



MEMORANDUM

Date: July 12, 2016

To: Park District Oversight Committee

From: David Graves, Strategic Advisor

Subject: Major Projects Challenge Fund: Staff Recommendations

Requested Committee Action

- On July 19, Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPR) staff will provide an overview of the nineteen Major Projects Challenge Fund (MPCF) proposals received and also make a recommendation as to which proposals should be funded.
- At the August 16th meeting, the Park District Oversight Committee is scheduled to deliberate and make a recommendation to the Superintendent as to which proposals should receive funding.

Staff Recommendation

SPR's staff recommendation is to fund the following proposals, allocating the first two years of the initiative funding:

Staff Recommendations: Major Projects Challenge Fund							
Proposal	Requested Amount	Match	Total Project Cost	Recommendation	2016 Allocation	2017 Allocation	Total Amount Awarded
Amy Yee Tennis Center Improvements	\$1,273,000	\$1,273,000	\$2,546,000	Award requested amount	\$600,000	\$673,000	\$1,273,000
Daybreak Star Capital Needs Assessment and Facility Improvements	\$30,000	\$0	\$3.5-4,000,000	Award requested amount for study	\$30,000	\$0	\$30,000
South Park Community Center – Playground and Playfields Renewal	\$2,315,000	\$785,500	\$3,073,000	Award \$50,000 for planning/design	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000
Kubota Garden Ornamental Walls & Gates	\$925,000	\$925,000	\$1,850,000	Award requested amount	\$500,000	\$425,000	\$925,000
Madrona Bathhouse Theater Improvements	\$50,000	\$0	TBD	Award \$40,000 for study	\$40,000	\$0	\$40,000
Magnuson Park Community Center Improvements	\$50,000	\$25,000	\$3-4,000,000	Award requested amount for study	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000
Green Lake Small Craft Center Redevelopment	\$93,300	\$46,900	\$2.5-6,000,000	Award requested amount for study	\$50,000	\$43,300	\$93,300
Magnuson Park Playfield Development Project	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000	Award \$50,000 for planning & design	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000
SUB-TOTAL					\$1,370,000	\$1,141,300	\$2,511,300
Contingency					\$82,000	\$379,500	\$461,500
SPR Staff Support					\$100,000	\$70,000	\$170,000
Contracting Allocation					\$48,000	\$49,200	\$97,200
TOTAL					\$1,600,000	\$1,640,000	\$3,240,000

Two of the eight, Amy Yee Tennis Center and Kubota Gardens are ready to proceed and are recommended for full construction funding (highlighted in green above). For the remaining 6 projects, the initial funding recommendation is for a feasibility analysis and/or planning/design work to determine the actual scope and cost of the project. It may be that some of the projects recommended for study prove infeasible or so costly that the Major Projects Challenge Fund is not the appropriate funding mechanism. Funding of the feasibility, planning and/or design work will not be a guarantee that the future project will be funded through the Major Projects Challenge Fund.

Two projects are recommended for planning funding without providing any match: Daybreak Star and Madrona Bathhouse. The awards to these projects recognize the need to assist diverse communities/organizations which may not have resources to generate matching funds.

The recommendation leaves about \$460,000 for contingency which would roll over to the next application cycle if not needed.

Project or Policy Description and Background

The Major Projects Challenge Fund is a Park District initiative in the Building for the Future category with an initial allocation of \$1.6 million in 2016 (a total of \$8.4 million during this 6-year planning cycle). The MPCF provides funding to leverage community-generated match for renovation of parks and SPR facilities.

A “major project” is loosely defined as a significant improvement or renovation to an existing SPR owned site or facility which significantly expands its life and usability, with a minimum total project cost of \$2 million. The combination of MPCF money and community-generated money will allow for projects to be accomplished throughout the city. Recognizing that all communities are not equally able to provide matching funds, the initiative allows for a portion of funding to be allocated to assist diverse communities and organizations that lack resources for a match.

Working with the Park District Oversight Committee, application review criteria were developed in the fall of 2015. The criteria emphasize equity and include an Equitable Prioritization Scoring Matrix (Attachment B) which assesses applications based on a neighborhood’s rate of:

- Children receiving free or reduced price lunch
- Residents below the poverty level
- People receiving public assistance
- Child obesity levels
- Unemployment
- Number of children in the neighborhood

These criteria were compared to the City average to yield the score. The equity scoring is combined with additional criteria (Attachment C), such as the impacts to on-going maintenance costs and community support, to determine overall project scores.

The nineteen submitted proposals were reviewed using the screening criteria and Equitable Prioritization Scoring matrix; the scoring sheet is included as Attachment A.

Public Involvement Process

Because the MPCF is for SPR facilities, outreach was primarily directed to stakeholder groups. The media campaign included posting information on the Park District website and advertising in two press releases, one in January announcing the fund and one in early March as a reminder of the deadline. After consulting with the Office of Immigrant and Refugee Affairs and reflecting on our stakeholder groups we targeted nine ethnic media outlets:

- The Facts
- The Medium
- La Raza del Noroeste
- El Mundo
- Seattle Chinese Times
- International Examiner

- NW Asian Weekly
- Seattle Globallist
- Runta

The press releases were sent to these outlets twice with a follow-up call to the editors asking that they highlight the fund.

Stakeholder outreach began with developing a list of stakeholders and working with community groups that had fostered relationships with Seattle Parks and Recreation. The two press releases were sent to the groups listed below:

- Associated Recreation Council - Advisory Councils
- Volunteers (5400)
- Department of Neighborhoods District Councilors
 - We connected with all the Department of Neighborhoods District Coordinators to be sure they knew about the fund and would help us get the word out to their community groups. We also included the information on the City Grant Portal.
- Seattle Parks and Recreation RSJI Change Team
- Parks and Green Spaces Levy Citizens Oversight Committee
- Parks Legacy Plan RSJI Outreach list
- Seattle Parks and Recreation Concessionaires – 50 people/organizations that do business in our parks.
- Seattle Parks Foundation
- City Council
- Parks and Green Spaces Levy Opportunity Fund interest (500 emails)

In addition, David Graves met with the Seattle Parks and Recreation Change Team asking for their help in promoting the MPCF to community groups.

Environmental Sustainability

The focus of the MPCF is improvements to existing SPR facilities. Individual project sustainability is a component of the proposal review.

Budget

The Park District Financial Plan includes approximately \$8.4 million for the Major Projects Challenge Fund during the initial 6-year planning cycle (2015-2020). The required community match provides additional financial support for the improvement and long-term preservation of SPR facilities and defrays potential future City spending.

Schedule

- Staff recommendation to the Park District Oversight Committee – July 19, 2016
- Park District Oversight Committee Recommendation to Superintendent – August 16, 2016
- MPCF awarded to projects – September/October 2016.

Additional Information

David Graves, david.graves@seattle.gov, ph.: 206.684.7048

Attachment A: Staff Project Scoring Recommendations

Attachment B: Equitable Prioritization Scoring

Attachment C: Scoring Criteria

Attachment A: Staff Project Scoring Recommendations

Proposal	Requested Amount	Match	Total Project Cost	Score	Notes	Staff Recommendation
Amy Yee Tennis Center Improvements	\$1,273,000	\$1,273,000	\$2,546,000	72		Award requested amount
Daybreak Star Capital Needs Assessment and Facility Improvements	\$30,000	\$0	\$3.5-4,000,000	64	Currently looking for an Executive Director although the UIATF has indicated that they have the capacity to work with SPR on the	Award requested amount to begin study work
South Park Community Center, Playground and Playfields Renewal	\$2,315,000	\$758,500	\$3,073,500	61		Award \$50K for planning/design. This project will need to coordinate with any improvements to the South Park Community Center.
Kubota Garden Ornamental Walls & Gates	\$925,000	\$925,000	\$1,850,000	61		Award requested amount
Madrona Bathhouse Theater Improvements	\$50,000	\$0	TBD	58	Needs significant ADA improvements to provide access; fundraising capacity for future capital project?	Award \$40K to begin study work
Magnuson Park Community Center Improvements	\$50,000	\$25,000	\$3-4,000,000	57		Award requested amount to begin study work
Marra-Desimone Park Natural and Farm Themed Playground and Community Gathering Space Project	\$1,686,000	\$0	\$3,406,222	54	The proposed match of \$1,720,000 is already committed SPR funds and past volunteer hours - no new dollars are provided	Defer until curent project is completed and new match secured
Green Lake Small Craft Center Redevelopment	\$93,300	\$46,900	\$2.5-6,000,000	54		Award requested amount to begin study work
Magnuson Park Playfield Development Project	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000	\$2,000,000	54	Estimate is likely too low, should start with planning/design to determine project cost and prepare construction docs	Award \$50K for planning and design
Volunteer Park Amphitheater	\$50,000	\$350,000	\$4,000,000	51	Volunteer Park Trust could undertake design work without MPCF \$; unknown match for larger capital project.	Defer until \$\$ needed for construction
Good Shepard Center Improvements - Green house, gardens & Summer House	\$40,000	\$40,000±	\$2,000,000	50	Limited usage by the general public	
Magnuson Park - Sail Sand Point Building 31 Improvements	\$50,000	\$0	\$3,000,000±	37		

Not a "Major Project" (Project cost is too low)

Garfield Community Center Improvements	\$256,000	\$0	\$256,000	48	
Westlake Park Improvements	\$1,012,000	\$120,000	\$1,000,000+	45	
Belltown Parks	\$23,700	\$0	TBD	35	Likely not "major project"
Magnuson Park Theater renovations	\$125,000	\$45,000	\$170,000	33	
Magnolia Manor Park Improvements	\$1,500,000	\$0	\$1,500,000	17	

Not on SPR property

I-5 Colonnade Improvements	\$100,000	\$540,000	\$640,000	47	In I-5 right-of-way; not a "major project"
Southwest Pool - Indoor Tennis Center Development	\$1,600,000	TBD	\$4-6,000,000±	42	On Seattle School District property



Attachment B: Equitable Prioritization Scoring

PROPOSAL SITE	TOTAL POPULATION ¹	% of POPULATION < 18	PERCENTAGE of UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS ²	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN RECEIVING FREE OR REDUCED LUNCH	RESIDENTS BELOW POVERTY LEVEL ³	PUBLIC ASSISTANCE ⁴	HEALTH ⁵ (Childhood Obesity)	UNEMPLOYMENT ⁶	SCORE
SEATTLE	637,850	15.5% / SCORE	30.5% / SCORE	38% / SCORE	13.8% / SCORE	19.2% / SCORE	13% / SCORE	6.5% / SCORE	
Amy Yee Tennis Center; 98144	27,496	17.0 / 1	51.4% / 1	30% / -1	15.6% / 1	23.6% / 1	13.8% / 1	6.7% / 1	5
Belltown Parks; 98121	12,753	2.9% / -1	31.6% / 1	-% / -	17.0% / 1	13.6% / -1	12.3% / -1	4.4% / -1	-2
Daybreak Star – Discovery Park; 98199	20,548	19.8% / 1	14.5% / -1	11% / -1	4.6% / -1	2.2% / -1	12.3% / -1	4.9% / -1	-5
Good Shephard Center; 98103	47,559	13.5% / -1	17.4% / -1	15% / -1	9.0% / -1	9.0% / -1	12.2% / -1	4.8% / -1	-7
Garfield CC; 98122	34,054	11.9% / -1	35.4% / 1	91% / 1	17.5% / 1	31.3% / 1	15.8% / 1	6.5% / -	4
Green Lake Small Craft Center; 98103	47,559	13.5% / -1	17.4% / -1	15% / -1	9.0% / -1	9.0% / -1	12.2% / -1	4.8% / -1	-7
I-5 Colonnade; 98102	22,776	5.5% / -1	18.7% / -1	31% / -1	9.8% / -1	3.5% / -1	12.2% / -1	4.6% / -1	-7
Kubota Garden; 98118	44,440	22.6% / 1	66.0% / 1	77% / 1	20.0% / 1	38.8% / 1	13.8% / 1	10.9% / 1	7
Madrona Bathhouse Theater; 98122	34,054	11.9% / -1	35.4% / 1	57% / 1	17.5% / 1	31.3% / 1	15.8% / 1	6.5% / -	4

¹ Based on 2014 data/estimates from the US Census.

² In the United States, people of color and low-income earners typically occupy the urban core and/or low-income inner ring suburbs where green space is either scarce or poorly maintained. Wealthier households often reside on the suburban periphery where greenspace is abundant, well-served, and well-maintained (Heynen, Perkins, & Roy, 2006).

³ Population 18 years and over.

⁴ Children living in households with Supplemental Security Income (SSI), cash public assistance income, or Food Stamp/SNAP benefits.

⁵ Park proximity plays an important role in promoting higher levels of park use and physical activity amongst diverse populations, particularly for youth. (NRPA, 2014)

⁶ Population 16 years and over.



Equitable Prioritization Scoring

PROPOSAL SITE	TOTAL POPULATION	% of POPULATION < 18	PERCENTAGE of UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS	ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN RECEIVING FREE OR REDUCED LUNCH	RESIDENTS BELOW POVERTY LEVEL	PUBLIC ASSISTANCE	HEALTH (Childhood Obesity)	UNEMPLOYMENT	SCORE
<i>Magnolia Manor Park; 98119</i>	23,506	11.3% / -1	17.3% / -1	11% / -1	10.2% / -1	4.2% / 1	12.3% / 1	5.1% / -1	-3
<i>Magnuson Park; 98115</i>	48,558	18.8% / 1	17.5% / -1	7% / -1	10.5% / 1	3.8% / -1	12.2% / -1	5.2% / -1	-3
<i>Marra-Desimone Park; 98108</i>	24,220	23.7% / 1	67.9% / 1	83% / 1	15.9% / 1	51.1% / 1	15.8% / 1	9.1% / 1	7
<i>South Park Community Center; 98108</i>	24,220	23.7% / 1	67.9% / 1	83% / 1	15.9% / 1	51.1% / 1	15.8% / 1	9.1% / 1	7
<i>Southwest Pool – Tennis Ctr.; 98126</i>	21,648	21.3% / 1	31.1% / 1	89% / 1	13.9% / 1	30.6% / 1	13.8% / 1	5.6% / -1	5
<i>Volunteer Park Amphitheater; 98112</i>	22,290	17.7% / 1	16.9% / -1	37% / -1	8.7% / -1	5.8% / -1	12.2% / -1	6.6% / 1	-3
<i>Westlake Park Improvements; 98101</i>	10,803	2.7% / 1	26.1% / -1	-% / -	18.7% / 1	20.3% / 1	13.8% / 1	6.1% / -1	2
Information Source	Census data (2013)	Census data (2013)	Census Data, based on Race & Ethnicity (% of non-white)	Seattle School District using zip code and elementary school in that zip code (2012-2013)	Census data (2013)	Census data (2013)	Childhood obesity index – zip code based	Census data (2013)	

Criteria Scoring:

Higher than city average = 1

Equal to city average = -

Lower than City Average = -1

Attachment C: Major Projects Challenge Fund – Scoring Criteria

MPCF Project: _____

Criteria	Possible Points	Score	Rationale
Located in an underserved and/or under represented community	20		<p>High (20 pts): Scores 6-7 on the Equitable Prioritization Criteria.</p> <p>Medium (14 pts): Scores 3-5 on the Equitable Prioritization Criteria.</p> <p>Low (7 pts): Scores 1-2 on the Equitable Prioritization Criteria.</p> <p>Zero (0 pts): Scores 0 or below on the Equitable Prioritization Criteria.</p>
Match	10-30		<p>70% match = 30 points 50% match = 20 points 30% match = 10 points</p>
Community Support	20		<p>High (20 pts): The project is consistent with a Parks & Recreation approved plan or other recent SPR planning documents such as Vegetation Management Plans, 2011 Parks Development Plan, Neighborhood Matching Fund Plan.</p> <p>Medium (14 pts): The project is identified in the City of Seattle Comprehensive Plan or in a plan adopted by the City Council such as the North Downtown Park Plan, Ballard Open Space Plan, or Livable South Downtown Planning Study.</p> <p>Low (7 pts): The project has demonstrated a high degree of neighborhood support or involvement as demonstrated through a public review process such as Letters of support from: Neighborhood or Community Council, District Council or other organization representing a neighborhood that is recognized by the City's Department of Neighborhoods.</p> <p>Zero (0 pts): The project is not consistent with any approved plans and</p>

Attachment C: Major Projects Challenge Fund – Scoring Criteria

Criteria	Possible Points	Score	Rationale
			has no documented neighborhood support.
Restoration or significantly extend the life of a current park or facility	10		<p>High (10 pts): The project repairs, replaces or upgrades aging infrastructure or facilities, extending their life at least 20 years.</p> <p>Medium (7 pts): The project repairs, replaces or upgrades aging infrastructure or facilities, extending their life at least 10 years.</p> <p>Low (3 pts): The project repairs, replaces or upgrades aging infrastructure or facilities, extending their life at least 3 years.</p> <p>Zero (0 pts) : No restoration or no extension of life of current park or facility</p>
Reduce maintenance and operation costs	10		<p>High (10 pts): No net increase in the City’s maintenance and operating costs.</p> <p>Medium (7 pts): The project increases the City’s maintenance and operating costs and a business, non-profit or existing approved community group has agreed to take on all maintenance responsibilities for a period of at least 5 years.</p> <p>Low (3 pts): The project has minor increase to the City’s maintenance and operating costs and a business, non-profit or existing approved community group has agreed to take on some maintenance responsibilities for a period of at least 5 years with a net result being reduction of maintenance costs for the Department.</p> <p>Zero (0 pts): The project will significantly increase maintenance and operating costs.</p>

Attachment C: Major Projects Challenge Fund – Scoring Criteria

Criteria	Possible Points	Score	Rationale
Community benefit	20		<p>Projects which will be used by the greater community and not just a limited audience will score higher.</p> <p>Excellent (20 pts), Very Good (17 pts), Good (14 pts), Adequate (10 pts), Questionable (6 pts), Unacceptable (0 pts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project includes meaningful effort to create community participation. • Clear community partnerships and support. • Reaches diverse audience. • Demonstrates significant impact for community served. (Cultural, Economic, Educational...etc.) • Evidence that the facility is well used by the community.
Maximum points	110		