

# Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation

## Seattle Board of Park Commissioners Meeting Minutes November 10, 2011

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:

Antoinette Angulo  
John Barber  
Terry Holme, Chair  
Diana Kincaid, Vice-chair  
Donna Kostka  
Jackie Ramels

Excused:

Jourdan Keith

### ***Seattle Parks and Recreation Staff***

Eric Friedli, Acting Deputy Superintendent  
Sandy Brooks, Park Board Coordinator

This meeting was held at Magnuson Park. Prior to the meeting, Parks staff led Commissioners on a tour of the park, along with several members of the public. Commissioner Holme called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm and reviewed the meeting agenda. **Commissioner Barber moved approval of the November 10 agenda, the October 13 minutes, and the record of correspondence. Commissioner Kincaid seconded. The vote was taken and the motion carried.**

Commissioners voiced concern that Commissioner Keith was struck by a vehicle while crossing an intersection earlier this week and sustained serious injuries.

### **Superintendent's Report**

Acting Deputy Superintendent Friedli reported on the following topics in both a verbal and written report available to the Board and audience. To listen to the report, see <http://www.seattlechannel.org/videos/video.asp?ID=6005> and move cursor to position 2.00.

City Council Budget Update: City Council plans to make a final vote on the City's 2012 budget on November 21. The funding for Building 30 appears headed for approval. Two community center items were added by Council: \$205,000 for people counters, and \$100,000 to add additional community center hours. Council also approved two Statements of Legislative Intent (SLIs) for the Park Department to complete in 2012: look at longer-term funding options on operations, and determine how to replace the admissions tax funding cut from the General Fund.

Denny Awards: A ceremony for the 2011 Denny Award winners is scheduled at Wing Luke Museum on Tuesday, November 29, at 6:00 pm. Each year more than 40,000 volunteers donate about 350,000 hours to Seattle Parks and Recreation and the Denny Awards recognize those volunteers. This year's winners include the Park Board Chair, Terry Holme, for the Superintendent's Award. "For nearly a decade Terry has served as a volunteer commissioner on the Park Board. During that time, he has attended 175 public meetings, including 80 public hearings, listened to hundreds of citizens testify and received thousands of emails and letters. Concurrent with his Park Board work, he also served for eight years on the Parks Levy Oversight Committee and for two years as the Board's representative to the Seattle Parks Foundation. He has been a regular attendee at new park and facility grand openings and dedications, and spends many hours in his off time visiting Seattle's parks. In the past 10 years, he has donated more than 5,000 hours to Seattle Parks and Recreation."

Potential Liability to Board Members: Commissioners recently expressed concern they may be held liable when making a recommendation to the Park Superintendent and be party to a lawsuit. Parks staff checked with the City's Law Department, and in the event such suit occurs, the City's Law Department will defend commissioners and the City will pay any claim or settlement.

### **Oral Requests and Communication from the Audience**

The Chair explained 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-to-three minutes each, 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 Old/New Business. Five people testified. To hear their testimony see <http://www.seattlechannel.org/videos/video.asp?ID=6005> and move cursor to position 10.00.

Tom Kelly: He is a neighbor of Magnuson Park and expressed concern that the parks' vegetation management plan (VMP) is incomplete, with 40 acres still to plant. He believes this should be a priority, as the cost is low and the yield is high. He recommends that Parks spend \$50k each year on the VMP, manage it properly using volunteers to help with the plantings and maintenance, and include targets and measures.

Lynn Ferguson: She thanked the Park Board for holding their meeting at Magnuson Park and hoped they enjoyed the tour. Much has been accomplished at Magnuson Park and there is still more to do. Earlier this week Ms. Ferguson forwarded historical information to the Board on this former Naval Base's role in World War II, and specifically Pear Harbor. Commissioner Holme thanked her for sending the interesting information.

Sharon LeVine: Ms. LeVine thanked Brenda Kramer, Seattle Parks' strategic advisor responsible for off-leash areas (OLA's), and Acting Deputy Superintendent Williams for the resolution at the Jose Rizal Park off-leash area. The resolution has kept the OLA at nearly its original size. [Note: a group of orchardists have been maintaining the three apple orchards at Jose Rizal Park and asked that the two smaller areas, located inside the boundary of the OLA, be fenced off so the dogs cannot access the fruit tree areas. Several off-leash area supporters have opposed the potential loss of any of the OLA area.] Ms. Levine stated the orchardists are always welcome at the off-leash area. However, if the apple trees are fenced in and space is opened in another area for the off-leash, she stated that off-leash maintenance funds should not be used to pay for this; instead the orchardists should pay.

Carol Fisher: She thanked the Park Board and Acting Deputy Superintendent Friedli for all their work. She agrees with Ms. Levine; dog owners are excited about Jose Rizal off-leash area being re-activated by the recent addition of the bike trail and efforts to improve the park. She asked that Parks not take any of the off-leash area away.

She also asked the Department to consider establishing a Lifelong Learning Center at Magnuson Park and allot it a permanent space. This would serve many seniors in Northeast Seattle.

Guy Marquiss: Mr. Marquiss stated he is representing Magnuson Park ballfield users. Kids need a place to play and the Parks Department is taking ballfields away from them! The number of ballfields at Magnuson Park has been reduced from eight to three and Parks is now removing another in the north field section for parking. He stated that several years ago the Park Board agreed with this plan. Commissioner Holme asked him to send additional written information to the Board.

## **Report: Sound Transit Contingency Plan for Tunnel Boring Machine Repair Under Volunteer Park**

Elma Borbe, Sound Transit Environmental Analyst, and Ginger Ferguson, Sound Transit Civil Engineer, briefed the Board on Sound Transit's underground boring at Volunteer Park. Prior to the meeting, a written report was provided to the Board. It is included below and was made available to the public on the Board's web page. Ms. Borbe and Ms. Ferguson stated there are unique condition below Volunteer Park and Sound Transit will only use this process if required. They next described the elements of the drilling project and the schedule.

To hear the full briefing and the Board's questions, see <http://www.seattlechannel.org/videos/video.asp?ID=6005> and move cursor to position 25.00.

### *Written Briefing*

#### **Contingency plan for tunnel boring machine repair under Volunteer Park**

##### **A Contingency Plan to Ensure Safety of Workers**

Sound Transit is currently boring twin tunnels for its University Link light rail extension from downtown Seattle to the University of Washington. The route of the tunnels takes them under Seattle's historic Volunteer Park on Capitol Hill.

Because of the unique geological conditions under the park, it is possible that a tunnel boring machine (TBM) could encounter water-saturated sand, gravel, cobbles, or boulders that could cause problems to the tunneling machine. If this occurs, workers will need to enter the pressurized excavation chamber in the front of the TBM to fix the problem by replacing cutting tools, dislodging rocks, breaking boulders or other actions.

The tunnels under the park will be about 300 feet deep. The water table in this area is very high and causes great pressure on the TBM. Workers would encounter dangerous conditions if they had to repair the machine in such a high-pressure environment. Working under this environment causes several potential health hazards including decompression illness (the bends), nitrogen narcosis, oxygen toxicity, breathing difficulty, and isolation. Sound Transit can reduce the pressure inside the TBM excavation chamber and provide workers a safer environment to repair the machine by lowering the underground water table, also known as "dewatering."

##### **Description of the Dewatering System**

TFK, Sound Transit's contractor, has designed a dewatering system that could be quickly installed in Volunteer Park in the event a TBM needs repair under the park.

**This is a contingency plan that would be put in place only if needed. If the TBMs continue to operate smoothly and encounter no impeding obstacles under the park, the system will not be built. The machines have needed none of these repairs so far on the U-Link project. The system is temporary and fully reversible and will remain in place no longer than needed.**

The dewatering system would reduce pressure on the TBM by pumping out much of the ground water, resulting in a safer environment for workers. The water would be pumped into a drain pipe located on East Prospect Street. The dewatering system would include ten wells located over the tunnel alignment. The wells would be connected by a network of plastic pipes laid on the surface. The pumps would be powered by a whisper-quiet generator located at a corner of the Seattle Asian Art Museum (SAAM). The location of the

potential wells and other elements has been coordinated with the Seattle Parks Department and SAAM. To assure that trees and roots won't be damaged, locations have also been approved by a certified arborist. Above-ground pipes will be clearly marked to avoid tripping hazards. ADA-complaint ramps will be placed over the pipes where they cross roads and pathways.

### **Schedule**

Currently, the TBMs are scheduled to pass under the park next year between January and April. If needed, the system could be installed quickly and would be completely removed by fall 2012. Areas of the lawn that may be impacted will be restored, and no other features of the park, including buildings, tree, or plantings would be altered.

For further information, please contact Roger Pence, Sound Transit Community Outreach Coordinator, at (206) 398-5465 or [roger.pence@soundtransit.org](mailto:roger.pence@soundtransit.org).

Commissioners thanked Ms. Borbe and Ms. Ferguson for the briefing.

## **Update Briefing: Magnuson Park – Today and Long-Term Planning**

Prior to this meeting, Parks staff led a tour of Magnuson Park with commissioners and citizens present. Rebecca Salinas, Seattle Parks Partnerships Manager; Charles Ng, Seattle Parks Contracts and Grants Manager; Brenda Kramer, Seattle Parks' Strategic Advisor; and Nathan Torgelson, Seattle Parks Policy Manager, and Kevin Bergsrud, Planning and Development Specialist for Magnuson Park, led the tour and introduced themselves to the audience. A panel discussion with the Park Board and Parks staff followed. Commissioners received a written briefing prior to the meeting, available to the public on the Board's web page, available as handouts at this meeting, and included in these minutes. To hear the presentation and the Board's discussion, see <http://www.seattlechannel.org/videos/video.asp?ID=6005> and move cursor to position 39.00.

### *Written Briefing*

#### **Requested Board Action**

No Board action is requested at this time. Staff will provide the Board with a park tour focusing on buildings/structures that are located within the Historic District of the park. The Board will receive a briefing on the status of recently completed and anticipated developments within the park, a summary of the programs and partnerships operating in the park, and the identified capital investment needs. Staff will also present an outline for a proposed Strategic Development Plan process that will reconfirm the vision for the entire park, help Parks identify key strategies for moving forward towards achieving that vision, and realizing the full potential of the park.

#### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff would like the Board's input into the Strategic Development Plan process. The process will result in a new Strategic Development Plan for Warren G. Magnuson Park.

#### **Background**

Naval Air Station Seattle properties conveyed by the Navy to the City, Solid Ground, and the University of Washington total 336 acres. The 309 acres which comprise Warren G. Magnuson Park has slowly transformed, in over 30 years, from large paved runways, aging buildings, and a leveled topography, to a park offering users a variety of activities, both recreational and passive, provided by Parks and its many partner organizations. With the completion of the wetlands and soon-to-be completed shore ponds project, park users also have wonderful opportunities to enjoy a variety of wildlife and habitat. Add in the one mile of shoreline and public access to Lake Washington, and the park truly is one of Seattle's treasures.

#### **Park Investments**

This transformation is not without a price. The City of Seattle has invested over \$42 million and completed 40 capital improvement projects. And, our partners have already invested more than \$33 million, transforming

seriously deteriorated buildings into safe and attractive public recreational facilities. Solid Ground and the University of Washington (UW), also property owners, have invested over \$54 million for property under their jurisdiction and ownership. The UW has fully renovated three of the five buildings located on their properties; Solid Ground has renovated six buildings and constructed three new buildings located on their properties.

### **Historic Landmark Designation**

The Sand Point Historic District now has federal, State, and City historic district designations requiring the 42 historic structures (Parks, SDOT, Solid Ground, UW owned) be maintained to preserve district landmark status. The federal designation provides developers eligibility for federal historic tax credits. Parks, UW, and Solid Ground are working with staff from the Department of Neighborhoods to develop a Controls and Incentives agreement and design guidelines for the historic district. The Controls and Incentives agreement must be approved by the City Council, and the design guidelines have to be approved by the City Landmarks Preservation Board (LPB). Currently, any new development, building exterior, or landscape alterations must be approved by both the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the City Landmarks Preservation Board (LPB). SHPO may delegate its review authority to the LPB, which would likely occur after the City Landmarks Board approves new design guidelines.

### **Capital Investment Needs**

There are almost \$57 million in estimated projects still needing completion, including building, site, and infrastructure improvements, and major maintenance. Of the 11 City-owned buildings within the Historic District, several remain underused and require substantial capital investment (estimated at \$48 million in 2010 dollars). Sanitary and storm sewer system upgrades, connecting Parks buildings to the City Light electrical system, and general site and transportation improvements add up to about an additional \$6 million. Options need to be developed for funding Magnuson's unfunded needs. Until funding is secured, a number of key building renovations and park improvements have been deferred. These include:

- NOAA Entrance/North Shore Recreation Area entrance;
- Complete renovation of the Magnuson Community Center;
- Building 138 (the Gatehouse) renovation;
- Utility system improvements; and
- Seattle Conservation Corps relocation from Building 2.

### **Immediate Needs**

There are a number of needs that should be addressed in 2011-2013 which currently are without funding, a few of which are:

- Circulation Plan – Staff have begun working with stakeholders on a plan to address issues which currently make park circulation difficult, including signage and wayfinding, bicycle and pedestrian connections, parking, traffic safety, and traffic calming. Wayfinding signs identifying park tenants are now allowed.
- Building renovation –
  - Building 30 – The east wing houses Parks staff and a variety of tenants. Events in the hangar have been limited by the Seattle Fire Department and the Department of Planning and Development to four events annually, due to needed fire and life safety improvements. The public has prioritized developing the west wing as an arts facility. The Mayor's 2012 budget proposes a bond issuance for 12 years and general fund support for a Phase I, \$5.5 million renovation of the building; minimum renovation for full use of the hangar, and occupancy of lower two floors of west wing. Phase II in 2015 (\$3.4 million) would complete the renovation, but is currently not budgeted. Building 30 is a contributing building to the Historic District.
  - Building 2 – This large building, consisting of two hangars and former aircraft repair workshops, was home to Arena Sports until they renovated and moved to Building 27. The Seattle Conservation Corps still occupies the northwest corner of the building. Total renovation of the building is estimated at \$27.6 million. The cost of mothballing the building is estimated at

\$200,000 and would require approval by SHPO and/or the City Landmarks Board, as it is a contributing building to the Historic District.

- Building 18 – The former fire station is in desperate need of repair; the entire roof has failed and there is no working electrical system. Basic shell and core renovation is estimated at \$3.6 million. Cascade Bicycle Club is considering initiating a capital campaign to renovate the building for a Northwest Cycling Center. Building 18 is a contributing building to the Historic District.
- Building 9 – This building is owned by the UW. The UW is working with the City Office of Housing on a possible Request for Proposal process to gauge interest in the disposition of the building. The federal government is willing to lift the educational restriction on this building so it could be used for housing. Total renovation is estimated at \$29 million. It is also a contributing building to the Historic District.
- Building 308 – The Magnuson Park Concept Plan (1999) identified the development of permanent ground crew quarters and maintenance yard in the park at Building 308. The proposed 2012 CIP will include funds to develop maintenance crew quarters, located north of NE 65<sup>th</sup> Street, and east of Sportsfield Drive.

### **Strategic Development Plan – Looking Ahead**

Parks is beginning a Strategic Development Plan process to reconfirm the vision for the park and develop a strategic plan for making the vision a reality. The planning process would include:

- Prioritizing capital improvements;
- Exploring possible management structures;
- Developing a funding plan for capital improvements;
- Developing a funding plan for ongoing operations and maintenance; and
- Identifying desired programming and activities.

The plan would be developed with broad stakeholder input and be completed, by May 2012. (See attached DRAFT of the Strategic Development Plan Schedule.)

During the week of October 24, 2011, Parks staff met with the other site owners (UW and Solid Ground) and with some of the park's tenants. They all recognized the challenge of arriving at a plan that would successfully address diverse visions for the park, but, nevertheless, were very supportive of a strategic development planning process and promised their support and involvement. On November 9 Parks will discuss the Strategic Plan process with the Magnuson Park Advisory Committee to gather their input on the proposed planning process and schedule.

### **Public Involvement Process**

It will be critical to do extensive outreach and gather input from internal and external stakeholders, using a variety of information-gathering tools, including surveys, attendance at community meetings, a Park Board public hearing, and a half-day day community retreat. Parks hopes to hear from other jurisdictions that have, or are, successfully developing similar Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) properties to see what might be learned and incorporated into our Strategic Development Plan.

### **Budget**

There will likely be some costs to creating a Strategic Development Plan for the park. Costs would include marketing/outreach, survey of stakeholders, meeting(s) with jurisdictions who have developed BRAC properties, and expenses for a half day retreat. These activities are budgeted for 2012.

### **Additional Information**

See attachments for additional information about the Park's development.

Rebecca Salinas: [rebecca.salinas@seattle.gov](mailto:rebecca.salinas@seattle.gov)

## **Magnuson Park Strategic Development Plan Schedule**

A master plan for Magnuson Park was adopted by the City Council in 1997 and amended in 1999 and 2004. In 2011, the Sand Point Historic District was designated by the federal and City governments. Seattle Parks and Recreation, Solid Ground, and the University of Washington have invested over \$54 million in developing the park and buildings in the historic district. Our partners have invested more than \$33 million in improvements. An estimated \$57 million is needed to fully implement the physical improvements called for in the master plan. After 15 years it is time to pause and review how far we have come and where we need to go to realize the full potential of Magnuson Park. To that end, Parks is embarking on a process to create a Strategic Development Plan.

The purpose of the Strategic Development Plan is to:

- Review and reconfirm a vision for Magnuson Park
- Prioritize capital improvements
- Develop a preferred management structure – short term and long term
- Develop a funding plan for capital investments
- Develop a funding plan for operations and maintenance
- Identify desired programming and activities

### **October 2011- January 2012: Initial discussions with internal and external stakeholders**

Initial discussions with stakeholders will review development history, public/private investment to the park, current capital investment, and infrastructure improvement needs. There will be an exploration of the long-term vision for the park, including possible operations and management models, funding mechanisms, and desired programming and activities.

- Meet with Magnuson Property Owners (10/24)
- Meet with Magnuson tenants/partners (10/26)
- Meet with Magnuson Park Advisory Committee (MPAC) (11/9)
- Board of Park Commissioners tours Magnuson Park and meets with Parks staff (11/10)
- Meet with key City policy makers – Mayor's office; Councilmember Bagshaw; City Budget Office, Council Central Staff, etc.
- Hold a ½ day retreat with kick-off from Mayor and Councilmember Bagshaw; invite speaker(s) from jurisdiction(s) with developed BRAC properties (possibly Orange County, California Great Park, Fort Mason, Presidio); Institute for Alternative Futures possible facilitator; include key internal and external stakeholders – Park Board, MPAC, owners, partners, community representatives, etc.
- Gather input from citywide stakeholders – stakeholder survey on website

### **January – February 2012: Review and analyze feedback from stakeholders and finalize DRAFT Strategic Development Plan**

- Staff reviews stakeholder comments and incorporates into the plan as appropriate
- Plan will include future vision of park (physical development, programs, uses); possible management, operations, and funding models for capital needs; prioritization of capital needs; and a development timeline

### **March 2012: Review and Approval of FINAL Strategic Development Plan**

- Follow-up meetings with park tenants/partners, owners; and key external stakeholders
- Post the Plan on Seattle Parks' website
- Park Board Review, public hearing, and recommendation to Superintendent
- Staff revise Plan as needed
- Briefings with Mayor's office, City Budget Office, City Councilmembers
- Superintendent approves final Plan

**April 2012: Draft Council Resolution adopting the Magnuson Park Strategic Development Plan**

- Resolution through legislative process

**May 2012: Council adopts the Plan**

- Legislation adopting plan presented and adopted
- Finalize Resolution

**Additional Information**

Rebecca Salinas: [rebecca.salinas@seattle.gov](mailto:rebecca.salinas@seattle.gov)

## Planning Framework – Plans Developed 1965 to Present

Date	Activity	Description
July 1965	Recreation Plan	Publication of "Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan" by the Seattle Park Department and Seattle Planning Commission. Identified future acquisition of Naval Air Station for development as 340-acre "major park".
May 1975	Master Plan	Publication of Sand Point Park Master Plan included proposed development of 75-acre "Interior Lands" for a Sports Meadow for multi-purpose play and team sports, adjoining tennis courts; a neighborhood park; maintenance complex, and restaurant. Appendix included statement by Sand Point Park Citizens Committee: "The Park is conceived as an active urban regional park. It is planned to provide for a wide variety of user activities, active as well as passive, organized as well as unstructured." (p 32).
January 1989	Master Plan Update	Publication of "Master Plan Update Magnuson Park" by Seattle Department of Parks and Recreation". Of 36 improvement elements, included the development of a drainage wetland and wildlife sanctuary from on-site water runoff; constructed new sports field area north of Building 193 (Commissary) for up to 4 soccer fields, inclusion of Navy properties to the west for additional sports fields; construction of permanent bleacher seats at new soccer field area; and construction of regulation-size baseball field in the Sports Meadow. Included statement that the new soccer fields will be "unlit turf and not all-weather material due to neighbors view/aesthetic considerations."
November 22, 1993	City Council Action	Resolution 28832, adopted the Community Preferred Reuse Plan for Sand Point, and authorized the Seattle Planning Department to forward the Plan to the U. S. Navy anticipating closure of Naval Station Puget Sound. The Reuse Plan divided the base into six activity areas, including the Magnuson Park Open Space/Recreation Expansion Area. Included the statement, "further improvements would be needed to meet the burgeoning demand for sportsfield facilities." (p. 15).
November 1996	U.S. Navy Action	Publication of Draft EIS, Reuse of Naval Station Puget Sound, Sand Point. Assesses the impacts of November 1993 Community Preferred Reuse Plan (City Plan), Muckleshoot Indian Tribe Proposed Reuse Plan, and a no-action alternative. Appendix A: Scoping Comments Summary, noted under the section Visual Resources, that "additional lighting and night glare associated with commercial activities, the sporting complexes and street lighting were also concerns raised." (p. B-6).
June 16, 1997	City Council Action	Resolution 29429, approving the Sand Point Physical Development Management Plan. To guide the reuse of Naval Station Puget Sound by defining six activity areas within the 151-acre campus. The "Magnuson Park Open Space and Recreation Area" identified the inclusion of existing sports fields into the park (now known as Sand Point Fields), further improvements "to meet the burgeoning demand for sports fields facilities", the development of a softball cloverleaf – four softball diamonds – on near the south end of the Sand Point Fields, and additional soccer fields developed in the area between Magnuson Fields and Sand Point Fields.
November 3, 1997	City Council Action	Resolution 29624, adopting the "Design Guidelines Manual for Sand Point / Magnuson Park. The guidelines were applied to the 151-acre site of former Naval Station Puget Sound. Five development

Date	Activity	Description
		framework plans were developed, including one for the North Shore.
February 1999	Citizen Committee Action	Publication of "Report to the Mayor and Seattle City Council: Sand Point Blue Ribbon Committee". The Committee recommended that the "Citizens Plan" developed by the Citizens Sand Point Planning Association be used as the base plan for the Magnuson Park design process.
November 1, 1999	City Council Action	Resolution 30063, Magnuson Park Concept Plan, providing additional guidance on the design for Magnuson Park; and superseding Resolution 29429 that adopted "The Physical Development Management Plan for Sand Point".
April 2, 2001	City Council Action	Resolution 30293, providing additional guidance on the design for Magnuson Park, and amending the Magnuson Park Conceptual Design as approved in Resolution 30063.
June 14, 2004	City Council Action	Full City Council approval of the master plan for the wetland and sports fields project.
December 11, 2006	City Council Action	Ordinance 122318, amending the Master Plan approved by Ordinance 121502; expressing support for the proposed phase 2 wetlands, natural areas and athletic fields; reaffirming conditions in Ordinance 121502 for the use of external funding for wetlands, natural areas and athletic fields; and lifting a budget proviso that had restricted spending on phase 2 construction of athletic fields.

### *Presentation and Board Discussion*

Mr. Bergsrud presented a Powerpoint showing some of the 30-year history of Magnuson Park, including land and building ownership (Parks, University of Washington (UW), Seattle Department of Transportation, Solid Ground, and Office of Housing), as well as the transportation system (owned by Parks, Seattle Department of Transportation, and Seattle Public Utilities.)

The City has invested \$45 million, the UW \$48 million, and Low-Income Housing Institute/Solid Ground \$16 million – and there is still a great deal of work to do. Approximately \$15 million in revenues has been raised at the park since 1999, with an average of \$1 million income annually. City costs for needed future development include the Historic Sand Point District, \$48 million, the Historic District Site, \$6 million, and Magnuson Park improvements/maintenance, \$2.5 million, for a total of \$57 million.

Next, a panel of Ms. Salinas, Mr. Ng, and Mr. Torgelson presented information and answered questions from Commissioners.

Ms. Salinas stated the Parks Department is now evaluating long-term goals for Magnuson Park and how best to reach those goals. It is also a good time to reflect on and appreciate the great amount of work already accomplished. Staff have reviewed the Magnuson Park Master Plan, adopted in 1997 and amended in 1999, as a basis for developing a strategic development plan for the park's future. Staff have also discussed the Strategic Plan with many stakeholders and received a great deal of helpful feedback. Next steps are to meet with key City policy makers, and hold a half-day charrette, scheduled for early 2012. Ms. Salinas reviewed the entire timeline, included in the written briefing paper (above.) Mr. Torgelson added that Magnuson Park is a regional facility and an affordable option for family use; Parks will continue to build on that.

Commissioner Ramels is concerned Parks is planning during a major recession, which may result in it searching for external partners to help fund the projects. Ms. Salinas responded that staff will look at short-term and long-term goals, including oversight of the park by a Public Development Authority (PDA) or conservancy. When funds are low, it is a good time to plan and be ready when opportunities do arise. Some of the projects can be accomplished now, such as the wayfinding, while others are three-five years in the future. It is important to plan how to accomplish the goals. Mr. Torgelson added that the federal tax credit given at the park is also attracting new businesses.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Ramels whether the new plan will be flexible, Acting Deputy Superintendent Friedli responded that it will identify what needs funding, although funding sources may not be identified in the plan. In addition, specific projects, such as the wetlands, may attract funding partners.

Commissioner Barber asked how the Magnuson Park Advisory Committee (MPAC) is reacting to the plan. Ms. Salinas answered that MPAC was involved in the first round and felt it was a good idea to move ahead. MPAC will be involved in the charrette and survey, as well. It has not yet been determined who will be invited to the charrette. Ms. Salinas described the community center operations public process held by Parks earlier this year; Parks staff may use a similar model for the long-term plan for Magnuson Park. Responding to a question from Commissioner Barber, Ms. Salinas stated the Plan will be distributed to the community councils. Feedback on the plan and process has, so far, been favorable.

Commissioner Kincaid, the Board's representative to MPAC, commented that this work is timely. She believes the park's greatest asset is the shoreline and it is good to clean that up, as well as complete the circulation/wayfinding plan. She is especially interested in maintaining public access to the park and how future projects will be funded. She also recognized this is a regional park that also serves the nearby communities.

Commissioner Angulo asked how the Plan will engage and promote opportunities for the public to get involved in helping pay for future projects. Ms. Salinas responded that Parks staff have been meeting with the tenants and many are excited about the projects and reaching out to their members to ask for their support.

Commissioner Kostka noted that Discovery Park was also a military base that was turned over to the City and suggested it be used as a model for Magnuson Park.

Commissioner Holme has toured Magnuson Park on several occasions with Park staff and it is heartening to see how much has been accomplished since the Board's last tour. There is much to do and it could become overwhelming; however, the City is really behind Magnuson Park and it's great to see the progress being made. He had several suggestions for making the plan more user friendly to those who are non-planners. He asked if Magnuson Park's Master Plan will be updated and Ms. Salinas answered that it won't. He suggested that, as the plan progresses, the Park Board's role should be clearly spelled out.

He also requested Parks staff review the ballfield issue referenced in public testimony at the beginning of the meeting. Acting Deputy Superintendent Friedli responded that removal of the fields is consistent with the Master Plan. A tennis center is being built, displacing parking that is moving where the fields were located. A total of three-four fields will be lost as a domino effect of development at the Park. Commissioner Kincaid noted there are unstructured games at the fields and asked if the space will be replaced. Acting Deputy Superintendent Friedli stated that the fields use about ¼ of the grassy area, leaving the remaining ¾ for unstructured games. Parks staff will try to mitigate the loss creatively. It is important to recognize where the Park is in its evolution. When the Master Plan was developed and approved by City Council, there was little structured programming. The development affects some programming and it is important to look at that during the Strategic Plan.

Commissioner Kincaid is excited to see the arts and cultural programs come to life at Magnuson Park. She next referred to Building 9. Solid Ground is looking for additional space; is Building 9 available? Mr. Torgelson answered that the University of Washington owns Building 9 and as long as it does, the building must be used for educational purposes. However, the UW is looking to dispose of the building. If it does, the education restriction would be lifted and the building could be used for housing. He added Building 9 is huge and will be very expensive to make livable.

Commissioner Ramels asked why the sportsfield drive requires improvements. Mr. Bergsrud answered that with the current road design, vehicles are parked in a way that blocks the road. The improvement is on a "wish list."

Commissioner Holme has two issues: priorities and management. He asked if Seattle Parks will continue running Magnuson Park or turn it over to someone new. If it does the latter, how does that fit with this planning process or create sustainable funding? Ms. Salinas stated that the 1997 Master Plan directs Parks to look at who runs the park. Acting Deputy Friedli added this is a concern. Parks may do this process and then turn Magnuson Park over to other management. Of course, that would take awhile to determine. In the meantime, the City will take advantage of any opportunities to move forward. Parks staff will develop scenarios and options, and make as much headway as possible while exploring other management models. Commissioner Barber believes this is a really good time to do this process and develop the long-term strategy.

Commissioner Holme thanked Parks staff for the update and look forward to future briefings as the Strategic Plan is developed.

### **Update Briefing: Seattle Parks Sponsorship Policy Revision**

Ms. Salinas, Ms. Kramer, and Mr. Ng next discussed the Department's Sponsorship Policy Revision. Prior to the meeting, Commissioners received a written briefing paper which was also posted to the Board's web page for public review. Copies were also made available on the meeting agenda table. To listen to the full briefing and discussion, see <http://www.seattlechannel.org/videos/video.asp?ID=6021> and move cursor to position 10.00

## *Written Briefing*

### **Requested Board Action**

The department currently has an approved Sponsorship Policy (1.21.2003) that provides guidelines for partnering with private business and corporations. Staff will present a revised draft of the Sponsorship Policy for consideration and input by the Board that includes guidelines for partnering with non-profits and for-profit businesses. The Board will be asked to make a recommendation on the policy to the Superintendent at the December 8 Board meeting. If approved, the revised policy will supersede the current Sponsorship Policy.

### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff is recommending the Board approve the revised Sponsorship Policy at the December 8 Board meeting.

### **Project or Policy Description and Background**

The current Sponsorship Policy states that corporate sponsorships "provide an effective means of generating new revenues and alternative resources to support Department of Park and Recreation (DPR) facilities and programs." The proposed revised Sponsorship Policy updates and provides a stronger framework around the sponsorship process by:

- outlining a step-by-step sponsorship approval process;
- establishing design standards for various types of sponsor recognition;
- presenting ethical considerations; and
- requiring monitoring and reporting of sponsorship activities to the Park Board and City Council.

During the Park Board meeting of August 11, 2011, Partnerships staff presented a briefing on current Partnerships, recommending DPR continue to think creatively and openly regarding partnership development that will support programs, facilities, and services to the public, particularly during these challenging economic times. This includes exploring sponsorship opportunities from both non-profit and for-profit entities. Acknowledging that sponsorships must be carefully crafted and must support the mission and vision of DPR, the new proposed policy is more comprehensive, providing greater direction to department staff as they consider new sponsorship opportunities.

### **What are the guiding principles of the proposed policy?**

The following are the general guiding principles from which staff can engage and develop sponsorships:

1. All sponsorships must directly relate to the intent of the community center or subject park, and its Master Plan.
2. Sponsorships cannot be made conditional on Parks performance.
3. The mission of a sponsorship organization should not conflict with the mission of Parks.
4. Sponsorships should provide a positive and desirable image to the community.
5. Sponsorship benefits offered should be commensurate with the relative value of the sponsorship.
6. Operating costs associated with a sponsor's proposal should not exceed 10% of the value of the sponsorship.
7. Individual sponsors should not limit Parks' ability to seek other sponsors, unless approved by the Superintendent.
8. Recognition benefits to be offered do not compromise the design standards and visual integrity of the park or facility.
9. An evaluation of the potential sponsor and its proposal shall include but not be limited to:
  - Products/services offered
  - Company's record of involvement in environmental stewardship and race and social justice
  - Principles of the company
  - Sponsor's rationale for its interest in Parks
  - Sponsor's expectations
  - Sponsor's timeliness or readiness to enter into an agreement
  - Impact to the community and park patron experience where the sponsorship is implemented
  - Impact on the ability of the public to access the Parks facility and/or programs.

10. All sponsorship proposals that exceed \$500,000 will be approved by City Council.

### **Issues**

Staff anticipates many of the potential issues will revolve around public concern of 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 sponsorship development will be consistent with the department's core values.

### **Environmental Sustainability**

Parks will review potential new sponsors and determine if it is feasible for them to provide services and programs that promote, advocate, and implement the City's "Green Initiative" as well as other environmentally-friendly initiatives.

### **Budget**

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

### **Schedule**

The Park Board will be briefed on the revised Sponsorship Policy at the November 10 meeting and is scheduled to discuss the Policy and make a recommendation to the Superintendent of Parks and Recreation at the December 8 meeting.

### **Additional Information**

- Attachment A Proposed Sponsorship Policy

Rebecca Salinas: [rebecca.salin@seattle.gov](mailto:rebecca.salin@seattle.gov)

---

### **Department Policy & Procedure**

Subject: Number 060-P 1.5.1

Sponsorship Policy Effective \_\_\_\_\_

Supersedes \_\_\_\_\_

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: Parks and Recreation

#### 1.0 INTRODUCTION:

1.1 Seattle Parks and Recreation (Parks) frequently seeks sponsorships with nonprofits, individuals, foundations, private businesses, and corporations to enhance our ability to deliver parks and recreation services.

1.2 Parks often receives offers and requests for sponsorship opportunities from a variety of organizations, including private businesses and corporations, that would like to provide financial support to Parks in exchange for sponsor recognition.

#### 2.0 PURPOSE:

2.1 To establish the guidelines and procedures for entering into sponsorship agreements.

2.2 To recognize that sponsorships provide an effective means of generating additional resources to support Parks facilities and programs.

2.3 This policy is not applicable to gifts, grants or unsolicited donations in which no benefits are granted to the donor and where no business relationship exists.

2.4 This policy is not applicable to events authorized by a Special Event Permit issued by the City of Seattle.

3.0 ORGANIZATIONS AFFECTED:

3.1 Seattle Parks and Recreation

3.2 Board of Park Commissioners

3.3 Advisory Councils

3.4 Associated Recreation Council

3.5 Seattle Parks Foundation

4.0 REFERENCES

4.1 Park and Recreation Naming Policy #060 – P 1.4.1

4.2 Acceptance of Gifts and Donor Recognition Policy #060 – P 2.13.1

4.3 City of Seattle Sign Ordinance

4.4 Partnership Development Policy #060 – P 3.9.2

5.0 POLICY:

5.1 It is the Parks' policy to seek sponsorships for its events, services, parks, and facilities from individuals, foundations, corporations, nonprofit organizations, and other entities. The purpose of sponsorships is to increase Parks' ability to maintain facilities, deliver services to the community, and/or provide enhanced levels of service beyond the core levels funded from the City's general fund.

5.2 It is the Parks' policy to provide sponsors with suitable acknowledgement of their contribution. Sponsor recognition will be done in a way that minimizes impacts on the visitor's experience and the visual qualities of the site. Sponsor recognition will not be perceived as creating a proprietary interest.

5.1.1 Corporate sponsorship agreements will exist in accordance with the guidelines and procedures set forth in this policy.

5.1.2 Corporate sponsorships must not detract from the mission and policies of Parks.

5.1.3 Corporate sponsorships will not result in any loss of Parks' jurisdiction or authority.

5.2 In general, the following industries and products are not eligible for corporate sponsorships with Parks: religious and political organizations and companies whose business is substantially derived from the sale of alcohol, tobacco, firearms, or pornography.

6.0 DEFINITIONS

For the purpose of this policy the following definitions apply:

6.1 Sponsorship - Financial or in-kind support from an individual, foundation, nonprofit, corporation, or other entity, for a specific service, program, facility, park, or event in return for certain benefits,

6.2 Sponsorship Agreement - the legal instrument that sets out the terms and conditions to which the parties have agreed.

6.3 Advertising – the action of attracting the public’s attention to a particular product or service, especially by paid announcements.

6.4 Community Center – a Parks-owned building in which structured and unstructured recreation and cultural activities are provided.

6.5 Corporate Slogan – a word or phrase that may be attached to a corporate name or logo.

6.6 Donation – the provision of in-kind goods and/or money for which no benefits are given in exchange.

6.7 Interpretive Sign – a sign within a park that describes natural, historic, and/or cultural features.

6.8 Facility – any building or structure located on property owned or managed by Parks.

6.9 Logo – a symbol or name used to brand an organization.

6.10 Park – open space owned or managed by Parks for its recreational and/or natural resource values.

6.11 Park Resources – the natural and/or cultural landscape elements within a park.

6.12 Plaque – a flat memorial plate containing information that is either engraved or in bold relief.

6.13 Recognition Benefits – opportunities given to a sponsor to have its name/logo appear on park property or materials for a specified period of time.

6.14 Sign – a structure used to identify a specific park, to convey direction to parks users, and/or to inform them of relevant regulations and other pertinent information.

6.15 Temporary Sign – a sign erected for a specified period of time, usually not exceeding 18 months.

6.16 Partnerships and Business Resources (PBR) – a unit of Parks that supports and guides partnership development and contract assistance, including sponsorship agreements and other types of partnership agreements.

6.17 Board of Park Commissioners (Park Board) – an advisory board to the Superintendent of Parks, the Mayor, City Council and other City departments with respect to park and recreation matters.

## 7.0 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

### 7.1 Sponsorship Proposals

The following principles form the basis of Parks’ consideration of sponsor proposals:

1. All sponsorships must directly relate to the intent of the relevant community center or park and its Master Plan, if applicable.
2. Sponsorships cannot be made conditional on Parks’ performance.
3. The mission of a sponsorship organization should not conflict with Parks’ mission.
4. Sponsorships should provide a positive and desirable image to the community.
5. Sponsorship benefits offered should be commensurate with the value of the sponsorship.
6. Operating costs associated with a sponsor’s proposal should not exceed 10% of the value of the sponsorship.
7. Individual sponsors should not limit Parks’ ability to seek other sponsors, unless approved by the Superintendent.

8. Recognition benefits to be offered do not compromise the design standards and visual integrity of the park or facility.
9. An evaluation of the potential sponsor and its proposal will include but not be limited to:
  - Products/services offered
  - Company's record of involvement in environmental stewardship and race and social justice
  - Principles of the company
  - Sponsor's rationale for its interest in Parks
  - Sponsor's expectations
  - Sponsor's timeliness or readiness to enter into an agreement
  - Impact on the community and park patron experience where the sponsorship is implemented
  - Impact on the ability of the public to access the Parks facility and/or programs.
10. All sponsorship proposals that exceed \$500,000 will be approved by City Council.

### 7.2 Recognition of Sponsors

The following principles form the basis of the organizations' recognition of sponsors:

1. Parks encourages sponsorships that enable Parks to further our mission.
2. Recognition of a sponsor will not suggest in any way the endorsement of the sponsor's goods or services by Parks or any proprietary interest of the sponsor in Parks.
3. Any physical form of on-site recognition will be done in such a way that it minimizes impacts on the visitor's experience and visitor use or routine community center/park operations.
4. The form of any on-site recognition will be of an appropriate size and color and will be done in a way that minimizes impacts on the park surroundings or any interpretive message.
5. All sponsorship agreements will be for a designated period of time commensurate with the value of the sponsorship and the life of the asset being sponsored.
6. Naming of events and/or facilities within a park or community center in recognition of a sponsor is permitted, providing such names are subordinate to the name of the park or the community center, and the naming is consistent with the Parks Naming Policy.
7. The Superintendent may impose additional subject-matter restrictions on advertising, sponsorship, and naming rights agreements consistent with applicable law and the use of Parks facilities by citizens of all ages, in particular young children and families.

### 7.3 Naming rights

Where naming is to be offered in recognition of a sponsorship, the sponsorship proposal will first be reviewed by the standing Seattle Parks and Recreation Naming Committee, comprised of one member or appointee of the Board of Park Commissioners, one appointee of the Chair of the City Council committee that considers parks and recreation matters, and one appointee of the Superintendent. If the Naming Committee determines that the proposed request is consistent with existing Seattle Park and Recreation policies and authenticates the supporting information, Parks will inform the media and post notices at the park and/or facility, and the Project Manager will coordinate communication with the community. The Naming Committee will take public comments into consideration when making their recommendation to the Parks Superintendent. The Superintendent, after reporting to the Board of Park Commissioners, may accept or reject any proposal.

Upon approving a name for a park or recreation facility, the Superintendent will, within ten days, notify the Mayor, the Chair of the City Council committee dealing with parks and recreation matters, and the City Clerk, at which time the name will become official for the term of the sponsorship agreement.

## 8.0 PROCEDURES & GUIDELINES

These procedures and guidelines are established to ensure all sponsors are treated equitably and appropriately, and to ensure that in recognizing a sponsor's support, the values and purpose of a particular

community center and/or park is not diminished. The guidelines and procedures in this policy do not apply to gifts and/or grants for which there is no benefit or recognition.

#### 8.1.1 Sponsorship Categories

Sponsorships are appropriate for the following broad types of activities:

- Events – Financial or in-kind support for an event organized by Parks on park property
- Park/Facility Development – Financial or in-kind support associated with the design, construction, repair, and/or improvement of a particular park or recreational or cultural facility. Projects in this category will typically be of a one-time nature.
- Program Delivery – Financial or in-kind support that facilitates the ongoing delivery of a particular citywide or site-specific program.
- Community Sports Teams – Businesses and merchants may sponsor community sports teams (soccer, softball, etc.) and are not subject to the Sponsorship Policy. The Superintendent must approve any recognition of this sponsorship on park property other than on uniforms.

#### 8.1.2 Types of Recognition

Sponsors will be provided with a level of recognition that is commensurate with their contribution. In acknowledging a sponsor, Parks will give preference to an off-site form of recognition that may include one or more of the following:

- A thank you letter
- Publicity through such channels as Parks' website, newsletters, and/or media releases, and through the sponsor's newsletter, annual report, and/or website
- Events such as a press conference, photo opportunity, groundbreaking, or ribbon cutting ceremony
- Mayoral and/or Council acknowledgement at civic functions
- Commemorative items such as a framed picture or plaque
- Register of sponsors that is accessible to the public either online or at Parks' administrative offices and community centers
- Acknowledgement on printed materials such as recreational and environmental program catalogs
- Inclusion of the individual's name or company name and logo on a sponsorship recognition wall at a community center or another facility

Where on-site recognition is to be provided, types of recognition may include (in most cases sponsorship names and logos cannot be visible to passing motorists, per the Seattle Sign Code):

- Temporary signs, which may include logos, acknowledging a sponsor during the construction or restoration of a particular facility, park, or at an event
- Interpretive sign, which may include logos
- Permanent plaque or sign (permanency is limited to the life of the asset)
- Naming of a particular facility within a community center or park where the sponsorship contributes a minimum of \$250,000 or covers at least 60% of the cost of the particular facility or structure, whichever is greater. The sponsorship contribution cannot include public money.

#### 8.1.3 Determining types of Recognition

Decisions as to the type of recognition to be provided to sponsorships under \$10,000 will be made by each Parks Division. For sponsorships over \$10,000, decisions will be made by the Division Director in consultation with the Partnerships Manager, unless they involve naming of a facility within a community center or park. For sponsorships over \$100,000, decisions will be made by the Superintendent following a recommendation by the Division Director in consultation with the Partnerships Manager. In determining the type and extent of recognition benefit, current market research data will be used to determine the value for each tangible and intangible benefit offered to the sponsor.

#### 8.1.4 Determining Design Standards for Various Types of Recognition

Design and Location of Temporary Signs and Plaques: Recognition of a sponsor will be permitted on either a temporary sign or a directional, informative, or interpretive sign. In such circumstances the sponsor's name and/or logo will be designed so that it does not dominate the sign in terms of scale or color. The Partnerships Manager, in consultation with the Communications Manager, will determine approval of a sponsor's name and/or logo on signs. Likewise, the Partnerships Manager will approve the design and content of plaques, in consultation with the Communications Manager and Parks Resources staff.

The site of temporary signs and plaques will be determined jointly by the Partnerships Manager and Park Resources and Planning and Development staff. In the event consensus cannot be reached, the Superintendent will make the final decision.

Signs must be affixed in a way that minimizes wear and tear on Parks facilities. All sponsorship agreements will specify terms of maintenance of signs and require that the signs be removed at the end of the agreement.

Design and Location of Sponsorship Boards: The Partnerships Manager and Parks Resources staff, in consultation with the Communications Manager, will determine the design of sponsorship boards. In developing a suitable design, Parks will consider a format that allows for the recognition of sponsors using small name plates, plaques, or tiles so sponsor details can be added or removed easily.

The Partnerships Manager, in coordination with staff from Recreation and Planning and Development, will determine the location of sponsorship boards within facilities. In the event that consensus cannot be reached, the Superintendent will make the final decision.

The type, location, size, design, content, and duration of any advertising, or sponsor recognition must meet City of Seattle Sign Code 18.12.050 and Land Use Code Chapter 23.55, and will be specified in the contract, permit or agreement and if applicable Land Use Code Chapter 23.66 (Special Review Districts). In most cases sponsorship names and logos cannot be visible to passing motorists.

Design and Information Requirements for Website: The Partnerships Manager, in consultation with the Parks Public Web Manager and the Communications Manager, will determine the design and information relating to sponsor recognition to be posted on Parks' website.

Freestanding billboards are not allowed in Parks facilities.

Neon signs and light boards for outdoor areas at parks and recreation facilities are not allowed.

## 9.0 SPONSORSHIP AGREEMENT

All sponsorship offers will be the subject of a sponsorship agreement. An example of such an agreement is attached.

## 10.0 SPONSORSHIP PROCESS

To facilitate an integrated approach to the establishing and managing sponsorships, in October each year, the Partnerships Unit, in consultation with all Parks managers, will develop a sponsorship plan that includes a prioritized sponsorship opportunities list ("list") for the purpose of soliciting sponsorships for the upcoming year.

This list will be approved by Parks Executive Team and the Superintendent will communicate it to the Seattle Parks Foundation and the Board of Park Commissioners.

### 10.1 Proposals Under \$10,000

The development of sponsorship proposals and the procurement of a sponsor for proposals identified on the list that are less than \$10,000 will be handled by each Parks division.

#### 10.1.2 Proposals over \$10,000

All sponsorship proposals over \$10,000 will be referred to the Partnerships Manager, who will be responsible for their evaluation for making a recommendation to the appropriate Parks Division as to whether the proposal should be accepted or rejected.

10.1.3 Upon securing a sponsor, staff will consult with the Business Resources Manager to execute the necessary sponsorship agreement and benefits recognition provisions.

10.1.4 Ongoing administration of the sponsorship agreement and the management of the sponsor's relationship with Parks will be the responsibility of the division securing the sponsorship, in consultation with the Partnerships Unit.

10.1.5 To ensure a consistent and coordinated approach, before contacting a potential sponsor, Parks staff will:

1. Consult with the Partnerships Manager on the content and layout of the proposal document, recognition benefits to be offered, and the organizations, companies, and/or individuals to be approached.
2. Submit the sponsorship proposal to the Partnerships Manager for approval.
3. The Partnerships Manager and other appropriate Parks staff will consult with the Associated Recreation Council (ARC), individual Advisory Councils, and other partners, on aspects of the sponsorship that might have an impact on their operations or programs.
4. Staff will utilize the attached Sponsorship Criteria and Assessment Form PRIOR to implementing any Sponsorship Agreements.

### 11.0 TERMINATING SPONSORSHIPS

Parks reserves the right to terminate any sponsorship should conditions arise that results in conflict with this policy or the sponsorship no longer serving Parks' best interests. The Superintendent will make the decision to terminate a sponsorship.

### 12.0 ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Sponsorships are an important way in which Parks can obtain additional resources to support the pursuit of its mission. However, sponsorships may come with unintended consequences and, as such, all sponsorship offers need to receive careful consideration.

12.1 On occasion, Parks may need to reject a sponsorship offer. Circumstances under which this may occur include but are not limited to:

- The potential sponsor seeks to secure a contract, permit or lease.
- The potential sponsor seeks to impose conditions that are inconsistent with Parks' mission, values, policies, and/or planning documents.
- Acceptance of a potential sponsorship would create a conflict of interest or policy, e.g., a sponsorship from a tobacco company.
- The potential sponsor is in litigation with the City of Seattle.

### 13.0 MONITORING AND REPORTING SPONSORSHIP PERFORMANCE

Fundamental to improving the management and performance of sponsorship activities is an effective program of review and reporting.

13.1 The following performance indicators will be reported upon annually to the Board of Park Commissioners and City Council:

- Number of active sponsorships

- Dollar value of active sponsorships
- Type of sponsorship
- Description of a sampling of the sponsorships, including benefits provided to the sponsor

#### 14.0 SPONSORSHIP CONTRACT DEVELOPMENT AND EXECUTION

All successful sponsorship proposals will require a sponsorship contract to be negotiated and developed between the sponsor and the Partnership and Business Resources Manager. Any sponsorship agreement proposed for more than one year will require legislation.

#### *Discussion*

Ms. Salinas, Mr. Ng, and Ms. Kramer gave a brief review of information in the written briefing paper. They have researched several other municipalities' sponsorship policy and especially liked the one used in Portland. Next they reviewed the Parks Department's current policy while asking the question - is it the right process? The proposed revisions add more guidelines which help put a better framework around the policy. Prior to this meeting, Commissioners submitted several changes and those were incorporated in the latest policy version.

Commissioner Kostka asked about the one-year term referred to in Section 14.0. Mr. Ng responded that City Council requires all sponsorship policies that exceed one year be brought to Council for approval. It would be helpful if that were changed to five years. Commissioner Kostka agreed, as one year is a very short period for a sponsorship. Commissioner Ramels believes the one-year guidelines better protects the public. She asked that Parks staff send the redlined version of the policy to Commissioners; Parks staff will do so.

Commissioner Barber asked about recognition and whether the policy includes a time limit on recognition. Ms. Salinas read Section 6.1, "the sponsorship will provide certain benefits. The sponsorship agreement will have a start and end date for the recognition." Commissioner Barber urged that the time limit language be made "tight" and Ms. Salinas agreed. Commissioner Kincaid asked that Parks also ensure a sponsorship doesn't impede access to a park or facility by the public. Ms. Salinas stated the Policy is so written. Commissioner Holme noted that section 7.1 reads that access shall not be impeded. Commissioner Angulo asked what evaluation indicators will be used to avoid impeding access. Ms. Salinas responded that Parks would immediately hear from the community if their access were impeded by a sponsorship and each sponsorship will have performance standards and outcomes.

Commissioner Ramels asked if 7.2, Recognition of Sponsors, is new. Could a corporation such as Google donate \$5 million and the Department name a community center after them? Acting Deputy Superintendent Friedli responded that could happen with or without this policy as City Council would make such a determination. Commissioner Ramels asked if the naming requires public input and Commissioner Holme asked that Parks staff address this at the December 8 meeting. Ms. Salinas agreed and added that any sponsorships of \$500,000 or more must also go to City Council for approval. Ms. Kramer added that Parks staff are looking at both its Naming and Donation Policies as they relate to the Sponsorship Policy.

Commissioner Barber approves of recognizing donors, but urged it be done in such a way that the public clearly knows the named person/company is a donor and not an owner of the facility. He gave examples of the Bank of America logo on the West Entry of Woodland Park Zoo and the Starbucks recognition at Powell-Barnett Park.

Commissioner Holme suggested the Sponsorship Policy include language stating the donor is responsible for maintenance of their corporate name/logo, including vandalism. He also requested that Parks study SeaFair, which sponsors an annual major event on Seattle Parks property, yet it gives little back to the Parks Department.

Commissioners thanked staff for the briefing and will submit any additional suggestions or questions to Ms. Salinas prior to the December 8 meeting, at which time it will discuss the policy and vote on a recommendation to Acting Superintendent Williams.

**Old/New Business**

City's Shoreline Management Policy: Commissioner Barber noted the City's Department of Planning and Development is currently looking at new restrictions for the City's shoreline property. He asked for a written staff report to the Board to help determine whether commissioners should comment. Acting Deputy Superintendent Friedli will check with Parks staff and advise Commissioners on how best to proceed.

Magnuson Off-leash Area (OLA): In reference to citizen testimony, Commissioner Ramels asked whether Citizens for Off-Leash Areas (COLA) or Magnuson Off-leash Group (MOLG) operates the Magnuson Park off-leash area. Acting Deputy Superintendent Friedli responded that COLA handles most of the operations, with MOLG having raised \$50,000 for the site. Some tension exists between the two groups. He will check whether MOLG is still functioning and report to the Board at an upcoming meeting.

Delridge Community Center Concerns: Commissioner Ramels has heard rumors of open air drug dealing at this community center. Acting Deputy Superintendent Williams has had no reports of this behavior. He will check with Parks staff and the Park Rangers. The public should notify Delridge Community Center staff if they observe drug dealing.

Park Board Committees: Commissioner Kostka's term is scheduled to end on December 31. Currently she represents the Board on the Central Waterfront Committee and stated Commissioner Keith is interested in replacing her on the committee. The Board's representative is appointed by the Superintendent.

SR520: Commissioner Barber referred to the property where the SR520 ramps will be torn down and believes the State wants payment for this property. He urged the Parks Department to acquire this as new park land.

Summit Slope Park Skate Area: Responding to a question from Commissioner Barber whether there have been any more complaints about skateboarding at this Capitol Hill park, Acting Deputy Superintendent Friedli stated the Department hasn't received any.

Dogs Off Leash: Commissioner Kincaid asked if Citizens for Off-leash Areas (COLA) can mandate that dog owners keep their dogs on-leash unless they are in an official off-leash area. In theory, COLA could do this; however, there is no practical way to enforce.

There being no other new business, the meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

APPROVED: \_\_\_\_\_

Terry Holme, Chair  
Board of Park Commissioners

DATE \_\_\_\_\_