



District Oversight Committee Meeting Summary- October 15, 2015

Welcome – with Tom Tierney, Park District Oversight Committee Chair

Public Comment

- **Joyce Moty, GROW Board Member** -It Makes Sense to Have P-Patch Staff Manage the P-Patch Infrastructure Renovation Funds. Sites, such as those owned by the Seattle Housing Authority may require more staff attention due to language barriers, lack of skills and availability.
- **Ray Schutte, GROW Board Member**- GROW is asking that implementation of the rejuvenation plan be prioritized in accordance with need and not give priority status to P-Patch Gardens based on ownership. GROW believes that this would be consistent with the MPD initiative.
- **Jon Jaffe, GROW Board Member**- DON has great working relationships and memos of understanding in place with al/ landowners and gardeners that should be leveraged. This worked well with 2008 Parks and Green Spaces Levy passed by voters that included \$2 million to build four community gardens.
- **Carol Valdrighi, Magnuson Park Advisory Committee**- Magnuson Park's kids and their families need help. Magnuson Park Community Center must be funded and staffed to its full hourly schedule and the facility must be completed with appropriate space and staff to serve the Park's growing population.

Initiative 4.2: Major Projects Challenge Fund – with Michael Shiosaki, Seattle Parks and Recreation, Planning & Development Division Director and David Graves, Seattle Parks and Recreation, Strategic Advisor

Covered:

At the Committee's request, staff presented an initial list of potential list of sites and/or facilities in need of improvement that may be eligible for funding.

At the Committee's request, greater definition was given to the term "Major Project". Projects that propose a significant upgrade, improvement or expansion of an existing facility beyond routine maintenance fall under the definition of "Major Project". The project budget should be in excess of \$2 million. Staff presented recent project examples to further illustrate what a "major" project might look like, both in budget and in scale.

Staff presented a draft scoring sheet responsive to committee recommendations made at the September 8th meeting. In addition, staff presented an Equitable Prioritization matrix which uses census data to help identify underserved and underrepresented populations within the City.

Staff presented a timeline for the implementation of the Major Projects Challenge Fund in 2016
Staff presented plan to target \$300K in 2016 for planning and design funding, including \$100K for staff support to help applicant(s) get projects ready to submit for funding and identify matching dollars. The remaining \$1.3 million could be available if there is a construction ready project that meets the criteria or it could be rolled over to subsequent years. Any project that receives funding in 2016 would be expected to meet the previously presented criteria and the scoring would be a way to prioritize the projects and funding.

Q&A, Comments- Initiative 4.2: Major Projects Challenge Fund

Comment: Be consistent across criteria with weight. Consider using property values and education level, is there a negative correlation between low income and crime rates. Consider average distance to public open space as an indicator for need. Vehicle ownership was dropped and age from other body's set of criteria -- can you use that (from SDOT)? Consider taking out transportation and add open space proximity and closeness to school lunch numbers.

Comment: The scoring criteria is fairly binary with the -1 or +1 rating system. It is not just the dispersion of the average that makes a difference but the distance as well. How can we adjust for this variable?

Comment: The scoring criteria is fairly binary with the -1 or +1 rating system. It is not just the dispersion of the average that makes a difference but the distance as well. How can we adjust for this variable?

Comment: We can only fund 3-7 projects for the whole 6 year period. Consider providing a schedule for how the money will be allocated over the six-year cycle. This may provide help potential applicants not participating the planning fund portion understand when that should start preparing for the application process. Consider flexibility as a key factor in success. We don't want to lock ourselves into a large allocation upfront. Leveraging the funding is a high priority but, we don't want to prioritize leverage at the expense of meeting our RSJI goals.

Q1: How valid is the crime risk score a good indicator of need when the data may be skewed by access to reporting? Is transit a good indicator?

A1: The prioritization criteria is still in development. We will test the prioritization criteria and adjust as we discover better indicators.

Q2: Consider an administrative fee adjustment. Is 30% the right number?

A2: We believe these costs are static. The proposed represents a rough estimation of those costs. .

Q3: When will we see a finalized prioritization matrix?

A3: We will return in June 2016. We will have vetting and finalized the criteria by then.

Recommendations/Decisions Made- Initiative 4.2: Major Projects Challenge Fund

- The Committee decided to provide additional recommendations to staff by October 23, 2015
- The Committee decided to recommend the approval of the general approach for implementation and the direction of the scoring criteria. The decision to recommend approval was contingent staff's agreement to amend some metrics and scoring criteria.

Seattle Parks and Recreation 2016 Budget Update- Michele Finnegan, Seattle Parks and Recreation, Finance Director

Covered:

Annual Budget Process- SPR submits budget issues to the City Budget Office in early April and a draft budget in early June; Mayoral Review and budget refinements June – August; Mayor submits budget to City Council in late September; Council reviews the Mayor’s budget proposal from late September through mid-November; Council adopts the budget in late November.

Seattle Parks and Recreation 2016 Budget Overview

Total Operating Budget of \$155.2 million (918.68 FTE)

- General Fund \$96,589,513
- Other Funding \$58,562,752
- Seattle Park District \$13,613,159

Total Capital Budget of \$54,218,000

- Seattle Park District (\$34.2M)
- Cumulative Reserve Sub-Fund
 - Real Estate Excise Taxes (\$14.3M) and Unrestricted (\$400K)
- Central Waterfront Improvement Fund (\$2.2M)
- King County Levy (\$1.66M)
- Community Development Block Grant (\$808K)

To learn more about the proposed budget:

- <http://murray.seattle.gov/mayor-ed-murrays-2016-proposed-budget/#sthash.uskt5huZ.H1y04bLk.dpbs>
- [Mayor Ed Murray’s budget speech, as prepared](#)
- [Highlights of Mayor Ed Murray’s budget](#)
- [Press release about Mayor Ed Murray’s proposed budget](#)
- [Learn more from the City Budget Office](#)

Mayor unveils \$47 million Seattle Park District plan for 2016

- <http://murray.seattle.gov/mayor-unveils-47-million-seattle-park-district-plan-for-2016/#sthash.UNXjCnNr.dpbs>
- <http://murray.seattle.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/09/Park-District-Funded-Services.pdf>