Seattle Parks & Recreation
20 Community/Recreation Centers
5 Limited-Use Sites
1 Center under construction

Demographic information - 2010

- Estimated population: 600,000
- One community center(including limited-use sites) for every 30,000 people, 4,122 children, and 5,014 senior adults

Budget - 2011

- Total Department: $121,724,137
- Recreation Budget: $38, 569,216
- Recreation Revenue: $20,961,487 (projected)

System of Community Centers

- 20 Community Centers
    - All sites open 6 days per week
    - 53 operating hours per week
    - Five sites have 5 additional operating hours on Sunday
    - Late Night program operates at 10 sites
    - 5 full-time staff for each facility (Coordinator, Assistant Coordinator, Rec. Leader, Rec. Attendant, Custodian)
    - Average annual site budget is $418,022
- 5 Limited-Use Sites
    - 20 operating hours per week
    - One Rec. Leader and Rec. Attendant – Temporary/Intermitent staff
    - ARC child care operates in 4 sites
    - Lifelong Recreation and Special Pops administrative offices located in Laurelhurst Community Center
- 3 Teen Life Centers
    - Garfield TLC operates 40.5 per week over six days
    - Meadowbrook and Southwest TLCs match sites operating hours – 53 hours
- 1 Center under construction (Rainier Beach CC)

Current partnerships

- 180 partnerships currently logged. The majority of Parks partners are with non-profit organizations, followed by social service agencies, businesses, individuals and volunteers.

Human Resources Lens

- Joint Crafts Council Agreement with the City of Seattle
    - Community Center staff represented by one of two unions (1239, Teamsters)
    - Section 14.24 of the Agreement between The City of Seattle and joint Crafts Council is primary reference point when exploring different operation models for community centers

Operational Changes

- Limited Use sites established in 2011 – see notes above

Seattle Parks & Recreation
20 Community/Recreation Centers
5 Limited-Use Sites
1 Center under construction

- City Council has posed a series of questions, asking DPR how it can maintain community center services while relying less on the general fund for operations.

Denver Parks & Recreation
24 Community/Recreation Centers
3 Transitioned Sites

Demographic information - 2009

- Estimated population: 582,447
- One community center for every 24,268 people, 6,431 children, and 4,807 senior adults

Dodie Owens – Deputy Director

Budget

- $102 million for 2011
- Have taken $25 million in reductions since 2004
- Reduction of additional $5 million for 2012
- 20% cost recovery via fees, membership, and other revenues

Three-tier system of Community/Recreation Centers

- 7 Regional Centers (Aquatics, fitness centers, several program rooms). Open 82-90 hours per week. 4 of these sites open 7 days per week
    - 7 full-time staff members for each site, along with on-call staff.
        - Recreation Supervisor
        - Aquatics Coordinator
        - Two Operation Coordinators
        - One customer service specialist
        - 2 full-time instructors (part-time staff supplement where needed)
        - 1.5 custodians
    - Average size of these sites is 57,000 sq. ft.
    - Average budget is $550,000; average revenue is $350,000
    - Operating hours determined on a site-by-site basis
- 11 Local Centers with focused amenities for neighborhood (pottery center, arts room, climbing wall)
    - One supervisor oversees two of these facilities
    - Three full-time staff covers two facilities
    - Rely heavily on on-call staff to cover
    - Open 60-70 hours per week
    - No square footage data available
    - Average budget is $400,000 for any two sites paired together; average revenue is $80,000 per site
    - Operating hours determined on a site-by-site basis
    - All sites have a gymnasium and at least one program space
- 6 Neighborhood Centers – building built in 50s and 60s. Typically just a gymnasium or field house
    - Operate only 3-6 p.m., Monday – Friday, supervised by on-call staff
    - No square footage data available
    - Average budget for each is $50,000; average revenue is $10,000 per site
- 3 Transition Sites – previous Neighborhood Centers
    - Non-profit organization runs all programming inside facility – specific focus, based on community
    - Non-profit is responsible for:
        - Computer and phone installation, management, and expense

        - Custodial needs
        - Preventative maintenance of facility, based on schedule given by Denver Parks and Recreation (DPR)
        - All utility costs once cap is reached. Cap is $35,000 combined for the three sites – paid by DPR
        - All damage to interior and exterior of the building, up to $500. DPR covers the remaining portion
        - Exterior maintenance is responsibility of DPR
        - Paying prevailing (union) wages to employees
    - DPR budget for Transition sites - $50,000 total
    - All three located in low-income neighborhoods, with a regional center no more than one mile away
        - Cultural barriers tend to keep communities from going to neighboring regional center

- **Pros**
    - Permits maximizing budget dollars in locations with high customer volume
    - Permits 4 sites to be open 7 days a week, 82-90 hours
    - Smaller sites remain open and a presence remains in these communities
    - Program-focused in the Local and Neighborhood Centers – not duplicating services
- **Cons**
    - Staff stretched in the Neighborhood Centers – relying often on on-call staff to run buildings
    - Major maintenance on Transition Sites could be a budget drain – non-profit tenant only carries $500 of the responsibility

Transition Sites - process

- Chose three Neighborhood Centers with limited amenities and neighboring Regional Centers
    - 2009 – approached 2,000 Denver-area non-profit organization with RFP to run programs in these sites
    - Only one applicant – many found the application cumbersome, too long, and complicated
    - Held public meetings with organizations and public, outlining how to apply and provide support for the process
    - Non-profit organizations chosen based on how relevant their programs were to the neighborhood and the amenities available in these smaller facilities
        - Johnson Community Center: Colorado Miners oversees youth sports and fitness activities. They partner with Food Bank of the Rockies to provide after school food to children.
        - Partnerships expected to be outlined in application to RFP
- Public Response
    - Generally negative to private organization "taking over" a public facility
    - DPR invited vocal members of the community to several meetings with non-profit organizations interested in RFP process
        - Two tough citizens were sold during the meeting – able to humanize the process by meeting non-profit org. staff, understand what they will provide, and what their vision is.
    - DPR leaders also sold this process as a method of keeping City assets owned publicly and not sold to private developers
- **Pros**
    - Public response shifted, once invited into the process and relationships formed
    - Non-profit organization partnering with others to serve the community
    - City assets remain publicly owned

Denver Parks & Recreation
24 Community/Recreation Centers
3 Transitioned Sites

- **Cons**
  - Neighborhood Centers in low-income neighborhoods and only open 15 hours per week, M-F
    - Cultural barriers keep some in these neighborhoods from accessing a Regional Center within one-mile

Human Resources Lens

- No collective bargaining
  - Employees do have a union – not strong
- 24 full-time FTEs lost
  - 14 full-time staff laid off
  - 10 additional took retirement incentives
  - 10 positions not returned until re-organization proposed
- **Pros**
  - 10 staff received retirement incentives
- **Cons**
  - Lost 24 full-time staff – 10 with great institutional knowledge and 14 with enthusiasm, energy, and new ideas

Operational Changes

- Budget office told DPR that a re-organization required before 10 positions restored
  - Adult fitness program now centrally managed – increase revenue
  - Youth sports now centrally managed – use of more volunteers to decrease cost
  - Facility Coordinators now focused on the facility – no longer lead programs, drive teens on field trips, etc.
  - Facilities are now program-focused – no longer offering "everything, everywhere."
  - Adult, Youth, and Senior membership fees
    - My Place program reduces this youth fee by 50% - for children attending a school where 75% or more of the students receive free/reduced-fee lunch
- **Pros**
  - Increase revenues from centrally managing certain program areas
  - Facility Coordinators focusing on the operations of facility – will create more efficient operations
  - Program-focus allows DPR to diversify and attract more clientele
  - Membership fees are tiered based on resident, non-resident status
- **Cons**
  - Membership fees for youth a barrier
  - Many illegal immigrants will not fill out paperwork for membership – children use cash, thus pay more for regular use
  - Membership fees a political hot-button for 2011 – all local Denver political candidates will either not discuss publicly or explicitly do not support
  - Centrally managing program areas takes work away from facility staff that may be a source of energy and inspiration for them

El Paso Parks & Recreation
25 Community/Recreation Centers

Demographic information – 2009

- Estimated population: 602,672
- One community center for every 24,107 people, 8,178 children, and 4,861 senior adults

Nanette Smejkal - Director

Budget

- 2011 - $13 million
  - Only includes salaries, benefits, programs, custodial, and pest control
  - All utilities, external maintenance, IT, HR, and Accounting expenses paid by another Department
- 2010 revenue - $3.2 million
  - Facility rentals, program fees, general admission fees, weight rooms

Three-tier system of Community/Recreation Centers

- Category A
  - Average 22,000 square feet
  - 64 operating hours per week
  - Gymnasium, weight room, 5-6 program spaces
  - Average budget
- Category B
  - Average 12,000 square feet
  - 44 operating hours per week
  - Most have a ½ gymnasium, one or two programmable spaces, and some have a weight room
- Category C
  - Average 2,000 square feet – clubhouses
  - 35 operating hours per week
  - One room or space, typically

Private/Public partnerships

- Informal partnerships help various operations – no specific information available

Human Resources Lens

- No HR component needed currently

Operational Changes

- Minimal operational changes during economic downturn
- Minor operation hours cuts – no layoffs
- El Paso's economy has remained stable for the last few years

Portland Parks & Recreation
12 community centers
3 transitioned sites

Demographic information - 2009

- Estimated population: 548,988
- One community center for every 45,749 people, 10,084 children, and 9,581 senior adults.

Operational 12 community centers

- Site budgets range from $500,000 and $2,000,000. The most expensive sites include a pool, fitness center, and full-size gymnasium and community rooms.
- Open a range of 40-98.5 hours, depending on the site
- Staffing varies completely, depending on site. Largest site has two Building Managers, five Recreation Coordinators overseeing different areas, and one Recreation Leader.
- Average square footage of sites is (information forthcoming)
- Each site has a gymnasium and at least one MPR, except for the Laurelhurst Dance Studio. Some large sites have additional program spaces. 5 have both an aquatics and fitness center. One additional non-aquatics site has a fitness center.

Fred Kowell – Finance Manager

Sponsorship Program

- 1.0 Dedicated FTE
- Columbia Sportswear sponsoring Sellwood Community Center and Park – ongoing costs. Paying for a Park Technician - $100,000 per year
- Freightliner LLC - $100,000 sponsor for summer concert program
- Starbucks funding $10,000 for Summer Free For All – Playground program, Movies in the Park, and Summer Festival
- 10 for 10 program – try to get 10 corporations to sponsor 10 parks/community centers. The corporation can choose any location within the parks system.
- New revenue stream idea – Tree pruning and sidewalk repair fees to fund parks and public works.
    - City will provide service when customer calls, or when city sees fit to prune tree or sidewalk
    - Homeowner is billed for either at a reduced price than current. Funds go toward parks and recreation.
- **Pros**
    - $220,000 to preserve a major facility, park, and series of programs
    - Provides one FTE for body of work – employment opportunity
- **Cons**
    - Reportedly took 2-3 years for first deal (Columbia Sportswear) to become final
    - 1 for 10 currently within the "10 for 10" program – most sponsors interested in funding capital, not ongoing maintenance/operations.
    - Sponsorships are good for the fringe programs and facilities; not enough for core operations

Portland Parks & Recreation
12 community centers
3 transitioned sites

Todd Lofgren – Property & Acquisitions Manager

Public/Private Partnerships

- **Non-profit organization assuming responsibility for operations**
  - Interstate Firehouse Cultural Arts Center
    - 1990s – "Friends of" group assumed responsibility of operations
    - Parks staff no longer manages this facility
    - Portland did provide funds for programs until July 2010. - **$100,000 savings for 2011**
    - Interior of the building is the responsibility of the non-profit resident
    - Exterior and elevator system is the responsibility of City of Portland
    - Public consternation about the July 2010 handover – public opposed to privatization
  - Woodstock Community Center
    - "Friends of" assumed responsibility of operations in 2003, saving the building from closure
    - Staffed by the "Friends of" non-profit group – no City staff
    - City responsible for the exterior; Friends of Woodstock Community Center responsible for interior
    - No information on public input or reaction for this
  - **Pros**
    - Savings of $100,000 when Portland stopped funding programs
    - Preserves City responsibility of facility, keeping assets publicly owned for potential future "re-activation."
    - Maintains programs for the public
  - **Cons**
    - Portland not paying for programs – no ability to leverage quality-assurance guidelines
    - Does not align with expressed desire of the citizens
    - Maintenance costs can be unpredictable – may reduce expected savings
    - City jobs lost

- **Non-profit organizations leasing space from facility still managed by City staff**
  - Multnomah Arts Center
    - Six non-profit orgs. lease space
    - 1/3 of programs designed by staff, 2/3 designed by non-profit groups
    - $1 million annual budget, $1.15 million in annual revenue
      - 80% of revenue comes from programs designed by 3.5 City of Portland staff
      - 10% of revenue comes from leases
      - 10% of revenue comes from private rentals
    - 50,000 clients per year in City staff-designed programs – 3.5 FTE dedicated to this work
  - **Pros**
    - Able to pay for itself through three, primary revenue streams
    - Employees retain City of Portland pay rates, titles, and benefits – saves jobs
    - Relationships with non-profits in the building is harmonious – working together to serve the community
    - Reaches 50,000 citizens per year
  - **Cons**
    - Brand is confusing – multiple groups in same building mean citizens view the facility in varying ways (i.e. senior center, arts center, food bank)
    - Majority of programs designed by non-City organizations

Portland Parks & Recreation
12 community centers
3 transitioned sites

Gregory Dubay – Executive Director of the Community Music Center

Non-profit organization assuming partial fiscal responsibility for City-run facility

- Community Music Center
  - "Friends of" non-profit group fundraises $90,000 via facility rentals and private donations. City of Portland budgets an additional $90,000 to complete the operating budget of $180,000
    - Overall revenue for rentals and classes is $600,000 per year. Rental revenue goes to non-profit group; class revenue goes back into the general fund.
  - City of Portland provides two staff people (Executive Director, Assistant Director) to run facility. All instructors are City employees, as well.
  - Fundraised funds pay for staff, building maintenance, and supplies – reimburses Portland 100%.
- **Pros**
  - $90,000 of general fund dollars turns into $300,000 of revenue returned to the general fund
  - City of Portland identifies the benefits of music education. Children who participate in these programs are twice as likely to exercise and volunteer in the community. (From an unknown study cited by Gregory)
  - Sites focusing on the performing arts can be the greatest revenue generators for a City
  - Partnership has existed since 1960 in some form – long-standing relationship with Portland
- **Cons**
  - Non-profit relationship with City is always tenuous – consistent fear of being pushed aside
  - Struggle between the mission of non-profit and City of Portland – which set of priorities is more important?

Margaret Evans – Human Resources Manager

HR Lens

- Transition Site Model – at least 10 years
  - Identify a site that is no longer financially viable (Pittock Mansion example)
  - Employees given one year notice of the plan to transition site to non-profit management
  - 6 months into this year, staff given more details about what is to come
  - Employees have opportunities to apply for other city jobs during this time, in the hopes they will remain employed
  - Employees also have the opportunity to remain in their position and transfer employment to non-profit entity
  - One staff person went "kicking and screaming." Involved the unions, but the union on board from the very beginning on the "transition site" model.
  - This staff person transitioned to a lower-level position in the organization and is now "happier than ever."
- **Pros**
  - Everyone on board from the very beginning, including unions
  - One year notice time for employees – provides transition time and space, information, and respect
  - Provide multiple opportunities for transition – showing they are valuable
- **Cons**
  - Current budget situation may not provide many transition opportunities for City of Seattle staff
  - Definition of when a facility is not "financially viable" is not clear

San Diego Parks & Recreation
46 Community Centers

Demographic information – 2009

- Estimated Population: 1,297,618
- One community center for every 28,209 people, 6,992 children, and 5,618 seniors

Operations of 46 Community Centers

- Each facility open for 40 hours per week over 5-6 days
    - 1 – 6 p.m. are core hours where all sites are open. Each site is then able to schedule the additional 15 hours based on community need and use.
    - Sites previously open 60 hours per week in 2007 – reduced since then
    - Looking at a potential reduction to 20 hours per week over 5 days
    - Each site has a Center Director and then hourly employees to fill in the rest of the needs
    - Maintenance Laborer is ½ time for each site, and includes responsibility for external building and park maintenance
    - Very minimal staff – bare bones
    - Average budget – unknown at the moment. Budgeting occurs geographically and is not site-specific
- Recording of drop-in use data
    - No system in place to collect these data
- **Pros**
    - Sites still open to the public
- **Cons**
    - Operating hours reduced dramatically over time and looking at further cuts
    - Not enough staff to operate safely and effectively
    - Budgeting system antiquated

Scott Reese – Deputy Director

Current Budget Crisis

- July – June budget cycle: submitting proposals in to Mayor's office by April 15th
- Good news: projected deficit for San Diego down to $46 million from $73 million, for the next budget cycle
    - Several Council members attempted to allocate this "gain" to support police and fire, to no avail
    - Additional dollars still on the table for all Departments, potentially
- Strategies taken to help preserve operations with a tight budget
    - Reduction of operating hours – from 40 per week to 20 possible for 2011-2012 budget
        - "Brown out" – pairing up sites by geographic area and alternating hours/days of operation, so only one is open at any time
    - Re-purposing of sites is on the table
        - Unions currently blocking any discussion of "privatization"
        - Union not very strong in San Diego, except in this area
        - Ideas around privatization need to go through a "management competition," which essentially requires employee approval to move forward. Employees not in support of private/public partnerships
        - No strategy currently on how to finesse this
- **Pros**
    - Signs of economy bouncing back
    - "Brown outs" may move sites to work in coordination
    - Employees empowered around direction of the Department

- **Cons**
  - Reduced service to the public
  - "Management Competition" policy leaves little room for creative problem solving

HR Lens

- Community Centers have yet to be closed during this fiscal crisis – no layoffs of permanent staff
- Unions blocking re-purposing plans at the moment - see notes above
- No plan currently for anything else to do with personnel
- Assumption: memo from Parks and Recreation Director drafted to send clear message to staff about what is coming, based on the current model of operating
- **Pros**
  - No layoff of staff yet
- **Cons**
  - No long-term solution to fiscal crisis

San Jose Parks & Recreation
10 Community Centers
46 Reuse Facilities

Demographic information - 2009

- Estimated population: 934,415
- One community center for every 93,442 people, 33,878 children, and 17,374 senior adults

Operations of 10 Community Centers

- One for each City District
- These sites not eligible for Reuse Program – must remain operational, based on a bond requirement
- Operating hours range from 42-70 hours per week. Facilities with fitness centers/programs and a pool open longer hours.
  - One Aquatics Center
  - Two Youth Centers
  - Two Fitness Centers
  - At least two sites combined with a library
  - One site is also a police substation
- Budget for largest Facility is $700,000 – 8.25 FTE
- Staff roles vary, depending on site and community needs

Rudy Nevaro – Facility Reuse Program Manager

- 2006 – San Jose had 56 Community and Neighborhood Centers
- 2008 – San Jose Parks and Recreation adopted a Facility Reuse program after 7 years of budget deficits
  - City Council requested a 35% reduction in Parks and Recreation
  - Initial decision was to close 17 sites – Facility Reuse plan implemented in response to public resistance to simply closing sites

Facility Reuse Model

- Initial model provided free space for return of services; City of San Jose provided maintenance and utilities
- Community involved from the beginning of process, providing input on:
  - What services they would like to have in the facilities
  - Which non-profit organizations would be best suited for their neighborhood
  - Non-profit community involved in providing input and developing vision
  - Facility Advisory Councils also involved
- 2008 – 17 sites set for Reuse
  - Sites selected based on being older or not well-utilized (specific criteria unknown)
  - RFPs went out for all 17 sites – community involvement process influenced these requests
  - All 17 RFPs received applications and awarded to groups, including
    - Boys and Girls Club
    - Arab American Services Agency (specific site in neighborhood with large Arab immigrant population)
- 2009 – 6 additional sites set for Reuse
- 2010 and 2011 – 23 sites set for Reuse
  - RFP process similar to above. No problems getting non-profit organizations to apply.
- 2010 – City no longer offering free space for service

- Organizations now provide partial or full reimbursement for all maintenance and utilities, depending on the contact
- San Jose Parks and Recreation now books facility rentals in all Reuse sites to generate revenue
- Caused one non-profit org. to break contract and not provide further services
    - YMCA moved into the facility to expand its child care program

- Public reaction to Facility Reuse Program
    - Initially concerned that services would not be provided equitably or affordably
    - By including the community through every step of the process, consensus built over time
    - RFP process also includes community members at every step
- **Pros**
    - Community involvement every step of the process
    - Neighborhood-specific programs and services
    - All RFPs received a response
    - Moving into a fiscally sound model, where San Jose no longer offering free space for service
- **Cons**
    - Loss of operations from the public sector at these sites
    - No longer offering free space for service adversely affected at least one operation of a Reuse Facility
    - Community outreach efforts not as inclusive by neighborhood-specific non-profit groups

HR Lens

- Before 2011, very few staff lost employment
    - Unions not strong in San Jose
    - Many employees were moved into other City positions
    - Others were offered jobs by the non-profit organizations taking on operations of the Reuse sites
        - Required as part of many Reuse contracts
        - Savings of $1 million
    - 2011 – expecting layoffs at the end of this year