

City of Seattle
Gregory J. Nickels, Mayor

BRIEFING MEMO

DATE: October ?, 2009

TO: Board of Park Commissioners

FROM: Eric Friedli, Manager, Policy and Business Analysis

Subject: Parks and Recreation Fee Setting Policy Review -
Follow-up and Public Hearing

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 to 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.....	1
2) Background.....	2
3) Best Practices Research	3
4) Fee Policy and Price Setting Options.....	5
5) Cost Recovery Goals.....	9
6) Price Setting Protocols.....	10
7) Summary: Cost Recovery Goal and Price Setting Protocols.....	11

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, 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
<p>Community Benefit or Public Services: <i>Services providing access to the public generally without restriction and/or benefit the general public equally</i></p>	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
<p>Community/Individual: <i>Some benefit exclusive to individuals or individual organizations, but also has significant benefit to the community and general public</i></p>	20 - 50%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • partial cost recovery • social benefit, scholarship/discount • tradition pricing
<p>Individual/Community or Merit Services: <i>Strong benefits to both the community and the individual person or organization</i></p>	40 - 80%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • partial cost recover • social benefit, scholarship/discount • tradition pricing, peak pricing • demand (peak load) pricing
<p>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></p>	75 - 110%.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market based • full cost recovery • peak pricing • demand (peak load) pricing
<p>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></p>	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			West Seattle and Interbay
	Admission		Youth Practice
	Horticultural Class		Youth Games
	Weddings		Adult games
	Tours		School Gym Rentals
	Photography permits		Outdoor tennis courts
Japanese Garden			League games
	Admission		Sports Fees
	School Group Rate		Youth Sports Fees
	Annual Pass	Facility Rentals	
Seattle Aquarium			Hourly Room rentals
	Admission		Gymnasium Rental
	School Group		Alcohol Fee
	Memberships	Camp Long	
	Rentals		Group Day Use
	Education Program		Cabin rentals
Amy Yee Tennis Center			Lodge Rentals
	Indoor Court	Discovery Park	
	Outdoor Court		Group Guided walks
	Special Fee for Tournaments		Room Rentals
	Tennis Lessons - Adult		Room Rentals
	Tennis Lessons - Junior	Carkeek Park	
	Tennis Lessons - Tiny Tots		Room Rentals
	Competitive flights	Golden Gardens Bathhouse	
	Special Events		Booking Fee
	Equipment rental		Room rental
	Public Service Adult Indoor Court Time		Alcohol Fee
Swimming Pools			Maintenance Fee
	Recreation Swimming	Langston Hughes	
	Fitness		Performance rentals
	Instruction		Marquee rental
	Safety Courses		Film/video
	General rental		Conference, meeting, seminar
	Competitive training		Rehearsals
	Timing system, rental		Technician
	Special use fees		Meeting Rooms
	Birthday Party	Lake Union Park	
	Wading pool rental		Booking fee
	Aquatic Special events		Room Rentals
Athletic Facilities			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