

# & Procedure

## Department Policy



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.
  - 3.2.3. There will be no private use of public land exclusively for personal gain.
  - 3.2.4. Any partnership must include some level of clear, measurable public benefit.
  - 3.2.5. 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.
  - 3.2.6. 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.
  - 3.2.7. The proposed activity should not adversely impact and/or restrict public access to a park facility or programs.
  - 3.2.8. 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 enter 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"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul>			
Impact on access to the public: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. increased cost</li> <li>b. decreased operating hours</li> <li>c. location suitability</li> <li>d. Equity/RSJ issues-- decreased/increased access by diverse/populations</li> <li>e. increased traffic or reduced available neighborhood</li> </ol>			

SAP6A4ia,b, c

<p>parking f. impact on existing programming—will it expand or decrease programming?</p>			
<p>Timing of implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there adequate time to plan the proposed programs/services?</li> </ul>			
<p>Cost analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• staff costs</li> <li>• supplies costs/O &amp; M costs</li> <li>• revenue generated</li> <li>• fees</li> <li>• accounting feasibility</li> <li>• customer base</li> <li>• site suitability to physically support proposed enterprise</li> <li>• If site is a building structure, is it up to code to support proposal?</li> <li>• Impact on staff?</li> </ul>			
<p>Benefits of proposal—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand existing programs/services</li> <li>• Increase quality of use—safer, better conditions/more amenities</li> <li>• Increase diversity of use</li> <li>• Increase department revenues</li> <li>• Improve management</li> <li>• Increase Cost efficiency</li> <li>• Improve facilities</li> <li>• Leverage existing resources</li> </ul>			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Others?</li> </ul>			
Public support or reaction— <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will this proposal cause controversy?</li> <li>• What Public involvement engagement process is needed?</li> <li>• How will this be marketed and communicated?</li> <li>• What process is in place to receive public feedback? Can it be measured? How?</li> </ul>			
Mayoral, City Council, and law department consideration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will this proposal require review and approval</li> </ul>			

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?

## SAP6A4ia,b, c

- 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?
- Were there 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.