

On-Site and Off-Site Paid Use					INCLUDE?	yes	All On-Site Comm Center Users - by Type of Activity or Program - Calendar Year 2010 Data														
INCLUDE?					yes	On / Off SITE	onsite														
Sum of Total Visits					On / Off SITE	Sum of Total Visits		Secondary Category													Grand Total
MASTER Facility	OFFSITE	onsite	Grand Total	% OFF-site	MASTER Facility	Out-of-School Care/Camps	Athletics	Aerobics/Fitness	Aquatics	Arts: Visual/Crafts	Drop-In	Late Night Rec	Other	Performing Arts & Dance	Science, Nature & the Environment	Special Events/Over nights	Grand Total				
Alki CC	3,794	26,674	30,468	12.5%	Alki CC	22,340		1,974			212			286		310	26,674				
Ballard CC	520	33,445	33,965	1.5%	Ballard CC	16,611	5,230	2,822		1,288	2,575		352	4,177		390	33,445				
Bitter Lake CC	488	37,028	37,516	1.3%	Bitter Lake CC	17,994	2,572	1,589		49	6,454	3,544	1,918	2,774		134	37,028				
Delridge CC		25,622	25,622	0.0%	Delridge CC	10,454	7,191	2,731		150	441	1,954	1,931	757		13	25,622				
Garfield CC	1,303	17,934	19,237	6.8%	Garfield CC	12,811	1,251	1,542			1,063		240	736		291	17,934				
Green Lake CC	2,848	25,838	28,686	9.9%	Green Lake CC	1,235	9,037	1,366		1,241	6,962		974	5,023			25,838				
Hiawatha CC	14,873	36,213	51,086	29.1%	Hiawatha CC	15,049	14,387	802		170	1,596		1,568	2,416		225	36,213				
High Point CC	2,205	27,892	30,097	7.3%	High Point CC	8,435	5,875	827		164	2,978	2,585	45	2,787	130	4,066	27,892				
International District CC	29	15,529	15,558	0.2%	International District CC		755	136			12,256		1,192	700	22	468	15,529				
Jefferson CC	114	30,950	31,064	0.4%	Jefferson CC	13,741	1,225	3,030	12	1,817	6,357		1,419	3,163	137	49	30,950				
Laurelhurst CC	16,357	10,099	26,456	61.8%	Laurelhurst CC	675	1,824	3,681		2,086	1,169		215	207	19	223	10,099				
Loyal Heights CC	845	32,274	33,119	2.6%	Loyal Heights CC	4,797	16,249	3,729		94	4,121		886	2,038	4	356	32,274				
Magnolia CC	3,107	47,758	50,865	6.1%	Magnolia CC	24,349	10,068	4,138		1,200	1,814		138	6,051			47,758				
Magnuson CC	1,577	31,905	33,482	4.7%	Magnuson CC	2,783	6,671	9,643		594	4,361		3,687	3,657	3	506	31,905				
Meadowbrook CC	13,201	37,519	50,720	26.0%	Meadowbrook CC	12,049	11,329	3,769		293	5,764		3,319	888		108	37,519				
Miller CC	1,633	16,448	18,081	9.0%	Miller CC	1,395	6,048	598			7,751		295	348		13	16,448				
Montlake CC	7,745	35,756	43,501	17.8%	Montlake CC	7,410	21,648	2,680		1,706	1,199		475	596	30	12	35,756				
Northgate CC	284	29,861	30,145	0.9%	Northgate CC	10,155	4,704	4,177		1,034	7,101		402	1,995		293	29,861				
Queen Anne CC	439	26,079	26,518	1.7%	Queen Anne CC	6,078	7,217	7,903		1,083	1,117		1,477	1,097	10	97	26,079				
Rainier CC	149	35,423	35,572	0.4%	Rainier CC	7,788	6,425	3,814		80	5,489	9,749	1,296	652	65	65	35,423				
Ravenna-Eckstein CC	30,541	29,099	59,640	51.2%	Ravenna-Eckstein CC	3,224	11,887	2,394		584	4,898		482	5,086		544	29,099				
South Park CC	26	17,120	17,146	0.2%	South Park CC	8,619	604	149			1,547	5,871	221	104		5	17,120				
Southwest CC	1,177	8,457	9,634	12.2%	Southwest CC	1,617	1,239	902		40	4,327		307	12		13	8,457				
Van Asselt CC	1,667	13,933	15,600	10.7%	Van Asselt CC	7,116	3,117	162		21	1,391		1,170	947		9	13,933				
Yesler CC		8,934	8,934	0.0%	Yesler CC	4,983	606	642		92	1,935		481	72	35	88	8,934				
Garfield TLC		9,981	9,981	0.0%	Garfield TLC		4,761					3,676	1,544				9,981				
Meadowbrook TLC		3,416	3,416	0.0%	Meadowbrook TLC							3,416					3,416				
Southwest TLC		5,871	5,871	0.0%	Southwest TLC							5,871					5,871				
Rainier Beach CC	3,182	27,630	30,812	10.3%	Rainier Beach CC	8,919	3,317	1,500			189	10,829	2,414	394	68		27,630				
Grand Total	108,104	704,688	812,792		Grand Total	230,627	165,896	66,700	12	13,786	95,067	47,495	28,734	47,570	523	8,278	704,688				
	13.3%	86.7%	100.0%			32.7%	23.5%	9.5%	0.0%	2.0%	13.5%	6.7%	4.1%	6.8%	0.1%	1.2%	100.0%				

NOTES: (1) Incl. CLASS, Membership Card Swipes, Late Night Rec, Paid Drop-in and Front Desk Paid Entry (PLU Sales). (4) Includes leagues run by Citywide Athletics. (7) Does not include POOLS.
(2) Includes only paid CC entry, except for Garfield TLC, which captures ALL entries. (5) Does not incl. free youth sports clinics (6X citywide / year). (8) Late Night Rec does not include Mercer Middle School site.
(3) Numbers represent total VISITS. Five people in a class, five days per week, for ten weeks = 250 visits. (6) Teen drop-in generally undercounted; Teens do not have to pay. (10) Does not include RENTALS (e.g., Puget Sound Basketball).

Community Center On-Site Visits: Data Used for Service Level Assignment in 2012 Proposed Budget All Data for Calendar Year 2010

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	11	12	13
MASTER Facility	TOTAL On-Site Paid Use	CLASS Childcare	CLASS Non-Childcare	LateNite Rec	Member ships	PLU Sales	Subtotal On-Site Paid Use	DIFF from AVG	%	Days Open / Wk	Visits / Day
Alki CC	26,674	22,340	4,108			226	4,334	(13,115)	-75.2%	6	13.9
Ballard CC	33,445	16,547	9,966			6,932	16,898	(551)	-3.2%	6	54.0
Bitter Lake CC	37,028	17,994	9,001	3,544		6,489	19,034	1,585	9.1%	6	60.8
Delridge CC	25,622	10,454	11,159	1,954	6	2,049	15,168	(2,281)	-13.1%	6	48.5
Garfield CC	17,934	12,811	3,389		13	1,721	5,123	(12,326)	-70.6%	7	14.0
Green Lake CC	25,838	1,235	15,219		330	9,054	24,603	7,154	41.0%	6	78.6
Hiawatha CC	36,213	15,049	17,469			3,695	21,164	3,715	21.3%	7	58.0
High Point CC	27,892	8,435	11,755	2,585		5,117	19,457	2,008	11.5%	6	62.2
International District CC	15,529		2,608		743	12,178	15,529	(1,920)	-11.0%	6	49.6
Jefferson CC	30,950	13,741	10,373			6,836	17,209	(240)	-1.4%	6	55.0
Laurelhurst CC	10,099	675	8,159			1,265	9,424	(8,025)	-46.0%	7	25.8
Loyal Heights CC	32,274	4,718	20,521		34	7,001	27,556	10,107	57.9%	6	88.1
Magnolia CC	47,758	24,349	20,109			3,300	23,409	5,960	34.2%	6	74.8
Magnuson CC	31,905	2,783	24,525			4,597	29,122	11,673	66.9%	6	93.1
Meadowbrook CC	37,519	12,049	17,702		51	7,717	25,470	8,021	46.0%	6	81.4
Miller CC	16,448	1,395	5,704			9,349	15,053	(2,396)	-13.7%	7	41.2
Montlake CC	35,756	7,410	26,851			1,495	28,346	10,897	62.5%	6	90.6
Northgate CC	29,861	10,155	10,936		7	8,763	19,706	2,257	12.9%	6	63.0
Queen Anne CC	26,079	6,078	14,991		10	5,000	20,001	2,552	14.6%	6	63.9
Rainier CC	35,423	7,788	10,683	9,749	56	7,147	27,635	10,186	58.4%	7	75.7
Ravenna-Eckstein CC	29,099	3,224	18,596			7,279	25,875	8,426	48.3%	6	82.7
South Park CC	17,120	8,619	937	5,871		1,693	8,501	(8,948)	-51.3%	7	23.3
Southwest CC	8,457	1,617	4,376		71	2,393	6,840	(10,609)	-60.8%	6	21.9
Van Asselt CC	13,933	7,116	3,524			3,293	6,817	(10,632)	-60.9%	6	21.8
Yesler CC	8,934	4,983	1,802		12	2,137	3,951	(13,498)	-77.4%	6	12.6
Subtotal:	657,790	221,565	284,463	23,703	1,333	126,726	436,225				
Average by CC:	26,312	9,232	11,379	4,741	121	5,069	17,449			6.2	54.2
Garfield TLC		-	1,544	3,676	4,761		9,981	n/a	n/a	6	31.9
Meadowbrook TLC		-		3,416			3,416	n/a	n/a	5	13.1
Southwest TLC	5,871	-		5,871			5,871	n/a	n/a	6	18.8
Rainier Beach CC	27,630	8,919	6,765	10,829	151	966	18,711	1,262	7.2%	7	51.3
Grand Total	704,688	230,484	292,772	47,495	6,245	127,692	474,204				

1) "DIFF from AVG" reflects visits per year, excluding Childcare.

3) See prior worksheet for add'l notes.

2) Black font = used in 2012 Service Level assignment. Red = excluded.

New Community Center Management Model

Option 2 is our Recommended Community Center Management Model:

- Options 1-4 in Community Center Partnership and Planning Analysis SLI response describe different CC management models
 - Option 1: Geographic Management
 - Option 2: Geographic/Tiered Management
 - Option 3: Geographic/Tiered Management with 2-3 Closed CC
 - Option 4: Status Quo Management with 7-10 Closed CC
- Option 2 recommended
 - Options were identified through an inclusive, informed, and data-driven process.
 - Option 2 recommended because it:
 - Increases flexibility to meet current needs as well as to adjust to short-run and long-run change
 - Reduces General Subfund (GSF) support significantly (\$1.23m)
 - Targets programming at community needs to increase utilization and preserve services.
 - Departs from the “cookie cutter” approach, and allocates service hours based on data on usage, physical size and demographics.
 - A robust monitoring and evaluation process will be established to assess how the change to this new service model achieves its goals.
 - The previous community center management model has worked well for the last 20+ years but times have changed and we must change too in order to:
 - Continue to provide essential public services.
 - Continue to be relevant and effective as recreation professionals.
 - Operate as a team to maximize the contribution of every staff person.
 - Respond quickly to increasing financial pressure.
 - Meet ever-changing community needs in a timely manner.

Increase flexibility to meet current needs and to adapt to short-run and long-run change

- Geographic Teams allow more flexibility and efficiency in the use of staff.
- Geographic Team supervisors can reallocate staff and hours among their community centers as circumstances change or special needs arise
- Different service levels at community centers within a geographic team allow limited resources to be allocated where there is demonstrated need, based on the best data available.
- Scheduling of public hours may vary by day, week, or season in order to serve the greatest number of users.
- Scheduling of public hours done in consultation with the community.

- All sites, no matter their service level, have professional City staff assigned to them (in contrast to limited use sites that were staffed almost entirely with temporary staff in 2011).
 - Provides more continuity, consistency, and connections with the community.
 - Permits better supervision and training of community volunteers

Reduce General Subfund Support

Community Center Partnership and Planning Analysis Statement of Legislative Intent (SLI) had a goal of “reducing the Community Centers’ (almost complete) reliance on General Subfund support.”

- Typical community center (CC) budget is over 80% personnel costs.
- For public and employee safety, there need to be two staff present during CC public hours
- Therefore, reducing General Subfund (GSF) support requires using staff more efficiently as well as reducing public hours.

Option 2: Geographic/Tiered Management System

- 5 Geographic Teams (GT) each consisting of 5 CC
 - Supervision and Programming done on a GT basis
 - Associated Recreation Council (ARC) reimburses a portion of the cost of Parks staff that program ARC and Parks activities in CC
- Each CC assigned a service level based on its GT and current use, facilities, and demographic data
 - Service Level 1 sites maintain or increase public hours, Service Level 2 sites decrease public hours
 - Staff level reflects public hours.
- Net result is saving of \$1.23 million per year, \$784k due to Parks staffing changes and \$446k due to increased Associated Recreation Council (ARC) reimbursements.

Target Programming to Increase Community Center Utilization:

Community Center Partnership and Planning Analysis SLI had a goal of “increasing the public’s utilization of Community Centers.”

- Limited resources need to be used efficiently and effectively to meet community needs
 - Public hours and staffing for each community center depend on the service level provided through them.
 - Public hours schedule set with community input within GT.
 - No more “cookie cutter” approach
 - Strong message from the public at February 2011 meeting.
- Users may travel to other CC in Geographic Team to access services
 - Coordinated programming and public hours enhance services available within the Geographic Team.
 - CC may specialize in particular program or hours.
 - One center may be open early and another open late.

- Yoga may meet Monday evening at one, Wednesday at another within Geographic Team.
 - Close supervision, sharing of resources and measurement of usage allows quick response to changing community needs and concerns
 - Work with partners to program hours when CC are closed or underutilized, i.e. “dark hours”
 - ARC will continue to provide childcare and programming outside of public hours
 - Identify other partners to provide programming in “dark hours”
 - Location of Neighborhood Service Center at Southwest CC
 - MOUs with 7 Senior Centers

Inclusive and Data-driven Process:

SLI called for a process that involved the community, Parks’ employees, Parks’ partners, the City Budget Office, and City Council. It also laid special emphasis on data collection and research on practices of other jurisdictions.

Process:

- **Work Group** consisting of Parks, City Budget Office, and Council staff who collected data, researched practices of other jurisdictions, and developed options for CC management, fees, and partnerships.
- **Community Center Advisory Team (CCAT)** consisting of representatives of Parks employees, labor unions, ARC, Board of Park Commissioners, teen and senior representatives, and members of the public. Met twice a month for five months to receive information from the Work Group and help formulate options.
- **Public Meetings and Employee Meetings** that provided input on general hopes for and concerns about community centers and that provided feedback about options identified.
- **On-line and Hardcopy Survey** that was the final way that both the public and employees could register their opinions about each of the options identified in the SLI response.
- **Superintendent of Parks and Recreation** reviewed and accepted the work group recommendations.

Data:

- Assignment of a service level to a community center is based upon the best data available.
 - Data includes usage, physical size and demographics.
 - Data relative to others in Geographic Team determines service level assignment.
- Assignments will be reassessed periodically, based on new and emerging data; including revenue, usage and fee-based and free programming.
- Teams will be held accountable for reaching or exceeding certain performance thresholds that data suggest would improve service and sustainability.

Other Jurisdictions:

- Seattle currently has one CC per 30,000 residents. Other cities we researched range from one per 24,000 (Denver and El Paso) to one per 93,000 (San Jose)
- Tiered community center models exist in Denver and El Paso
- In the face of budget reductions San Diego reduced CC hours by closing half the centers in an area on alternate days.
- Other cities have closed and repurposed CC (San Jose went from 56 community centers to 10, Denver has repurposed 3 “Transition Sites.”)
- Those cities that most resisted change, lost the most services.

Frequently Asked Questions about Proposed Changes in Community Center Management

1. What's GOOD about this proposal? It just seems like another cut in City services to me?

- All community centers remain open and serving the public
 - Our research into other cities facing similar budget problems showed that those that most tried to maintain the status quo, wound up closing the most centers.
- The management of community centers will be more flexible, efficient, and community focused
 - Public hours will be set to maximize community use, and this will be done in consultation with the community
 - Programs at nearby community centers will not be duplicative but will complement one another.
 - Community center performance will be more closely monitored and needed adjustments will be made quickly because geographic team management can shift resources among centers in the team.
 - General tax revenues will be freed up to support other urgent needs. This plan saves \$1.23 million relative to the 2012 Endorsed Budget.
- The old management model served us well for over 20 years, but times have changed and Parks and Recreation must change too. Parks is excited about the possibilities that this way of operating provides for the communities we serve.

2. What is the net impact of your proposal on community center public hours of operation?

- In 2010 there were a total of **1,402** public hours per week available across all community centers. 26 community centers were open at least 51 hours per week. The typical center was open 53 hours per week in the winter (37 weeks) and 46 hours per week in the summer (15 weeks) for an annual average of 51 hrs per week. Eight centers were open more than standard hours. These hours do not include those for teen Late Night or other special programs.
- In 2011 there are a total of **1,238** public hours per week available across all community centers. This represents a reduction of 12 percent or 164 hours per week based on the designation of five sites as limited use and the closure of Rainier Beach Community Center for construction. Three limited use sites were open 30 hours per week and two were open 35 hours per week.

- In 2012, there will be a total of **1,095** public hours per week available across all community centers. Using maximum estimates of public hours (70, 45, and 25 hours per week for Level 1, Level 2a, and Level 2b services respectively) results in a further reduction of 12 percent or 143 hours per week in community center public hours. This reduction includes the conversion of Southwest Community Center to a Teen Life Center and the co-location of a Department of Neighborhood's Neighborhood Service Center at that site.

3. Are community centers completely closed and vacant except for “public hours”?

- First, let's define public hours. Public hours are times when anyone can drop in and use the community centers for many purposes. Adults might pay a fee for drop-in use of the gymnasium or fitness room, teens might hang out in the teen room after school, and parents with children might register for childcare or recreation programs.
- In “non-public hours,” centers are still heavily used by participants in particular programs or by particular age groups. For instance, ARC childcare and ARC recreation classes are open to registered participants even during non-public hours. Also, rooms may be rented by a preschool or church or for meetings and celebrations. In this case the center is open to their participants or guests only. Finally, certain Parks programs such as the late night teen program, lifelong recreation, or specialized recreation programs may take place during non-public hours. During these times center use is restricted to those participating in the program.

4. Why can't the general public also use centers when they are open for use by specific programs?

- Parks staff in the building is limited during non-public hours. In general, a program or rental pays for one Parks staff person to open the doors and to see that nobody who isn't a participant enters the building. The program or rental leaders monitor only their participants in the space they are using.
- In order to monitor the rest of the building to see that there is no dangerous, inappropriate, or destructive activity taking place, it would require an additional Parks staff person. If there were sufficient funds to pay for this additional person and if there were sufficient demand for services by non-participants during these hours, Parks would create additional public hours. Parks is working on policies and procedures that would allow certain volunteers associated with renters to open and monitor the building during their programs. This, however, would reduce Parks staff present during non-

public hours and make it even more difficult to open the facility to the general public.

5. Did the City consider turning the management of the centers over to volunteers?

- Our community centers are a highly complex business with a total 2011 operating budget of \$20.2 million (including both ARC and City expenses but excluding teen life centers, lifelong recreation, and special population program expenses). The centers generate about \$8.9 million of revenue (including both ARC and City revenues) with the City's General Fund covering the remaining \$11.3 million. They provide valued recreation services to all ages, help our youth and teens grow into productive citizens, serve as the center of a community by bringing people of all ages and abilities together, and are a community-building gateway for those new to America. We believe it is unlikely that the community would be able to provide the same level of complex and specialized services exclusively through the use of volunteers.
- Although Parks is planning to expand its use of volunteers in community centers, it takes City staff to recruit, train, and supervise these volunteers on a continuing basis. Also, certain activities require highly trained, and sometimes licensed, professionals for activities dealing with children and vulnerable adults. As such, volunteers can only be used for certain activities. This limits the possibility of centers being run entirely by volunteers if the community desires the same level and range of services.
- The City owns the community centers and is responsible for the safety, routine maintenance, and ongoing preservation of these public assets. Any individual or organization that staffs a center would need to foster a similar safe environment for staff and patrons to avoid the mistreatment of the city-owned facility. This may include situations ranging from a disruptive patron, to someone overdosing in the lobby, to a teenager taking refuge from street violence. These are all issues that may place significant financial and perhaps legal burdens on individuals or groups involved in the management of centers.

- Recreation employees are highly trained professionals who deal with a wide variety of issues while offering a broad range of recreation services to the public. We believe it would be very challenging both financially and legally to duplicate these services at a lower cost under a volunteer-run management model.

6. Why join community centers into geographic teams?

- The proposed change in the community center operational model divides our system into five geographic teams of five centers. Each team will be led by a Senior Recreation Program Coordinator and programmed in a coordinated fashion by two Assistant Recreation Center Coordinators. In addition, each community center will have staff assigned to it consistent with the service level provided through it.
- Geographic teams allow more flexibility and efficiency in the use of staff. Geographic team supervisors can reallocate staff and public hours among community centers in a team as circumstances change or special needs arise.
- Geographic team community centers can specialize, thus offering a wider range of services to the public. For instance, one community center might be open early and another late or one might specialize in fitness and another in arts.
- Coordinated programming across a geographic team means that there won't be a duplication of services (e.g., two yoga classes on Wednesday evening and none on Monday or Tuesday, egg hunts at all community centers in a team). We will also be better able to leverage internal resources and define team success rather than individual centers competing with each other. Having a single senior staff person in charge of each geographic team will increase consistency across the team, and having two staff program all the community centers in the team will be more efficient than having one programmer per community center.

7. Why are there five geographic teams?

- Parks considered several different options, including six or seven geographic teams. In the end, we chose five because it provided the maximum amount of programming options across all community centers.
- The advantage of five vs. six or seven geographic teams is that one can implement a management model in which one senior person is responsible for the overall management of all the community centers in the team with support from two staff per team to work on coordinated programming at each center. Under a model with more geographic teams, fewer programming staff were available, which resulted in less programming flexibility across community centers.

8. How were the service levels provided at each community center determined?

- First a team of staff from Parks, the City Budget Office and City Council, assembled the best available data on the physical facilities available at each site, the current use of the community center, and the demographics surrounding it.
 - From this data, specific measures were chosen and a maximum number of points assigned to the measure to reflect the reliability of the data and the overall weight attributed to it. The highest ranking community center for that measure was assigned the maximum points and the lowest ranking community center was assigned zero points. Those in-between the extremes got points proportional to their ranking. Finally, all points for all series were added together and compared to the totals for other community centers in their geographic team.
- The City's Race and Social Justice Initiative provided important insights into the choice of measures used for the service level determinations. For instance, a variety of data reflecting paid use, drop-in use, physical facilities, and scholarships was used so that centers in lower-income neighborhoods would not be disadvantaged. Comparing centers within geographic teams rather than across the whole system also ensured that one area of the City would not receive disproportionately more or less service than another.

9. Why didn't you use census data to measure the community needs?

- Because Seattle is a compact, dense city and many of our community centers are quite close together geographically, a number of census tracts were within the service territories of more than one community center.
- There are also a range of income levels, ethnicities and other measures of community need even within one census district. A high average income, for instance, does not mean that there is not a need for services to those with low incomes.

The group concluded that using the number of individuals using a community center who received scholarships was a better measure of the need among those who actually use the community center.

10. Why do some community centers with lower service levels have higher point totals than some community centers with higher service levels?

- Point totals were compared within geographic teams, not to the entire collective group of community centers. This was one way to reflect the relative needs of different areas while keeping some geographic equity among different areas of the City.

- 11. Why not just make geographic teams and have all community centers treated the same – NO DIFFERENT SERVICE LEVELS?**
- Just grouping the centers does not address differences in how the facilities are utilized by the community. It would continue the “cookie cutter” approach to community center management that was frequently criticized by the public during the first public meetings.
 - In 2011, the City implemented five limited use sites, which essentially created a two service level system. However, the five community centers were chosen without an extensive analysis of usage patterns and community needs and they did not have professional Parks staff assigned to them. Both of these factors resulted in programming and service level issues. These deficiencies have been corrected in this new model.
 - Grouping the community centers without delivering lower service levels at some would actually cost the City money: bringing the limited use sites back to full regular hours would cost more than the geographic management option saves. This means there would be a net cost increase rather than a further cost saving.
- 12. Why do some geographic teams have one Level 1 community center while others have two Level 1 centers? How did you choose which community center would be the extra Level 1 site?**
- In order to preserve as many public hours as possible under the new service model, we chose to include either one or two Level 1 sites in each geographic team.
 - The highest ranking site in each geographic team was budgeted and staffed for Level 1 service and one more site with Level 1 service was added in the north and south areas of the City. These extra Level 1 sites were the next highest ranking centers.
- 13. Why do the number of Level 2a and Level 2b sites vary among geographic teams?**
- Level 1, Level 2a and Level 2b sites were distributed among geographic teams to ensure an equitable distribution of minimum public hours across the five geographic teams. Teams with more than one Level 1 site typically have more Level 2b sites. Teams with only one Level 1 site typically have more Level 2a sites.
 - An extra Level 1 site generally replaced one of the sites that would otherwise have been a Level 2a site? Again, this was done to preserve as many public hours as possible.

- Because Rainier Beach Community Center is closed for construction, the southeast geographic team has only four community centers but two Level 1 sites.

Within a geographic team, community centers with similar point totals are classified in the same level.

14. How much more would it cost to provide Level 2a service rather than Level 2b service?? ... provide Level 1 service rather than Level 2a service?

- \$86,261 to change Level 2b service to Level 2a service
- \$56,048 to change Level 2a service to Level 1 service.

15. Why is the staff budget higher for some sites compared with others providing the same service level?

Some sites have extra staff associated with a teen late night program. The teen late night program is not changed by this proposal.

16. What about Southwest Community Center? What's happening to it?

- Southwest Community Center is becoming a specialized teen site. The downstairs portion of the facility will be a Teen Life Center, as it is now. The preschool that currently meets upstairs will move downstairs since this use does not conflict with the teen use.
- The upstairs area will become a Neighborhood Service Center operated by the Department of Neighborhoods (DON). This will provide a place for residents to pay various City bills and to find out about the services offered by the City, including Parks and Recreation.
- The location of DON's outreach staff in a Parks facility will help all of our southwest community centers do a better job of connecting with their communities.

The Southwest Pool will continue to operate as it does currently.

17. Does this proposal hurt the Associated Recreation Councils (ARC)?

- ARC has been a true partner in putting together this proposal. They have been involved in the Community Center Advisory Team that advised the department throughout the option identification process.
- They have offered, for the first time, to help pay for City staff that program both ARC and City run activities. The experience with the limited use sites this year has taught both ARC and Parks that Parks employees are crucial to our mutual success.
- The total added payment to Parks from this community center operational model and a small increase in the PAR fee (the percent of gross revenues that ARC

pays to the City) will mean that ARC is paying almost \$500,000 more per year to Parks.

ARC recognizes the importance of Parks' operational changes to their success and believes that this added payment will help us both thrive in the coming years.

18. What did you learn from the limited use community centers in 2011?

- Parks learned that it is essential to have professional Parks staff assigned to a center. This enhances continuity, consistency, and connections with the community. It also permits better supervision and training of community volunteers.
- Parks also learned that a community center can remain active outside of public hours through the provision of daycare, summer day camps, senior recreation activities, adaptive recreation, and other programs provided by Parks staff that program on a city-wide basis or by partners such as the Associated Recreation Councils (ARC).
- Parks learned the difficulty and yet the value of community centers working together as a team. Each limited use site was paired with a regular community center that supported its management and helped with its programming. The regular site in the pair also learned that there was a limit to the help they could supply to a limited use site.

Parks learned how important professional Parks staff is in supporting ARC through their programming of classes and planning of special events.

19. What is the impact of this option on Parks staff?

- This option results in a decrease in Parks staff of 13.63 full-time equivalents but 75 positions are affected by this change.
- The current staffing model for a regular (i.e. not limited use) center consists of 5 FTE per community center: Coordinator, Assistant Coordinator, Recreation Leader, Recreation Attendant, and Maintenance or Utility Laborer.
- The Geographic Team Model removes the Assistant Coordinator from each center and instead has two Assistant Coordinators per geographic team who work with the Coordinators to program the sites in a coordinated manner. This eliminates 11 Assistant Coordinator positions system-wide.
- The Geographic Team Model also has a Sr. Recreation Program Coordinator position who is responsible for managing each team.
- The staff remaining at each community center depends on the service level provided at the site. Level 1 sites have a Coordinator, a Recreation Leader, 1.5 Recreation Attendants, and a Maintenance or Utility Laborer (4.5 FTE total). Level 2a sites have a Coordinator, 0.75 Recreation Leader, 0.75 Recreation Attendant, and a Maintenance or Utility Laborer (3.5 FTE total). Level 2b sites

have 0.5 Coordinator, 0.5 Recreation Leader, 0.5 Recreation Attendant, and 0.5 Maintenance or Utility Laborer (2.0 FTE total).

- The Senior Coordinator positions provide more opportunities for advancement for employees.
- Jobs are preserved by reducing rather than eliminating some positions. This allows some employees to retain benefits, even though their hours are reduced. There may also be opportunities for employees to work above their budgeted hours in place of temporary employees that otherwise would have been hired. This change also preserves employment relative to closing enough community centers to save the same amount of money.

20. Why did the City Council request that this analysis be done for community centers rather than other Parks and Recreation facilities such as swimming pools or athletic fields?

- The City Council spent considerable time reviewing the Parks Department proposal for Limited Use Community Centers during the Fall of 2010.
- Following that review, Council asked Parks to conduct further analysis on community centers, with the underlying idea that community centers, like many City functions, might be able to provide services in a different manner, be more responsive to community needs, and utilize less general fund monies.
- City Council also asked Parks to work with the Rowing and Sailing Centers to chart a path toward substantial self-sufficiency that could be implemented in the 2013-2014 budget.
- Based on the efforts of the past eight months, Council may ask for similar analysis of other areas of the Parks and Recreation budget.

Recreation Community Outreach & Engagement Plan

Outreach & Engagement Guiding Principles:

- Promote racially inclusive collaboration and civic engagement.
- Encourage, develop, and establish new, financially-sustainable partnerships.
- Expand recreational opportunities and access for individuals and families.
- Use outreach partners (ARC, HSD, DON, DPD, SPD etc.) to improve outreach efforts.
- Involve older adults, teens, youth, families, and those with special needs in process.
- Assess current community conditions and plan to achieve the desired community effects.
- Avoid unintended consequences of new operating hour models.
- Support new ways of thinking and operating related to the 2012 Recreation Operating Model.

September – mid-October: Create detailed and inclusive Parks' outreach plan.

- Meet with outreach partners (HSD, DON, DPD, SPD, etc.) for help in reaching stakeholders including marginalized communities.
- Work with City Demographer to more effectively use 2010 Census data to identify diverse groups in neighborhoods.
- Work with Recreation leads to improve existing outreach plans and assemble contact lists for each community center.

Weeks of October 17th thru November 11th: Community Center Outreach Meetings @ 24 locations, (use existing monthly Associated Recreation Council – ARC meetings), to determine how to schedule and program public hours:

- Community Center Managers, Coordinators, & Sr. Coordinators schedule Outreach meeting dates at each community center based on current ARC meetings
- Assemble information on current public hours and uses of the center within and outside these hours.
- Translate meeting documents and publicize to all groups identified in outreach plans.
- Ask participants what recreational needs are currently underserved.
- Schedule multiple meetings as needed to more fully engage all groups.

Weeks of November 14th thru November 30th – 5 internal Geographic Team Meetings that bring together issues and outcomes from Community Center Outreach meetings:

- Identify service priorities for different neighborhoods.
- Coordinate public hours and programs across the geographic team.
- Establish process for ongoing evaluation and adaptation of hours and programming.

Weeks of December 1st thru December 16th – Recreation Division finalizes and announces public hours and resource allocation for implementation in 2012. The public hours may change based on unidentified needs and will be assessed regularly.

January thru March, 2012 (on-going) – Continue to work with community and staff to periodically assess current community center schedules and possible new and emerging needs. Additional community meetings will be added as applicable.