect to Mica Peak and other. If necessary, raise fees."
- "Depends on what this entails - back-country access is important."
- (Tourism & Visitation) "Least desirable."
- (Note on map, Scheme B) "Calypso orchids here."
- (Re: Ecosystem scheme) "Too much development, but overall, best scheme."
- (Scheme C) "Too much development and emphasis on revenue."
- "We don't feel maxing money is feasible over the long term."
- "Please, should move ORV park out of the valley of the park."
- "Each plan should consider the impact on animals and plants, always striving to preserve, minimal impact on them."
- (Circled Scheme B) "Favor."
- (Crossed out text re: expanded camping) "No good."
- (Re: text suggesting water access improvements) "Already adequate for non-motorized access."
- (Scheme A legend) "Limited number (of cabins). What is sustainable with low environmental impact?"

Table 2

- (Scheme B) "Educational shelter/hub is very important, perfect outdoor classroom to get city-dwelling youth/adults exposure to local environment. Trail connection to Mica Peak is important."
- (Ecosystem scheme) "Favored for lake protection."
- "ORV park use converted to mountain bike (downhill?) area."
- (Scheme A) "Further development needs stormwater/runoff/ecosystem considerations. Lake protection; this applies to all scenarios."
- (Re: keynotes) "Option 6, 3, 7, 1, 9"
- (Scheme A) "XC course (is a) cool idea; will there be snow to make this work? Maybe a site in ORV park? More snow > higher elevation."
- (Scheme B) "Incorporate nature/play elements."
• “Incorporate themed playground equipment (nature theme).”
• “Include obstacle course.”
• “Zipline.”
• “No zipline - too commercial.”
• “Two-lane road with shoulders is desperately needed for ingress/egress.”
• “School field trips cause traffic issues.”
• (Scheme B) “I like the connector trails to Mica Peak, maybe with remote backpacking campsites.”
• “2/3 of summer, this expansion (the watercraft training channel) would be inaccessible to boats due to natural lake level declines.”
• (Re: watercraft training channel) “Potential water quality issues connecting stop-moat back channel to main lake body - nutrients.”
• (Scheme B) “Long portage from lot to lake an issue for less mobile users. Paddle craft launch a great idea.”
• “By (building ADA access) in, more grants may be accessible for build-out.”
• (Re: dock at Active Families scheme) “Larger, but not expanded to wetland.”
• (Re: boardwalk, scheme C) "With observation decks and nooks. Info signage."
• (Re: boardwalk, scheme C) "Make to edge of wetland."
• (Re: cabins, scheme C) "Sewer/water?"

Table 3

• (Scenario A, trail) “Yes to this, but in one of the other scenarios.”
• (Scheme B) “Adding cabins. Revenue potential.”
• (Scheme B) “Kayak dock.”
• (Scheme B, remote tent areas 10) "Yes, informal OK, expanded more public tent camping."
• (Re: #12 tent camping, Active Families scheme) "Yes!"
• "More connectivity to other trails - Mica Peak new section."
• “Trail improvement on loop.”
• "Easier family trail, OK to extend camping."
• "Signed, improved trail to real Mica Peak."
• “Put the boardwalk where the old trail (maintenance trail) is because people use it anyway. Makes a nice family loop.”
• “Higher user fee rather than concessions.”
• “The only concession should be kayak/paddleboard/paddleboat rentals. No food, no motorboats, keep it simple, non-motorized, and truly an outdoor experience. Don’t bring ‘town’ activities to
the park (meaning busy-busy stuff). Maintain opportunities for solitude."

• (Scenario A) "I am not in favor of this scenario in general."

• (Scenario A) "Other areas already exist (Pavillion Park, Riverside State Park, etc.); boat launch Valley Girl Triathlon."

• (Scheme B, re: Conservation HQ) "Something like West Valley Learning Center."

• (Scheme B, re: Cabins, yurts) "No."

• (Scheme B, re: Playgrounds) "School field trips."

• (Scheme B, re: Conservation HQ) "Yes."

• (Scheme B, re: Conservation HQ) "Parks and recreation classes."

Table 4

• (Scheme C) "Do not dredge new canals in wetlands."

• (Scheme C) "This is a family community, and this park should be developed with families in mind."

• (Scheme C) "No concessions."

• (Scheme C) "This is an opportunity for active recreationalists, not just families."

• (Scheme C) "I believe this will draw too many people to the area. The traffic/roads into the park will not support the traffic."

• (Scheme C) "What I love about the park is that it is less developed. Can have hikes near town, with solitude."

• (Scheme C) "This is where the focus should be, within this there should be priority for beach access. This is one of the few parks in the area that can support a beach. Very little beach area is available around Liberty Lake, otherwise, it is here."

• (Scheme A) "Do not extend beach!"

• (Scheme A) "Amphitheater - move to area 5?"

• (Scheme A) "Expanded parking to area 7 is a good idea."

• (Scheme A) "Winterized cabins - access? Roads need upgrading."

• (Scheme A) "Winter access - snow is not consistent in the park - would have to be used as an access to Mica."

• (Scheme A) "Do not draw tourist/events to this park. There are enough areas in the region that can support those activities. There are very few opportunities close to town to just go out in the woods for a hike. Keep it simple."

• (Scheme B) "Don't extend activities into the wooded areas...unless there is increased fire education."

• (Scheme B) "Increased boardwalk and observation tower is good - children's education would be great."

• (Scheme B) "Amphitheater to area 5."
• (Scheme B) "Nature playground, yes!"
• (Scheme B) "Boardwalk is a great idea - something between schemes B and C."
• (Scheme B) "Docks should be for non-motorized uses."
• (Scheme B) "No further motorized boat traffic is needed."
• (Scheme B) "Don't interfere with marsh ecosystem, it keeps the lake healthy."
• (Scheme C, dock keynote) "Nope. The lake is too small for more motorboats."
• (Scheme C, activities area keynote) "Nope. Too much for this park. Let people do this at other parks."
• (Scheme B, non-motorized launch) "Nice idea."
• (Scheme B, boardwalk) "Keep the shoreline natural. H2O quality is an issue."

Table 5

• (Scheme A) “Please consider disc golf. It can be mixed-use of land area. Doesn’t have to be all or none. There are many volunteers in the disc golf community to help with planning, site surveys and environmental impacts. Thanks, Brian Cuda, Liberty Lake resident and terrible golfer."
• (Scheme B) "Prefer this option. Would be for educational boardwalk for learning purposes."
• (Scheme B) "The healthy marsh and forest keeps the water in the lake clean; pressure on this ecosystem would challenge this."
• (Scheme B) "Like the nature-themed playground."
• (Scheme B) "Keep RV sites the same; increased RV traffic on roads would be difficult."
• (Scheme B) "Like the more natural plans, like bouldering, obstacle course, nature-themed playground."
• (Scheme B) "Concerned with traffic on other plans. Road needs improvement and maybe a trail next to it."
• "I would like to see a disc golf course included in the master planning document for the county park. One course would encompass at least 25 acres and could use as much as 40 acres for a decent course. The possibility of a disc golf 'complex' may also be considered where eventually there could be as many as three courses in a certain area. Jeff Crum, Executive Director, Disc Golf Uprising, 509-475-5378."
• (Re: disc golf comment) "Yeah, and I think this is a terrible idea. It's too commercial. Let them use other developed parks. Leave Liberty Lake Park with small footprint of developed activities and keep the trail system as main attraction."
• "Liberty Lake and its watershed are tiny, not a large Idaho lake; increased pressure would run the risk of damaging the ecosystem and character. Plus, roads in and out are not able to handle additional traffic, would need massive, expensive upgrades. Added motorized boat traffic would trash such a tiny lake, borderline dangerous."
• "Doggy area?"
• “More RV and camping areas?”
• “Could the ‘special event lodge’ be combined with ‘Conservation Headquarters Area’ with environmental displays, classroom setting for school groups, scouts etc.? Recreation Department programs and an area for events - weddings, meetings etc. Campground programs could also be offered there. Always thought the Dishman Hills Lodge should have been built for multi-purpose - public nature displays and private events.”

• “Build a nature trail with eventual signage from the expanded campground across that hillside to the Conservation/Event building. Families could walk from campsites without having to walk on the road.”

• “Remove current boardwalk. Build new boardwalk where the ‘maintenance trail’ exists. People keep walking there and it should be a protected wetland. Great spot for star viewing - benches? Connects to the other trail for a short loop and makes the long loop shorter for those who cannot walk eight+ miles. Would make a woodland/wetland loop ideal for classroom groups. Funding from a grant/bond? WDFW? WWRP? Local group sponsorship and building? Ducks unlimited?”

• “Maybe rental cabins that could be hiked in to? Snow-shoed in? At top of Waterfall Loop, by the rope wall? Off Edith Hansen with a view? Would rentals pay for them eventually?”

• “It seems to me the park is often at capacity, so adding major events would crowd the park, however there are things that might serve the current population but bring in income like the cabin rentals, a few more campsites in a better location, maybe kayak, paddle board rentals.”

• “I am opposed to food concession as it contributes to litter and often attracts yellowjackets.”

• “Is there money to be made from a disc course? If so, how about putting it on the MacKenzie property? Do organizations reserve for competitions?”
Introduction
This report summarizes the responses to the Liberty Lake Regional Park “Priorities Poll” conducted as part of the public engagement process. The poll, designed by the consultant team and reviewed by Spokane County staff, was launched on July 22 and publicized using County email to citizens and stakeholder groups, social media outlets, the County’s website and articles in local media. Hard copy versions were distributed at the “Bivvy Day” tent in the park (July 22) and at the August 19 Liberty Lake Farmers Market. Questionnaire responses were collected through September 21st. 134 respondents completed the poll online, with 32 respondents completed completing the paper version for a total of 166 responses. Of all respondents, 110 identified themselves as residents living in “City or Town, Spokane County”, 41 indicating “Unincorporated Spokane County”, and 15 responding “Other/Don’t Know.” The survey understood as advisory and not statistically valid. Inferential tools including mean and standard deviation are included to help describe response patterns. Results are charted and analyzed on the following pages.

Questions and Responses
Q1. I reside in: (check one)

A majority of respondents answered that they live in a City or Town, Spokane County (66%), Unincorporated Spokane County (24%), Other/Don’t Know (9%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City or Town, Spokane County</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Spokane County</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Don’t Know</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q2. What’s the right balance for Liberty Lake Regional Park?

*Wide vs. narrow focus*

Respondents were asked to move a slider bar (online) or mark the box (paper) that most closely matched their policy inclination, with the far left end (-2) characterized by “The park should focus on a wide range of activity types and interests, building or improving features that provide a little something for everyone.” The opposite response, to the far right (+2) was characterized by “The park should focus on a narrow range of activity types and interests, building or improving features that provide a top-shelf experience for things that really match the park’s natural capacities.”

Out of the five options, 67% of respondents chose 1 or 2, favoring a narrow range of activities and interests. The mean of the answers was 0.66 with a standard deviation of 1.33.
Q3. What’s the right balance for Liberty Lake Regional Park?

Part of system vs. self-sustaining

Respondents were asked to move a slider bar (online) or mark the box (paper) that most closely matched their policy inclination, with the far left end (-2) characterized by “The park should be designed and managed as part of a larger system, developed in ways that anticipate cost-sharing by users, community groups, other agencies and Spokane County.” The opposite response, to the far right (+2) was characterized by “The park should be designed and managed to be as self-sustaining as possible, ensuring that for the most part, users cover costs of operations and maintenance.”

Responses were nearly tied on either side of this sliding scale, with 47% of respondents choosing -2 or -1 (a park that is “designed and managed as part of a larger system”) and 44% of respondents chose 1 or 2, favoring a park that is “designed and managed to be as self-sustaining as possible.” The mean of the answers was -.02 with a standard deviation of 1.37.
Q4. What’s the right balance for Liberty Lake Regional Park?

Local gem vs. true “regional” park

Respondents were asked to move a slider bar (online) or mark the box (paper) that most closely matched their policy inclination, with the far left end (-2) characterized by “The park should be improved and maintained as a local gem, with features targeting the needs of a more casual (after-work and day-trip) user base.” The opposite response, to the far right (+2) was characterized by “The park should be improved and maintained as a true ‘regional’ park, with features and programming that attract groups and users from miles away.”

Out of the five options, an overwhelming majority - 71% of respondents - chose -2 or -1, indicating the park should be “improved and maintained as a local gem.” The mean of the answers was -.78 with a standard deviation of 1.25.

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses to the policy inclination question. The bar for improved and maintained as a local gem is the highest at 36%, followed by -1 at 35%, 0 at 8%, 1 at 14%, and improved and maintained as a true “regional” park at 7%. The mean is indicated at -.78.](chart.png)
Q5. What’s the right balance for Liberty Lake Regional Park?

Nearby features vs. tight focus on features inside park boundaries

Respondents were asked to move a slider bar (online) or mark the box (paper) that most closely matched their policy inclination, with the far left end (-2) characterized by “Designs should embrace nearby features and opportunities, favoring investments that help the park become more of a ‘gateway’ or ‘hub.’ Ties to nearby features are an important priority.” The opposite response (+2) was characterized by “Park design should keep a tight focus on features and opportunities within existing park boundaries. Connecting to features outside the park would spread resources too thin.”

Out of the five options, 36% of respondents chose -2 or -1, favoring a design that helps the park “embrace nearby features and opportunities.” A greater percentage (58%) felt the park should maintain a focus on features within existing park boundaries. The mean of the answers was .32 with a standard deviation of 1.35.