Seattle Parks & Recreation

healthy people   healthy environment   strong communities

Major Projects Challenge Fund
$1,600,000 per year
Program category: Building for the Future

Anticipated Key Outcome: Renovated, expanded, or upgraded parks and park facilities, funded through a combination of City and community-generated funds

Racial Equity Outcome(s): Develop a fair and equitable criteria resulting in the implementation of an inclusive process that ensures historically underserved and underrepresented communities will have opportunities to access this fund

Current Situation: The City is often asked to provide financial support to capital development or improvement projects that focus on parks and recreation, for which there is little or no City funding available, and interested communities don't have enough funding to cover the total cost of the project.

Solution: This Challenge Fund will provide City funding to leverage community-generated funding for renovation of parks and park facilities where other City funding is unavailable.

An annual competitive application process will prioritize projects with a parks and recreation mission, public access, leveraged non-City funds, and other pertinent criteria. A portion of funding will be allocated to assist diverse communities and organizations that lack resources for a match.

The purpose of the Major Project Challenge Fund is to provide a funding match, to fund a "major project" that is not otherwise covered by an identified Seattle Parks and Recreation (SPR) fund source. While not specifically defined, it is envisioned that a "major project" is a significant improvement or renovation to an existing SPR owned site or facility. It is not necessarily a collection of small project or a simple building repair such as a new roof. Merely being expensive doesn't necessarily make it a major project – it should significantly expand the life and usability of the subject facility such that it provides more opportunities for more people to make use of the facility. SPR will again target $300K in 2018 for planning and design funding, including $100K for staff support to help applicant(s) get projects ready to submit for construction funding in future years and help to identify matching dollars.

Included in the process will be some key strategies to mitigate historic and current barriers preventing access and opportunities by underserved and underrepresented communities. One of the most critical components of this process will be the outreach to underserved and underrepresented communities. The second critical component will be staff support to enable these communities to effectively navigate

the application process. Third will be identification of the match; some communities may have easier access to dollars with which to provide a match. Other projects may not have any match or the match could be limited to volunteer hours or other in-kind services. Being creative on the type and timing of the match will be important to ensure equity across all project proposals. Finally, providing planning and design money in advance of funding a construction project will also be an important component of this process.

The following is an outline of how the application process will work in 2018. After several months of public outreach, consistent with the City's Inclusive Outreach and Public Engagement guide, a four-page letter of intent/project proposal letter will be due to SPR. The idea is to require a relatively simple description of the proposal to make it easy for an applicant to apply for the funds, with amply space to provide a complete proposal description. SPR staff could then work with the applicant to refine the project, identify potential match source(s) and determine at least a rough order of magnitude cost for the project, if necessary.

Major Project Challenge Fund – Proposed Timeline

- **September 19, 2017** – Presentation to District Oversight Committee
    - o Update on 2016 projects
    - o Updated Scoring Criteria and Scoring
    - o Strategy for 2018
- **September – December 2017** - Staff Development of outreach strategy and On-line materials
- **January – March 2018** – Public Outreach, including use of the IOPE. (may include workshops or information sessions for potential proposals)
- **March 2018 – Proposal Letters Due**
- **April – May 2018** – Staff review of applications
- **June 2018 –**District Oversight Committee review and recommendation to Superintendent
- **July – September 2018** – Funds awarded to project. Projects will be managed by SPR.

Based on all of the above, the following are the updated criteria and scoring by which SPR staff would screen the initial requests for planning and outreach, design and permitting funds. Updates are highlighted.

CRITERIA

a. Is it on SPR owned property and/or a SPR owned facility?

Rationale: Since the funds come through the Park District, they should be spent directly on SPR property and/or an SPR owned facility. Also, SPR will manage the project.

b. Is it an identified capital need at a park or park facility that is lacking in funding; is it a large scale project that may be funded from a variety of public and private funding sources with a total construction cost estimated to be in excess of $2 million? It should be a single project such as building renovation or expansion, or a facility improvement.

Rationale: There are other City funding sources such as the Neighborhood Matching funds available for smaller projects. The idea is that this funding should go to a significant project that improves or expands

an existing facility. What is important is that the project be significant enough to provide long term value to the greater community.

c.   What is the match? ==Provide a complete description of the proposed match, including fund source(s) and timing.== How does the project leverage or have the potential to leverage other resources through the actions of other public agencies, funding from public, private or philanthropic partners, and/or in-kind contributions of time and energy from citizen volunteers?

Rationale: For the actual construction phase of the project, the Major Project Challenge Fund should be leveraged with a 50% match but the match amount could be less and/or provided by other than a monetary match. Ideally, the applicant would be able to raise 50% (or more) of the project cost and the fund would fill the gap to bring the project up to 100% funding. There may be situations where there is significant community support for a project but the applicant doesn't have the resources and/or connections to provide the full 50/50 match. In those situations, this criterion is intended to be flexible in setting a target goal for a match, but not an absolute requirement. There may also be situations where the applicant is unable to identify any match. In those situations, it may be up to SPR staff to step in and help the community with the funding process. If no other funding sources are identified during the initial submittal, it will be incumbent on staff to work with the applicant on funding during the proposal review.

For planning and design proposals where SPR would make smaller amounts available in the range of $20,000 – $50,000 for planning and/or design work, there still should be some sort of match. The percentage and form of the match could be more flexible at this initial phase to get a project ready to apply for the larger construction amount.

d.   Does the project demonstrate a high degree of community support or involvement as demonstrated through a public review process and/or is the project consistent with approved plans, such as a neighborhood, community council or other recent planning documents? ==Include user data such as which community or communities use the facility now.==

Rationale: We are looking to fill an established/identified need at a particular facility. Ideally the project would have been previously identified in some prior planning work done by Parks or another government agency, or the community through a community process. A newly identified need/project could be considered, but the proposal will likely have more support if the project fills a long standing gap/need.

e.   Does the project serve an underserved community==? Include data such as who uses the facility now==.

Rationale: Parks has a commitment to racial equity and social justice. This funding is an opportunity to target improvement(s) to SPR facilities in underserved communities where there is an identified need but no or limited funding sources. These areas deserve special consideration if our goal is to provide equal access to all. SPR staff will be working to ensure that all communities are aware of this funding program and are provided the resources necessary to identify projects and prepare a competitive application. SPR staff will work with underserved communities during the initial application stage to establish a recommended match that will be vetted by the oversight committee. The match could be other funding source(s) or something else such as donated services.

f.   Does the proposal restore or significantly extend the life of a current park or facility?

Rationale: In keeping with the "fix it first" mantra of the Park District, we are looking for projects that make improvements to existing facilities. The purpose of this challenge funding is not to undertake new capital projects but to make improvements to or expansion of existing parks or facilities.

g. What potential effects does the project have on the City's maintenance and operating costs?

Rationale: We will want to see how the proposed improvement/expansion impacts our maintenance and operating costs at the subject facility. Part of the review of any proposal will be SPR staff determination of potential added facility costs. SPR staff is better suited than any awardee to undertake this detailed analysis and it should be part of the proposal/application review. That said, the initial funding request should include a rough order of magnitude of the additional maintenance and operating costs of an improved/expanded facility; i.e., what are existing costs and what are costs anticipated to be with the expanded or renovated facility. These costs could shift as a design evolves and thus just serve as a baseline in reviewing any proposed application.

h. What is the overall benefit of the project to the community? Include user data such as who would use the improved facility and how does the facility serve typically underserved/underrepresented communities now and/or in the future.

Rationale: We will want to see the project and hence the expenditure benefit as many people as possible.

Based on the above, see the attached matrix for potential scoring of the criteria.

Criteria	Possible Points	Score	Rationale
a. Is it an SPR owned facility	0	Yes/No	Must be yes to qualify for funding
b. Is it an identified capital need at a park or park facility that is lacking in funding; is it a large scale project that may be funded from a variety of public and private funding sources with a total construction cost estimated to be in excess of $2 million?	0	Yes/No	Must be yes to qualify for funding
c. Match	10-30		30% match = 10 points 50% match = 20 points 70% match = 30 points
d. Community Support	20		**High** (20 pts): The project is consistent with an SPR Parks Approved Plan such as the 2017 Parks and Open Space Plan or is identified in a broader City of Seattle Plan such as the North Downtown Park Plan, Ballard Open Space Plan, or Livable South Downtown Planning Study. **Medium** (10 pts): The project demonstrates a high degree of neighborhood support or involvement as demonstrated through a public review process such as Letters of support from: Neighborhood or Community Council, District or Advisory Council or other organization representing a neighborhood that is recognized by the City's Department of Neighborhoods. **Low** (0 pts): The project is identified in any approved plans and has little or no documented neighborhood support.

Criteria	Possible Points	Score	Rationale
e. Located in an underserved and/or under represented community	30		**High** (30 pts): Scores 7-8 on the Equitable Prioritization Criteria. **Medium** (20 pts): Scores 4-6 on the Equitable Prioritization Criteria. **Low** (10 pts): Scores 1-3 on the Equitable Prioritization Criteria. **Zero** (0 pts): Scores 0 or below on the Equitable Prioritization Criteria.
f. Restoration or significantly extend the life of an existing park or facility	10		**High** (10 pts): The project repairs, replaces or upgrades aging infrastructure or facilities, extending their life at least 20 years. **Medium** (7 pts): The project repairs, replaces or upgrades aging infrastructure or facilities, extending their life at least 10 years. **Low** (3 pts): The project repairs, replaces or upgrades aging infrastructure or facilities, extending their life at least 3 years. **Zero** (0 pts) : No Restoration or no extension of life of current park or facility
g. Reduce maintenance and operation costs	10		**High** (10 pts): No net increase in the City's maintenance and operating costs. **Medium** (7 pts): The project increases the City's maintenance and operating costs and a Business, non-profit or existing approved community group has agreed to take on all maintenance responsibilities for a period of at least 5 years. **Low** (3 pts): The project has minor increase to the City's maintenance and operating costs and a Business, non-profit or existing approved community group has agreed to take on some maintenance responsibilities for a

Criteria	Possible Points	Score	Rationale
			period of at least 5 years with a net result being reduction of maintenance costs for the Department. **Zero** (0 pts): The project will significantly increase Maintenance and Operating Costs.
h. Community benefit	20		Projects which will be used by the greater community and not just a limited audience will score higher. Include user data such as who would use the improved facility and how does the facility serve typically underserved/underrepresented communities now and/or in the future. Excellent (20 pts), Very Good (17 pts), Good (14 pts), Adequate (10 pts), Questionable (6 pts), Unacceptable (0 pts) • Project includes meaningful effort to create community participation. • Clear community partnerships and support. • Reaches diverse audience. • Demonstrates significant impact for community served. (Cultural, Economic, Educational...etc.) • Evidence that the facility is well used by the community.
Maximum points	**120**		