

Department of Parks and Recreation

Seattle Board of Park Commissioners
Meeting Minutes
November 5, 2009

Web site: <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/parkboard/>
(Includes agendas and minutes from 2001-present)

Also, view Seattle Channel tapes of meetings, June 12, 2008-most current, at
<http://www.seattlechannel.org/videos/watchVideos.asp?program=Parks>

Board of Park Commissioners:

Present:

Neal Adams, Vice-chair
John Barber
Terry Holme
Donna Kostka
Jackie Ramels, Chair

Excused:

Jourdan Keith
Diana Kincaid

Seattle Parks and Recreation Staff:

Christopher Williams, Deputy Superintendent
Sandy Brooks, Coordinator

Commissioner Ramels called the meeting to order at 6:30 pm and reviewed the meeting agenda topics. **Commissioner Holme moved approval of the agenda as presented, as well as the record of correspondence received by the Board since its October 22 meeting. Commissioner Barber seconded the motion. The vote was taken, with all in favor. Motion carried.**

Commissioner Ramels noted that the Park Board has only one meeting scheduled in both November and December and has extended meeting times for both. At this time, the meetings are scheduled to begin at 6:30 pm, rather than the usual start time of 7:00 p.m.

Superintendent's Report

Superintendent Gallagher was out of town at a conference. Deputy Superintendent Christopher Williams reported on the following items. To learn more about Seattle Parks, see the website at <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/>.

Parks Staff Meet with Starbucks: Parks Executive Team met at Starbucks headquarters on Wednesday, November 4, with their customer service experts to learn about the Starbucks approach to customer service and how it might apply to Parks and Recreation. Parks staff learned:

- While Starbucks handles 4 million transactions a week, they strive to handle each customer individually;
- Starbucks mission and values are very clear at the barista level;
- Employees are empowered to make decisions;
- Interviews for employees focus on interpersonal skills – and not about the coffee;
- They don't hire seasonal help because of a three-month learning curve for new employees.

Following the meeting, the Executive Team had a good discussion about translating Starbucks' interpersonal interview approach to Parks' hiring process and will look at the Department's customer service strategy.

Mayoral Transition: Parks staff has assembled transition papers for the new mayor based on issues that need to be resolved and policy decisions. A list of imminent issues includes: Parks and Green Spaces Levy; Lake Union Park and Museum of History and Industry move to Lake Union; Magnuson Park; Gas Works Park; Downtown parks; Park Rangers; Youth Violence Prevention Initiative; and firearms in parks. A three-to-nine month issues list includes: Schools/Parks agreement; Emma Schmitz Seawall; Relocation of Parks Administration Staff; Belltown Community Center; Aquarium Transition; Special Event Permitting; Encroachments; Strategic Action Plan; Lifelong Recreation; 2010 Furloughs; Green Seattle Partnership; and Waterfront Park.

Commissioner Barber asked that the SR520 project, which will affect the Washington Park Arboretum and several other parks, be added to this list. Deputy Superintendent Williams noted that Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) is the City's lead on the SR520 project; Commissioner Barber responded that SDOT doesn't speak for the parks.

Parks to Hold Discussion with Seattle Public Utilities (SPU): Superintendent Gallagher and Deputy Superintendent Williams have scheduled a meeting with SPU leadership to discuss sediment cleanup at Gasworks Park, a mitigation process for SPU utility work on Parks property, and will argue for utility drainage credits to acknowledge the role park land plays in sequestering storm water (over a \$7 million annual benefit.)

Community Parks Program Honored: Two community groups which work closely with the Community Parks Program were honored this past week at the "2009 Community Builder Awards" presented by the Seattle Neighborhood Group: The Othello Park Alliance for their work on activating Othello Park, and the Leschi Community Council for their monthly concerts at Flo Ware Park. The awards ceremony honors the crime prevention efforts of individual volunteers and community groups to make local communities safer, and was attended by many including Deputy Police Chief/Chief of Staff Clark Kimerer.

Community Concerns re: Soundview Playfield: Deputy Superintendent Williams stated that this park has been the site of teenage girl fight clubs on Friday afternoons and other illegal behaviors. A recent community meeting was held to discuss the problems, with a high number of park neighbors in attendance. Park maintenance staff met with Seattle Police to determine which plants need to be removed to improve police sight lines into the park. Seattle Police also recommended that Parks staff prune and clear places near the tennis courts that have become hiding places. These efforts will help deter illegal activities and assist police in patrolling the site. For more information on this park, see http://www.seattle.gov/parks/park_detail.asp?ID=251.

Parks and Green Spaces Levy: Public meetings are now being scheduled for the next batch of Levy projects, namely the West Seattle and Maple Leaf reservoirs and various play area renovations. Public meetings have been held in the last few weeks for the Delridge and Genesee Park and Playfield projects. The public hearing on the proposed criteria for the Opportunity Fund has been set for November 9 before the Levy's Citizen Oversight Committee. For more information on the Levy Oversight Committee, see <http://www.seattle.gov/Parks/levy/oversight.asp>.

Commissioner Holme referred to the \$1.8 million of the Parks and Greenspaces Levy that is earmarked for a Belltown Community Center. Commissioner Barber asked if there is a deadline to spend these funds and Deputy Superintendent Williams stated there is. Commissioner Barber noted that a development at the corner of 2nd and Pine has come to a halt during the current economic situation and suggested the Department look at a public/private partnership development that would include the community center. Deputy Superintendent Williams responded that Seattle Parks Property Acquisition Manager Donald Harris is looking into this. However, \$1.8 is not a lot of funds, and it would be easier to re-locate Parks staff from the Denny Park headquarters building and renovate the building for a Belltown Community Center.

Property Donation: Parks' acquisition staff received the donation of a vacant property adjacent to Fauntleroy Park at the corner of undeveloped SW Fletcher Street and undeveloped 37th Avenue SW. The property is a great addition to the park and will complement the ongoing vegetation management plan. The donor's family originally platted the area and has fond memories of playing on Fauntleroy Creek. For more information on Fauntleroy Park, see http://www.seattle.gov/parks/park_detail.asp?ID=453.

Cyclocross Event at Lincoln Park: In 2003, Seattle Parks permitted a cyclocross event at Lincoln Park that resulted in tremendous damage to the park. Unfortunately, information was not added to the file that this event should not be re-permitted at this park. Event sponsors applied for a permit and not until five days before the event did staff realize that the event should not have been permitted at Lincoln. The Department canceled the permit and relocated the event to a park in White Center (which the City will annex in the near future.) The cyclocross event had 600 participants, and reports are that the White Center park was badly damaged. Eric Friedli, Seattle Parks Policy and Business Analysis Manager, is working to develop a use guideline for this sport and the new park classification policy will help with this.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Kostka on how the Department will ensure that cyclocross is not held at Lincoln Park in the future, Deputy Superintendent Williams answered that the information has been added to the computer files and staff are working on guidelines to determine what size event is appropriate for specific parks.

Commissioner Holme noted that November is the wettest time of the year in the Northwest and recommended that Parks staff take a seasonal approach and only permit this type of activity during dry weather. Commissioner Ramels asked if any of Seattle's parks are appropriate for cyclocross. Deputy Superintendent Williams answered that there is an area in Lower Woodland Park near the current bmx track and a cyclocross event has been scheduled there for November 15.

Commissioner Barber stated that he is very distressed to learn such an event was scheduled at Lincoln Park. For more information on Lincoln Park, see http://www.seattle.gov/parks/park_detail.asp?ID=460.

Oral Requests and Communication from the Audience

The Chair explained that this portion of the agenda is reserved for topics that have not had, or are not scheduled for, a public hearing. Speakers are limited to two minutes each and will be timed, and are asked to stand at the podium to speak. The Board's usual process is for 10 minutes of testimony to be heard at this time, with additional testimony heard after the regular agenda and just before Board of Park Commissioner's business. No one testified.

Briefing/Public Hearing: Partnership Development Policy

At its August 13 meeting, Charles Ng, Seattle Parks Grants and Concessions Manager, presented a briefing on this new policy. To read the minutes from that meeting, including the briefing paper and the Board's discussion, see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2009/08-13-09.pdf>. Tonight Mr. Ng presented an update briefing on the policy, which was followed by a public hearing. Prior to this meeting, Commissioners received an updated written briefing paper and a copy of the draft policy. Both are included in these minutes.

Written Briefing and Draft Policy

Requested Board Action

Staff is requesting the Board review and make a recommendation on the department's proposed new Partnership Development Policy, attached. The Board is scheduled to make its recommendation at the December 10 Board meeting.

Staff Recommendation

Staff is recommending that the Board approve the Partnership Development Policy at its December meeting.

Policy Description and Background

This is an update and follow-up to a briefing made to the Board on August 13th 2009 during which the Board was informed about the development of a new partnerships policy that will provide an expanded framework for the development of key partnerships with public and private entities. This policy will also provide general guidelines and procedures for department staff to use when considering and engaging in partnership development.

Responses to Board Questions

Following are responses to Board member questions and comments from the August meeting:

- The attachments provided at the August 13th meeting listing a number of contractual partners were simply a sampling of the department's active contracts. They were not meant to be a definitive list, nor addendums to the proposed policy. The Business Resources unit manages an extensive database containing information about all the department's contracts and agreements that is updated annually.
- An inventory of active contractual partners will be included in a new Partnership web page that should be available in the first quarter of 2010. This would include "Friends of" groups.
- The proposed policy was sent to current contractual partners for feedback in early October through November 4th.
- The proposed policy has been reviewed by the department's management team, the Race and Social Justice Change Team, and Recreation Division staff.

What is the project background?

In 2008, a Mayor's Office Fellow conducted best practice research and a survey of Parks staff to identify department strengths and areas of needed improvement in the development of partnerships and contract-based relationships. Some of the findings were as follows:

- Parks' partner organizations bring activity and vitality to the park system;
- Partnerships provide substantial public benefits and increase the capacity of Parks to maintain parks and facilities;
- Partnerships enable the department to offer a wider variety of programming;
- The department needs a more comprehensive, proactive and coordinated approach to partnership development to avoid confusion, duplicated efforts, and a lack of a uniform message to potential partners;
- Some informal oral agreements have led to unrealized expectations and unintended commitments that are inconsistent with Parks mission statement;
- The department must develop partnerships to increase programming and community-building opportunities for immigrant and refugee populations, and to accommodate diverse cultural, religious and language needs; the department must be able to sustain these services during good and bad economic times; and
- Staff are asking for clearer guidance that will assist them in seeking out and developing new partnerships.

Strategic Action Plan

One key goal in the department's Strategic Action Plan is Goal #6 (5) which states, the department will... "identify opportunities to partner with organizations that can more effectively provide services by leveraging

skills and resources.” The proposed Partnership Development Policy will help identify potential partners that have common goals and objectives with the department.

Public Involvement Process

The Park Board is holding a public hearing on the proposed policy on November 5 and welcoming feedback through December 10.

Issues

Staff anticipates that many of the issues will revolve around public concern over privatization or commercialization of parks and potential loss or limiting of access to park facilities. The proposed policy includes a set of criteria and filters that will ensure that any potential partnership will be consistent with department core values, be mutually beneficial and provide significant public benefits to Park users.

Environmental Sustainability

Potential new partners can provide services and programs that promote and advocate for environmental stewardship and will assist the department in implementing the city’s “green” and environment- friendly initiatives.

Budget

Current Department resources will be used to implement this process. No additional funding is requested at this time.

Additional Information

Attachment A: Proposed Partnership Policy

Charles Ng, Business Resources Manager
charles.ng@Seattle.gov
 684-8001

Draft - Department Policy & Procedure



Subject: Partnership Development		Number 060-P X-XX-10
		Effective January 1, 2010
		Supersedes
Approved:	Department: Parks & Recreation	Page 1 of 8

1. PURPOSE

1.1. The purpose of this Partnership Development Policy is to outline for staff and the public, principles and procedures to be followed as Seattle Parks and Recreation considers partnership opportunities with public and private entities to deliver department programs and services. This policy provides a framework for expanding opportunities for interested parties to engage in partnerships with Seattle Parks and Recreation that may not only involve monetary consideration but also an exchange of services that result in clear public benefits.

2. ORGANIZATIONS/INDIVIDUALS AFFECTED

- 2.1. Department of Parks and Recreation
- 2.2. Board of Park Commissioners
- 2.3. Department Advisory Councils
- 2.4. Park Neighbors
- 2.5. Current DPR Concessionaires and contracting parties
- 2.6. Potential public and private sector partners

3. POLICY

- 3.1. Seattle Parks and Recreation recognizes that developing mutually beneficial partnerships with individuals, organizations, businesses, etc. is a viable and appropriate way to expand the number and variety of parks and recreation programs available to the citizens of Seattle. Seattle Parks and Recreation will consider partnership ideas and proposals as they are brought forward and will actively pursue partnerships as deemed appropriate. It is important to evaluate these partnerships on an ongoing basis to assess effectiveness in supporting the department's core mission, achievement of desired outcomes and provision of public benefits. Although it is a key responsibility of the Partnerships and Business Resources unit to develop and manage new partnerships, all department staff will take the initiative in seeking new potential partnerships.
- 3.2. The following principles will help determine whether or not to consider a particular partnership:
 - 3.2.1. The proposed partnership is lawful and is consistent with the Seattle Parks and Recreation's core mission and values.
 - 3.2.2. The proposed partnership will help the department carry out the Strategic Action Plan. There will be no private use of public land exclusively for personal gain.
 - 3.2.3. Any partnership must include some level of clear, measurable public benefit.
 - 3.2.4. The proposed activity should not displace existing Parks, Associated Recreation Council (ARC), or other partner programs, unless pursuing the proposed activity allows Parks to reallocate current resources to new programs and services.
 - 3.2.5. Special encouragement and support ought to be given to partnerships with non-traditional partners, i.e. immigrant populations, diverse populations, etc. or that increase the department's ability to serve these populations. The proposed activity should not adversely impact and/or restrict public access to a park facility or programs.
 - 3.2.6. The proposed activity and partnership agreement meets all city, state, and federal rules and regulations, including securing a valid City Business license, purchasing adequate insurance that names the City of Seattle additionally insured.
- 3.3. Seattle Parks and Recreation shall take appropriate action(s) to recognize those partners that it has entered into contractual relationships with and such relationships have resulted in measurable public benefits.

4. DEFINITIONS

- 4.1. Partnership - a working relationship with another organization that has compatible values and goals and which results in mutual benefits. It may or may not be subject to a formal written agreement. The partnership may be formed around a single activity or event or it may be long-term and multi-faceted.
- 4.2. Partner - an individual or organization who, through a written or verbal agreement, provides a benefit to Seattle Parks and Recreation or Seattle's citizens and in exchange gets some benefit from Seattle Parks and Recreation. These may include:
 - 4.1.1 Individuals who can provide services, money, or time.
 - 4.1.2 Businesses or corporations who provide money, time, people, and other goods or services.
 - 4.1.3 Social service or community partners people or services.
 - 4.1.4 Non-profit partnership similar to social service or community partners.

4.1.5 Volunteer/neighborhood partnerships—park sponsored volunteer opportunities and “Friends of” groups who provide volunteer time, money, and other resources.

4.3. Partnership Agreement – a written agreement memorializing a partnership that may or may not be legally binding.

4.4. Contractual Partnership – a partnership that has been memorialized through a legally binding contract such as a lease or memorandum of agreement.

5. RESPONSIBILITY

5.1. Partnerships and Business Resources will be available to help staff review and assess desirability of potential contract and agreements with public and private entities.

5.2. Seattle Parks and Recreation staff shall submit those potential Partnership opportunities that exceed the delegated authority of divisions for entering into contracts and agreements, to the Partnerships Manager for review and approval prior to implementation.

5.3. Seattle Board of Park Commissioners review proposed Partnerships expected to last over one year or that have a significant change to the use or activity in a park.

5.4. City Attorney review templates for recurring Contractual Partnerships or unique language for non-recurring Contractual Partnerships.

6.0 PROCEDURE

6.1 Parks staff when considering entering contracts with potential partners shall:

6.1.1 Review and complete the attached “Partnership Criteria and Assessment Checklist” and submit it to their immediate supervisor.

6.1.2 Review Policies 060-P3.9.1 and 3.9.1.1 and follow them as appropriate.

6.1.3 Partnerships and Business Resources staff will be available to assist department staff in negotiating and writing the MOA, contract or other type of partnerships agreement.

6.1.4 Staff will consult with the Partnership Manager early in the consideration of a Partnership where there is some degree of exchange of services in lieu of a financial commitment of the parties.

7.0 REFERENCES

7.1 Number 060-P 3.9.1 Department Policy & Procedure-- Concession Contracts and Use Permits.

7.2 Number 060-P 3.9.1.1 Concession Contracts: Public Participation In Request for Proposal.

7.3 Number 060-P 1.5.1 Corporate Sponsorship Policy.

8.0 APPENDICES

8.1 Partnership Criteria and Assessment Checklist.

PARTNERSHIP CRITERIA AND ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

1. General Process

1. Prepare proposal summary—one page description of proposed program/services. Conduct pre-implementation assessment. Use key analytical questions to decide to:

- a. Terminate consideration of proposal
- b. Proceed with consideration of proposal
- c. Proceed with implementation of proposed partnership program/services.

2. Conduct implementation and post implementation assessment of partnership programs/services – Use key analytical questions to:

- a. Decide to terminate partnership programs/activities
- b. Decide to continue partnership programs/services

2. Pre-implementation assessment

Key Analytical Questions

Question	Summary response	Go/No-go	
Relationship to DPR mission and Strategic Action Plan			
Consistency with existing DPR policies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • list relevant policies, i.e., Department Use Management Guidelines, Seattle Department Park Codes, SMC 18.10, Public Involvement Policy/Process- Concession policy, Naming, donation, etc. 			
Impact on access to the public: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. increased cost b. decreased operating hours c. location suitability d. Equity/RSJ issues-- decreased/increased access by diverse/populations e. increased traffic or reduced available neighborhood parking f. impact on existing programming—will it expand or decrease programming? 			
Timing of implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there adequate time to plan the proposed programs/services? 			
Cost analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • staff costs • supplies costs/O & M costs • revenue generated • fees • accounting feasibility • customer base • site suitability to physically support proposed enterprise • If site is a building structure, is it up to code to support proposal? • Impact on staff? 			
Benefits of proposal— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expand existing programs/services • Increase quality of use— 			

safer, better conditions/more amenities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase diversity of use • Increase department revenues • Improve management • Increase Cost efficiency • Improve facilities • Leverage existing resources • Others? 			
Public support or reaction— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will this proposal cause controversy? • What Public involvement engagement process is needed? • How will this be marketed and communicated? • What process is in place to receive public feedback? Can it be measured? How? 			
Mayoral, City Council, and law department consideration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will this proposal require review and approval 			

3. Pros and Cons:

Pros	Cons:

3. Implementation Assessment

Performance measures

1. Was the Proposal in accordance with department policies-- followed the proposed schedule, achieved expected outcomes, and managed effectively?

- Were required contracts with potential partner/sponsor (s) executed, including all required documentation, prior to actual implementation?
- Did implementation of the proposal occur in the expected number of department facilities (i.e., for banners at indoor pools-- at least 5 out of 7 indoor pools)?
- Was the proposal implemented on time?
- Was the proposal implemented in a way that made the best use of existing resources?
- Was there a clear point person established to monitor this program and interact with potential partner/sponsor?
- Were there management tools in place to track revenues and expenses?
- Were there effective communication tools in place to inform, coordinate and disseminate information about the status of the project and facilitate action items that are needed to resolve issues as they come up?
- Were the terms and conditions of the agreement between the potential partner/sponsor and parks met and to the satisfaction of both parties?

- Were expected benefits realized?
2. New earned income.
 - Did this proposal bring in new income to the dept. not previously received?
 - Did this proposal achieve revenue and expense reduction expectations?
 3. Positive cost recovery.
 - Did the proposal result in more income than the cost of implementation? What were the costs associated with implementation?
 - What were the costs associated with operation?
 - Was there any new maintenance costs associated with implementation?
 4. Public feedback.
 - What level of public feedback has been received? (i.e., complaint boxes, recreation coordinators' feedback, informal survey, etc.)
 - Are the majority of users/ participants satisfied with the partnership program/services, or gave no substantial negative feedback?
 - Have overall expectation and goals of dept. staff been satisfied?

Recommendation/next step.

Discontinue partnership program/services
 Continue with partnership program/services.

Verbal Briefing/Discussion

Charles Ng, Parks Concessions and Grants Manager, introduced himself. Mr. Ng first briefed the Board on the New Partnership Policy at the August 13, 2009, meeting where Commissioners made a number of suggestions to the policy. Mr. Ng has incorporated many of those comments into this latest draft. He also distributed the draft policy to the Department's current 80 or so contractual partners for comments. Five partners commented that the policy "looks good."

Questions and Answers

Commissioner Ramels clarified that Commissioners may e-mail small changes to Mr. Ng until December 9. The Board plans to discuss the policy and make a recommendation to the Superintendent the following day, at its December 10 meeting. Commissioners voiced the following comments/suggestions:

Commissioner Adams

- Complimented the policy and likes how it has come together. He has several minor suggestions on the policy itself.
- Referred to Section 3.2.6 and recommended that the policy not call out one-two particular groups and that the "i.e." and "etc." be removed.
- Asked how rigorously the words partner/partnerships were discussed, as the use of these two words seems inconsistent to him. He noted that in Section 5.1 "Partnerships" is the name of Mr. Ng's work unit, while it has a different meaning in other sections of the policy. He suggested staff look again at these two words to ensure their use and meaning is consistent throughout the policy.
- Believes it is critical for the checklist to be consistent, with clear instructions, so various people will fill out the forms the same way. Mr. Ng noted that a number of internal staff reviewed the checklist during the development of the policy.

Commissioner Barber

- Requested that "park users" be added as 2.7 under Organizations/Individuals Affected.

- Asked why the Department would even consider a partnership if it will not result in a significant benefit to parks.
- Asked for clarification on 3.2.2 "*The proposed partnership will help the department carry out the Strategic Action Plan.*" He believes this language is too vague and that each partnership should show clearly where it fits into the SAP. Deputy Superintendent Williams responded that the partnership policy itself is a significant part of the SAP.
- Asked if there has been any discussion on threshold requirements or requirements for further review of this policy. Mr. Ng responded that this is intended to be a broad, rather than limiting, policy and is not intended as a threshold. If the policy is implemented, staff will evaluate it at the end of the first year.
- Recommended expanding the language of 3.2.7 "*The proposed activity should not adversely impact and/or restrict public access to a park facility or programs.*" to include "or adversely affect the property." If a partnership is no longer fulfilling its function, the contract should not be renewed.
- Recommended that Parks staff reach out to a new population and he believes this can be done with a concerted effort. He attended a recent meeting at High Point Community Center with the Superintendent that had a very successful mix of new populations who attended the meeting.

Commissioner Holme

- Expressed the concern that, while the Arboretum Foundation and Seattle Park Foundation are partners, the provisions of this policy are not applicable to these two organizations. In the interest of avoiding confusion, he requested that these two organizations be specifically excluded from this policy, and Deputy Superintendent Williams concurred.
- Understands the policy as implying that some applications will be rejected. Add policy language that describes an applicants' recourse following a partnership rejection.

Commissioner Kostka

- Asked how Section 5.3 "*Seattle Board of Park Commissioners review proposed Partnerships expected to last over one year or that have a significant change to the use or activity in a park*" will affect the Board's workload. Mr. Ng expects to bring 4-5 mutually beneficial contracts, requiring City Council legislation, before the Board for review. Deputy Superintendent Williams noted that the Department historically has brought all change of uses of a park to the Board for its consideration.
- Recommended that language describing the renewal process be included in the policy to make contract renewals easier.

Commissioner Ramels

- Asked how the policy will impact the Department 10 years from now. Mr. Ng responded that he foresees a core list of partners that share the same values as Parks. These partners would be of help to the Department during tough economic times. He envisions new partners from emerging communities such as East African, Iraqi, other immigrant communities, and refugees.
- Asked how the policy will impact Parks structure and staff and whether the unions will protect Parks staff from being negatively impacted by this policy. Mr. Ng answered that full implementation of the policy will require some additional staffing levels and that the policy is not designed to supplant any of Parks' current staff. Deputy Superintendent Williams added that the Department must tread lightly, as the policy is not meant to displace the work that staff members currently perform; however, the Department desperately needs new partnerships.

The public hearing began. The Chair reminded the audience that speakers have up to two minutes to testify and will be timed. No one testified.

The Board plans to discuss the policy and make a recommendation to the Superintendent at the December 10 meeting.

Briefing/~~Public Hearing~~: Fees and Charges Policy

Eric Friedli, Seattle Parks' Policy and Business Analysis Manager, presented a briefing on the Fees and Charges Policy. Prior to this meeting, Commissioners received a written briefing which was posted on the Board's web page and is included in these minutes.

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

The Board is being requested to gather public feedback through this public hearing on fee setting policies and price setting strategies. Staff is interested in initial comments, concerns and suggestion on what information ought to be considered as Parks reviews our approach to fees and charges. The Board will be asked for its formal feedback in December.

Background

The Board was provided an initial briefing on this topic on September 10, 2009. Since that time staff has begun a pilot project using the aquatics program to consider ways to assess 1) what costs ought to be in a cost recovery model and 2) alternative ways to define various levels of community and individual benefit.

The lack of existing policy guidance for setting fees is recognized in Parks and Recreation's Strategic Action Plan (SAP), which calls for an evaluation of fees and charges policies for programs and services (Goal 6.D.1i-v). Specifically it calls on Parks and Recreation to "evaluate current fee structures and establish fee policies that consider equity, cost recovery, consistency, and clear understanding for the public" (Goal 6.D.1).

In fall 2008, the Seattle City Council adopted a Statement of Legislative Intent stating that it "intends to review the Department of Parks and Recreation's (DPR) fee setting policies in 2009 to ensure DPR's fee setting policies are consistent and equitable when DPR submits its next fee ordinance in 2011." Through the SLI, the Council asks Parks to provide certain information by July 1, 2009. That information includes:

- 1) "Criteria DPR uses to determine fee increases or decreases;
- 2) The potential for congestion pricing of athletic facilities rentals, including athletic fields, to better manage demand;
- 3) DPR's cost recovery goals for various fee-supported program[s]; and
- 4) An explanation and rationale for how DPR balances cost recovery with affordability."

In response to the SLI and the SAP, Parks developed the attached review of fees and charges and policy proposal. This document has not changed since the September 10 briefing and is presented here for general public review (Attachment 1).

Purpose

The objective of developing a fees and charges policy is to establish a consistent and equitable framework for setting prices for parks and recreation programs, services and facility use that recognizes the trade-offs between community benefits and individual benefits.

Parks has developed a possible approach to this policy that is in two parts -- Cost Recovery Goals and Price Setting Protocols. The attached review and policy outline is at the policy level and does not address specific fees or charges such as congestion pricing of athletic fields. We anticipate moving into that level of detail after considering the policy framework and as fees come up for revision in the 2011-12 biennial budget.

One of the significant challenges is determining program costs for fee based programs, which is a critical component for measuring cost recovery and useful in discussing fee setting policies. Having cost data directly linked to specific programs would be beneficial to understanding what cost recovery goals, if any, would be appropriate for specific programs or facilities. Unfortunately we do not have that data available and no systems in place to collect it at this time. Our Strategic Action Plan recognized this deficiency and calls on Parks to rectify it. Parks is moving towards having cost data in sufficient detail and organized in a way that

will allow us to determine program costs. We have developed a system that is currently being tested through which our staff can easily record what work task they are doing at which facility. Many of our parks maintenance staff are already using this system. As we expand its use to recreation program and administrative staff over the next 1-2 years we will be able to easily determine program costs. Until that system is fully implemented we can use existing information to estimate program costs for generalized program categories such as pools and community centers.

The lack of detailed programs costs should not preclude us from having a discussion about the process and rationale for setting fees. Engaging in a discussion now, prior to a lot of detailed data analysis, allows us to understand what issues and concerns community members may have early in our thought process which is Parks purpose for engaging in his discussion now.

Next Steps

- Conduct a case study using the aquatics program to assess various methods for computing cost recovery and various ways to determine community benefit programs – by end of 2009.
- Propose goals and protocols for developing fees and charges – 1st quarter 2010.
- Use the proposed goals and protocols to develop fees and charges in 2010 for the 2011/2012 budget process. We do not plan to undertake a complete revision to our fees and charges, but to use the goals and protocols as fees and charges are revised, removed, or newly implemented.
- Assess the utility of the Goals and Protocols for setting fees after the 2011/2012 budget process is complete in 2010.
- Refine goals and protocols as appropriate in 2011.

Additional Information

Eric Friedli: eric.friedli@seattle.gov; 684-8369

ATTACHMENT 1

SEATTLE PARKS AND RECREATION
 FEES AND CHARGES REVIEW
 2009

1) INTRODUCTION..... 14

2) BACKGROUND..... 14

3) BEST PRACTICES RESEARCH 15

4) FEE POLICY AND PRICE SETTING OPTIONS 17

5) COST RECOVERY GOALS 20

6) PRICE SETTING PROTOCOLS..... 21

7) SUMMARY: COST RECOVERY GOAL AND PRICE SETTING PROTOCOLS... 22

SEATTLE PARKS AND RECREATION
FEES AND CHARGES REVIEW

1. Introduction

Fees and charges are necessary to provide financial support to Seattle Parks and Recreation (Parks) for the operation and maintenance of programs, facilities, and park grounds. The revenue generated by these fees constitutes only a portion of funds required for operating and maintaining the park system. There has not been a comprehensive, public review of Parks' fees and charges in recent memory. The purpose of this review and report is to:

- 1) Review Parks' current fee setting process and policies.
- 2) Consider best practices from other park systems.
- 3) Propose a set of fee policies for Parks.

a) Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI)

In fall 2008, the Seattle City Council adopted a statement of legislative intent stating that they "intend to review the Department of Parks and Recreation's (DPR) fee setting policies in 2009 to ensure DPR's fee setting policies are consistent and equitable when DPR submits its next fee ordinance in 2011." Through the SLI, the Council asks Parks to provide certain information by July 1, 2009. That information includes:

- 5) "Criteria DPR uses to determine fee increases or decrease;
- 6) The potential for congestion pricing of athletic facilities rentals, including athletic fields, to better manage demand;
- 7) DPR's cost recovery goals for various fee-supported program[s]; and
- 8) An explanation and rationale for how DPR balances cost recovery with affordability."

b) Strategic Action Plan (SAP)

In September 2008, Parks completed its six-year Strategic Action Plan (SAP): 2009-2013. The plan outlines an action-oriented work program to guide the department over the life of the plan. Parks developed the SAP through a series of meetings and work sessions with citizens, Parks staff, and elected officials. One of the six key goal areas outlined in the plan is to "strengthen organizational systems and structures." Within that broad goal area the plan calls for an "evaluat[ion] of fees and charges policies for programs and services" (Goal 6.D.1i-v). Specifically it calls on Parks to "evaluate current fee structures and establish fee policies that consider equity, cost recovery, consistency, and clear understanding for the public" (Goal 6.D.1).

c) Current Revenue from Fees

In 2008 Seattle Parks and Recreation collected \$46.6 million from its various fees and charges. This accounted for 38.1% of the department's total expenditures. While department-wide we recover 38.1% of our costs from fees there is substantial variability across program areas. Golf and the Seattle Aquarium recover approximately 115% and 100% of their operating costs respectively. The Recreation Division recovers approximately 26% of its direct costs, but a simple calculation doesn't reflect many indirect costs that are shared across the department such as accounting, human resources, etc. The discussion below outlines many of the complications inherent in calculating cost recovery information.

2. Background

a) Legal Context

Fees and charges are necessary to provide financial support to Parks for the operation and maintenance of programs, facilities, and park grounds. The revenue generated by these fees constitutes only a portion of funds required for operating and maintaining the park system. All fees collected from park and recreation activities and concessions are used exclusively for park purposes, as these funds are deposited in the Park and Recreation Fund, not the City General Fund, per Article XI, Section 3 of the City Charter.

i) Fees and Charges Ordinance

Parks proposes fees and charges each year as a part of the city's budget process. Both the Mayor and City Council review and, by ordinance, authorize Parks to collect these fees and charges. The Park and Recreation Fee Schedule lists each fee and charge Parks is authorized to collect and is adopted by ordinance and published each year. Addendum 1 lists the categories of fees and charges. The full Fees and Charges Schedule can be viewed at <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/reservations/feesandcharges/contents.htm>.

In addition to the fees and charges identified in the adopted Schedule, the user may be required to pay additional non-Departmental fees, Parks costs resulting from user's use, and/or a reasonable portion of the City's costs for traffic control and police services when the user's event requires them. Some fees and charges are set by partnering agencies, and are not published in the City's Fees and Charges Schedule, i.e. the Association of Recreation Councils (ARC) which offers programs at park-owned facilities.

ii) New, Experimental and Promotional Fees and Charges

The Parks Superintendent is authorized to establish a fee for requested uses not included in this Schedule, keeping the Mayor and the City Council advised thereof.

The Superintendent is authorized, as provided in SMC Chapter 18.28, to establish experimental rates, and to engage in special promotional and marketing activities to enhance Parks programs. These include, but are not limited to, use of 2-for-1 coupons, 50% discount coupons, and free admission days for children. Discounts for senior adults (age 65 and older) vary by program. These types of activities may occur at various Parks facilities throughout the year.

iii) Fees and Charges Waivers/Reduction Authority

The Superintendent is authorized, as provided in Seattle Municipal Code (SMC) Chapter 18.28, to waive or reduce any fees in the Schedule. The Superintendent is authorized, as provided in SMC Chapters 18.04 and 18.28, to approve the free use of Parks facilities by the Associated Recreation Council, recognized recreation advisory councils, and reduce fees for other organizations that are open to the public, that further Parks goals and programs, and that apply any proceeds to Parks services.

b) Fees and Charges Setting Process

Proposals for new fees and charges or changes to existing fees and charges are typically developed by Parks program staff in cooperation with Parks and Recreation finance and administration staff. The Superintendent reviews proposals and determines if they should be proposed to the City Department of Finance (DOF) and the Mayor. After review by DOF and a decision by the Mayor to support a new fee or change to an existing fee, the proposal is submitted to the City Council in the Fee Ordinance as part of the Mayor's budget proposal. If the City Council adopts a new fee or changes an existing fee, that change is reflected in the Fees and Charges Schedule.

There are more than 275 different fees and charges listed in the Schedule. Diverse uses such as birthday parties at swimming pools, Camp Long cabin rentals, and commercial photography are each assigned different fees.

Fees are recommended by Parks and the Mayor and adopted by the City Council using a variety of criteria that are not consistent across fees, not based on clearly spelled out policy, and not easily articulated to the public. Fees are reported by Parks staff to be based on cost recovery, the marketplace, and revenue generation goals.

3. Best Practices Research

Park and recreation agencies across the country collect fees and charges for services. No park and recreation agency has been found that does not charge some type of fee for selected services. There is no overall consistent method established for identifying uses for which to charge fees, or for determining what fees to charge. Other jurisdictions take various approaches to addressing equity and access, and vary in their use of

cost recovery and allocation in fee setting. Market factors only appear to be important in relation to commercial activities allowed on publicly owned parks property.

a) Pros and Cons

Park and recreation agencies historically did not collect fees, and some park and recreation professionals still believe that few or no fees should be charged. Park and recreation facilities have been viewed as basic services that ought to be provided free of charge. The economic reality has altered that stance, and fees are now common practice.

Arguments against fees include:

- 1) Parks and park and recreation services meet a basic human need;
- 2) Park agencies provide services to those who often cannot afford any alternative;
- 3) It looks like double taxation to charge for something that tax dollars already support; and,
- 4) Charging fees makes the programs and facilities appear more commercial and driven by a profit motive.

Arguments in support of fees include:

- 1) Fees provide some amount of cost recovery for providing the facility or service;
- 2) Revenue can be used to enhance the facility or program;
- 3) Fees can be used to spread the use of the facility or program to avoid congestion;
- 4) Fees are paid by those directly benefiting from the service; and,
- 5) Fees alleviate competition with the private sector that may be impacted by free public competition (Kelsey and DeFillipo, 2007; Loomis and Walsh 1997).
- 6) Fees – even small ones -- tend to make people value a program or service more than if it is free.

The enabling legislation for the Land and Water Conservation Fund allows for fees as long as they are consistent with:

- 1) The public policy or interest served by the agency;
- 2) The direct and indirect costs to the government and the general public;
- 3) The benefits to users and the general public;
- 4) Comparable prices charged by private, other federal and non-federal public agencies;
- 5) The economic and administrative feasibility of fee collection; and
- 6) Other pertinent matters such as effects on public health and safety (Loomis and Walsh, 1997 p.321).

b) Other Jurisdictions

There is a wide variety of approaches taken by other jurisdictions in setting fees. Most jurisdictions appear to have a wide range of fees and no set policy for how those fees should be set. Typically, staff develops fee proposals; some are reviewed by a citizens' Board of Park Commissioners and then approved by an elected City Council. In some instances the City Council has delegated authority for setting fees to the Department. A few jurisdictions have established goals for recovering costs through fees and charges collected by their park and recreation agencies. We have not found a jurisdiction that has a comprehensive policy for setting fees and charges.

The following summary is not intended to be exhaustive, but to highlight interesting examples of different approaches to fees and charges.

In Everett, the City Council adopted their Parks Department's Cost Benefit Policy in 2007; it included policy direction to set fees to achieve a 35% cost recovery by 2012 and stated that fees ought to be lower for uses that provide community benefits and higher for uses that provide individual benefits. The Department is

authorized to set fees after consultation with the Parks Board of Commissioners and notifying the City Council. They are authorized to set resident and non-resident fees and prime and non-prime time fees.

Spokane has developed a Cost Recovery Policy that establishes cost recovery goals for various types of programs ranging from 25% for aquatic programs to 185% for personal interest programs. The Spokane Board of Park Commissioners reviews fees proposed by staff.

The Portland, OR City Council adopted its Parks and Recreation cost recovery goals in 2004, establishing cost recovery goals for direct and total cost recovery and varying it based on the income level of the neighborhood surrounding the facility. Portland City Council established cost recovery goals of 100% for adults, 42% generally for youth and 23% for youth use of facilities in low income neighborhoods. For example, Portland calculated the athletic field use fees by calculating the total maintenance costs and dividing by the schedulable hours for four types of fields in their system (<http://www.portlandonline.com/parks/index.cfm?c=39174&a=176616>).

Chicago recently set seven different price levels for its day camp programs based on the income level of its neighborhoods. It assessed all 270 parks that independently set prices and hours for their day camps. Seven price points were established and each park was assigned a price it could charge for its day camp programs. The result is a consistent and equitable pricing system.

College Station, TX set fee policies for various activities, differentiating between youth and adult programs. Adult fees are designed to recover the costs of maintaining and operating facilities, while youth fees are not. College Station also assesses rental fees to cover all costs and pool admission fees to cover 50% of the pool operating expenses.

Clark County, NV and Walla Walla, WA have fees and charges policies that are non-specific but generally differentiate between commercial and non-commercial activities, and accommodate users' ability to pay through scholarships and waivers.

In San Jose, CA the parks, recreation and neighborhood services department is in the midst of a process to develop a 5-year pricing and revenue plan. Facing challenging budget times they are looking to develop a sustainable and fair pricing plan. They are considering pricing methods including prime time pricing, seasonal variations, benefits based pricing, length of stay and scholarships. Similar to Everett, San Jose is looking at pricing based levels of public versus private benefit associated with each program (<http://sanjoseca.gov/prns/pricing%2Drevenue/default.asp>).

Fee Policy and Price Setting Options

There are a variety of methods that may be used to set prices. More important than the method used to establish a final price is understanding why charging a fee is appropriate in the first place. We first look at various policy parameters to be considered when deciding to establish or extend a fee or charge and then we identify various options for setting prices.

c) Fee Policy Options

There are multiple purposes for charging fees, including generating revenue, making reservations and maintaining control over Parks operated sites and facilities. Park and recreation facilities and services are, in most jurisdictions, supported to some extent by general tax revenues. Given that general tax revenues are collected from the community as a whole and allocated to support park and recreation facilities and programs, there is a reasonable expectation on the part of citizens that they will be provided some level of service at no charge.

The tax revenues used to support programs can be viewed as the measure of the community benefit associated with that program. The fees paid by individuals for a program measure the individual benefit associated with a program. The combination of the community benefit (taxes) and the individual benefit

(fees) is the overall benefit of a program. If a program does not provide enough community benefit to warrant tax support, and it does not benefit individuals enough that they are willing to pay fees to support it, then the program ought not to exist. It is the trade-off between community benefit and individual benefit that, while difficult, is important to assess.

For example, the community sees a benefit to having pools and community centers -- as demonstrated by numerous votes to tax themselves for the construction and renovation of community centers. There is a great deal of community benefit in the existence of pools and community centers. Overall, we would not expect these facilities to be fully supported by fees and charges.

Within the community centers and pools, however, there are programs that benefit individuals at different levels. There is community benefit to have people know how to swim and to have access to pools for health and fitness activities. Individuals benefit personally through improved health and increased quality of life.

Competitive swim teams provide a great deal of benefit to the individuals who participate, but provide much less benefit to the overall community. Use of the pool or community center room for a retirement party is solely for the benefit of the individual since the rest of public is excluded.

These different types of use and activity demonstrate the range of benefits between community and individual. People using the pools to learn to swim would pay lower percentage of the cost of operating the pool while people participating in swim team or having retirement party would be expected to pay a much higher percentage of the operating costs.

As indicated above, the Cities of Everett and San Jose have both recognized this and provide a useful framework. San Jose distinguishes between public services, merit services, and private services. Everett has adopted a five level classification system of highly individual, mostly individual, individual/community, community/individual, community benefit.

i) Community Benefit or Public Services

These are services that provide to the public generally without restriction and/or benefit the general public equally. Open park land, open community centers, playgrounds, and trails are examples of public services for which NO FEE would be charged. Everett has established a cost recovery goal of 0-25% for programs that fall in this category; San Jose is considering 0 – 20%.

ii) Community/Individual

This category includes programs and facilities that have some benefit exclusive to individuals or individual organizations, but also has significant benefit to the community and general public. These include special events, youth recreation leagues, children's and youth classes, youth drop-in activities, youth theater programs, and many programs for seniors and people with disabilities. Everett has established a cost recovery goal of 25 - 50% for programs that fall in this category.

iii) Individual/Community or Merit Services

The programs and facilities that fall into this classification have strong benefits to both the community and the individual person or organization. Swim lessons, after school programs, adult drop-in programs, advanced youth programs, adult theater programs, facility rentals by non-profits for fee-based programs open to the public, and introductory adult programs. Everett has established a cost recovery goal of 50 - 75% for programs that fall in this category. San Jose is considering 20 – 90%.

iv) Mostly Individual

As the title suggests, this category encompasses those programs and facilities that provide some level of benefit to the general community but most of the benefit is accrued to the individual. This would include

intermediate and advanced adult classes, and adult recreation leagues. Everett has established a cost recovery goal of 75% and 100% for programs that fall in this category.

v) Highly Individual or Private Services

These include programs and facility uses that have minuscule or no benefits for the general public, and are for the almost exclusive benefit of the individual. These include room rentals for private parties, elite youth and adult sports, private instruction, facility rentals by for-profits for fee based programs, golf, and boat launch. Everett has established a cost recovery goal of 100 – 125% for programs that fall in this category. San Jose is considering 90 - 125%.

d) Price Setting Options

Once a decision is made on whether to charge a fee, and there is a determination about how that fee ought to be weighed -- in view of the program's or facility's benefit to the community or individual, then there are myriad ways to set the price for that program or facility.

i) NO FEE

Some programs and facilities may be identified as not warranting fee or charges of any type. The community benefit is so significant that consideration of fees is not warranted.

ii) Demand (Peak Load) Pricing

Prices are set to be higher during times of peak demand and use.

iii) Market Based (Comparative Rate) pricing

A scientific survey is conducted of competitive businesses, and the price is set based on what others in the marketplace are charging. It may be based on all other recreation service providers, or just on those of other public parks and recreation agencies.

iv) Loyalty Program

This price would reward frequent facility or program users by offering a reduced rate or "volume buying" discount.

v) Full Cost Recovery

This would require a calculation of the full cost of providing a service or facility and setting prices to recover those costs averaged across the anticipated users. Full cost recovery would include the cost of the capital outlays to construct and maintain the facility, the indirect administrative costs for operating and maintaining the facility (offsite management, accounting, purchasing systems, etc.), and the direct costs associated with the program or facility (on-site instructors, utilities, maintenance, etc.).

- 1) Direct costs: Fees would be set to recover the direct costs associated with the program or facility. For example, this could be the actual cost of the instructor and supplies required for the program.
- 2) Indirect Operation Costs Included: In addition to the "Direct Costs" noted above, this would include overhead expenses such as custodial and utilities. These are daily costs required to keep the doors open. NOTE: This could be used in a calculation of value of use as part of the exchange of services with Seattle Public Schools.
- 3) Capital costs: Costs associated with the construction and long-term maintenance of a facility would be included in full cost recovery.

vi) Partial Cost Recovery

This could mean anything less than full cost recovery. Costs would be calculated and prices set to recover a certain subset of costs.

- 1) Direct costs only: Fees would be set to recover only the direct costs associated with the program or facility.
- 2) Indirect Operation Costs Included: Some types or level of indirect costs may be included in partial cost recovery.
- 3) No capital costs: Costs associated with the construction and long-term maintenance of a facility would be excluded from the fee setting method.

vii) Social Benefit (Differential) Pricing

Prices are set differentially based on a set of social goals. For example:

- 1) Participant group: Lower fees for youth and senior citizens, higher for young adults.
- 2) Commercial enterprise status: Lower fees for non-profit entities, higher for for-profits.
- 3) Location of program or facility: Lower fees for people in low income neighborhoods, higher in high income neighborhoods.

viii) Tradition Pricing

Prices are set based on tradition and historic precedent.

ix) Ability to make coin change

Frequently fees are set to allow the cashier to make coin change with few errors and increased speed. For example, at swimming pools, all fees are divisible by \$.25. This allows for speed in transactions which is critical when 100 people are all trying to pay for a one hour swim. The lockers at pools accept quarters so this is an ongoing source of change for basic operations.

x) Applying pricing research theories

Learning Resources Network is one of a number of professional research sources that has studied pricing. For example, they concluded that when a fee is \$49 or \$51 there is a greater trust in the accuracy of these numbers. When a fee is \$50, customers tend to feel this is an inflated figure and are less likely to pay.

xi) Scholarship/Discount Pricing Option

Prices are set based on Full Recovery or are market driven, yet scholarships or discounts are available to citizens who need reduced pricing alternatives. Parks currently has in place mechanisms for reviewing and determining the appropriateness of reducing fees. This process recognizes that for some programs or facilities, the uses benefit primarily an individual. However there is a community benefit to giving access to the program or facility to those who may not be able to afford its cost. In those instances a process for awarding a scholarship or offering a discount price is appropriate.

- a. Scholarship (for example, day care fees)
- b. Reduced prices (for example, golf youth fees)
- c. Fee reduction (for example, facility use for community groups)

4. Cost Recovery Goals

Cost Recovery Goals have been developed in order to establish a clear and shared framework for discussing and developing prices for parks and recreation programs, services, and facility use that recognizes the trade-offs between community benefits and individual benefits. These Goals are expected to be applied, in conjunction with the Price Setting Protocols, to guide settings fees.

Each cost recovery goal is to be applied to major facilities (pools, community centers); specific programs (drop-in basketball, environmental learning center classes); and facility uses (weddings, special facility rentals). Costs should include full direct and indirect costs.

a) Community Benefit or Public Services

- Cost recovery goal: 0 - 25%.

b) Community/Individual

- Cost recovery goal: 20 - 50%.

c) Individual/Community or Merit Services

- Cost recovery goal: 40 - 80%.

d) Mostly Individual

- Cost recovery goal: 75 - 110%.

e) Highly Individual or Private Services

- Cost recovery goal: 90 - 125%.

5. Price Setting Protocols

Price Setting Protocols have been developed to provide: 1) guidance for staff in developing price proposals, and 2) a mechanism for decision-makers to use in understanding, reviewing and adopting prices.

a) Community Benefit or Public Services

Price setting to be based on:

- NO FEE program or facility
- partial cost recovery,
- social benefit,
- scholarship/discount, and
- tradition pricing

b) Community/Individual

Price setting to be based on:

- partial cost recovery,
- social benefit,
- scholarship/discount, and
- tradition pricing

c) Individual/Community or Merit Services

Price setting to be based on:

- partial cost recovery,
- social benefit,
- scholarship/discount,
- tradition pricing,
- peak pricing,
- demand (peak load) pricing

d) Mostly Individual

Price setting to be based on:

- market based,
- full cost recovery,
- peak pricing,
- demand (peak load) pricing

e) Highly Individual or Private Services

Price setting to be based on:

- market based,
- full cost recovery,

- peak pricing,
- demand (peak load) pricing

6. Summary: Cost Recovery Goal and Price Setting Protocols

	Cost Recovery Goal	Price Setting Protocols
Community Benefit or Public Services: <i>Services providing access to the public generally without restriction and/or benefit the general public equally</i>	0 - 25%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish as a NO FEE Program or facility • partial cost recovery • social benefit • scholarship/discount • tradition pricing
Community/Individual: <i>Some benefit exclusive to individuals or individual organizations, but also has significant benefit to the community and general public</i>	20 - 50%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • partial cost recovery • social benefit, scholarship/discount • tradition pricing
Individual/Community or Merit Services: <i>Strong benefits to both the community and the individual person or organization</i>	40 - 80%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • partial cost recover • social benefit, scholarship/discount • tradition pricing, peak pricing • demand (peak load) pricing
Mostly Individual: <i>Programs and facilities that provide some level of benefit to the general community but most of the benefit is accrued to the individual</i>	75 - 110%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market based • full cost recovery • peak pricing • demand (peak load) pricing
Highly Individual or Private Services: <i>Minuscule or no benefits for the general public and are for the almost exclusive benefit of the individual</i>	90 - 125%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market based • full cost recovery, peak pricing • demand (peak load) pricing

Addendum 1 Seattle Parks and Recreation List of Fee and Charges Categories

Volunteer Park	
	Admission
	Horticultural Class
	Weddings

	Tours
	Photography permits
Japanese Garden	
	Admission
	School Group Rate
	Annual Pass
Seattle Aquarium	
	Admission
	School Group
	Memberships
	Rentals
	Education Program
Amy Yee Tennis Center	
	Indoor Court
	Outdoor Court
	Special Fee for Tournaments
	Tennis Lessons - Adult
	Tennis Lessons - Junior
	Tennis Lessons - Tiny Tots
	Competitive flights
	Special Events
	Equipment rental
	Public Service Adult Indoor Court Time
Swimming Pools	
	Recreation Swimming
	Fitness
	Instruction
	Safety Courses
	General rental
	Competitive training
	Timing system, rental
	Special use fees
	Birthday Party
	Wading pool rental
	Aquatic Special events
Athletic Facilities	
	West Seattle and Interbay
	Youth Practice
	Youth Games
	Adult games
	School Gym Rentals
	Outdoor tennis courts
	League games
	Sports Fees
	Youth Sports Fees
Facility Rentals	

	Hourly Room rentals
	Gymnasium Rental
	Alcohol Fee
Camp Long	
	Group Day Use
	Cabin rentals
	Lodge Rentals
Discovery Park	
	Group Guided walks
	Room Rentals
	Room Rentals
Carkeek Park	
	Room Rentals
Golden Gardens Bathhouse	
	Booking Fee
	Room rental
	Alcohol Fee
	Maintenance Fee
Langston Hughes	
	Performance rentals
	Marquee rental
	Film/video
	Conference, meeting, seminar
	Rehearsals
	Technician
	Meeting Rooms
Lake Union Park	
	Booking fee
	Room Rentals
	Armory Lawn
	Historic ships wharf
	Application fee
	10% admission/sales fee
	Alcohol fee
	Maintenance fee
	Other rentals
Warren G. Magnuson Park	
	Application fees
	Facility / Site rentals
	10% admission/sales fee
	Alcohol fee
	Tables / chairs rentals
	Staffing fees
Washington Park Arboretum	
Moorage Fees	
	Leschi and Lakewood

Boat Ramp	
	Permits
	Overnight parking permit
	Day Use
Recreation Participation fees	
	CC and Outdoor Class
	Teen dance
	Senior Adult Programs
	Small craft Centers
Park Area Reservation Fee	
	Kubota and Parsons
	Wedding and ceremonies
	Hourly special event
Picnic Reservation	
	Shelter Half Day
	Shelter Half day - special parks
	Shelter Full Day
	Shelter Full Day - special parks
	Table
	Reschedule fee
Day Camps	
Use Permits	
	Application Fee - 1st amendment
	Application fee standard
	Booth fee
	10% admission/sales fee
	Load/unload fee
	Utility hook-up fee
	Late application fee
	Commercial signage fee
Photography	
	Commercial hourly fee
First amendment vending	
Construction bidding documents	
Revocable Use Permit fee	
Limited Term Permit Fee	
Continuing Use Permit Fee	
View Tree Pruning Permit	
Facility Rentals	
	Hourly Room rentals

	Gymnasium Rental
Recreation Participation fees	
	CC and Outdoor Class
	Teen dance

Verbal Briefing

Mr. Friedli introduced himself and stated that there have been no changes to this policy since he presented an outline to the Board in September. To read the minutes of that meeting, as well as the briefing paper, see <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/ParkBoard/minutes/2009/09-10-09.pdf>.

Mr. Friedli gave a brief summary of information in the written briefing paper. Work will continue on developing this policy and he expects to bring it back to the Park Board in January-February and hold a second public hearing.

Board Discussion

Responding to a request from Commissioner Kostka to define congestion pricing, Mr. Friedli explained that there is an increased demand for athletic fields from 5:00-9:00 pm. Rates could be set higher during this time period and lower in non-peak times.

Commissioner Barber agrees with the great idea of free use of public parks; however, he realizes that a fee should be charged when a park/field is scheduled for exclusive use and recognizes that there is high demand for park facilities. Seattle voters recently passed a new park levy and he asked if being charged a fee to use the levy-funded facilities results in double taxation. Mr. Friedli responded that use of levy-funded facilities may not be at full cost recovery. Commissioner Barber asked whether this initial policy is to set the framework, rather than determine the fees. Mr. Friedli agreed that it is framework and not to determine fees.

Commission Adams understands that the cost recovery rate is based on community benefit vs. individual benefit, and asked how this relates to a free use of a facility vs. being charged. Mr. Friedli responded that one person using a facility does not benefit anyone else and would be charged 100% of the fee. If the use is of community benefit, there would be no charge and the costs would be handled by the taxpayers. A gray area is determining the rate when the use is of some benefit to the community. Commissioner Adams stated this is a complicated fee system. Mr. Friedli agreed that it isn't a typical process and is a learning curve for Parks staff. The Department is asking the Board for its recommendation to help guide the policy's development. Deputy Superintendent Williams added that staff looked at "how fees subsidize those who can't pay" policies that are used across the country.

Commissioner Ramels is amazed that the Department does not have the means to determine specific program costs, as that is essential to determining cost recovery by program. She agrees with the policy of charging 100% recovery rates for use that benefits only an individual. She has observed some business owners using the parks public property for their private gain and believes they should also pay the 100% rates.

Mr. Friedli, who is the Department's Policy Manager, asked if the Board finds it helpful to be brought into the policy development in the earlier stages. Commissioner Ramels agreed that it is and appreciates this being brought to the Board in its early stages.

Public Hearing

The public hearing began. The Chair reminded the audience that each person has up to two minutes to speak and will be timed. Two people testified.

Mark Bishop: He is an assistant manager with Co-Rec Soccer, which is the largest adult soccer league in Seattle. Mr. Bishop distributed notebooks to the Commissioners and Parks staff and stated that, due to the Park Department's fee increases, since 2002 there are 1,813 fewer Co-Rec soccer teams playing. In 2002,

soccer players were told by the Park Superintendent that synthetic fields would cost \$8,000 annually and grass fields \$40,000 annually. He stated that, using these figures, Co-Rec soccer is paying 158% of maintenance fees at the Department's 14 synthetic fields. He asked that adult sports fees be affordable to the general community.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Ramels whether Co-Rec Soccer is a non-profit, Mr. Bishop answered that it is a small local business.

Bill Farmer: He is a member of Friends of Athletic Fields, which wants Parks to be successful and have good quality fields. They also want limited increases in annual fees and ask that teams be given adequate time to adjust to any increases. He next referred to several sections of the fees and charges policy and stated that the Department needs good detailed program costs before moving ahead with this.

The public hearing concluded.

Commissioner Holme asked to clarify that the Park Board will hold another public hearing on this topic in March [now scheduled for February 11] and Deputy Superintendent Williams agreed and added that the policy might look different at the next public hearing. Commissioner Holmes asked that the Department hold meetings on this policy throughout the community. The latest version of the briefing paper will remain on the Board's web page until the Board's discussion and recommendation. Commissioners thanked Mr. Friedli for the presentation.

Briefing: Rainier Community Center – Schematic Design

David Graves, Seattle Parks Senior Project Planner, presented a briefing on the schematic design for the Rainier Community Center. Prior to this meeting, Commissioners received a written briefing which was posted on the Board's web page and is included in these minutes.

Written Briefing

Requested Board Action

This is a briefing on the Rainier Beach Community Center and Pool project. No action is requested of the Board at this time. The Board of Park Commissioners has not yet been briefed on the project and staff wanted to outline the public outreach to date and provide an update on the schematic design process for the planning, design and construction of a new community center and pool at the Rainier Beach site.

Project Description and Background

The Rainier Beach Community Center and Pool (RBCC), located at the corner of Rainier Avenue South and South Henderson Street, was built in 1972 along with the adjacent Seattle South Shore School. The existing Community Center provides important program spaces for the Rainier Beach community including a multi-purpose room, childcare, a large double gym and a swimming pool.

The Seattle School District and Seattle Parks and Recreation (Parks) share some spaces in this building through a joint operating agreement between the two agencies. The property line separating the two entities runs down the center of the north/south hallway. The spaces to the east are owned by Parks and include the swimming pool, associated locker rooms, a drop-in day care room and general meeting rooms (for a total of approximately 25,500 square feet). The spaces immediately to the west on School District property include classrooms, restrooms, the gymnasium and locker rooms (approximately 46,000 square feet). These spaces have historically been shared spaces that are programmed by both agencies. Once the new community center is constructed, the School District will continue to use the community center gymnasium under the Parks/School District Joint Use Agreement and Parks may use the school facilities in the evening. The utility service entries and mechanical and electrical systems are located at the north end of the shared spaces on school property.

In July 2007, the Seattle School District began demolition of the school portion of the building to construct a new facility adjacent to the shared spaces. The new school construction began in April 2008 and was completed in August 2009. The South Shore kindergarten thru 8th grade school is an entirely separate facility. As of October 2007, the School District has no longer operated in the shared spaces and made these spaces available to the Park Department.

The remaining structure, owned in part by Parks and in part by the School District, is in need of significant upgrades and the spaces do not function well for use by community center patrons and staff. Based on a Building Assessment Report prepared by ARC Architects in 2007, it is less expensive and more cost effective to completely demolish the structure and construct a new community center and pool on the existing site. On a parallel track, Parks is negotiating with the Seattle School District to acquire the School District property which lies between Parks' property and the new South Shore School. Design of the new structure is based on this acquisition moving forward and being completed before the project goes out to bid sometime in late 2010. ARC Architects was selected to lead the schematic design process based on their submittal, team of sub-consultants and performance at the interview.

Public Involvement Process

The Rainier Beach Community Center service area is the most ethnically diverse area of the city. The most recent census data is from 2000 and is likely not necessarily reflective of the current mix. The neighborhood is constantly changing and the new Light Rail station will add an additional engine for demographic shift in the neighborhood. There are five predominant ethnic groups in the area: East African, Samoan/Pacific Islander, Filipino, Hispanic and Vietnamese

Due to the broad diversity in the neighborhood, Parks is taking a three pronged approach to engaging the community during the schematic design process for the new Rainier Beach Community Center and Pool. First, Parks will hold a series of three public meetings at the community center. The meetings were/will be held on June 9, September 15 and November 17, 2009. A flyer announcing each of these meetings was translated into six languages, Spanish, Tagalog, Vietnamese, Somali, Traditional Chinese and Amharic, and mailed to all residents within a half-mile radius of the community center; a total of 7,100 households. A press release was/will be issued and distributed to all of the City's ethnic media. A meeting flyer was also distributed to an e-mail list, posted around the neighborhood at visible locations such as the Rainier Beach Public Library and mailed to 40 community organizations, schools and churches.

Second, Parks convened a Project Advisory Team (PAT) comprised of area residents to both provide input on the schematic design and to assist with public outreach. More specifically, the PAT will evaluate and make recommendations to Seattle Parks and Recreation on the community center and pool design. The PAT will also provide advice and guidance to Parks staff and architects as they move forward on the design, and report back to the community as the design progresses. The first PAT meeting was held on September 8, 2009; PAT members gave invaluable input on the three schematic design options in advance of presenting these to the public on September 15. The second PAT meeting was held on October 20th. Meetings of the PAT are open to the public.

Finally, Parks has also undertaken targeted outreach to specific groups which have traditionally been hard to engage in a typical public process. These meetings involved more focused discussions regarding current and potential future needs, desires and community center and pool. To date we've met with the following groups and plan on meeting with them at least one more time during the schematic design process:

Group	Date/Location (1)	Date/Location (2)
Rainier Beach Youth/Teens	June 26, 2009 - RBCC	TBD

Vietnamese Community – Vietnamese Resource Fair	July 17, 2009 – New Holly Neighborhood Campus	TBD
Filipino Community - UGNAYAN Meeting	July 27, 2009 – Filipino Community Center	TBD
Samoa Community	July 29, 2009 - RBCC	TBD
East African community	November 2, 2009 – New Holly	TBD

Issues

- Overall, the public is generally very supportive of the project. The biggest challenge has been to go beyond the typical three public meeting format and to reach out to those people who don't come to meetings and who would take advantage of the community center and pool.
- Parks has met with several other service providers and organizations such as the Atlantic Street Center, BikeWorks, the Department of Neighborhoods and the Seattle Police Department (SPD). There will not be any dedicated space for other than Parks usage in the new community center due to square footage costs except that a small office will be provided for use by SPD. There may also be a computer terminal available for use by other City staff. Beyond that it is too costly to provide any single use space.

Environmental Sustainability

Consistent with Parks' policy, the new community center will achieve at least a LEED Gold rating. The existing site will be redeveloped and materials from the old community center will be re-used or recycled to the maximum extent possible. The new building will have systems for natural ventilation, heating and cooling, and water re-use to minimize the building's impact on the environment and maximize its efficiency.

Budget

The budget for the project is \$25 million for planning, design and construction of the project. The City is issuing bonds for the cost of the project.

Schedule

Schematic design will be completed by the end of the year. Design development will start as schematic design is ending. The goal is to begin construction in early 2011 and have the new community center and pool open in mid to late 2012.

Additional Information

David Graves; ph.: 206.684.7048; e-mail: david.graves@seattle.gov. The project website is: http://www.seattle.gov/parks/projects/rainier_beach_cc

Verbal Briefing/Board Discussion

Mr. Graves introduced himself and reviewed information in the written briefing. He noted that Parks received 27 responses to the Request for Quotes (RFQ.) The real challenge now is not the building design – it is how to design the best community center to fit this diverse community's needs. He gave several examples of design considerations: how to accommodate the kitchen for those who don't cook pork, include an area for visitors who say prayers during the day; or plan the pool to accommodate the East African swim sessions to fit their cultural segregation when swimming. It is easier to fit these needs in when they are included in the design. He also reviewed the Department's extensive public outreach.

Parks, with the help of the Project Advisory Team, is now narrowing its selection from the three designs. Mr. Graves showed large drawings of all three designs and pointed out different elements of each. The Project Advisory Team, Seattle Design Commission, and community all prefer Design C and the Department is moving

ahead with that design. A final schematic design community meeting will be held on November 17 and the design will then go back to the Seattle Design Commission for further review and comments.

Outreach:

Commissioner Adams was really impressed with the outreach and that staff went to the community, instead of inviting the community to a meeting. He asked about the Native American population and whether Parks staff met with them. Mr. Graves responded that the census data for the area is nearly 10 years old; however, there is a small community of Native Americans. However, there is no cohesive community group to present information to. He noted that the community center staff has been really helpful in reaching out to the diverse neighborhood. Commissioner Barber asked how the Department will keep the community engaged in the project. Mr. Graves responded that there will be two more public meetings and the design will be taken back to the community groups.

1% for Art:

Mr. Graves noted that this is a \$25 million project, with a 1% designation for art, and 222 artists have submitted proposals. Commissioner Barber stated that the last parks project brought before the Park Board that had an art element was the Dexter Pit. The Arts Commission did not involve the parks' neighbors in the process and he asked if there will be a public process for the art element. Mr. Graves stated that the artist will be on board during the design process and will follow Parks' public involvement policy. Responding to a question from Commissioner Ramels on how the artist will be awarded, Mr. Graves answered that he will help Seattle Arts Commission and the architect to cull through the applications. Parks staff will remain involved during the process to give feedback.

Design:

Commissioner Holme asked how the school's passenger drop-off relates to Parks' drop-off. Mr. Graves responded that it doesn't and pointed out the two on the drawings. Commissioner Adams referred to a design extension that appears to be a cone-shaped room. Mr. Graves responded that it will not look like that in the final design.

Funding:

Commissioner Holme noted that the remodel/rebuilds of other community centers were funded by the Community Center Levy and there are still eight centers awaiting funding. He asked why the Department undertook this \$25 million project without involving the Board of Park Commissioners earlier. Deputy Superintendent Williams responded that Seattle School District approached Parks with the offer to demolish the school and build a new facility. Parks staff briefed the mayor, who directed Parks to go back to SSD. Youth violence is a priority for the mayor and the rate of youth violence near the community center is high. This was a timing issue and the mayor took the proposal directly to City Council. Parks realizes there are still seven other community centers that need a remodel/rebuild.

Commissioner Holme commented that this feels like a "back door" operation. The Board is a good tool for the Department to use to be more transparent. Commissioner Ramels agreed with Commissioner Holme and asked which community center is next on the list to be upgraded. Deputy Superintendent Williams responded that he will ask Kevin Stoops, the Project and Planning Division Director, to brief the Board on plans for the remodels/rebuilds. At least three of those on the list, Queen Anne, Alki, and Magnolia, are in jointly shared facilities with Seattle School District.

Commissioner Kostka referred to the \$25 million budget and asked if the funding is secure. Commissioner Holme responded that the City Council will not pass an ordinance if it isn't under the statutory limit for bonding.

Commissioner Ramels asked if there is a cost for trading the property. Mr. Graves responded that ideally the property is traded with no dollars changing hands. Deputy Superintendent Williams added that the

Department and Seattle School District are currently updating their Joint Use Agreement to ensure the greatest benefit to the public.

Commissioner Ramels complimented the extensive public outreach for this project and stated that it should become the Department's outreach prototype for future projects. Mr. Graves commented that this is the first new community center in several years and the Department wants it to work well for its community.

Commissioners thanked Mr. Graves for the briefing.

Old/New Business

Leschi Community Update: Commissioner Barber spoke about the October 31 murder of a Seattle Police officer in the Leschi community. Last night the Leschi Community Council, of which he is a member, held a meeting at the Central Area Senior Center to discuss the crime and what the community can do to help so this doesn't happen again. He stated that gang activity affects the City's parks and it affects the Park Department, too. The Leschi community has done a great deal to program its parks and he believes that gang members see their territory (some parks) being taken away. At last night's meeting, Seattle Police Department officers discussed other methods to improve safety. One such measure is the crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED.) (For more information, see <http://www.seattle.gov/police/prevention/Neighborhood/CPTED.htm>.) SPD also suggested that community members walk around their neighborhoods at night and look at whether people's homes and community areas appear to be safe.

Commissioner Ramels added that Seattle is so fortunate to be able to increase programming in its parks. Many cities are closing their parks, due to the current economic conditions, while other cities have parks that its residents are too frightened to use. Seattle has an excellent park system and she doesn't believe the parks here will ever be abandoned, as is happening in other parts of the country.

Associated Recreation Council (ARC): Commissioner Adams represents the Park Board on the Associated Recreation Council's Board. He is impressed with several of ARC's innovative and new techniques: (1) ARC will unveil exciting new programming for the 50+ age group in January; (2) Seattle residents are encouraged to try any of the community center's programs/activities for \$2; and (3) ARC is investigating new social media tools (Facebook, Twitter, and others) to spread the word about ARC's programs.

Commissioner Ramels, who previously served as the ARC Board president, wondered whether ARC had hired a public relations staff person yet, to assist with social media outlets.

Parks Levy Oversight Committee and Acquisition Fund: Commissioner Holme announced that the public hearing on Opportunity Fund criteria (1) is coming up and includes a lot of community opportunities; (2) the language in the \$20 million Acquisition Fund is much broader this time. Parks staff is going out to the community to ask if the community wants a new park and for ideas on acquiring land. Deputy Superintendent Williams added that the community is a good source for this information. Commissioner Ramels asked if the Gap Analysis [which shows gaps in where parks are located] is being used. Commissioner Holme responded that it is being used, however, the Opportunity Fund language allows for much broader land acquisition in this round.

There being no other new business, the meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

APPROVED: _____
Jackie Ramels, Chair
Board of Park Commissioners

DATE _____