



**Date:** August 16, 2011

**To:** Sally Bagshaw, Chair of Parks and Seattle Center Committee

**From:** Christopher Williams, Acting Superintendent, Seattle Parks and Recreation

**Re:** Addendum to Community Center Partnership and Planning Analysis Statement of Legislative Intent *Response to SLI 101-1-A-1: Final Survey Results*

---

In our initial SLI response, the Department of Parks and Recreation identified 9 options to consider concerning the operation of community centers, fees for services in community centers, and how the Department works with partners in operating the community centers. The nine options included in the SLI response were:

**Option 1- Geographic Management of Community Centers:** Organize community centers into seven geographic groups of three or four centers that are managed and programmed in a coordinated fashion, and partially or fully restore the current limited use sites.

**Option 2-Tiered Community Centers:** Each community center is classified as belonging to a tier, based on criteria including physical facilities, current use, and demographics. Public hours and staffing depend on the tier. As in Option 1, the centers are managed in geographic groups with programming done on a coordinated basis. ARC partially reimburses the City for programming staff (subject to approval).

**Option 3- Tiered Community Centers with 2-3 Closed or Run by Others:** Tiered community centers as in Option 2 but with 2 – 3 lower-tier centers closed. Closed centers are made available for partnerships to operate all or part of a center as in Options 8 and 9.

**Option 4- Close Community Centers:** Stop City operation of between 7 and 10 community centers (no City staff, no public hours). Closed centers are made available for partnerships to operate all or part of a center as in Options 8 and 9. Community centers that remain open operate as they did in 2010.

**Option 5- Increase PAR Fee:** The City currently retains 3.25% of gross revenue from Associated Recreation Council (ARC) classes, sports fees, and childcare services (10% for Lifelong Recreation courses) to support community center operations. This percent retained is known as a Participation Fee or PAR fee. Change the PAR fee to 4% or 5%.

**Option 6- Resident Discount:** Pilot raising basic fees for programs and services about 10% but offering Seattle residents a 10% discount. Pilot could be at Amy Yee Tennis Center or at all swimming pools.

**Option 7- Volunteers:** Expand use of volunteers in order to forge stronger connections with the community, free professional staff for duties requiring their expertise, make community centers more welcoming to all users, and make programming and rentals during dark hours more affordable.

**Option 8- Reprogramming of Underused Spaces:** Times when a community center is not open to the public or when it is underused are called dark hours. This option would recruit outside organizations (partners) to provide programs or services using community center facilities during dark hours. Partners could include other governmental organizations and private or community-based organizations. The goal is to maximize the use of community centers and provide a range of services to the public.

**Option 9- Long-Term Lease of Entire Community Center:** An outside organization assumes total responsibility for operation of a community center that would otherwise be closed (see Options 3 and 4). Parks retains ownership of the facility and responsibility for major maintenance costs.

For each option a 2-page summary of the option and its impacts was prepared and available on-line. In order to get feedback on the options, a survey was devised asking the respondents to rank the options on a scale going from 6 = “strongly support” to 1 = “do not support at all.” First the Community Center Advisory Team responded to the survey at their last meeting. Their results are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1  
Community Center Advisory Team  
Survey Responses

Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6	Ttl Resps	Avg Resp
<b>Opt 1 - Geo Team Mgt</b>	-	-	1	-	5	6	12	5.33
<b>Opt 2 - Tiered + Opt 1</b>	-	-	-	4	7	1	12	4.75
<b>Opt 3 - 2-3 Closures + Opt 2</b>	1	3	2	3	3	-	12	3.33
<b>Opt 4 - Status Quo + 7-10 Closures</b>	10	-	2	-	-	-	12	1.33
<b>Opt 5 - Increase PAR Fee</b>	-	-	-	2	4	6	12	5.33
<b>Opt 6 - Resident Discount</b>	-	-	1	2	2	7	12	5.25
<b>Opt 7 - Volunteers</b>	2	-	1	2	2	5	12	4.42
<b>Opt 8 - Program Dark Hrs</b>	-	-	1	5	6	-	12	4.42
<b>Opt 9 - CC Run by Others</b>	6	1	4	1	-	-	12	2.00

The Department then held two public meetings (June 15 at Bitter Lake Community Center and June 16 at Jefferson Community Center) to explain the options and answer questions about them. The survey was available on line and in hardcopy at each of our community centers from June 8 through July 8. We had 451 responses to the survey. These are summarized in Table 2 below.

**Table 2  
Public Survey Responses**

<b>Rating</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>Ttl Resps</b>	<b>Avg Resp</b>
<b>Opt 1 - Geo Team Mgt</b>	37	48	66	76	104	120	451	4.16
<b>Opt 2 - Tiered + Opt 1</b>	50	60	74	94	95	67	440	3.74
<b>Opt 3 - 2-3 Closures + Opt 2</b>	167	94	61	60	21	40	443	2.53
<b>Opt 4 - Status Quo + 7-10 Closures</b>	299	63	26	23	13	26	450	1.81
<b>Opt 5 - Increase PAR Fee</b>	54	41	69	72	87	123	446	4.04
<b>Opt 6 - Resident Discount</b>	54	34	48	68	88	152	444	4.26
<b>Opt 7 - Volunteers</b>	53	39	65	71	77	135	440	4.10
<b>Opt 8 - Program Dark Hrs</b>	48	29	50	74	93	151	445	4.32
<b>Opt 9 - CC Run by Others</b>	126	69	69	66	61	53	444	3.06

In addition to rating the options, the survey included a question that asked for a general comment about community center operations. 166 respondents included a comment. These comments are included here as Attachment A.

The Department hopes that this additional information will inform your decisions about these options in the 2012 Budget.

Cc: Kieu-Anh King, Council Central Staff  
 Traci Ratzliffe, Council Central Staff  
 Amy Williams, City Budget Office  
 Karl Stickel, City Budget Office  
 Eric Friedli, Parks  
 Sue Goodwin, Parks  
 Carol Everson, Parks

## Attachment A

### Comments by Respondents to the Community Center Survey

1. All these options will deliver diminished community services compared to centers with strong, permanent staffs that are familiar with the individual needs of the neighborhoods in which they serve. A complete analysis should attempt to measure what is lost in the potential implementation of these proposed changes.
2. Lease option to "community" orgs like the YMCA or other professionally managed orgs
3. Community centers need to stay within each community. We need talented management to get community relevant activities in these center, whether private groups or our own. We just need good management who knows what's appropriate for each center and charge money for it. Volunteers are great too.
4. From what I can tell, the analysis of the community centers started with the premise that the centers needed to pay their own way. That the centers need to be at the very least a revenue neutral function of Parks. If this is the way Parks is considering to managing itself in the future than all programs need to be on the table. Play structures generate no funding. Athletic fields are costing \$1.1 to 1.5 million to build with another \$300-500K thrown in for lights plus maintenance, electricity, and now add an amortized replacement cost of \$80-100K per year. Skate boarding facilities generate no funding along with wading pools and swimming beaches. Of course there are the Off Leash Areas and our open space parks and gardens that are heavily used with no user fees. Community Centers are the heart of the community and are needed to keep and build community. With the QA community Center closed there is a large whole in the community. There is no gathering place for the community that provides such a welcoming and neutral place to meet as a community center. There is no meeting place for all those community volunteers that are being asked to pick up where our government funding has lacked. Where meetings of people can feel they belong regardless of who they are, their financial standing, their political/social belief, or differences of opinion. These are the things that the Park's analysis did not include in the cost basis of the centers. If I had been asked I would have said raise my taxes. Parks are important. If asked I would vote for community centers before bike roads. To build community and to keep a community we need Community Centers or how else does our new Urban Centers have any chance of surviving? Thank you.
5. Open Queen Anne Community Center back to 100%. My kids need somewhere to go, and we cannot afford to pay for private courses, and we do not have the ability to drive elsewhere. Public transport is not an option because buses do not allow push chairs, and I am unable to lift both of my children (two children - under the age of 3) on and off of the bus, and move from bus to bus on my own. It is unfair for the City of Seattle to look at a geographic area and assume that everyone in that area has the same financial access. If the City of Seattle brings in private companies to run Community Centers, the prices will go up and local families will not be able to afford to use the resources. Community Centers need to be run by the City for the Community. A private company will only want to make money, they wont care about providing an affordable community service - especially on Queen Anne where everything is already overpriced.

6. I strongly believe that community centers are meant to be local neighborhood places where residents of all ages, backgrounds and economic levels come together for social, recreational, educational, and organizational purposes. They were established by residents who saw these centers as one among many of the essential services provided by local government with tax revenues generated by those very same residents. They were never established to be profit centers: sources of revenue for City government coffers. Further, neighborhoods should not be tiered in a manner that pits one against another. Community centers are intended to be for all communities on an equal basis.
7. I think the Executive and the Council need to go back to the budget and come up with the funds to keep the community centers opening and functioning fully. The idea that the \$1.5 to 2.5 million dollars that may be "saved" with these cuts is not looking at the big picture. And looking at the Big Picture is their job. Money that is cut from Parks programs and support will only put additional stress on police, fire, and social services. Any savings will be lost
8. I like the idea of a combination of lowering charges for residents and making use of volunteers.
9. When did community centers become a potential revenue source. Community centers should be for the use of the community and not rental properties. What kind of community center would it be if it was rented out for a for profit organization like select basketball programs that are not open to those members of the community that need the community centers. The Parks department has become so big with the addition of new parks that are built and not maintained that community centers are now looked upon as a cash cow to be used to fund the other parks. Parks should put a moratorium on building new parks like Kinnear and Magnolia Manor. It is fine to have the community fund the building of them, but who pays for maintaining them. Maybe Parks should sell naming rights to the Parks. Instead of Magnuson Park we could have the Paul Allen Park or Verizon Park. And stop targeting the areas north of downtown for closure. Our communities need viable community Centers as much as areas south of downtown.
10. It is very difficult to register for tours. By phone, registration begins at noon. Phone lines are busy for an hour, and by the time a connection is reached, all tours are booked. We have been on the wait list for all the sessions we have signed up for. Eventually, another van is found for most of the wait list, but this is a week before the event.
11. Community Centers are not supposed to make money-of course they cost money and we all benefit just like public schools. Keep community centers strong.
12. It is difficult to comment meaningfully in a multiple choice survey. Even reading the brief descriptions. Depends in part about how centers are being used and could be used. Judith Stoloff  
FAICP
13. Community centers are important. Its not always about money, it should be about the people.
14. Please do not close any pools or reduce the amount of classes! Seattle has relatively few pools (only two outdoor ones) and water safety is so important
15. Community centers provide a lot of "bang for the buck," especially among low-income families. If you raise fees for programs, I think you should also offer a "free" afternoon or evening once or twice a month (especially at swimming pools), so that people who have large families and are strapped for money can still enjoy public facilities. Are there times (e.g., middle of the day?) when there is a lower use of the public facilities? If you're going to limit hours, perhaps you could make

sure they are open during peak use times, even if it means closing during the middle of the day (e.g., don't some Metro drivers work split shifts to cover morning and evening rush hours)? Parks and community centers are, to me, like libraries. Public facilities make such a difference to people who might otherwise not have access to the benefits that they offer. Would it be possible to seek corporate sponsorship of certain programs?

16. Why are so many north-end centers being targeted (Green Lake, Queen Anne, Ballard, Laurelhurst...???!). What about the South-end? What about fairness? Also, your idea of closing down Green Lake Community Center is just TERRIBLE....Green Lake is the most popular park in the whole state, and the community center, pool and all of the other amenities around it are very important to the community. They are icons of Seattle.....and a few park department cronies want to have these beautiful surroundings for their plush new digs??? GO TO MAGNUSON!!!! There is plenty of room there and your excuse that (insert whiny voice here) "We can't because it will cost too much money for upgrades!" is lame because Green Lake community Center needs upgrades too. I'm not buying it! You must really think that Seattleites are stupid...
17. Please don't close the Magnuson center. There are marvellous programs run from this site and the parking is wonderful. Bus service is good. Participants are drawn from a wide area.
18. Its hard to guess what the impact will be from some of the options. The devil is in the details. I could imagine my use (and support) of the community centers being increased, or totally eliminated depending on the details. I use the Green Lake community center several times a week. I don't drive, I walk there. It would be impractical for me to use the other centers in the "geographic group".
19. I am most concerned about the tremendous need to save indoor tot playtime at as many community centers as possible. Especially on the many bad weather days, the indoor playtime with bouncy houses and so forth provides immeasurable joy to the kiddos and a most welcome change of pace for parents. The 1-4 age group especially needs positive places to exercise and play. Providing positive experiences during these formative years is crucial. Please save indoor toddler playhouse at the community centers!
20. These options are not really all that clear. I don't want to see the city selling off community centers to private enterprise; however, when private-for-profit organizations use the community centers (if that is even allowed) charge them more. But non-profits should always have priority over for-profit organizations. Also, some community centers have playfields, and these are used by ball teams. Raise the price for using these. There are a lot of ball fields in the city and they should be fully supported by those organizations which use them: including maintenance, use of toilets, utilities, parking, lights, etc. I am aware of ball clubs coming here from outside Seattle. They should expect to cover all costs.
21. The question I asked was not used at the first hearing. My concern is that we aren't given information as to whether or not there has been a complete analysis of the Parks & Recreation organization in terms of paring it back where it doesn't affect the neighborhoods as much as community centers do. I believe that the Department of Neighborhoods and the Department of Parks & Recreation should be subjected to an externally driven functional analysis that would result in a number of ways to develop a comprehensive network of regionally operated facilities and

programs for City neighborhoods with less centralized bureaucracy and more attention to programs and services for neighborhoods.

22. WHAT! This has to be without question the most poorly written survey I have ever read.
23. In communities of under used community centers perhaps information fares to inform what is available and to encourage community support, as well as, identify needs of that community and how to gain their involvement. Until a few years ago, I had no idea what a wonder resource these centers really are and that might just be the case of others, too. I am willing to pay a bit more for programs and I think those who can't pay should be allowed to participate. The Life Long Learning Program has been a blessing in so many ways. As a retiree, the social aspect has been most meaningful.
24. I think there are other options that had been presented at the meeting at Jefferson Park on the 16th of the month that should be reviewed and discussed further. Thinking outside of the box is often a step in the right direction. While I would not want to see all of Magnuson Park sold and not available for use in the future we may need to consider it as an alternative for some of the restricted use sites. I also really liked the idea of a city use tax/fee that was briefly mentioned for visitors to Seattle, like what one would find in other cities. It seems like something like this could generate millions of dollars from tourists every year that are utilizing many of our cities resources. This in turn would then offer us a way to help those that live and use our city on a daily basis not just once a year, or maybe once every few years on vacation. If this works in other cities, would it not work here? Many people travel here specifically for our city, yet many more also use this as a stopping point for a portion of their travels in many other parts of the world. It would be a great thing to tap into this money to help those that reside here permanently.
25. Unfortunately, none of the options are good ones, but I support maintaining as many well-used and well-run community centers as possible. Usage should be based on PRE-2011 numbers, as counting usage at the limited use sites is a joke! Community support can also be counted in ways other than the number of site users, such as monetary support, vocal support (letters written both to the city council as well as Parks), etc.
26. I have personal experience running a City-owned neighborhood center that operates like Option 9. Since the City department responsible for major maintenance costs has notified us that they will no longer be responsible for maintenance, I see this option following suit. Our organization does not have the resources to repair and maintain our facility. Because our neighborhood is next to the smallest in Seattle, I am hesitant to support options that limit access to only a few centers. Ours would fold under those options. Our neighborhood has the highest level of racial diversity in the city. I think environmental justice would keep our center open where those with lowest incomes and lack of decent public transit live.
27. IF PEOPLE ARE NOT USING COMMUNITY CENTERS THEN CLOSE THEM BASED ON USE OBVIOUSLY THE CITY DOES NOT NEED THEM - IF THEY ARE NOT BEING USED TURN IT INTO A REVENUE GENERATING PROPERTY STILL UNDER CITY OWNERSHIP - DO NOT ALLOW GROUPS TO USE THESE UN-SUPERVISED BY THE CITY OR BY A SET CRITERIA WE DO NOT NEED UNSCRUPULOUS GROUPS USING THESE FACILITIES FOR BAD THINGS I.E. ANARCHISTS!
28. I like the idea of providing opportunities for other groups to use the space - but also know that that would take staff to coordinate... Is it possible to keep the centers open during the summer, then

once school starts up close them to save money? I hate the idea of kids not having a place to go... Also - I do think you should prioritize adult activities below children's...adult generally have many more options... thanks for asking!

29. I strongly support our parks, community centers, pools and beaches, and feel that we should maintain these facilities as much as possible through this downturn as positive and affordable community assets available to all Seattle residents. These are high priority to a livable and healthy city and we should keep as many open as possible, while looking for efficiencies and creative public-private partnerships.
30. If the community center (Bitterlake) is closed, The after school program provided to Broadview Thompson must stay open. The potential impact to the state in revenue loss because of impact to working parents is a significant one that will build over time as parents spend more of their income on privatized childcare and less of it on things that generate revenue for the state.
31. Rates already increased by a lot over the past year at Amy Yee Tennis Center. I would discourage increasing rates there. Definitely consider other options, such as opening more courts for private lessons, which can generate more income than regular rentals.
32. I could be persuaded to support 3 and 4 options if these were temporary measure with demonstrated partners quickly and efficiently available (otherwise time that it takes to get start up may be better served just bringing down the level of current operation, and then raising as funds increase.) I think that Community Centers must be kept open rather than consolidated into regional centers, because people using them need to be closer to them (not have to spend 1/2 hour or more in one-way travel to get there by bus or on foot) - I think most users are neighbors, and they serve a vital function to keep they & their kids active! thanks for the chance to give input, judy
33. Fundraise; The Human Society raised 2million dollars through it's annual walkathon through partnerships with individuals, nonprofits, businesses, and media outlets in June 2011 Seattlites love our parks and community centers, I'm positive many people will contribute and partake, especially if this results in saving our community centers. In addition most community centers have resources to set up a community gathering that can then lead to a central walkathon. Keep our community centers community based, partnership with non profits okay but dont let them takeover. Public spaces should be accessible to ALL community groups/individuals!
34. In a time where earnings are limited for individuals and unemployment is high, the use of community centers is critical for families with limited means. How about looking at rentals like for weddings or parties after hours? Anything to avoid removing yet another service that our tax dollars pay for.
35. I can't imagine any community center closing-- centers are a significant resource for every neighborhood. They're a center for gathering, learning, keeping our kids safe and active, and creating a sense of family in each community. I think any option that enables a center to bring in more revenue should be explored. As a secondary cost-cutting measure, I would rather have every center take a small cut / furlough day or some other cost- reducing measure rather than close or significantly impact any center. As a regular at the Ballard Community Center, and one who leans on its fantastic after-school program for my kids, I sure hope the city can resolve budgetary issues without impacting our centers any further!!!! -Laurie Zettler

36. The Queen Anne Community Center is very important for our neighborhood as I am sure all the others are. People use these centers on a daily basis for so many various purposes. So many kids would lose strong footholding for afterclass events if you close the centers. Our little ones would lose play gyms during so many dark and rainy Seattle days. If the city needs to raise more money in order to operate the centers they should increase the fees from \$2/per kid to \$5 or at least do a study of what should be this fee in order to make more money. Also include more volunteers as there are so many of us that would like to help. And at the end, the city should start auditing itself more regularly. As a former auditor myself I am sure there are plenty of holes in the city budget where money is simply lost. Stop taking things away from your community. Respectively, Marija Berker, Queen Anne
37. Please keep community centers open! They are vital to the health of our communities and city as a whole.
38. Most community centers are needed in the neighborhoods for the community and families. Bitter Lake community center is used a lot for the neighboring schools and sports, family activities, summer programs kids, recreation sports, and additional activities in the building. Closing community centers is the wrong approach for these neighborhoods. Additionally, these activities tend to keep our kids safe and out of trouble/harm. Thank you.
39. give them all up completely to their own neighborhoods to own and to do with as they see fit
40. The North Seattle Area is growing by leaps and bounds with young families which will be strong support in the future.,why is the focus always on the high income areas of Seattle, which does not meet the needs of those families in Seattle without resources for recreation.
41. My complaint is the Bitterlake Community Center is there but what does it do? Finding a schedule of what's going on is impossible...and most of what I do see is not interesting for me, a senior citizen. If It can be operated for the kids that's great, but in this time of budget shortfalls I would rather see the money spent for health services.
42. Anything that can be done to keep the Community centers viable, should be considered. The CC's are more than the sum of their parts -- they represent a lifeline to many low-income kids and seniors. SOme CC's are underutilized but this is a vicious cycle - as the hours are cut, they are less appealing (less programming) and utilized even less. The CC's are a vital part of what makes Seattle neighborhoods special, and once they are closed it seems unlikely they would ever again be opened. It would be the slow death of neighborhood services.....
43. Our community centers, like our libraries, need to be up and running. We use 2 community centers several times per week, and would like to see them stay open. In these hard times one cannot afford private sector entertainment and fitness facilities for families. I would be willing to be a volunteer for one of our local centers. We live in NE Seattle. Peace, Holly Girouard
44. Please keep Queen Anne community center open!
45. As a senior with limited income, the Community Centers are extremely important to me. We are bombarded with information about how to stay healthy in our later years and one of the major components of a healthy life is consistent exercise. It is short-sighted and counter-productive to curtail or remove the Over 55 activities at the centers. Raise fees if you must, but keep the core activities. Lorraine Pozzi Queen Anne

46. I'd like the focus to be on maximizing service, and keeping buildings and programs protected for the future when funding is less constrained. I'm fine with paying fees for these great services. The best way to protect our buildings and programs is to use them.
47. During the dark hours - couldn't there be a standard rental fee for other organizations to use? Wouldn't that help generate a little income for the community center? (would have to be enticing to rent)
48. I really like the Queen Anne Community Center.
49. I support partnerships with community organizations and love the idea of expanding/maintaining hours using volunteers. I also firmly believe the centers need to remain clearly, obviously publicly owned and operated and do not appear to be run/operated by outside groups. Encouraging or requiring outside groups to offer free access to the facility (as opposed to programs for a fee) will help make center use accessible to more people. Community/neighborhood councils could/should be great partners. Work with DON to bring people in. Seattle needs free, welcoming public spaces, both indoor and outside. Thank you Parks for your creative efforts to keep us healthy and connected.
50. The more I have talked to people attending the community centers the more I hear people are willing to pay more to use them. I go to Pickleball at three different community centers a week. It is crucial for me to keep up my exercise at the age of 54 and to have a place indoors to play during the fall and winter.
51. Please restore hours to Queen Anne Community Center and keep the pre-school open.
52. This is a sad situation in general. The community centers are a great amenity in this city. Closure seems like a terrible idea and should be avoided. Hopefully revenue will increase and services will follow in a few years. Re-opening a facility is much more difficult than expanding offerings.
53. The community center that my son and his friends use is Hiawatha in West Seattle. Not only do we attend events there and play on its play fields, but our aftercare program is run from this facility by tremendously dedicated, caring and UNDERPAID professionals. If we lose the center, West Seattle loses its community "CENTER" a place for neighbors to gather, children to play, and our aftercare program. As a single mom and home owner--Hiawatha and its programs were part of my decision to live here--in Seattle and not Bellevue or south of West Seattle--was Hiawatha and the schools here. I know we have to save money--but, please don't forget the kids and working families who rely on the services of our community center. Closing our community center would make it more difficult for parents and kids. Please, please don't cut Hiawatha!!!
54. We need to have a safe place for young people to play So many people depend on the center More programs & less management
55. Please keep Community Centers open for children's usage. They need healthy and safe environments where they can belong to the community and venture beyond their backyard! Please keep Alki Community Center open - it is a place where all ages, but especially older youth and teens hangout. They need healthy choices
56. If there isn't enough money to operate, then you have to not provide service.....so close some of the centers. But good luck picking which ones to close.
57. Why don't you layoff some of your 'glutted so called managers' ! It is shameful how the City of Seattle has loaded themselves with non-essential management, who draw very comfortable wages

while the so -called laborers draw barely living wages! Shame on you bean counters, too many of you are do-nothings!

58. I would support a range of options, but the last resort should be to close community centers. Establishing partnerships to maximize use sounds like a great idea. Thanks.
59. although everyone's opinions may not be heard, it is known that many people rely on community centers for services, programs, classes, and sometimes just to be safe. community centers have already taken a huge hit, and for them and it's customer's/clients/users, another hit would be detrimental. please consider everyone that this will effect, and not just how much it will effect the city's budget.
60. Rent out community centers for private use like birthday parties and social events during off hours (when public is not using)
61. Seattle: you cannot keep cutting social services!! Like Denver, try raising the fees for moving violation tickets, NOT parking that affects all of us. Do something BESIDES simply cutting expenses - PLEASE get rid of some middle management, ensure ALL who make \$100,000+ get some cuts, and make ALL positions do furlough days, 12 months not 10 or 11! thanks for this opportunity to do this survey, kara kara@wallingfordchamber.org
62. I have an interest in our parks and the programming. I live in the View Ridge Neighborhood and remember a time when our community centers were busy with families and activity. In activity programming, I have a concern that our local Magnuson Park Community center has become more directed to theatre. We used to have a pottery studio. Has anyone considered emphasizing more art related programming? I know of Pratt Fine Art Center and their direction, but the location is quite a distance from the North Seattle area. Could we ever have printmaking, pottery, and jewelry studios on the north end. Programming that might include water color classes, photography, things that could easily compliment and celebrate the existing park and wildlife environment. We could classes and walks that include topics from aquatic life (insects, fish, and reptiles) partnering with the UW, to the ever changing waterfowl and birds (UW and audobon society). Is it possible to install green BBQs and picnic tables and even firepits (smoke free). Of course we still need the exercise and extensive children's programming for afterschool and summer. We could have indoor/outdoor activities like volleyball, picklball to compliment the sports field activity. Have your artists share with the communtiy. When you give out contracts, have a public benefit part. A lecture, a class, a rotating exhibit of art that travels from center to center sharing with all. We could have first aid classes, emergency preparedness, nutrition, right along with cooking and exercise. Can we get a computer room and classes? We could have dances, lectures on local plants or gardening, garden design, flower arranging, vegetable garden topics, getting local business people involved. Our family has gone to our local community centers for about 22 years. Even as our college children return home, we head to the local center to exercise! Regarding your survey, there should be no underused spaces in such a beautiful city. It is our job to keep the facilities clean, safe and attractive. If we can not afford to do this, we need to negotiate a way to get them up to code and USED to benefit our communitites. Use volunteers for all we can, they are important. From the young to the elder, all have gifts to contribute - from answering telephones to writing thank you notes, from teaching computer classes, to cooking, to writing, to painting. Try a communtiy survey to see all the resources you have close to your centers, you will be amazed. Thank you for your

effort in addressing the use and efficiency of our parks. Please feel free to send me an email if you have any questions, [jfullerseattle@comcast.net](mailto:jfullerseattle@comcast.net) Thank you, Julie Fuller

63. You are going to have to implement a combination of options in order to meet the budget shortfall. Option 1 + 3 + 5 + 6 = about 2.7 million savings Closing or increasing dark time could draw more transient, gang or loose kid usage and reduce the health of the neighborhoods. Long term lease of some facilities at the sites more popular for out of towners (Green Lake/ Pools/ Tennis Courts) would probably be useful - staff reduction of upkeep, possible improved business model and property improvements.
64. Please restore programs at Greenlake Community Center. Greenlake is destination park, not a local park and should be a showplace of Seattle, not a underused building due to limited hours. Greenlake is the most heavily used park in Seattle and should be funded as such.
65. Extreme budget cuts require creative partnerships. Before you close down a center, maybe there is a church or non profit that is willing to rent the building for a period of time and pay rent that can help the Parks & Recreation Dept with their overall budget.
66. I have been told Amy Yee Tennis Center has two managers who make obscene salaries and do little work. If this is true at other City facilities as well, there could be a huge savings in reducing the number of managers, and paying them a reasonable wage. Or pay them hourly for the work actually performed while on-site.
67. The more the community centers are used, the better. I would like all of them to stay open (especially Alki) but be rented out during off-hours or for special events to raise more money.
68. I have no problem with fees being increased, and would suggest that it be means-tested; low income folks could be exempt from any increase. My local community center seems underused to me for everything apart from basketball and the kiddie play sessions. Ironically, I use the fitness/weight room regularly, but I must be one of the few because it's almost always empty when I do!
69. Our community centers are so important! We have to find better ways to fund them! Closing them should never be an option!
70. For option 9 I assume services would still be open to the public
71. I hate the idea of closing community centers - but partnering to use the space when not otherwise being used is a good idea. Good luck with this - challenging times and options.
72. When I was looking for an exercise program, I had a hard time finding anything in my neighborhood in the evening hours. Doesn't the city realize that people work. Then I found a Yoga class about 1/2 mile from my house, but alas, I was rejected from registering for it because I was too old. Since when is 57 too old to take a yoga class????? Then similarly, all or most of the classes offered for those over 55 are in the daytime, when I work.....It appears to me that better planning of classes that would be convenient to people to people would be helpful.
73. Cutting back on any of the community center hours, facilities and programs is a real shame, and will slowly deteriorate the fabric of our society here in Seattle. Community Center; it's right there in the name. There are many other areas to where funding can come from, starting with overpaid City employees. This city is too expensive to live in, and one of the options is to charge more for those who aren't residents, those who already can't afford to live in the city? Seattle has become a town of elitists. We strive to have healthy citizens in Seattle, but you're cutting funding to one of the key

elements of creating a healthy life style. I sincerely hope the City does not cut funding to any of the community centers or their programs. Concerned citizen, -Oliver

74. At the end of the day Council has passed up a viable funding model the MPD!! Tell this do nothing Mayor to get out of the way and bring sanity to the system with or without him.
75. My Community Center is Green Lake. It was part of the reason I purchased my house, with the ideal of "aging in place". What I like most is that I can walk to it....saying I can travel to another CC doesn't work for me. Green Lake CC, (built in 1929!) was the lowest rated facility in the 2008 Parks Dept evaluation....while the City continues to build new CC's in other parts of the City, our community patiently waits for its turn to get a major renovation or new CC. The facility is not very inviting, which does not promote community use. It is convenient to I-5, so many people from other communities use it on their way home from work, esp the Evans pool. Now you want to rate/rank the CC's based on usage and facility? We know ours already ranks dead last. The location, in the most intensely used municipal park in the state and beside the Lake, would be very desirable for a commercial entity, but it seems to me this breaks a promise with the taxpayers about how the land and the building would be used. Why should I vote for levies, knowing that in the future the purchases may be converted into profit centers for private parties?
76. remodel the Rainier beach pool/community center verses a complete tear down.. at a \$25 million cost--you should be able to remodel it for under \$20 million and use the remainder to starve off hte budget cuts for the entire Parks dept Develop private/public partnerships -i.e. corporate sponsors to be able to name each center or place their corporate image/logo in the centers for a cost Alan Abe
77. Any outside organization would have to be non religious in nature. Not sure about that. Miss the Alki community center!
78. Community centers are too vital to too many to consider closing them. My family has enjoyed and benefited greatly by the programming. These are truly places where the communities gather and sets Seattle apart as a city with a strong sense of community. Do what you must to keep the centers open.
79. I think if the community centers would coordinate spaces for parties and charge rental fees (some do now but there are almost NO party coordinators and help) this would be a GREAT service. Parents are always trying to find places for parties that are not going to cost \$300 but be at an outside location. For 90 minute parties and facility rentals (gym/toys) and \$150 per party, that could be very helpful especially if it was coordinated by a centralized party planner. I personally volunteer to help create such a program so email or call me if you need help! Community centers are SUPER important. Fund drives, rummage sales, donations to keep programs from those who depend on certain programs for kids, themselves, etc. would help as well. Maybe a drive for corporate sponsors of various centers as well as a competition sort of thing and ability to 'rename" a center w/corporate sponsor who donates \$1M+ each year for 10 years or more sort of thing. I am a stay at home mom with 18 years in marketing/PR at Microsoft (and easy to work with, i promise:)) --- email: anniehall16@hotmail.com/Erin Cullen Harris -- happy to help! :) thanks!!
80. I would support combining options 2 & 9 in a modified fashion. Dark hours use by lessees would likely allow flexibility in re-accessing facilities for Parks' use in the future, rather than a long term lease solely. For resident discounts, providing options such as where a child attends school to prove residency may lessen fears about giving documentation. For non-community center revenue raising,

I'm not sure if food vendors are currently allowed in places like Discovery, Carkeek, Seward Park and the like. Having a kiosk where you can buy drinks (hot in winter), ice creams, light snacks, etc., might draw visitors as well as provide some revenue. And what about a latte stand or something at Pools/Community Centers where parents are waiting for kids to finish swimming/ballet lessons?

81. Community Centers are vital to Communities in countless ways (some unnoticed). They provide programs, a place, a CENTER of Community activity, things vital to people living healthily in touch with their locale and neighbors. Bottom Line is: Cut some slack hours if you must, raise some fees (not too much) and think as big and creatively, as possible high you are trying to do with these survey options. The worst, stupidest thing to do is to close the Centers. You are asking for trouble in a Community that has no heart and no nourishment. Closing 7-10 centers is the worse. Work on upping the level of their programming and getting the Community INTO them in some innovative ways! PLEASE. Meadowbrook C.C. is a good example of a Community really networking with their Community. We all feel at home there. Other Community groups are meeting there and offering workshops and events through their brochure. See what the popular ones are doing and start doing that at other Centers less used. DO NOT CLOSE THEM OR CUT THEIR HOURS TOO MUCH. Money issues are real, but SHOULD NOT RIP THE HEART OUT OF A COMMUNITY!!
82. I also think a donation campaign might be of interest and allows users to actively participate in an effort to avoid closing facilities. I also believe there are people who would volunteer their time for use of the facility. There is no harm in determining if allowing outside groups to stage their programs during 'dark' hours is beneficial and will help the financial bottom line. It is definitely time to think outside the box and save the centers and the programs. For many people these programs are all they can afford.
83. Increase fees wherever possible. Provide discounts for low income Seattle residents.
84. Community Centers are a very valuable place for our communities. This is the place where children look forward to go to learn different things, meet and make new friends, this is where people in the community meet and get to know each other and support the community activities as well. Since we get a lot of rain in Seattle, community centers are a very valuable asset for raising children because it provides activities for the family. please cut budget somewhere else and think about the children, put them in our priority list since they are the future of our country.
85. It's time to start thinking about a city or county income tax. Seattle voted overwhelmingly in favor of I-1098 last year while the rest of the state was voting it down. Let's find a way to capitalize on that willingness to pay what it takes to maintain our quality of life, in a way that does not disproportionately burden the poor.
86. Raise taxes, raise user fees for everyone except low income and children.
87. Community Centers are a jewel in our parks system. As a former Seattle Parks Commissioner, I am strongly opposed to closing community centers and am opposed to long term leases of entire community centers. While there are concerns about many of the proposals, the City Council will need to pick among the difficult choices. The best option identified by the advisory team is to increase the Participation Fee to 4 or 5 percent. Most residents and users are willing to pay higher fees so that we can continue to access the wonderful classes, camps, and recreational opportunities provided by community centers citywide. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Grace Yuan

88. Eliminate the antiquated operations like the department of neighborhoods before cutting community centers.
89. Seattle's community centers -- along with its branch libraries -- are the nexus around which its many and varied neighborhoods function. Seattle residents live in a series of neighborhoods, many of them previously their own independent towns, that form the nucleus of their daily civic lives. Consolidating or closing community centers PRIMARILY effects those in the middle class or lower down the socio-economic ladder. These centers provide vital child care, exercise, recreational classes, and public third places to people who cannot afford private child care, expensive private gym memberships, or costly art or other classes. The majority of the options put forward will increase the speed at which Seattle is hurtling toward become a city populated by the wealthy and well off. As policy selections, I find these insensitive to the needs of the poor, the socio-economically disadvantaged, the shrinking middle class, communities of color, and the elderly. Go back to the drawing board. Develop plans that reflect a hybrid of options 7 and 8 in a way that keeps ALL community centers open and restores full functioning hours to those reduced in service scope. While I am sympathetic with the difficulties of dwindling revenues and competing demands for city funds to provide essential public services, there are better approaches that can preserve Seattle as a more economically, socially, racially, and demographically diverse city.
90. My concern is that potential cost savings will come at the price of disproportional access and availability to resources and services, especially in disadvantaged neighborhoods.
91. You don't provide enough information to truly understand and evaluate the options you are proposing
92. Community Centers are wonderful, I used them SO much when my kids were young, and don't know what I would have done without them. Sad to see the wading pools closing too. It's just not summer without them.
93. Making the facilities available to non-profit organizations would still be serving the community and save the City plenty of \$-perhaps even help them raise some \$
94. This is a confusing survey, in that there seems to be an assumption that respondent understands terms that could have different meanings to different people. For example, without a context as to what Parks Dept means by "tiers", I, not clear on what this means. ALSO: For Option 1---how can \$665,000 be SAVED if you're going to partially RESTORE operations @ "limited use" centers? Wasn't the reason that their hours were reduced to save \$? So this sounds contradictory. And how would re-grouping centers into 7 geographic zones be different than how they're currently grouped? Why would re-grouping save \$? If Options 3 and 4 have a choice of possibly having partners "operate all or part of a center", and Option 9 is having an "outside organization assume total responsibility for operation of center", what's the difference? A "partner operating all of a center" versus an "outdoor organization assuming responsibility for operation of center" sound the same. Maybe there's a difference between a "partner" and "outside organization"? Easy to get very confused between these 3 options.
95. Where would additional ARC money come from? Can we really count on it? Are you anticipating an increase in class fees? Have other ways of raising money been discussed (fund raising, etc). How did CCAT rate these options. Re: leasing, have private organizations been approached or would this be looked at down the road and cost time and money in doing so, what and how would this be

allocated? Re: option 1 has a plan for personnel changes been discussed to create an efficient system? What are the legal implications of leasing a public funded space to a private organization for a long term lease and does this require public approval (vote).

96. The tiered concept (options 2 and 3) seems to have worked well for Seattle Public Library, and may be able to get public support since people are already familiar with the idea. The lower tier sites need to be geographically spread. I would support a stronger version of option 6: have a resident and non-resident fee for all programs and services, with the non-resident fee being at least 50% higher. People who do not support the centers with their tax dollars should not enjoy the same benefits. I do not like the way this survey is set up. Because most surveys have "agree" on the left and "disagree" on the right, I am afraid that many people will mark this survey backwards, jumbling the results.
97. Why are we planning on opening a Belltown Community Center later this year when we have drastically reduced the Queen Anne Community Center which is only a few miles away?? I'm not sure Belltown has the demographics (children& senior citizens) to support a community center.
98. AS AN ACTIVE SENIOR CITIZEN AND PARTICIPANT IN PICKLE BALL AT THE COMMUNITY CENTERS AT MAGNUSON, RAVENNA AND MEADOWBROOK, I WOULD BE VERY UNHAPPY TO SEE THESE CENTERS CLOSED. I WOULD ESTIMATE THAT 95% OF MY FELLOW PICKLE BALL PLAYERS ARE LONG TIME PROPERTY TAX PAYERS AND VOTERS. WE RANGE IN AGE FROM 50 TO 85 YEARS YOUNG AND DO DESERVE A PLACE TO TAKE PART IN A SPORT THAT WE ALL LOVE. PERHAPS THE PARKS AND REC. BOARD COULD TAKE A LOOK AT THE THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS THAT ARE SPENT MAKING NEW PLAYGROUNDS "ARTSY". I WONDER IF THE CHILDREN OR THEIR PARENTS EVEN NOTICE THE FAKE STREAMS AND POLISHED BOULDERS THAT ARE BROUGHT IN AT GREAT EXPENSE. KEEP OUR COMMUNITY CENTERS OPEN AND CUT BACK ON UNNECESSARY SPENDING. glad2go@gmail.com
99. Please don't give these resources away to private groups that will end up charging us \$8 to go into what is/was ours. That's the difficulty of the "privatization" trend. Some sort of compromises need to be done, how about increasing the taxes for the rich and businesses for starters!!!
100. Community Centers by their very name a centers of community pride and activity. They should not be privatized. ARC does a great job of partnering with Parks to provide programs. Community Centers are part of the core mission of Parks.
101. Please AVOID privatization of public spaces, as indicated some spaces are already currently operated by private non profits, those programs are often limits Seattle citizens access to the services or programs because it is often more costly to partake and have less variable uses. The purpose of the "Community Centers" is to allow the community to access the space! I love the suggestion of having less managers oversee the more community centers. There are way too many bosses and paper pushers. Just have a handful of skilled in managers utilize there technique across the board while allowing the workers room to utilize their judgement. Also please please get rid of the people sitting behind the counters who are not interested in serving patrons. I am frequent visitor to many cententers throughout Seattle and sad to say the Rainer and Rainer Beach Com Center has some of the worst, lack of knowledge and lack of motivation to help. Make it easier to retain good talent and fire bad talent. Volunteerism is much more powerful then the community center realize. Many nonprofits reply heavily on volunteers. Have Senior citizen groups help with children activities. College students help mentor teens or help managers. Disabled people help with

simple task. Unemployed build new skills while volunteering. The possibilities are endless. Try to have the community centers operate like a for profit business. Get rid of inefficiency (bad talent, repetitive services within nearby centers, and less managers) Don't close any community centers limit the hours if you must. The economic downturn is temporary, seattlites are resilient when the economy upturns we must have our community centers, it is one of Seattle's greatest assets. Especially as people become less faithful we need a non religious place to gather. Community Centers are essential in keeping us connected with our neighbors and our city.

102. Laurelhurst Community Center is more remote and smaller than the Ravenna/Eckstein Community Center. Therefore, It would make better sense to use the R/E Center as one of the seven geological sites.
103. Jefferson Park should stay open, because it is a place to hang out and for kids to play.
104. Please consider partnering with nonprofits to run these centers...especially ones that are more effective and efficient than municipalities.
105. I know the city is struggling to maintain services all across the board and realistically I realize that city support of the community centers has to be reduced but I sincerely hope that a way can be found to keep as many centers open with the same staffing and hours as in 2010. These centers serve many different populations and their closing or a reduction of hours would disappoint people in many different age groups (from pre-schoolers to senior citizens in their 80's). I speak as a member of the latter group; I am 77 years old and have for many years been playing pickleball at least twice a week at either Ravenna, Magnuson, or Meadowbrook Comm. Centers. This activity is not only a great source of exercise for seniors, it also provides a very friendly social atmosphere for us and many great friendships have been formed among the pickleball players. In sum, I sincerely hope that pickleball will remain live and well at the Centers for many years to come. Diane Fathi
106. If Center are to be closed, make sure the city can support the ones that remain, and make the others available to community groups to manage. Why are community centers singled out? No other Parks Department activity is self sustaining. They all cost money. A similar approach should be taken for all assets.
107. Many of these options are tough choices, but I appreciate the work the Parks Dept has done to reach this point. I like the geographic and tiering of the community centers. I'm not as interested in the closing of community centers, unless the City of Seattle needs the budget savings. I'm ok with the reprogramming of underused spaces and, even, with the long-term lease idea -- as long as it fits within the Parks Dept mission and isn't for so long that we can't get out of it, etc. Good luck!
108. Our family will suffer greatly if Loyal Heights Community Center were to close or even if hours are reduced. The facility has offered us outstanding programs at rates that we can afford. The community center has given our family a true sense of belonging; a place where the staff knows our names, greets us warmly, and asks how our day is going. If you take that away from people by slowly dismantling the community centers, our neighborhoods will be at a great disadvantage as will the population of the city of Seattle in general.
109. If you allow an outside organization to take responsibility, i.e. the YMCA or Girls and Boys Club, will you allow for a membership model? Will you allow them to build a fitness center, etc. and charge monthly memberships? The fact is that these community centers are not financially viable because they do not cover their expenses. Organizations like the YMCA have developed a successful

model nationwide to offer recreation and fitness activities while covering their costs, but it's a different financial model (i.e. membership fees) and the city would have to allow for that possibility. Remember too that the YMCA provides financial aid on a sliding scale so that all people can participate.

110. I think it's critical that community centers stay open and available in areas where kids need them most--in the poorest neighborhoods, where kids don't have as much access to private recreational and sports activities, and need someplace safe to be that is not on the streets. I hope this value carries through regardless of the action taken, but especially if the tiered option is implemented.
111. I found it frustrating that each of these options did not list any pros or cons. It was up to me to determine those, and I know I don't know all of the details. I'm concerned that this survey will be skewed because of this. I guess I'll need to go to a public meeting, but what about everyone else who takes the survey?
112. Centers with childcare need to stay open.
113. I use the Queen Anne Community Center primarily for the circuit training program twice weekly. As a recovering heart patient, I find this program highly effective for my rehabilitation and urge its continuance. Thank you.
114. Option 9 should be a -10, but 1 was the lowest I could put in. Why would Parks be on the hook for the maintenance costs if it's effectively being privatized?
115. We moved to our community specifically so we could be within walking distance of the community center and pool - we actively engage and enrol our child in these spaces and they are SO important to our community. The staff at Medgar Evers pool is AMAZING, so professional and friendly. Please do not lease these important community builders/buildings away - reduce services and raise fees while times are tough but if you lose control of the physical spaces completely - they will be lost forever.
116. Do not destroy senior programs. Our city has a large senior population that is growing. Seniors need access to parks and recreation programs for social, physical, and mental stimulation. The Lifelong Learning Program needs to be retained and/or expanded.
117. Remember that Outsourcing (or "Partnerships" as you call it) tend to cost more over time since whoever is running it is going to expect to make a profit. It would be better to run the centers by the city and just improve the efficiency with volunteers and changing the way they operate to reduce costs.
118. Parks needs to bite the bullet and remember why we have community centers. They are for the community and built with taxpayer funds. Without seeing the actual breakdown of the study Parks has done it is impossible to determine the accuracy of their claims. Numbers don't lie but liar's figure. What assumptions were made other than giving our property to for profit companies will benefit parks? That assumption has never helped the general public.
119. Closing community centers would be a great loss to all of Seattle's wonderful communities. Even at limited use sites, there are still benefits to having Parks staff available at the center and having the centers open to the public. I support the tiered approach (Options 1 or 2), with open hours and staff scheduled according to the needs of the community. I do not support a lack of City funding for some community centers. ARC is doing a great job of providing programs, staffing, and

customer service along with Parks staff at all community centers. At limited use sites, the ARC staff have really stepped up and provided terrific customer service to their clients, when Park staff are not present. If centers must be closed, then I would support seeking an outside organization to run the center and offer programs and services. I do not know if ARC is ready to fully run community centers, but they seem like the most obvious partner.

120. I support trying to reduce expenses while re-programming the community centers and allowing other organizations to operate them.
121. Please don't take the "community" out of our community centers. Our child depends on the team of great people at Hiawatha and would be heartbroken to not have this facility available to him. Keep the community in the center.
122. Community centers are incredibly important to my family and the families of others. They are where the people who do not have major resources go for support and entertainment. The childcare program at Alki is INCREDIBLY important for my family. Please expand hours, or at the very least, keep the child care program open. Would it be possible to shorten some hours for ALL of the branches rather than hitting existing families? Why is Hiawatha o.k. but Alki is hurt? NOT FAIR Thank you, Genevieve Kostic
123. Option 9 -- i think this would only be a good idea if there were strict conditions under which an organization could rent a space. for instance, the purpose and focus of the tenant would need to be community focused, providing programs for all ages of the community. Option 5 -- confusing as written. hard to determine whether it will increase fees for users or not. and if so, by what percent. Our community center does such an amazing job of bringing the community together, I couldn't imagine it not being there as a resource. We bought our home in this location, in part, because the community center was there. There would be a huge void in the neighborhood with the loss of our CC.
124. I don't understand what the first few questions mean. "tiered" I do know that we love our community center open gym. thanks
125. Closing centers does not serve the residents well. Offering the local neighborhood community the chance to coordinate volunteers to keep costs down would be better than using paid staff or closing the centers. It is only acceptable to have temporary operations by the outside organizations ie YMCA ONLY IF they do not change the use, hours or existing programs, or the way in which the community center operates. They may ADD classes, services to charge for their own purposes fees etc, but NOT diminish the community programs existing. Community centers currently maintained or owned by the city are not supposed to be places for corporate or for-profit ownership. The city needs to get creative and listen to residents of the neighborhood, and neighborhood residents need to step up and take on volunteer hours or free maintenance, donations to keep services running etc. Neighborhood centers are places for those residents and people, not for outside groups with offices in other neighborhoods or cities who are not personally connected to the community. I understand the budget gap and crisis but offering leadership and costs to the people is better than assuming there is no money or time enough from residents to keep their own centers going. The city needs to provide opportunity for residents FIRST to operate and maintain their OWN centers under the parks dept. guidance or ownership before giving a contract to another party. Instead, support for the rental or use of the building after hours or for meetings, presentations etc, would generate some

income. In addition to free labor, skills and operations by the residents, fees collected by the residents for their own programs or classes could be used for maintaining and operating the park and/or center. Let the people take ownership.

126. I do not support any option that cedes control of a community center (that has been financed by myself and my neighbors) to an outside partner.
127. The city should eliminate ARC-based community center financing; this 'system' results in grossly inequitable services at lower-income community centers. ie, the very people who need the best services from their centers get the worst.
128. Please do not make any changes to southwest pool or staff. After attending deep water aerobics at almost every pool in the city, they are the best & people travel from a far to attend!
129. What? You want citizens to weigh in on this, but there's no directly-linked contextual analysis. What are these options' advantages and disadvantages? I can offer informed input only if you provide balanced, useful information. My overall input: our City & our region focus intensively on capital projects, but we consistently come up short on operational funds to support all that development. I know these funds come from different revenue sources, but it's so pervasive, so endemic, so predictable -- it's just tragic.
130. The Mayor and City Council need to find a better way to fund Parks' operating costs. A levy as used by King County and recommended by the Parks Foundation seems like a good way to go. Independent of this, someone needs to find out why Parks programming at community centers has decreased over the years. As the economy gets tough, more and more people should be turning to community resources as their recreation outlets so the decrease in attendance and programming is counterintuitive.
131. I tried to use the Rainier Community center when my sons were young. I found the staff to be rude, unhelpful, and generally unresponsive. The facility was dirty as were the toys used in the child playtime. I asked the staff how often the rooms and toys were cleaned and they stated it was everyday. This obviously was a mis-statement because you could see huge dust balls in the gymnasium, and the playtoys were greasy in the places that children grasped them. I wouldn't have expected them to wash the toys every day or every other day, but maybe once a week would have been nice. Also, for them to be honest and say, "Well, we don't really wash the toys that often," would have been better than an out and out lie. Also, whenever I went in to the community center, the staff were lounging around and not doing any work as far as I could see. Cutting staff seems like a logical way to reduce costs since the staff do not seem to do much there anyway. Because of the negative experiences I had early on, I have never been back in years and I can't see trying them again. I would rather go to a private business that tries to keep the place clean and helps its customers. When one has children, cleanliness and safety are the topmost priorities. You would do well to try and improve your service (not services - because it seems like you have wide variety of those) and staff accountability.
132. It's pretty hard to rate these without more of an explanation, arguments for and against, etc. I don't feel like I understand them enough to really rate them.
133. I am glad that the options do not sell off the parks and I think some partnerships or lease arrangements would be fine as long as they have a public component! Also, it would be important to me that they would still provide facilities for people using the adjoining parks. Options that I see

would be beneficial: great preschools that incorporate the natural surroundings around the park. More toddler gyms with low fees or donations. Cooperative preschools with a parent education piece.

134. I currently have two children at the Alki Community Center Preschool. This is a wonderful place and a great environment for my children. I do not want to see this service compromised, or my fees increased!
135. Really difficult to answer survey questions knowledgeably without more details, examples, or background on specific community center areas, history of use and currently limited sites, etc. I don't feel I really know what the consequences of my "support" really mean.
136. It is hard to vote & rate these items when we don't know which community centers are being impacted. I would ask that where library hours were cut (another city department) -- don't also cut the community center. Think broadly in conjunction with the whole city.
137. Raise fees enough to keep all centers open at full staff and services.
138. Reprogramming of underused spaces: Parks must bring other members of the city family into the mix. Department of Neighborhoods closed 6 Service Centers in 2010, rather than look at cohabitation of DON services with Community Centers. This is low hanging fruit and could save the city more than 1.7K in building and energy expenses. If Community Centers are where we "Build" community, all of the building blocks should be under one roof, perhaps community policing as well.
139. Community Centers and their programs are life lines for families. Keep them open, keep them funded! Stop closing wading pools or having the nearby residents pick up the tab. We already pay outrageously high water bills, can't this be enough to keep them open? Looking for more money, look to yourselves first and cut your own pay.
140. I am sure you did your best but these questions still feel very complicated with lots of implications not easily described in a survey. I hope you are using more than just public sentiment to make your decision.
141. If we hand over the use of these facilities how are the buildings both inside and out going to be maintained properly??? The city will no longer have control of what is really going on until something really goes wrong and then how much will it cost to fix the problem??? 3X,4X, more??? It would be like cutting the staff at say "your" office and asking someone who does not know what is going on to come in and take over with the same knowledge and experience as what is currently in place now?! This is not going to happen - sorry!
142. I support looking into ways to save money and encourage more use of our community centers. Although, it would be great if the class fees didn't increase too drastically as they would be more than your typical health club. Also, it's great when you have the drop in try it out promotions. It would be really great if you could have more of a punch card type of system to pay for classes. Thanks again!
143. Why do you provide space for exclusive groups like Queer Youth Space? I think things like that should be paid for by donation, not by taxpayer money.
144. I agree that community centers should charge extra for non-Seattle residents. We travel to Mountlake Terrace pool and are charged extra yet are willing to both make the drive and pay the extra fee since the facility is top notch quality. Nothing compares to it in Seattle (we look forward to the re-opening of Rainier Beach Pool!). With the different geographic groups, although Rainier CC is

within walking distance to our house, we either through public transit or our own car make the trip to Jefferson CC. It's bigger and offers more as far as the open playgroup sessions on Tue and Thurs. The Long-term Lease of those CC's that are permanently closed is an interesting option. If this option is exercised, I hope the leasee would be fully vetted before handing over operations to the party of interest. I based my rankings on how much the Parks would save for each option as well. Thank you!

145. Closing or limiting community centers should be based almost entirely on usage, with some consideration given to whether the facility has unique attributes (e.g., Magnusson's racquetball courts; Magnolia's pottery studio) or is uniquely serving an age demographic (e.g., Magnolia serves lots of seniors). "Usage" should include not only daily attendance, but also whether there is an active joint partnership with a school that keeps the center filled with out-of-school care or school sports practices. There should be NO consideration for race. (E.g., Queen Anne serves a mostly white clientele, Yesler mostly black. So what?) Ditto income levels of the neighborhood. There should be very little consideration for geography. Of course, you shouldn't close all south-end centers and leave open all north-end centers; there'd be too much backlash. But neither should you strive for exact geographic "parity," closing one or two centers in each quarter of the city or each cluster. The facts are that (1) community centers vary widely in their attributes and popularity; they are not interchangeable and populations will not readily move to another center, and (2) most citizens using the centers EITHER are part of the neighboring school OR use cars to get to the center. You needn't worry about ensuring that every citizen has a center in walking distance. As an example, my family regularly reads the online events schedules for ALL the clusters and travels all over the city to attend events. We've gotten to know some great community center employees and attended events we couldn't find at our "home" community center (e.g., High Point has great family night programs).
146. The first options are difficult to measure in support because there is not enough detail in the staffing models to accommodate and implement such changes.
147. Focus should be on access for community to programs. It does not matter who runs the programs. If a community group or private business can operate services even providing only limited public benefit, and would still retain access, who cares who runs the programs.
148. Here in NE Seattle we have MANY wonderful community centers. Many of them offer the same classes/opportunities - this lessens the participation at each center meaning that some courses get cancelled at one center while another's classes are brimming - could they have concentrations? Sometimes a concentration is dictated by facilities (pool, tennis courts) but what if one became the gaming center (chess club, game nights, Pokemon battles, etc) , one the art classes, and only half of them offered senior classes? What about offering the space for rent for entrepreneurs? I have a custom cake business and offer children's birthday parties in pastry or cake decorating. Can I hold classes in the center without being an offering in the catalog? We love our community centers!
149. We have to be part of the community not just be in the community. Thank you!
150. The city needs help – close low or non functioning sites and pool resources to keep thriving centers open. Allow successful non-profits to utilize affordable space at little or no cost to the city – sign 3 year leases and then re-assess. If the city is back on track take back the center. If not, sign another lease. The city holds all the cards on the lease. It's a no lose situation.

151. I am concerned with childcare. It is extremely important. Please do not close Alki.
152. I personally think this city should find a way to continue operating our community centers at or above our current levels. However, there are a large number of non-profit organizations around the city which do great work. If a community center cannot be fully utilized within the parks budget, or if some will be closed, partnering with some of these non-profits make sense. I work for one such non-profit that would be very interested in that sort of partnership.
153. I would like to volunteer and join my local community center (Loyal Heights) advisory board. Could the addition of many volunteers augment staff? This may not save a lot of money but could build on existing resources to add in more community activity support.
154. Paint "Pickle ball court" lines on most tennis courts so people can play anytime instead of cramming (often) 20 players into 12 positions for a 2 hour period here at Bitter Lake. –  
Inexpensive 1 time job.  
–No need for personal to oversee
155. Senior daily fees have gone up 100% this year \$1 to \$2. That is a large increase.
156. None of these options cheer me up. I think this set of options is the beginning of killing the community based programs of Parks and Recreation.
157. Green Lake has been functionally and operationally inoperable during "limited use." I have come many times when (closed) staff was one person who was often unable to do certain things even through there. At the core it is ludicrous to limit use of a highly and most widely used Park. I have visited site such as Magnolia and Montlake and rarely see nearly as many people using the facility. And I hope this will be amended.
158. (A)Closing centers, limiting participation by citizens at a time when "free/low cost" recreation is needed by many of us who are struggling to find healthy fulfilling activities is not a direction we should be taking. (B) All choices are grim as presented.
159. Could have been more economically and environmentally minded when mailing this questionnaire by changing the front size slightly and reduce the need for this final (pages) piece of paper entirely for this "comments?" question. For example: even the amount of space on the front page (cover page) has enough room for even my lengthy diatribe.
160. Bitter Lake is a community that is diverse. Some can afford a yearly dues an some can't; we need it not only for preschool and seniors but for teen agers.
161. This is a most peculiar survey; I hope that with the small info provided that I indicated my preference as I really want the community centers to be run.
162. Closed centers could be magnate for criminal and unsavory activity. Lease only centers still would require city oversight.
163. Very confusing choices. The staff should have most of the input into operation of the centers. If some of the centers are underutilized, then some of these options could be used. All I can say is please don't process this to death like so many other things in Seattle (the Viaduct). The City Council and Mayor are elected to make these decisions. I'm sick and tired of being asked (as a citizen) to do this as I don't have the time and information to make an "informed decision."
164. Please keep the community centers open and restore the hours. I am at the Queen Anne Community Center 3 or 4 times a week with my daughter who attends the pre-school and plays in

the toddler gym. We really miss the Friday night family fun nights. Also, I think restoring evening hours is important so that teenagers have a safe place to go.

165. I don't know enough about some of the options to make a judgment.

166. I realize I do not have all the data for community center usage that the City Council has. I agree with closing the most under-utilized centers and outside partnerships using the center facilities. I am a patron of the Northgate Community Center. I have seen a lot of activities going on here, from CPR classed, toddler play dates, basketball games, dance lessons, and weddings. I love the fitness room. A lot of the people I meet working out are doing medical rehab, prescribed by their MD's. They have spent so much money on the medical procedure that the Fitness Room is the better option than paying hundreds of dollars at a formal commercial gym. Thank you for your time.