



**July 12, 2011**

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

**From: Christopher Williams, Acting Superintendent**

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

---

As part of the 2011 – 2012 Budget process, Seattle City Council passed the Community Center Partnership and Planning Analysis Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI 101-1-A-1, included in this response as Attachment A). This SLI requested that the Parks Department “conduct research and analysis on: 1) Increased partnerships for the management and operations of the City’s Community Centers, 2) Increased partnerships for planning and fundraising for the City’s Community Centers, and 3) Alternate management, operational and staffing models for the City’s Community Centers.” It went on to state the goals of the analysis as: “(a) increasing the public’s utilization of Community Centers, (b) reducing the Community Centers’ (almost complete) reliance on General Subfund support, (c) enhancing the Community Centers’ ability to attain both short term and long-term financial stability and (d) enhancing the Community Centers’ flexibility to make changes to operations to better address the needs and desires of their users.” The SLI also encouraged Parks to consider ten areas of research, policy analysis, or change. Throughout the analysis and response, the SLI instructed Parks to work closely with the City Council, the City Budget Office, Parks Department employees, labor unions, and the public.

**Response Development Process:**

In January 2011, two groups were formed to work on the SLI response. The first was a staff working group that included two Council Central Staff members, one City Budget Office (CBO) staff member, and seven Parks’ employees (including three division directors). The second group was the Community Center Advisory Team (CCAT). A one-page summary of the purpose of CCAT was distributed to the group at their first meeting and is included here as Attachment B. The purpose of the CCAT was to advise the Department as the Department carried out the research and analysis dictated by the Community Center Partnership and Planning Analysis SLI. The CCAT also helped the Department identify options to include in the SLI response along with the advantages and disadvantages of each option. Finally, the CCAT was to assure that all voices were heard and all points of view considered. Its members included one Council staff person, one CBO staff person, three Parks employees, two union business representatives, two Park Commissioners, the CEO/Deputy CEO and Board Chairperson of the

Associated Recreation Councils (ARC), senior and teen representatives, and two members chosen from the public at large. This group met twice a month from late January through early June.

In addition to working with CCAT, the Parks Department hosted three public meetings and two meetings with Recreation Division employees. The first public and employee meetings asked general questions about Community Center operations and how they might be enhanced and made more efficient. The second round of public and employee meetings presented information about the options being considered and asked for feedback on them. These options form the main body of this SLI response.

**Current Operational Model for Seattle Community Centers:**

In 2011, Seattle operates 25 community centers (the 26<sup>th</sup>, Rainier Beach, is closed for construction). This is about one community center per 30,000 people, 4,000 children, and 5,000 senior adults. The standard community center is open to the public 53 hours/week during the school year (37 weeks) and 46 hours/week during the summer (15 weeks) for an annual average of slightly more than 50 hours/week. Some sites are open additional hours to host the Teen Late Night program or to meet special needs such as the use of the Green Lake Community Center as a hygiene center for homeless individuals. The “standard” site is staffed by 5 full-time staff plus temporary staff as needed. Whenever the center is open to the public, it is Parks’ policy that two staff be present. This standard allows good building supervision which provides safety for both the staff and public.

**Table 1  
Community Center Budgeted Expense, Revenue, and Net General Fund Support  
(2009 dollars)**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Expense*</b>	<b>Revenue**</b>	<b>Net GF Support</b>
2000	11,948,537	340,599	11,607,938
2001	-	-	-
2002	-	-	-
2003	14,770,116	3,150,838	11,619,278
2004	-	-	-
2005	15,828,571	3,455,420	12,373,152
2006	-	-	-
2007	15,377,865	3,648,997	11,728,868
2008	-	-	-
2009	16,714,578	1,312,059	15,402,519
2010	16,241,385	1,352,432	14,888,953
2011	14,898,721	1,386,532	13,512,189

\* Includes Community Centers, Teen Centers, Youth/Teen Programming, Senior Adult Recreation, and Special Populations Recreation.

\*\* Includes Pro Parks revenues of about \$2m per year from 2001 - 2008.

### **Trends in General Fund Support:**

From 2000 through 2011 total inflation adjusted budgeted expenditures on community centers, teen life centers, youth/teen programming, senior adult recreation and special populations recreation rose from \$11.9 million to \$14.9 million, a 25% increase. This is shown in Table 1 above. Table 1 excludes aquatics, tennis, golf and Recreation Division Administration. During this period there were new community centers added and others that were substantially renovated and expanded as specified in the 1999 Seattle Center and Community Centers Levy and the 2000 Pro Parks Levy. The Pro Parks Levy also included funds to enhance maintenance at community centers, augment teen programming, and to pay the costs of operating and maintaining facilities constructed by the Levy. This averaged about \$2 million per year from 2001 – 2008. In 2009 and 2010 the balance of Levy funds in the operating expense category was used (about \$700k/year for community centers) but, in 2011, no more Pro Parks funds were available. Because of the operating support included in the Pro Parks Levy, the net General Fund (GF) support of community centers stayed at around \$12m from 2000 -2008. In 2009, as Pro Parks operating support ended, GF support of community centers rose to its maximum, \$15.4 million. Then, because of the City's overall budget situation, it fell to \$13.5 million in 2011, a reduction of 12%. The City's budget situation has not stopped deteriorating, and 2012 reductions are being identified. The Community Center Partnership and Planning SLI is clear that one of its goals is to reduce General Fund support of community centers. While no specific target is given in the SLI, the working group and CCAT were told that a savings of \$1 million - \$2 million was desirable.

### **Data Driven Analysis:**

In order to reflect the different situations at each of our community centers in our analysis and identification of new operational models, the working group assembled information on both the ARC and Parks expenditures and revenues at community centers. In addition, information was collected on expenditures by Parks' shops (plumbers, painters, electricians, and carpenters) on repairs at community centers, and capital expenditures in past years and identified as needed in the future. Parks staff also brought together information from many sources on the physical facilities at each site and the general physical condition of the facilities. Summaries of this data are found in Attachment C.

The most difficult data to assemble in a meaningful way is data on facility usage. CLASS, the computer system used to register users for any activity requiring payment (recreation classes, childcare, room rentals, etc.), is designed to track reservations and funds, not report on usage. For instance, it might show quarterly registration for a child in an ARC childcare program as "one use", despite the fact that the child would be cared for on each of 60 days. CLASS would also count a drop-in use of a basketball court as "one use." Staff spent considerable time converting CLASS data into usage data that reflected the number of times a person used the community center on a relatively consistent basis.

However, once paid usage was correctly counted, there still remained the problem of measuring unpaid use of the community center. Most teen programs are available free of charge. There was good data on attendance at the Late Night programs, but youths/teens dropping in to "hang out" at the center after

school were not counted. Parks also lacked data on casual use of the center by adults who might also use the community center to play cards or socialize with their friends. To try to measure this usage, Parks put a “sign-in” sheet by every community center entrance. This created voluminous data that is still being processed. Parks also experimented with installing sensors above the doors at one community center that recorded when a person entered or exited a community center. Various technical issues with the use of this data are still being explored. Parks has yet to find an accurate and affordable way to measure non-paid use of community centers, but this work continues.

### **Other Jurisdictions Research:**

In order to identify ways in which Seattle might change the way it operates its community centers, charges for its services, and works with volunteers and other partners, the working group contacted other cities to see how they provided recreation services. Summaries of what was found are in Attachment D. Seattle currently has one community center per 30,000 residents. Other cities have community centers that range from one per 24,000 residents (Denver and El Paso) to one per 93,000 residents (San Jose). Some cities distinguish between different types of community centers. For instance, Denver distinguishes between Regional Centers, Local Centers, Neighborhood Centers and Transition Sites. El Paso has Category A, B, and C sites. It was found that most other cities have faced or are facing fiscal crises similar to the one Seattle is experiencing. Some, like San Diego, responded by reducing community center hours. They cut hours in half by closing sites in the same geographic region on alternate days. Other cities have chosen to close and repurpose community centers. For instance, San Jose used to have 56 community and neighborhood centers in 2006, but now it has only 10 (one for each city district). It has a facility reuse program that initially involved 17 sites but has grown to 46 sites. This program makes closed sites available for use by other organizations such as the Boys and Girls Club and the Arab American Services Agency. Denver has a similar program for its three Transition Sites. Portland has an innovative sponsorship program and partners with non-profits to either operate a center or rent space in a center operated by City staff. Research into the operations of other cities proved once again that there are many ways to provide important public services. It also convinced Parks that those who most resist change may experience the greatest reduction in service.

### **Change Options:**

Parks data collection and analysis, its research into recreation provision in other cities, and its interaction with CCAT, its employees, its partners, and the public have led them to identify nine change options. The first four options concern community center operations, the next two concern the way Parks charges for use of its facilities, and the final three concern how Parks interacts with other people and organizations to provide service to the public. They are not mutually exclusive and the choice of one may make the choice of another more or less likely. For instance, Option 2 includes Option 1 (geographic management) plus organizing the community centers into tiers. Option 3 includes Option 2 plus closure and repurposing of 2 or 3 centers. Option 4, however, rejects the changes included in Options 1 – 3 and instead simply closes centers to achieve a certain size budget savings while leaving the remaining centers unchanged. Options 8 and 9, which have to do with reprogramming underused times and spaces and reusing closed centers, depend in part on whether you chose Option 2 (because some

centers will have fewer public hours and thus more underused time to reprogram) or Options 3 or 4 (because these will have closed centers that could be made available to be operated by another group).

The remainder of this response consists of two pages on each of the nine options. These options are presented at a broad conceptual level. Parks understands that “the devil is in the details,” and that users most wish to know how their neighborhood community center will be affected by a particular option. The details are, in fact, still being worked out. Parks will be in conversation with the Mayor’s Office over the summer to determine which options or portions of options he wants to propose in the 2012 Budget. It will not be until the Mayor announces his choices in September that the full detail of the chosen options will be made public.

**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.

***Estimated Potential Budget Impact: (\$665,000) if hours are partially restored at limited use sites.***

**Summary:**

- Management and programming of each geographic group is done on a coordinated basis.
- Programming staff is partially reimbursed by Associated Recreation Council (ARC) (subject to ARC Board approval).
- Limited Use sites may remain as in 2011 or have hours partially (15-25 public hours per week) or fully (30-45 public hours per week) restored. Other sites would continue to average 50 public hours per week (46 summer, 53 winter) plus late-night program hours.
- Scheduling reflects community needs and may vary seasonally, weekly, and daily to maximize center usage.
- Group management may reallocate resources within the group as needed.

**Advantages**

- Allows more flexibility and efficiency in use of staff.
- Coordinates programming and public hours on a group-wide basis to better meet community needs.
- Provides significant savings if limited use sites aren't fully restored.
- If limited use sites are partially or fully restored, they do have some professional staff.

**Disadvantages**

- Does not include any systematic determination of tiers and reallocation of scarce resources as with Option 2.
- If limited use sites are not partially or fully restored, the result is a de-facto partially-tiered system, with little analytical justification.
- If limited use sites are not even partially restored they will continue to be operated without permanent staff, which results in a lack of continuity, consistency, and connection with the community, and in reduced maintenance levels.
- Reduction of professional staff and public hours limits quality and quantity of programs.
- Ability of users to move between centers in a geographic group is limited by public transit options.

**Similar Practice in Seattle and Other Jurisdictions:**

- Seattle's park maintenance function is organized into eight geographic districts, each managed by a crew chief who reports to one of two managers.

**Impacts:**

**System Flexibility**

- Geographic groupings allow more efficient and flexible use of staff.

- Geographic management may reallocate resources within a group as needed on a temporary or ongoing basis.
- Programming would be done on a coordinated and more flexible basis.
- Community driven scheduling of public hours would allow flexible seasonal, weekly, and daily schedules to maximize usage.

**Community Needs/Access:**

- If limited use sites are not restored:
  - Current, limited public hours continue.
  - Community needs may be better met by coordinated scheduling and staffing flexibility.
- If limited use sites are partially or fully restored:
  - There may be more public hours than in 2011, if fully restored.
  - Permanent staff should serve community needs better than 2011 temporary staff.
- Leaner staff may reduce the ability to build and engage community.
- Doesn't systematically align scarce resources according to demonstrated community needs.

**Partnership Potential:**

- Flexible scheduling may increase rentals, especially during hours when a center is closed or underused ("dark hours") – see Option 8.

**Implementation Issues:**

- A process for determining public hours of operation needs to be established to encourage participation from the entire community.
- If limited use sites are not restored, group management needs to determine how to operate them in a sustainable manner that coordinates with others in the geographic group.
- Different bodies of work need to be defined, classified, and staffed.
- Community driven scheduling may result in split shifts or seasonal staffing, which could lead to difficulty attracting and retaining quality staff.

**Potential Budget Impacts:**

<b>Revenue (Increase)/Decrease</b>		<b>GF \$\$</b>
ARC's Partial Reimbursement of Recreation Staff*		\$(446,000)
<b>Total Revenue Change</b>		<b>\$(446,000)</b>
*Subject to approval by ARC Board.		
<b>Expenditure (Decrease)/Increase</b>		<b>GF \$\$</b>
DPR Staffing Changes**		\$(667,000)
Partial Restoration of Limited Use Sites (avg 15 – 25 public hrs/wk)***		\$448,000
<b>Total Expenditure Change</b>		<b>\$(219,000)</b>
** Reflects only changes in regular staff. There may be additional savings in temporary staff or non-personnel costs. *** The cost to fully restore the limited use sites (avg 30 – 45 public hrs/wk) would be \$871,000, which would result in a Total Expenditure <u>increase</u> of \$170,000.		
<b>Total Net Increase/(Decrease) of General Fund Support</b>		<b>\$(665,000)</b>

**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).

**Estimated Potential Budget Impact: (\$1,230,000)**

**Summary:**

- Community centers are classified as belonging to one of three tiers (Tier 1, Tier 2a, or Tier 2b) based on physical facilities, current use, and demographics.
- Tier 1 centers average more than 50 public hours per week, Tier 2a centers average 30 – 45 public hours per week, and Tier 2b centers average 15 – 25 public hours per week.
  - Late night program hours are in addition to standard hours for the tier.
  - Lifelong Recreation, Special Populations, and Late Night programs are not changed.
  - Currently, the standard community center is open 46 hours/week in the summer and 53 hours/week in the winter for an annual average of 50 hours/week.
- Staffing levels will vary by tier, but all tiers have regular City staff.
- Scheduling reflects community needs and may vary seasonally, weekly, and daily to maximize center usage.
- Tier assignments will be re-examined periodically and changed if change is warranted.
- Group management may use staff flexibly and reallocate resources within a group as needed.

**Advantages**

- Recognizes that not all community centers are alike and allocates scarce resources equitably according to different physical facilities and community needs.
- Centers with fewer public hours have increased partnership opportunities as in Options 8 and 9.
- Regular City staff at all sites in all tiers will provide continuity, consistency, and connection with the community, and will permit better supervision and training of volunteers.
- Geographic management allows more flexibility and efficiency in use of staff.
- Coordinated programming and public hours better meet community needs.
- Provides significant budget savings.
- Social and economic justice consequences are considered in assigning centers to tiers.

**Disadvantages**

- Initially classification of sites in tiers will be controversial.
- Any differences in treatment of centers may be perceived as unfair.
- Reduction of professional staff and public hours limits the quality and quantity of programs.
- The ability of users to move between centers in a geographic group is limited by public transit options.

**Similar Practice in Seattle and Other Jurisdictions:**

- In Seattle, community centers currently have higher levels of funding and staffing if they host a late night teen program. Green Lake Community Center is open added hours to serve as a hygiene center for the homeless.
- Denver operates seven Regional Centers, 11 Local Centers, and six Neighborhood Centers with different public hours and staffing for each type of center. They also have three Transition Sites (previously Neighborhood Centers) operated by nonprofit organizations.
- El Paso has a three-tiered system of recreation centers.

**Impacts:**

**System Flexibility**

- Tiers allow staffing and hours to flex with amenities and usage.
- Geographic groupings allow more efficient use of staff.
  - Community driven scheduling of public hours allows flexible seasonal, weekly, and daily schedules to maximize usage.

**Community Needs/Access:**

- Systematically aligns scarce resources according to demonstrated community needs.
- Leaner staff may reduce the ability to build and engage community.

**Partnership Potential:**

- Centers in lower tiers have fewer public hours and therefore more hours when the center is closed or underused (dark hours). This provides increased rental, co-location or partnership opportunities – see Option 8.

**Implementation Issues:**

- Need to develop equitable and explainable methodology for classifying centers into tiers.
- Process for determining public hours of operation needs to be established to encourage participation from the entire community.
- Different bodies of work need to be defined, classified, and staffed.
- Community driven scheduling may result in split shifts or seasonal staffing that may result in difficulty attracting and retaining quality staff.

**Potential Budget Impacts:**

<b>Net Increase (Decrease) in General Fund Support</b>	<b>GF \$\$</b>
Option 1 – Geographic Management	\$(665,000)
DPR Staffing Changes due to Tiers*	\$(565,000)
<b>Total Option 2 – Tiered Community Centers</b>	<b>\$(1,230,000)</b>

\* Budget impact assumes that there will be 7 geographic groups, 7 Tier 1 sites, 9 Tier 2a sites, 8 Tier 2b sites and 1 site that becomes a specialized teen site. Savings reflect only changes in regular staff. There may be additional savings in temporary staff or non-personnel costs.

**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.

***Estimated Potential Budget Impact: (\$1,779,000)***

**Summary:**

- Two or three community centers are closed.
- Closed centers are made available for partnerships to operate all or part of a center as in Options 8 and 9.
- Closed centers could be marketed as available for rentals.
- Remaining community centers are operated as in Option 2 - Tiered Community Centers.
  - Scheduling reflects community needs and may vary seasonally, weekly, and daily to maximize center usage.
  - Tier assignments will be re-examined periodically and changed if change is warranted.
  - Group management may use staff flexibly and reallocate resources within a group as needed.

**Advantages**

- Significant budget savings.
- Opportunity for others to run community centers.
  - Non-City organizations may be more flexible in their management.
  - May serve particular communities better than a community center that strives to serve all communities.
- Advantages of geographic management are preserved for the remaining sites.
- Advantages of tiered community centers are preserved for the remaining sites.

**Disadvantages**

- Due to the time required to find and contract with other operators, there is likely to be a significant time when the center is simply closed.
- Loss of recreation and other services provided by the closed centers.
- If others are located in a center it may be difficult to reopen it as a City facility should the budget situation improve.
- If a building is unoccupied for two years, it must be brought up to current code to reopen.

**Similar Practice in Seattle and Other Jurisdictions:**

- In Seattle, Lake City Community Center is operated under a soon to expire contract with the Lion’s Club. Parks owns various arts facilities that are operated by nonprofits including Madrona Dance, Pratt Fine Arts, and Seward Park Clay Studio. The Phinney Neighborhood Association runs a facility very similar to a community center that receives no support from the City.
- San Jose instituted a facility reuse program in 2008 that has grown to include 23 former community centers. They are now operated by community based groups and nonprofits.

- Denver has three transition Sites that were previously Neighborhood Centers but are now run by nonprofits.
- Portland has two centers where a non-profit organization has assumed responsibility for operations (Interstate Firehouse Cultural Arts Center and Woodstock Community Center), and the Multnomah Arts Center, where six nonprofits lease space in a facility that is still managed by City staff.

**Impacts:**

**System Flexibility**

- Closure of sites reduces flexibility because the remaining system is smaller with fewer alternative sites for activities and fewer staff to use flexibly.
- Non-City organizations running centers may be more flexible than the City.

**Community Needs/Access:**

- Closed sites run by others could meet the same or different community needs (see Option 9).
- Some organizations running closed centers might serve the unique needs of particular communities better than the more general recreation services provided by a standard community center.

**Partnership Potential:**

- Provides a full community center for use by potential partners. (Option 9).
- Portions of closed community centers and dark hours of other centers are also available on a contract or rental basis (Option 8).
- The number of partners able to run a full community center may be limited.
- If ARC assumes full operation of a community center, they might not be able to partially reimburse the City for the cost of programming staff as assumed in Options 1 - 3.

**Implementation Issues:**

- Need criteria and a process to determine which centers to close.
- Need to conduct an RFP to identify and contract with other organizations to run closed centers.

**Potential Budget Impacts:**

<b>Net Increase (Decrease) in General Fund Support</b>	<b>GF \$\$</b>
Option 2 – Tiered Community Centers*	\$(1,230,000)
Staff Savings from Closing 3 Centers*	\$(549,000)
Savings from Income from Partners or Rentals	TBD
<b>Total Option 2 – Tiered Community Centers</b>	<b>\$(1,779,000)</b>
*Savings represent regular staff changes only. There may be additional savings from reduced temporary staff or non-personnel costs.	

**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.

**Estimated Potential Budget Impact: (\$1,458,000) - (2,714,000)**

**Summary:**

- Close 7 – 10 sites to reach savings targets of \$1.5 million - \$2.5 million.
  - No City staff.
  - No public hours.
- For those centers that remain open there is no change in current operations.
  - No tiers
  - No limited use sites.
- Closed centers are made available for partnerships to operate all or part of a center as in Options 8 and 9.

**Advantages**

- Significant budget savings.
- Others operating centers may contribute toward renovation or major maintenance costs in return for a longer lease.
- Minimizes change for those centers that remain open.

**Disadvantages**

- Closes a significant number of community centers.
- Many customers will have to travel farther to access community center services.
- Once a center is operated by another organization, it is unlikely to return to City operation.
- It may be difficult to find 7-10 service providers who can afford to operate centers.

**Similar Practice in Seattle and Other Jurisdictions:**

- In Seattle, Lake City Community Center is operated under a soon to expire contract with the Lion’s Club. Parks owns various arts facilities that are operated by nonprofits including Madrona Dance, Pratt Fine Arts, and Seward Park Clay Studio. The Phinney Neighborhood Association runs a facility very similar to a community center that receives no support from the City.
- San Jose instituted a facility reuse program in 2008 that has grown to include 23 former community centers. They are now operated by community based groups and nonprofits.
- Denver has three transition Sites that were previously Neighborhood Centers but are now run by nonprofits.
- Portland has two centers where a non-profit organization has assumed responsibility for operations (Interstate Firehouse Cultural Arts Center and Woodstock Community Center) and the Multnomah Arts Center, where six nonprofits lease space in a facility that is still managed by City staff.

**Impacts:**

**System Flexibility**

- Closing centers decreases system flexibility because it becomes a smaller system.
- Since the remaining centers are operated as they are currently, there is no increase in flexibility from geographic management or tiered operations.

**Community Needs/Access:**

- Community would lose access to 7 - 10 community centers unless they were operated by others.
- Services provided by partners could replace some of the services currently provided by community centers.
- Some partners might serve the unique needs of particular communities better than the more general recreation services provided by a standard community center.

**Partnership Potential:**

- Makes 7 – 10 full community centers available for use by potential partners.
- Portions of closed community centers could also be available on a rental basis.
- Number of partners able to run a full community center could be limited.
- If ARC assumes full operation of a community center, it could limit their ability to partially reimburse the City for programming staff as assumed in Options 1- 3.

**Implementation Issues:**

- Criteria need to be developed to decide which centers to close.
- Need to run an RFP process to identify potential partners to run a closed community center (as in Option 9).

**Potential Budget Impacts:**

<b>Revenue (Increase)/Decrease</b>	<b>GF \$\$</b>
Loss of Revenue from closure of 7 community centers	\$267,000
Added Revenue from Partners or Rentals	TBD
<b>Total Revenue Change</b>	<b>\$267,000</b>

<b>Expenditure (Decrease)/Increase</b>	<b>GF \$\$</b>
Expenditure Decrease from closure of 7 community centers	\$(1,725,000)
<b>Total Expenditure Change</b>	<b>\$(1,725,000)</b>

<b>Total Net Increase/(Decrease) of General Fund Support</b>	<b>\$(1,458,000)</b>
--	----------------------

**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%.

**Estimated Potential Budget Impact: \$(126,000) for 5%, \$(47,000) for 4%**

**Summary:**

- The Associated Recreation Council (ARC) is a nonprofit organization that provides programming and child care at Seattle community centers and other Parks facilities.
- Currently 3.25% of ARC gross revenue from classes, sports fees, and childcare is retained by Parks to support community center operations. Parks keeps 10% for Lifelong Recreation classes, and small craft centers pay a negotiated annual dollar amount.
- Change the percentage retained for all classes, sports fees and childcare (including Lifelong Recreation) to 4% or 5%.
- The negotiated small craft payments are not changed because another statement of legislative intent instructs the small craft centers to work on a plan to become self-sufficient by 2013. It would be inadvisable to make any change apart from that plan.

**Advantages**

- Relatively easy to implement since it simply changes the percentage that is currently retained.
- Changes a fee that is set by City Council as part of the Parks' Fees and Charges Ordinance.

**Disadvantages**

- The revenue increase, and therefore the General Fund savings, are small.
- May negatively impact ARC if they are not able to pass on this increase to customers without affecting registrations.
- If it does negatively impact ARC, they may not be able to partially reimburse Parks for programming staff as assumed in Options 1-3 or to make one-time contributions to support Parks in challenging budget situations.

**Similar Practice in Seattle and Other Jurisdictions:**

- Seattle charges concessionaires (e.g. food vendors) a percentage of their gross revenues (usually 10%) for the exclusive rights to do business at a particular location.
- We are unaware of another city with an organization like ARC that exists to program city-run community centers.

**Impacts:**

**System Flexibility**

- No Impact.

**Community Needs/Access:**

- Courses and activities would be more expensive. This would impact the poorest participants the most.
- For Lifelong Recreation courses, the cost would decrease since the percent retained would go from the current 10% to 5%.

**Partnership Potential:**

- Potential negative impact on our partnership with ARC if their enrollment is negatively affected or if they have to lower their fees to keep enrollment up.

**Implementation Issues:**

- Relatively easy technical implementation.
- Winter ARC fees would assume a higher percentage retained. They might be needlessly high if a higher PAR fee is not legislated with the budget.

**Potential Budget Impacts:**

<b>Programs (Current % Retained)</b>	<b>2010 ARC Revenue</b>	<b>2010 Retained</b>	<b>4% Revenue (Incr)/Decr GF Support (Decr)/Incr</b>	<b>5% Revenue (Incr)/Decr GF Support (Decr)/Incr</b>
Recreation (3.25%)	(\$7,391,776)	(\$240,234)	(\$55,437)	(\$129,355)
Lifelong Recreation (10%)	(\$186,159)	(\$18,616)	\$11,170	\$9,308
Environmental Learning (3.25%)	(\$346,967)	(\$11,276)	(\$2,602)	(\$6,072)
Japanese Garden (3.25%)	(\$3,595)	(\$117)	(\$27)	(\$63)
<b>Total</b>	<b>(\$7,928,497)</b>	<b>(\$270,243)</b>	<b>(\$46,897)</b>	<b>(\$126,182)</b>

**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.

**Estimated Potential Budget Impact: (\$7,000) tennis, \$(47,000) pools, \$(126,000) all facilities.**

*[can't be implemented until Spring so first year impacts of \$(5,000) tennis, \$(38,000) pools, and \$(95,000) all facilities.]*

**Summary:**

- Raise all basic fees and charges for services and programs whether set by the City or by ARC.
  - Pilot at tennis center or swimming pools.
  - If pilot is successful, apply to swimming pool, tennis center, environmental learning center, and community center programs.
  - Eventually apply to ARC programs, including athletic leagues and childcare.
- Offer a 10% resident discount.
- Added premium paid by non-residents would go to Parks because it compensates for non-residents not paying taxes that support community center operations.
- Pilot explores significant implementation issues that may add expenses that offset added revenue.
- The program creates incentives for misrepresenting ones place of residence and verification may be regarded as intrusive.

**Advantages**

- Provides a mechanism for non-residents to contribute to operation of community centers and other facilities.
- Proposal should not result in increased costs for Seattle residents.

**Disadvantages**

- Some residents may be fearful of providing a government agency with the documentation required to prove residency and may therefore pay the higher fee or not participate in a program or activity.
- Computer scheduling issues require setting two prices (resident and non-resident) for every program or service.
- May negatively impact ARC if their enrollment is negatively affected or if they have to lower their fees to keep enrollment up.
- If it does negatively impact ARC, they may not be able to partially reimburse Parks for programming staff as assumed in Options 1-3 or to make one-time contributions to support Parks in challenging budget situations.

**Similar Practice in Seattle and Other Jurisdictions:**

- Resident and non-resident charges are common in other local jurisdictions including Renton, Des Moines, and Mercer Island.

**Impacts:**

**System Flexibility**

- No impact.

**Community Needs/Access:**

- The proposal should not result in higher costs for City residents.
- Some people may be fearful of providing a government agency with the documentation required to prove residency and they may therefore pay the higher fee or not participate in the activity or program.
- Higher costs might adversely affect lower income populations who have moved out of Seattle but continue ties to their former neighborhood.

**Partnership Potential:**

- Negative impact on our partnership with ARC if their enrollment is negatively affected or if they have to lower their fees to keep enrollment up.
- Might limit ability of ARC to contribute to partially fund Parks' programming staff as assumed in other options or to provide one-time support to Parks in challenging budget situations.

**Implementation Issues:**

- Since winter brochures are published and registration occurs before the budget is adopted, implementation can only begin with the spring quarter.
- Because of computer system limitations, we must set two fees for every service. This adds a significant body of work.
- Piloting change at a few locations (Amy Yee Tennis Center or swimming pools) allows analysis and resolution of implementation issues.

**Potential Budget Impacts:**

	Add'l Revenue
<b>Rentals</b>	
Com. Centers	10,053
Pools	4,239
ELCs	661
LHPAC	546
Magnuson	5,423
<b>Total</b>	<b>20,922</b>
<b>Programs</b>	
Com. Centers	
Passes	44
Courses	23,756
Pt of Sale	3,635
<b>Total</b>	<b>27,435</b>
Pools	
Passes	23,505
Courses	14,780
Pt of Sale	8,535
<b>Total</b>	<b>46,820</b>
Tennis	
Passes	1,209
Courses	4,492
Pt of Sale	1,180
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,880</b>
ELCs	3,144
Childcare	21,070
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>126,272</b>

**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.

**Estimated Potential Budget Impact: Unlikely to be major source of budget savings.**

**Summary:**

- Parks currently uses volunteers to support athletic programs, environmental programs, and community events.
- Expand volunteer opportunities through training and supervision of volunteers to offer them more ways to support community center staff.
- Volunteers might work at only one center or across a geographic group.
- Trained and trusted building volunteers could improve access for rentals and programs for members of the community who cannot afford to pay staffing costs for building supervision.

**Advantages**

- Increases connections between a community center and the community.
- Frees professional staff for duties requiring their expertise, resulting in increased efficiency by staff and increased quality of service delivery for the public.
- A diverse group of volunteers makes a community center more welcoming to people for whom English is a second language or who don't see their culture represented in the professional staff.

**Disadvantages**

- Volunteers need both training and supervision. This takes significant staff time.
- Volunteers may be less reliable than paid staff.
- City is liable for the actions of volunteers when they are entrusted with care of youngsters or of City assets.

**Similar Practice in Seattle and Other Jurisdictions:**

- Seattle uses volunteer coaches for athletic programs, community volunteers for special events, and volunteer members of advisory councils for community input and advocacy.
- The Discovery Park Docent Program and the Green Seattle Partnership Forest Stewards Program are examples of current Parks programs that make extensive use of highly trained volunteers.
- Nonprofits such as Phinney Neighborhood Association and various senior centers make more extensive use of volunteers than Parks does.
- A recommendation of the study Sustaining Seattle's Parks: A Study of Alternative Strategies to Support Operations and Maintenance of a Great Urban Parks System prepared for the Seattle Parks Foundation by Tom Byers and Ken Bounds in January 2011 is, "The Department should continue to develop its innovative volunteer, job-training and community service programs." This recommendation is listed as one that is "wise and necessary under any scenario."

## **Impacts:**

### **System Flexibility**

- Expanded roles for volunteers could provide a more flexible alternative model for programming hours when community centers are closed or underused (dark hours) as in Option 8.

### **Community Needs/Access:**

- Increased volunteer opportunities could create stronger connections between the community and a community center.
- Volunteers working across a geographical group might bring diverse communities together.
- A diverse group of volunteers makes a community center more welcoming to people for whom English is a second language or who don't see their culture represented in the professional staff.
- Could improve access for rentals and programs for members of the community who cannot afford to pay for building monitoring costs.

### **Partnership Potential:**

- Volunteers are partners and this would increase the ways they can participate in their community centers.
- Volunteers may provide a bridge to other community groups, nonprofits, or businesses that might be good partners.
- Parks currently uses volunteers to support athletic programs, environmental stewardship, and community events.

### **Implementation Issues:**

- Risk and liability issues need to be identified and mitigated.
- Parks staff will train volunteers in building management, emergency response, and Departmental policies and procedures.
- Key access and security systems need to be updated.
- If there is a significant increase in volunteers, this would require an additional volunteer coordinator to track training, background checks, assignments, and evaluations.
- Use of volunteers needs to conform to existing union contracts or negotiate changes.

### **Potential Budget Impacts:**

- Unlikely to be a source of major budget savings.
- May require increased Parks' staff to train, assign, supervise, and evaluate volunteers.

**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.

**Estimated Potential Budget Impact: Unlikely to be a major source of additional revenue.**

**Summary:**

- Examples of this type of agreement are the current Joint Use Agreement with Seattle Public Schools, location of a Department of Neighborhoods' Neighborhood Service Center in one of our facilities, joint programming with an ethnic or cultural organization, or coordination of services with senior centers.
- Implementation requires identifying potential partners, determining the modifications to community center operations necessary to accommodate them, and negotiating a rental agreement or Memorandum of Understanding to allow for joint use of facilities.
- Key issues are whether the use of a space is exclusive or shared with other users and the terms of the agreement.

**Advantages**

- Uses City spaces more intensively to provide more services.
- Increases connections between Parks and other organizations with complementary goals.
- Forges relationships with ethnic or cultural organizations that may result in greater diversity of Parks' community center patrons.
- The longer the agreement with another organization, the more certain is the revenue stream, which provides more stability for both Parks and the other organization.

**Disadvantages**

- If space is dedicated exclusively to a single use at all times, it may decrease the space available for other programs during active periods.
- Recreation space may need to be converted to office space to meet potential partners' needs.
- The longer the agreement with another party, the more unlikely it is that that the space can be reclaimed by Parks should more funding become available.

**Similar Practice in Seattle and Other Jurisdictions:**

- Parks has a Joint Use Agreement with Seattle Public Schools that allows both parties free use of each others' facilities (when not in use by the owner), paying only for janitorial and utility costs.
- MOUs are being negotiated with all Senior Centers that receive City support to coordinate programs with Parks.
- Many organizations (nonprofit, for profit, and community-based) provide ongoing programs at community centers. Examples are ARC programs and child care, the Food and Fitness senior nutrition program, Arena Sports Little Kickers program, Jazzercise, Zumba, and a number of churches and preschools.

- A recommendation of the study Sustaining Seattle's Parks: A Study of Alternative Strategies to Support Operations and Maintenance of a Great Urban Parks System prepared for the Seattle Parks Foundation by Tom Byers and Ken Bounds in January 2011 is, "The Department should continue to forge community partnerships to leverage the capacity of nonprofit organizations to provide services. ... However, it should also be recognized that partnerships require time and energy, and may themselves create new operating and maintenance responsibilities for the City."

### **Impacts:**

#### **System Flexibility**

- The building schedule needs to accommodate both Parks' and partners' program viability. This requires more flexibility by Parks.
- Lease of a space exclusively to an outside organization would reduce the space available for Parks uses.
- Could negotiate more building responsibilities for trusted partners.

#### **Community Needs/Access:**

- Community needs are better met because programmable space does not sit empty.
- If two partners want to use same space at the same time or if the proposed use displaces a current use, Parks must decide which community to serve.

#### **Partnership Potential:**

- Expands partnerships with a wide variety of private, nonprofit, and governmental organizations.
- Pilot changing policies to give trusted renters keys to the building and ability to run programs with no Parks' staff present.

#### **Implementation Issues:**

- Need to determine methods for involving the community in decision-making about which partners use which spaces for what purposes.
- Community centers do not have large amounts of office space. Ongoing use by others may require the conversion of some recreation space to office space.
- May need to be implemented gradually as partners' existing leases expire.
- Contracts longer than a year in duration require City Council approval.
- Need to revise policies and procedures to allow partners to open and supervise buildings.
- Need to establish methods of resolving conflicts between users.

#### **Potential Budget Impacts:**

- Unlikely to be source of major budget savings.
- Revenue can be accounted for in the budget only after contracts are signed.
- May require increased Parks staff to identify, negotiate with, and support ongoing relationship with partners.

**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.

***Estimated Potential Budget Impact: Avoided General Fund net expense of \$(400,000) per standard center, \$(100,000) per current limited use center. Rent payments by lessee would provide additional savings.***

**Summary:**

- Parks conducts an RFP process to identify an outside partner to assume operations of a community center that has been or is about to be closed.
- Operator assumes all operational costs including staffing, equipment, janitorial, and utilities.
- Parks retains responsibility for major maintenance costs although the operator may contribute.
- Rent charges may be offset by public benefit or capital investment credits. Public benefits would include offering scholarships, reduced fees, or free public meeting space. Capital investments would include paying for major maintenance or building renovations.
- Lessee could offer programs similar to or different from Parks' programs.

**Advantages**

- Keeps some public use of a facility that would otherwise be closed.
- Provides relatively low-cost space to a community-based organization.
- Allows a community to continue to provide service that the City can no longer afford to provide.

**Disadvantages**

- Amount of time required to implement means that centers would likely close before being reopened by an outside operator.
- Parks must still budget for all or part of major maintenance costs in its CIP.
- Long-term leases make it difficult to resume use as a Parks operated community center.
- May be difficult to find organizations that provide similar service and can afford to operate our facilities.

**Similar Practice in Seattle and Other Jurisdictions:**

- Current examples of Parks facilities operated by others include Lake City Community Center, Pratt Fine Arts Center, Madrona Dance Studio, Bathhouse Theater, Seward Park Clay Studio, Seward Environmental and Audubon Center, and Cascade People's Center.
- Examples of organizations that have made major investments in buildings that they now use exclusively under very long-term leases are the Mountaineers Club (Building 67 in Magnuson Park) and Arena Sports (Building 27 in Magnuson Park).
- Phinney Neighborhood Association and various senior centers are examples of non-government organizations that run facilities similar to community centers.
- San Jose instituted a facility reuse program in 2008 that has grown to include 23 former community centers. They are now operated by community-based groups and nonprofits.
- Denver has three Transition Sites that were previously Neighborhood Centers but are now run by nonprofits.

- Portland has two centers where a nonprofit organization has assumed responsibility for operations (Interstate Firehouse Cultural Arts Center and Woodstock Community Center) and the Multnomah Arts Center where six nonprofits lease space in a facility that is still managed by City staff.
- A recommendation of the study Sustaining Seattle's Parks: A Study of Alternative Strategies to Support Operations and Maintenance of a Great Urban Parks System prepared for the Seattle Parks Foundation by Tom Byers and Ken Bounds in January 2011 particularly mentions the long-term agreements with the Woodland Park Zoological Society and the Seattle Aquarium Society that provide for the full operation of the zoo and aquarium by those organizations.

**Impacts:**

**System Flexibility**

- Partners might respond more quickly to the changing needs of the community.
- The longer the lease the harder it is for Parks to resume operations in the building.
- The longer the lease the more program stability is given to the operating organization.
- Other organizations may be more flexible than Parks.

**Community Needs/Access:**

- A community assets analysis can help determine what services and programs are being offered by other organizations and what additional programs and services are needed.
- The lease provisions could address community access and public benefits.
- Parks could offer the facility operator incentives to offer scholarships and/or free or reduced-fee programming.
- Because the RFP process and lease negotiation take significant time, the center will likely be closed before it reopens, and this will result in a temporary loss of services.

**Partnership Potential:**

- Potential for Parks to partner with a variety of organizations that have diverse expertise.
- Operator could sub-contract with other partners to expand program offerings.
- There may be a limited number of partners with capability of running a whole center.

**Implementation Issues:**

- RFP process and negotiation of agreement require significant effort and time.
- Leasing to another operator would involve laying off all Parks staff. Employees may not be hired by the lessee and existing labor contracts may not be assumed by the lessee.
- More easily implemented in a new facility provided that the facility was not debt financed, in which case "private use" restrictions apply.

**Potential Budget Impacts:**

- Average general fund (GF) savings of \$400,000 per standard center closed, \$100,000 per limited use center closed. Rent payments by the lessee provide additional GF savings.
- Parks must still budget for all or part of major maintenance costs in the CIP.
- A longer lease could reward capital investments by the lessee.
- The City might provide a short-term operational subsidy with a phase-out period as did San Jose.

**Public Opinion Concerning the Nine Options:**

The final public process in preparing this SLI response was a survey that asked the public to rate each of the nine options from 6 = “strongly support” to 1 = “do not support at all.” The Department hosted two public meetings that were designed to present the options and to answer questions about them. Those attending the meetings submitted their questions in writing and, if time did not allow them to be answered at the meeting itself, the questions and responses were posted on the Parks’ website. The Community Center Advisory Team also rated the nine options at their last meeting. The CCAT survey results and preliminary results from the public survey are shown in the tables below. These tables show, for instance, that 1 CCAT member rated Option 1 as a 3, 5 as a 5 and 6 as a 6. For Option 2, 4 CCAT members rated it 4, 7 rated it 5 and 1 rated it 6.

CCAT Rating of Nine Options								
Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total # Responses	Average Response
Option 1	-	-	1	-	5	6	12	5.33
Option 2	-	-	-	4	7	1	12	4.75
Option 3	1	3	2	3	3	-	12	3.33
Option 4	10	-	2	-	-	-	12	1.33
Option 5	-	-	-	2	4	6	12	5.33
Option 6	-	-	1	2	2	7	12	5.25
Option 7	2	-	1	2	2	5	12	4.42
Option 8	-	-	1	5	6	-	12	4.42
Option 9	6	1	4	1	-	-	12	2.00

Preliminary Survey Results as of 6/30/11**								
Rating	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total # Responses	Average Response
Option 1	34	45	61	75	95	112	422	4.16
Option 2	44	58	70	88	88	65	413	3.76
Option 3	150	90	60	58	20	38	416	2.57
Option 4	276	60	26	21	13	26	422	1.85
Option 5	51	39	65	67	81	117	420	4.05
Option 6	50	34	46	64	79	144	417	4.25
Option 7	52	35	59	66	74	127	413	4.10
Option 8	46	25	47	66	88	145	417	4.34
Option 9	115	63	65	64	59	50	416	3.09

\*\* Includes on-line and hardcopy survey results as of 6/30/11 except those hardcopy results that need to be translated. The survey is open through 7/8/11

After the survey closes on July 8, all results (both on-line and hardcopy) will be tabulated along with the comments received from the public and these results will be delivered to both the Mayor and City Council and posted on the Parks’ website.

**Next Steps:**

Over the course of the summer, the Mayor will consider the options and, taking into account the public feedback on them, will select some options or portions of options to include in his 2012 Budget. The Mayor's budget will be presented to City Council on September 26. During Council budget deliberations there will be additional opportunities for the public to comment on the proposed changes.

## Attachments:

- A. Community Center Partnership and Planning Analysis Statement of Legislative Intent
- B. Community Center Advisory Team
- C. Community Center Data (separate pdf file)
  - a. General Facility Information
  - b. Community Center User Data – 2010
    - i. All Community Center Users – by Type of Activity, On- and Off-site
    - ii. All On-Site Community Center Visits – by Data Source/ Point of Entry
  - c. Community Centers – General Fiscal Information
  - d. Community Centers Cost Recovery – ARC and Parks
    - i. Sorted by Revenue
    - ii. Sorted Alphabetically
- D. Experience of Other Jurisdictions (separate pdf file)
  - a. Seattle
  - b. Denver
  - c. El Paso
  - d. Portland
  - e. San Diego
  - f. San Jose

# Attachment A

## 2011 - 2012 Statement of Legislative Intent

Tab	Action	Option	Version
101	1	A	1

**Budget Action Title:** Community Center Partnership and Planning Analysis

**Councilmembers:** Bagshaw; Burgess; Clark; Godden; Rasmussen

**Staff Analyst:** Kieu-Anh King; Traci Ratzliff

Date		Total	SB	BH	SC	TR	JG	NL	RC	TB	MO
	Yes										
	No										
	Abstain										
	Absent										

### Statement of Legislative Intent:

The City Council requests that the Parks Department, working closely with their established community leaders and recreational partners (including the Associated Recreation Council and the City's Advisory Councils), the City Budget Office, the City Council and Parks Department employees, conduct research and analysis on:

1. Increased partnerships for the management and operations of the City's Community Centers,
2. Increased partnerships for planning and fundraising for the City's Community Centers,
3. Alternate management, operational and staffing models for the City's Community Centers.

This analysis should have the end goals of (a) increasing the public's utilization of Community Centers, (b) reducing the Community Centers' (almost complete) reliance on General Subfund support, (c) enhancing the Community Centers' ability to attain both short term and long-term financial stability and (d) enhancing the Community Centers' flexibility to make changes to operations to better address the needs and desires of their users.

This analysis should include a review of the following questions and/or issues:

- A. What are the historic and anticipated funding trends for the City's Parks Department and for Community Centers? The assumption is that the General Subfund support is likely to become scarcer.
- B. What opportunities are available for expanding partnerships with Parks Department's long-

term recreational partner, the Associated Recreation Council, to operate and manage Community Centers?

- C. What opportunities can be developed for expanding partnerships with other recreational, community or volunteer groups, such as the Boys' & Girls' Clubs, the YMCA, other community non-profits or community associations, to operate and manage Community Centers?
- D. What alternative operational models have other cities, counties and governmental entities implemented for their community or recreation centers?
- E. How can the Parks Department work more closely with its employees, their labor representatives, neighborhood leaders, and the City's Advisory Councils to find and implement efficiencies and to complete a "boots on the ground" analysis of Community Center operations?
- F. Encourage the Parks Department to find efficiencies and alternative schedules to effectively staff the Community Centers. For example, can one Community Center Coordinator manage two Community Centers, instead of the one-to-one ratio in the Parks Department's current staffing model? As another example, do all Community Centers need the same basic structure and amount of staff (4.00 FTE Recreational, plus 1.00 FTE Custodial)?
- G. Encourage the Parks Department to find efficiencies in the operational model for Community Centers. This might involve different drop-in hours at different Centers based on demand and need for services, or different drop-in hours depending on the time of year.
- H. Encourage the Parks Department, in cooperation with Associated Recreation Council, to develop consistent methodologies for collecting data on all community center users, including drop in use, classes or activities of interest to users, etc. and consider the use of current technologies in the collection of such data.
- I. Encourage the Parks Department to pursue a different pricing model for Community Center services and charge higher entry and enrollment fees to some users, to generate additional revenue to support Community Center operations.
- J. Encourage the Parks Department along with Council Central Staff and City Budget Office staff to review the upcoming analysis by the Seattle Parks Foundation regarding long term parks funding issues related to the operation and maintenance of parks and recreational facilities as applicable to community center operations.

The City Council expects that Council Central Staff will work closely with the Parks Department and the City Budget Office on this analysis, and that the Parks and Seattle Center Committee will review the results of the analysis beginning on or around June 2011, including any proposals for 2012 implementation.

**Responsible Council Committee(s):** Parks and Seattle Center

**Date Due to Council:** June 1, 2011

## Attachment B

### Community Center Advisory Team

---

**Background:** As part of the Parks Department's need to reduce General Fund support by \$10 million in the 2011 Budget, the Department converted 5 community centers to "limited use" sites. This involved a significant drop in public operating hours for these community centers and reduction or displacement of programming. However, these changes saved about \$1.3 million. In part as a response to these changes, City Council passed a statement of legislative intent (SLI), the Community Center Partnership and Planning Analysis SLI, that directed the Parks Department to conduct research and analysis on 1) Increased partnerships for the management and operations of the City's Community Centers, 2) Increased partnerships for planning and fundraising for the City's Community Centers, and 3) Alternate management, operational and staffing models for the City's Community Centers. The Department anticipates that the research and analysis will result in identification of a range of options for changes in how recreational services are provided through our community centers along with a discussion of the pros and cons of each option.

**CCAT Purpose:** The purpose of the Community Center Advisory Team (CCAT) is to advise the Department as the Department carries out the research and analysis dictated by the Community Center Partnership and Planning Analysis SLI. The CCAT will also help the Department identify options to include in the SLI response along with the pros and cons for each option. The CCAT is to assure that all voices are heard and all points of view considered.

**In order to do this, the CCAT will:**

- 1) Receive briefings on the Department's research and analysis and provide feedback that guides further work.
- 2) Become familiar with the current operations of our diverse community centers.
- 3) Become familiar with alternative service delivery models used by other jurisdictions.
- 4) Receive input from the general public and Parks Department employees. All CCAT meetings will be open to the public. Their times and locations will be announced on the Parks website.
- 5) Generate ideas for change in community center operations.
- 6) Comment on draft written materials provided by the Department.

**CCAT members will:**

- 1) Attend 10 evening meetings of CCAT plus other public meetings if possible.
- 2) Read all materials provided before meetings.
- 3) Follow agreed upon group norms.
- 4) Have fun and make a difference to their community!

**What the CCAT is not:**

- It is not the group that is doing the research and analysis or preparing the SLI response. That is the Department's role.
- It is not the group that decides what options will be implemented. That is the role of the Mayor and City Council.

It is not a forum for resolving regulatory or contract issues such as labor contract, zoning and environmental concerns. These may be referred to the appropriate forum for further review and resolution, as required by federal, state or local provisions.

**Attachment C: Community Center Data**

See separate pdf file.

**Attachment D: Experience of Other Jurisdictions**

See separate pdf file.