

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
Potential Park Ownership Interviews.....	4-19
MMSD.....	4
Milwaukee County Parks.....	6
City of Milwaukee.....	8
Menomonee Valley Partners.....	10
Urban Open Space Foundation.....	12
Milwaukee River Revitalization Foundation.....	14
Marquette University.....	16
Menomonee BID.....	18
Potential Park Management Interviews.....	20-47
Wisconsin DNR.....	20
MMSD.....	22
Milwaukee County Parks.....	24
City of Milwaukee.....	26
Menomonee Valley Partners.....	28
Urban Open Space Foundation.....	29
Milwaukee Land Trust.....	30
Friends of the Hank Aaron Trail.....	32
Marquette University.....	34
Friends of Milwaukee’s Rivers.....	36
Milwaukee River Revitalization Foundation.....	38
Riveredge Nature Center.....	40
Urban Ecology Center.....	42
Park People.....	44
Menomonee BID.....	46
A Classification System for Public-Private Sector Partnerships.....	48-57
Overview of types of organizations.....	48
National AIDS Memorial Grove.....	50
Maymont Foundation.....	52
Partnerships for Parks.....	54
Louisville Olmstead Parks Conservancy.....	56
Friends of Buttonwood Park.....	57

Executive Summary

In Summer of 2003 the Menomonee Valley Partners hired Urban Open Space Foundation to explore ownership and management opportunities for public open space lands in the Menomonee Valley. The open space opportunities were divided into various sections for consideration: 50 acres of natural areas referenced as River Park; 22 acres of floodplain referenced as Stormwater Park; and 2.5 acres of land reserved for soccer fields. Eighteen groups were interviewed to begin to explore their interest in open space ownership and/or maintenance. The following is an executive summary of those interviews.

1. **Acquisition**—two public agencies are positioned to potentially buy *all* lands designated as open space in the Menomonee Valley: the City of Milwaukee, and the Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District. Milwaukee County Parks could potentially buy River Park as a natural area, and Marquette University could potentially buy the area designated for soccer or field sports.
2. **Long-term ownership**—To make holding the properties possible, the City of Milwaukee would require a long-term ground lease with a partner agency. The Milwaukee Metropolitan Sewerage District's ownership would be temporary. They would retain a conservation easement to restrict development of the open space lands and transfer the lands to a "take-out" agency. The Urban Open Space Foundation is willing to take responsibility for all open space lands in the Valley, either through a ground lease with the city, or a transfer of title in fee from the District. If River Park were to be addressed separately, Milwaukee County could hold the land over time. If the soccer fields were to be addressed separately from other lands, Marquette University would incorporate the fields as part of their campus holdings.
3. **Maintenance**—Each of the government agencies expressed a desire to have a non-profit partner(s) maintain the open space lands. The Urban Open Space Foundation is capable of maintaining all of the open space lands identified in the project. The Friends of Milwaukee's Rivers, or the Friends of Hank Aaron State Trail could maintain parts or all of River Park. Other possible candidates for maintenance of River Park could include the River Revitalization Foundation or the Department of Natural Resources; however, these agencies may require lengthy decision-making processes. The soccer fields—if separated—would be maintained by Marquette University and used as practice fields for their athletic programs; they expect controlled public use and access.
4. **Management Endowment**—All groups with an interest in providing long-term maintenance expressed their interest contingent upon successful fundraising of a management endowment, or the creation of another ongoing revenue stream. It is essential that the maintenance endowment be earmarked and kept separate from—not co-mingled with—other agency operating revenues.
5. **Program Coordination**—While many groups welcomed the opportunity for involvement in natural area programming, the Urban Open Space Foundation expressed interest in partnership development and ongoing program coordination; again, the agency's interest is not limited to natural areas and extends to all Valley open spaces.

6. **Program Agents**—Many groups expressed an interest in providing natural area programming in the natural areas of River Park. Groups included: Friends of Milwaukee’s Rivers, River Edge Nature Center, the Urban Ecology Center, and the Friends of Hank Aaron State Trail. The Urban Open Space Foundation expressed an interest in providing volunteer development and programming in all designated open spaces.

)

**Menomonee Valley Partners
Potential Park Ownership**

1. **Agency:** MMSD

2. **Agency Description:** Local governmental agency

3. **Terms under which ownership in the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** It makes sense for MMSD to take ownership of a property only if there is another agency that would be responsible for long-term maintenance of the open spaces. However, it could be interested in ownership if the properties are part of a regional flood management program.

4. **Possibility of taking ownership of all, or a portion of, the available open spaces:** The MMSD would be interested in acquiring everything west of 25th Street (their jurisdictional boundary). They could also acquire the River Park area through their “Green Seams” program. Stormwater Park could be acquired through the Conservation Plan.

5. **Concerns regarding ownership:** Long-term maintenance responsibilities are a major concern for this organization. They also have a concern about the public perceiving them as being liable for the open space programming.

6. **Reasons for seeking ownership of the open space:** MMSD would prefer to buy the land and sell it to a “take-out agency” for \$1. It makes sense for MMSD to own the River Park area due to it being identified as a “connector” in the Green Seams project. Ownership of the Stormwater Park area makes sense if it could be a more economical solution to flood management at the Falk Corporation and it would provide a greater public benefit.

7. **Decision-making process:** Both the Green Seams and Conservation Plan are in the budget and approved. An MMSD acquisition plat may need to go before a commission as well as all land transactions.

8. **Sources of revenue available:** MMSD's Capital Improvement Program
\$1.70/1000 of assessed value.

9. **Cash or in-kind gifts available:** This organization would bring a wealth of real estate experience and engineering experience dealing with stormwater management.

10. **Innovative funding sources available:** Coastal Zone Management grants and potential for 2005 inclusion in budget of initiative dealing with watersheds.

11. **Innovative ownership models available:** No, MMSD is not interested in retaining ownership and leasing management to another agency for 99 years.

12. **Key contacts:** Kevin Shafer
(414) 225-2148

Menomonee Valley Partners Potential Park Ownership

1. **Agency:** Milwaukee County Parks
2. **Agency Description:** Local government
3. **Terms under which ownership in the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** There would need to be an agreement in place that is approved by the county board. An agreement with the other partners would also need to be in place. Defined roles and responsibilities would need to be established, with more details the better.
4. **Possibility of taking ownership of all, or a portion of, the available open spaces:** Always interested in acquiring new open space. Mostly the interest level depends on the project.
5. **Concerns regarding ownership:** The main concern is who is responsible for clean up. Defined roles need to be established up front so as to prevent any misunderstandings. Funding is a constant concern for undertaking new projects.
6. **Reasons for seeking ownership of the open space:** The qualification as the owner of the open space depends on what is going to be done with the site. If it is to be a natural area, then the county is the logical owner. If it is to be a high activity area, then it is too costly and another owner should be found.
7. **Decision-making process:** A due diligence period would need to be satisfied and depending on their findings, decide if the project should go to the county board for discussion. The county board will make the ultimate decision.

8. **Sources of revenue available:** Approximately 50% of the funds would come from a property tax levy, with the remaining funds coming from a variety of sources (e.g. user fees)

9. **Cash or in-kind gifts available:** This organization brings a tremendous amount of expertise and manpower to projects they become involved in.

10. **Innovative funding sources available:** None given.

11. **Innovative ownership models available:** None given.

12. **Key contacts:** Tom Forbes
(414) 257-4745

Menomonee Valley Partners Potential Park Ownership

1. **Agency:** City of Milwaukee

2. **Agency Description:** Local government

3. **Terms under which ownership in the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** As long as there is no cost to the city. This means that the property cannot be currently on the tax rolls. They do not want to remove a revenue generating property and lose that potential tax revenue.

4. **Possibility of taking ownership of all, or a portion of, the available open spaces:** No promises but they would review it to see if it made any sense.

5. **Concerns regarding ownership:** The biggest concern is if the property is currently on the tax rolls. They do not want to remove property from the tax rolls.

6. **Reasons for seeking ownership of the open space:** With the model of the city owning the property and another organization managing the open space, there is no real problem to the city being involved in the project.

7. **Decision-making process:** The process starts with a discussion amongst the staff, and then it goes to the Redevelopment Authority or City Council for further review and analysis. Finally it goes before the common council for review and discussions.

8. **Sources of revenue available:** Taxes would pay for a portion of the cost, but most would come from the city selling debt to finance the purchase. They would also review the possible funding from granting agencies (DNR or DOA).

9. **Cash or in-kind gifts available:** The city would have the unique ability of being exempt from Recreational Liability Clause in State statutes.

10. **Innovative funding sources available:** There are no innovative funding sources. The real trick is to have a long term funding strategy in place that works. Short period funding is easy, it's the long term that will make or break a project.

11. **Innovative ownership models available:** None that came to mind

12. **Key contacts:** Mike Wisniewski
Milwaukee Department of City Development
809 North Broadway
Milwaukee, WI 53202
(414) 286-5852

**Menomonee Valley Partners
Potential Park Ownership**

1. **Agency:** Menomonee Valley Partners

2. **Agency Description:** Local non-profit working on the revitalization of the Menomonee Valley.

3. **Terms under which ownership in the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** This organization would only consider being a short-term landowner. They would need both a permanent owner and an interim partner for the maintenance and management of the project.

4. **Possibility of taking ownership of all, or a portion of, the available open spaces:** Slim, they do want to be long-term landowners in the valley.

5. **Concerns regarding ownership:** The organization's work will be completed in the valley in 10 years and at that time they would close their doors.

6. **Reasons for seeking ownership of the open space:** None.

7. **Decision-making process:** N/A

8. **Sources of revenue available:** N/A

9. **Cash or in-kind gifts available:** N/A

10. **Innovative funding sources available:** None given.

11. Innovative ownership models available: None given.

12. Key contacts: Lilith Fowler
(414) 221-3829

Menomonee Valley Partners Potential Park Ownership

1. **Agency:** Urban Open Space Foundation
2. **Agency Description:** Madison based non-profit dedicated to preserving open spaces in urban environments.
3. **Terms under which ownership in the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** There would need to be a sufficient endowment for a maintenance and management plan.
4. **Possibility of taking ownership of all, or a portion of, the available open spaces:** UOSF could own all of the public parklands in the Valley corridor.
5. **Concerns regarding ownership:** The main concern would be funding for the maintenance and management of the open spaces.
6. **Reasons for seeking ownership of the open space:** Land ownership and management is a major program focus of the organization. The UOSF board has committed to becoming an exemplary model of urban land management. UOSF could also mobilize the member organizations of the Community Open Space Partnership to assist in the on going programming for the area.
7. **Decision-making process:** Executive Director would discuss the project with legal council and then present the opportunity to the Board for discussion and possible approval.
8. **Sources of revenue available:** An endowment would help cover the costs as well as fundraising for special improvements or programs and active volunteer programs for in-kind stewardship care.

9. **Cash or in-kind gifts available:** This organization brings technical support that includes fiscal analysis and project budgeting, construction oversight, real estate experience, fundraising, and natural resource management.

10. **Innovative funding sources available:** TIF, BID, and any other district models.

11. **Innovative ownership models available:** UOSF could own the land and lease it out to other organizations for maintenance, management, and programming. A public agency or private not-for-profit may own a conservation easement on lands UOSF owns and manages to further restrict development.

12. **Key contacts:** Heather Mann
(608) 255-9877 ext 11

**Menomonee Valley Partners
Potential Park Ownership**

1. **Agency:** Milwaukee River Revitalization Foundation
2. **Agency Description:** Local non-profit focused on connecting neighborhoods with the Milwaukee River.
3. **Terms under which ownership in the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** The parcels must on a river in the Milwaukee area.
4. **Possibility of taking ownership of all, or a portion of, the available open spaces:** Yes, but only the river front area. They are usually temporary holders of land.
5. **Concerns regarding ownership:** Their main concerns regard liability, staffing, and maintenance and management costs.
6. **Reasons for seeking ownership of the open space:** Because it is along the river and it fits with their mission.
7. **Decision-making process:** Their Executive Committee discusses a potential new project then takes it to the full board for discussion and possible approval.
8. **Sources of revenue available:** They would look into Stewardship money to fund part of their project and private sources for the rest.
9. **Cash or in-kind gifts available:** they bring staff and partnership expertise to the table.

10. Innovative funding sources available: None given

11. Innovative ownership models available: None given.

12. Key contacts: Kim Gleffe
(414) 271-8000

**Menomonee Valley Partners
Potential Park Ownership**

1. **Agency:** Marquette University

2. **Agency Description:** Private University

3. **Terms under which ownership in the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** The facility must be a Marquette facility.

4. **Possibility of taking ownership of all, or a portion of, the available open spaces:** Yes, only the portion that is designated as “high activity” areas.

5. **Concerns regarding ownership:** Liability is a big issue for Marquette. Staffing costs are also a big issue.

6. **Reasons for seeking ownership of the open space:** They would consider ownership of the open space so as to be able to control the access to the facility.

7. **Decision-making process:** The Athletic Director takes the opportunity to the Vice President who then takes it through the university chain of command. Since Marquette is a private school, they have the ability to make a quick decision.

8. **Sources of revenue available:** Most of their funding is university generated, but they may be able to find a benefactor to help fund a project.

9. **Cash or in-kind gifts available:** Mainly expertise in the maintenance and management of high activity open spaces.

10. **Innovative funding sources available:** None given.

11. **Innovative ownership models available:** None given.

12. **Key contacts:** Jim Nasiopolis
(414) 288-5931

**Menomonee Valley Partners
Potential Park Ownership**

1. **Agency:** Menomonee BID

2. **Agency Description:** Organization that focuses on the improvement of the Menomonee Valley and the businesses that operate there. Currently approximately 150-200 members.

3. **Terms under which ownership in the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** The BID will not own any property.

4. **Possibility of taking ownership of all, or a portion of, the available open spaces:** N/A

5. **Concerns regarding ownership:** N/A

6. **Reasons for seeking ownership of the open space:** N/A

7. **Decision-making process:** N/A

8. **Sources of revenue available:** N/A

9. **Cash or in-kind gifts available:** N/A

10. **Innovative funding sources available:** N/A

11. Innovative ownership models available: N/A

12. Key contacts: Dan Verzal
(414) 289-9800 ext 240

)

**Menomonee Valley Partners
Potential Park Management**

1. **Agency:** Wisconsin DNR

2. **Agency Description:** State governmental agency

3. **Terms under which management/maintenance of the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** The open spaces must impact the local community. There must be a set of “partners” in place to help with the programming.

4. **Concerns regarding park maintenance:** The strength of the partners and the quality of the programming that is proposed. Contamination of the proposed site is a very big concern.

5. **Reasons for seeking to maintain or help maintain the park/open spaces:**

6. **Decision-making process:** Frustrating for internal and external groups. If the proposed project is part of a state trail plan, then there is no additional study needed. If the proposed project is outside of the state trail plan, then an additional study of the proposed project will need to take place. This additional study could take up to 2 years to complete.

7. **Sources of revenue available:** Uncertain as budgets and staff are being cut. They are expecting an additional 200-300 more staff cuts in the fall of 2003. The legislature would have to approve any additional funds for larger projects.

8. **Cash or in-kind contributions available:** This agency can help with Stewardship grants for the development of the trails.

9. **Innovative funding sources available:** None given due to uncertainty of future budgets.

10. **Innovative maintenance/management models to be explored:** None given.

11. **Key contacts:** Melissa Cook
(414) 286-5852

**Menomonee Valley Partners
Potential Park Management**

1. **Agency:** MMSD

2. **Agency Description:** Local governmental agency

3. **Terms under which management/maintenance of the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** None, the district doesn't provide maintenance or management. MMSD may be involved if they helped maintain a detention pond for 100-year flood event.

4. **Concerns regarding park maintenance:** Long term costs and the ability to pay them.

5. **Reasons for seeking to maintain or help maintain the park/open spaces:** It would only make sense for MMSD to be involved if it could maintain the viability of the flood management.

6. **Decision-making process:** All negotiations would involve Mike Martin, Technical Services Director. All agreements would then require commission action.

7. **Sources of revenue available:** This organization would possibly use money from the Operations and Maintenance Budget. However, this fund is typically used for industrial properties.

8. **Cash or in-kind contributions available:** None.

9. **Innovative funding sources available:** None given.

10. **Innovative maintenance/management models to be explored:** Two were mentioned. First, both Tulsa and Denver have regional storm water management programs. Second, Lake County, IL has a storm water management district, but their responsibilities could be limited to those of a regulator.

11. **Key contacts:** Kevin Schafer
(414) 255-2148

Menomonee Valley Partners Potential Park Management

1. **Agency:** Milwaukee County Parks
2. **Agency Description:** Local government
3. **Terms under which management/maintenance of the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** There would need to be an agreement that is approved by the county board and that is also agreed to by all the other partners. The more details that are described up front, the better. Roles and responsibilities will to be clearly defined for all partners.
4. **Concerns regarding park maintenance:** Identifying all aspects of maintenance and management and all sources of funding. The strength of the partners will also need to be clarified.
5. **Reasons for seeking to maintain or help maintain the park/open spaces:** This organization has the expertise and the manpower to be effective with the maintenance and management.
6. **Decision-making process:** The first step would be to make sure all their due diligence is done and approved. Then they take potential new projects to the county board for approval.
7. **Sources of revenue available:** No sources of funding were offered.
8. **Cash or in-kind contributions available:** This organization brings a tremendous amount of expertise and manpower to any project they become associated with.

9. **Innovative funding sources available:** None

10. **Innovative maintenance/management models to be explored:** None

11. **Key contacts:** Tom Forbes
(414) 257-4745

**Menomonee Valley Partners
Potential Park Management**

1. **Agency:** City of Milwaukee

2. **Agency Description:** Local government

3. **Terms under which management/maintenance of the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** None at all. The city does not have the money to manage or maintain additional open spaces. The only remotely related type of project is the school board giving the city funds to maintain school playgrounds. The City would like to own the property, and then contract with another organization to maintain the open areas.

4. **Concerns regarding park maintenance:** N/A

5. **Reasons for seeking to maintain or help maintain the park/open spaces:** N/A

6. **Decision-making process:** N/A

7. **Sources of revenue available:** N/A

8. **Cash or in-kind contributions available:** N/A

9. **Innovative funding sources available:** N/A

10. **Innovative maintenance/management models to be explored:** N/A

11. **Key contacts:** Mike Wisniewski
Milwaukee Department of City Development
809 North Broadway
Milwaukee, WI 53202
(414) 286-5852

**Menomonee Valley Partners
Potential Park Management**

1. **Agency:** Menomonee Valley Partners

2. **Agency Description:** Local non-profit working on the revitalization of the Menomonee Valley.

3. **Terms under which management/maintenance of the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** This organization would not be interested in the maintenance and management of this project.

4. **Concerns regarding park maintenance:** They have no capacity or expertise in this area. It does not fit with their mission.

5. **Reasons for seeking to maintain or help maintain the park/open spaces:** N/A

6. **Decision-making process:** N/A

7. **Cash or in-kind contributions available:** N/A

8. **Innovative funding sources available:** N/A

9. **Innovative maintenance/management models to be explored:** N/A

10. **Key contacts:** Lilith Fowler
(414) 221-3829
**Menomonee Valley Partners
Potential Park Management**

1. **Agency:** Urban Open Space Foundation
2. **Agency Description:** Madison based non-profit dedicated to preserving open spaces in urban environments.
3. **Terms under which management/maintenance of the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** If UOSF was provided sufficient revenue from an endowment or other dedicated revenue stream.
4. **Concerns regarding park maintenance:** Sufficient funding to maintain a high-quality aesthetic and coordinate programming activities.
5. **Reasons for seeking to maintain or help maintain the park/open spaces:** The UOSF board has committed to initiating and sustaining green infrastructure projects that revitalize and care for existing public spaces in Milwaukee. UOSF has experience owning and maintaining multiple urban park spaces for the public's enjoyment.
6. **Decision-making process:** Executive Director will review with UOSF legal council and then present to the Board for discussion and possible approval.
7. **Sources of revenue available:** A maintenance endowment would help cover costs. Fundraising and volunteer programs for in-kind stewardship would round out the revenue needed to cover the rest of the maintenance and management costs.
8. **Cash or in-kind contributions available:** This organization would bring experience in fundraising, natural resource management, and building volunteer groups. Their technical support would include; fiscal analysis and project budgeting, and construction oversight. UOSF could mobilize members of the Community Open Space Partnership to provide stewardship and public education programs.

9. **Innovative funding sources available:** User fees, vendor contracts, and program leases.

10. **Innovative maintenance/management models to be explored:** UOSF has experience I creating “friends of” groups to help with the maintenance and management of open spaces. Currently, nearly a dozen are still thriving. UOSF could also tap into the membership of the Community Open Space Partnership.

11. **Key contacts:** Heather Mann
(608) 255-9877 ext 11

**Menomonee Valley Partners
Potential Park Management**

1. **Agency:** Milwaukee Land Trust

2. **Agency Description:** Local non-profit dedicated to protecting natural resources and maintaining a green visual backdrop to the community.

3. **Terms under which management/maintenance of the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** Since this organization is only two years old, they are concerned about making sure they become affiliated with projects that have public support. Clearly defined roles and responsibilities are important so they know the expectations others will have of them. Funding for the project is important.

4. **Concerns regarding park maintenance:** Making sure the partners are committed to a long-term commitment with the project. Funding should also be for the long term. This group will want proof of public support for the project.

5. **Reasons for seeking to maintain or help maintain the park/open spaces:** It fits into their mission of saving open space.

6. **Decision-making process:** Very simple process that consists of Executive Director taking a potential project to the board for discussion and possible approval.

7. **Sources of revenue available:** They usually start by soliciting their own members (they only have 35 members), then work on outside funding sources, both private and public.

8. **Cash or in-kind contributions available:** Their board has natural areas management experience.

9. **Innovative funding sources available:** They have approached the current property owner to help fund a project.

10. **Innovative maintenance/management models to be explored:** None offered.

11. **Key contacts:** Dileen Hanson
(414) 425-4608

Menomonee Valley Partners Potential Park Management

1. **Agency:** Friends of the Hank Aaron Trail

2. **Agency Description:** Local non-profit dedicated to the completion and management of the state bike trail.

3. **Terms under which management/maintenance of the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** Before this group would be involved, a clear set of responsibilities for each “partner” involved in the project would need to be established. Funding would also need to be in place and a leader identified in each of the partner groups.

4. **Concerns regarding park maintenance:** Continued funding needs to be in place. The project needs to have a clear mission with specific goals. The strength/staying power of the partners needs to be established. The project cannot have partners that will fold in two years time.

5. **Reasons for seeking to maintain or help maintain the park/open spaces:** It fits with their mission concerning the Hank Aaron Trail. They wish to see the completion of the trail and maintain its well being for all to enjoy.

6. **Decision-making process:** The decisions are made at the board level. Regional and local staff will review all projects than pass them to the Board for discussion, based on the relevance to their mission.

7. **Sources of revenue available:** This organization mainly uses grants to fund their projects.

8. **Cash or in-kind contributions available:** Since they have little cash, this group brings a skill set and experience that most groups will not. They have extensive knowledge of trail maintenance and programming. Their board is also connected in the private funding scene of Milwaukee.

9. **Innovative funding sources available:** This group mainly uses grants to fund their projects. They have the ability to tap into Transportation dollars. The Menomonee Valley provides an opportunity to tap into transportation dollars because there exists a Ped/Bike gap in the valley.

10. **Innovative maintenance/management models to be explored:** No.

11. **Key contacts:** David Schlabowske
(414) 271-9685

Menomonee Valley Partners Potential Park Management

1. **Agency:** Marquette University

2. **Agency Description:** Private university

3. **Terms under which management/maintenance of the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** The facility would need to be a Marquette University facility.

4. **Concerns regarding park maintenance:** Over use and abuse of the facility are big concerns.

5. **Reasons for seeking to maintain or help maintain the park/open spaces:** They have the expertise to maintain and manage the activity areas. They can then control access to the facility and prevent overuse of the field and abuse of the structures.

6. **Decision-making process:** The Athletic Director would take the opportunity to the Vice President who would in turn take it through the university chain of command. Since Marquette is a private university, they have the ability to make quick decisions.

7. **Sources of revenue available:** Most of the funds would come from university-generated sources. They might have a benefactor who would supply funds for a particular project.

8. **Cash or in-kind contributions available:** Expertise in the maintenance and management of high activity open spaces. Manpower and the potential to solicit a benefactor for maintenance funding.

9. **Innovative funding sources available:** None offered as most of their funds come through the university.

10. **Innovative maintenance/management models to be explored:** None offered.

11. **Key contacts:** Jim Nasiopolis
(414) 288-5931

Menomonee Valley Partners Potential Park Management

1. **Agency:** Friends of Milwaukee's Rivers

2. **Agency Description:** Local non-profit that concentrates it's efforts on the Milwaukee area river basin.

3. **Terms under which management/maintenance of the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** A structure with clearly defined roles and responsibilities for all the partners must be in place. Funding must also be identified and in place.

4. **Concerns regarding park maintenance:** Funding is always a concern when considering a new project. The strength of the other partners is also a concern. They have concerns that project funds may be co-mingled with other county funds and then used for other projects.

5. **Reasons for seeking to maintain or help maintain the park/open spaces:** The potential new project must fit with their mission of river restoration and maintenance. The project must also fit with the needs of the community and the vision of the Milwaukee County Parks Department.

6. **Decision-making process:** The process depends on the project. Most of the time it starts with the Executive Director then moves to the board for discussion and possible approval.

7. **Sources of revenue available:** If the project is small, they will do their own fund raising. If it is a larger project, they will seek grants and dedicated tax revenue to help fund the project.

8. **Cash or in-kind contributions available:** They bring an expertise in river issues and success in advocacy.

9. **Innovative funding sources available:** An innovative source of funding could be realized through "Penalty Funds". These are essentially environmental penalties for landowners.

10. **Innovative maintenance/management models to be explored:** None offered.

11. **Key contacts:** Lynn Broaddus
(414) 476-6042

**Menomonee Valley Partners
Potential Park Management**

1. **Agency:** Milwaukee River Revitalization Foundation

2. **Agency Description:** Local non-profit focused on connecting neighborhoods with the Milwaukee River.

3. **Terms under which management/maintenance of the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** A source of continuous funding must be in place as well as staff to manage the project.

4. **Concerns regarding park maintenance:** Same as above.

5. **Reasons for seeking to maintain or help maintain the park/open spaces:** This organization is heading towards becoming a full land trust. If they decide to do so, they would be interested in being considered for the maintenance and management of the project.

6. **Decision-making process:** The Executive Director makes recommendations to the full Board and they discuss the potential project then vote on approval of being involved.

7. **Sources of revenue available:** This organization would pull funds from it's membership then seek outside sources of funds from both public and private sources.

8. **Cash or in-kind contributions available:** No money to bring to the table, just an experienced board, staff and membership.

9. **Innovative funding sources available:** None given.

10. **Innovative maintenance/management models to be explored:** None given.

11. **Key contacts:** Kim Gleffe
(414) 271-8000

Menomonee Valley Partners Potential Park Management

1. **Agency:** Riveredge Nature Center

2. **Agency Description:** Local non-profit working to inspire, inform, and enable responsible environmental decision-making.

3. **Terms under which management/maintenance of the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** There must exist a defined management structure for the partners. Start up funding must also be in place. There must also be an educational component to the project.

4. **Concerns regarding park maintenance:** There must be dedication to building a volunteer staff and the funding to support that staff.

5. **Reasons for seeking to maintain or help maintain the park/open spaces:** A project must fit their mission, with educational outreach opportunities being a large part of that mission. If they are able to work on a number of projects at the same time, it increases their impact on the educational opportunities of the public.

6. **Decision-making process:** The process starts with the Executive Director then moves to the Executive Committee and finally to the Board.

7. **Sources of revenue available:** Potential to pull money from their membership.

8. **Cash or in-kind contributions available:** They bring expertise in educational programming (stewardship, environmental, research). They also have experience in “regenerative living”. They can discuss the ecological and environmental benefits from living sustainability.

9. **Innovative funding sources available:** None

10. **Innovative maintenance/management models to be explored:** None

11. **Key contacts:** Mark White
(262) 375-2715

Menomonee Valley Partners Potential Park Management

1. **Agency:** Urban Ecology Center

2. **Agency Description:** Local non-profit providing educational programs to enhance the environmental resources of a community.

3. **Terms under which management/maintenance of the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** This organization does not want to ultimately responsible for the maintenance or management of the open spaces unless there was a governmental agency that would fund them. They would also need clearly defined roles and responsibilities for each of the partners involved in the project.

4. **Concerns regarding park maintenance:** Making sure there is an established source of continuous funding, such as an endowment. Staffing is also a concern for this organization. They would need enough staff to be successful enough money to pay for that staff. They also suggested that the controlling partner be aware of the motives for being involved of all the potential partners. If they are in it for the PR value, then they will not be a strong partner when the going gets tough.

5. **Reasons for seeking to maintain or help maintain the park/open spaces:** Maintenance and management are not part of their focus. They would only consider maintenance and management if there were dollars available to pay for it. Their main focus is education.

6. **Decision-making process:** First staff would filter and discuss potential new projects, than the board would handle the decisions and larger issues. Since they are a small organization, they have the ability to make decisions quickly.

7. **Sources of revenue available:** When this organization is involved in a project, they will contact their membership to help fund projects. They will also seek grants and private foundations to help fund projects.

8. **Cash or in-kind contributions available:** This organization brings a proven track record of success with their projects. They are uniquely qualified because nobody else is doing what they do.

9. **Innovative funding sources available:** Sustainable money for the long term is the hardest thing to get. They have received money from the Milwaukee Public School system for educational projects.

10. **Innovative maintenance/management models to be explored:** They have seen a three-tiered project that worked well. First, a land trust owns the property. Then they enter into a management contract with the local government who then lets the non-profits do the programming in the open space.

11. **Key contacts:** Ken Leinboch
(414) 964-8505

**Menomonee Valley Partners
Potential Park Management**

1. **Agency:** Park People
2. **Agency Description:** Local non-profit that focuses on advocacy for Milwaukee County Parks.
3. **Terms under which management/maintenance of the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** None, it does not fit into what they do. They are tied very closely to the County Parks Department. Their main focus is advocacy not maintenance and management.
4. **Concerns regarding park maintenance:** Too many parks/open space projects fail due to poor staffing, no public access, and lack of funding.
5. **Reasons for seeking to maintain or help maintain the park/open spaces:** N/A
6. **Decision-making process:** Executive Director will review and then present to the Board for discussion and possible approval.
7. **Sources of revenue available:** None given.
8. **Cash or in-kind contributions available:** This organization would bring a great amount of advocacy experience to the project.
9. **Innovative funding sources available:** There is always money for open/green space. The trick is to find a long-term sustainable stream of those funds.

10. **Innovative maintenance/management models to be explored:** Make sure that the park board is a separate entity from the local governments. Having the board positions being political appointments will only cause the Board to be weak and have potential conflicts of interest.

11. **Key contacts:** Sue Slocum
(414) 273-PARK

**Menomonee Valley Partners
Potential Park Management**

1. **Agency:** Menomonee BID

2. **Agency Description:** Organization that focuses on the improvement of the Menomonee Valley and the businesses that operate there. Currently approximately 150-200 members.

3. **Terms under which management/maintenance of the Menomonee Valley Park would be considered:** None, it does not fit into what they do. They raise money to help promote the valley and be responsive to the needs of the valley land and business owners.

4. **Concerns regarding park maintenance:** N/A

5. **Reasons for seeking to maintain or help maintain the park/open spaces:** N/A

6. **Decision-making process:** The different committees within the BID will review potential projects then bring them to the Board for discussion and possible approval.

7. **Sources of revenue available:** The BID receives approximately \$30,000 per year in revenue that is generated by taxes. The BID can provide a short-term amount of seed funding, but the majority will have to be done by the maintenance and management partners that are selected.

8. **Cash or in-kind contributions available:** This organization would be able to provide business relationships that most organizations will not have.

9. **Innovative funding sources available:** None given.

10. Innovative maintenance/management models to be explored: None given.

11. Key contacts: Dan Verzal
(414) 289-9800 ext 240



A Classification System for Public-Private Sector Partnerships

Nonprofit organizations have a wide range of relationships and experiences with their public partners depending on the ability and resources of the government agency and the uses and condition of the park and its surrounding community. Because nonprofits vary in age and stage of development, they fit into five main categories as established by the Project for Public Spaces.

Smaller nonprofits usually fill the role of assistance providers. Their main task is to help the parks departments with educational, volunteer, and activity programming. They may also advocate for additional funding for park improvements and possible expansion. These organizations have few paid staff and are mainly comprised of volunteers. Because of their limited role, they have very little, if any, responsibility for the park itself.

Sometimes parks are initiated by nonprofits. These organizations are acting as catalysts and actively work with park agencies and other groups to initiate new projects. They may also provide financial support for new parks. Usually these types of groups are involved in advocacy, design, and construction issues. Catalyst groups are transitional in nature and tend to redefine their role with the public entity and in relation to the park once the project is completed.

Co-managers are the receiving the most attention these days. This type of organization typically works in collaboration with the parks department in one of two ways. First, they can jointly share park planning, design and capital construction responsibilities and/or partner in the maintenance and management of an open space facility. The second way in which co-managers work together is that a nonprofit can provide staff to the parks department or vice versa or possibly combine funds for joint activities of planning, capital projects and construction.

A few cities have taken the co-manager relationship a step farther and made the nonprofit partner a sole manager of the park/project. In this situation, the sole manager is responsible for management and maintains the park on its own, functioning as an independent entity. A sole manager also has limited involvement of the parks department and shoulders the majority of responsibility for the park. These organizations tend to determine the park policies.

The final category of nonprofit is called a citywide partner. These groups are organized around an entire city or area park system. They may advocate for more city dollars, train smaller "friends" groups, and they initiate citywide greening programs. Citywide partners exist not to increase use and activity in a single park, but to raise the level and quality of open space and parks in an entire city. They achieve this by utilizing neighborhood groups and park partnerships.

While organizational age, stage of development, and overall capacity will give a good indication as to which role they play, some organizations have responsibilities and relationships that are defined in more than one of the above categories.

Private/Public Park Partnership

Classification: Catalyst Organization

National AIDS Memorial Grove

In 1989 the National AIDS Memorial Grove was established by a small number of San Francisco residents who wanted to create a place for people to remember friends and loved ones who had died of AIDS. Today the organization has grown from all-volunteers to a paid staff of four. Their working relationship with the city of San Francisco has paid off by creating this memorial from a neglected 7.5-acre portion of Golden Gate Park. This group has a 99-year lease on the land from the city and has made many improvements. Improvements include; replanting the area, and installing memorial plaques and seating for visitors. With maintenance being an issue, they have fully endowed a full-time city gardener position to maintain the grove over the period of the lease. The San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department is the primary park care provider and is responsible for overall security and maintenance.

1. **Agency:** National AIDS Memorial Grove

2. **Agency Description:** San Francisco based non-profit that made cares for the grove and allows anyone touched by AIDS to use the grove to find comfort, grieve openly without being stigmatized and experience feelings of hope that nature can inspire.

3. **Size of the project:** The National AIDS Memorial Grove is 7.5 acres.

4. **Reason for the organization to exist:** In 1988, a small group of residents representing a devastated community were looking for a positive way to express their collective grief. Site renovations began in 1991 and have recently been completed.

5. **Current land ownership:** The City of San Francisco

6. **Others considered for ownership:** No, the spaces must be kept public.
7. **Formal or informal partnership:** This is a very formal partnership.
8. **Costs for launching the partnership:** Would not disclose. The city owns the land and National AIDS Memorial Grove leases it from the city. This organization is responsible for all maintenance and management on the facility.
9. **Have the partners changed since inception:** No, the same partners are in place as were on the initial day of operation.
10. **What are the advantages to this partnership agreement?:** This partnership works well for both the City of San Francisco and the National AIDS Memorial Grove. The organization can utilize the city parks department for its expertise and manpower. The city has an organization creating a national monument from a once derelict city park.
11. **Disadvantages to partnership?:** The city approval process is very frustrating. In some cases, it takes too long to be effective.
12. **Possible enhancements to partnership:** Besides the frustrating city process, the partnership works well.
13. **Funding for the project/partnership:** Almost all of the funds needed to maintain and manage this facility are received through a capital campaign and grants.
14. **Facility changes over time to adjust to programming needs:** None as the park was finished last year. The final product is the same as the original conceptual plans.
15. **Contact:** Rick Pavick
(888) 294-7683

Private/Public Park Partnership

Classification: Sole Manager

Maymont Foundation

The Maymont Foundation was formed in 1974 to address the issue of maintenance of the Victorian estate and grounds that had fallen into disrepair. The foundation is responsible for virtually all aspects of the park, including fundraising and outreach. The foundation has an agreement with the city that if the city would maintain Maymont as a public park, the foundation would provide all management and full responsibility for the property. The Maymont Foundation receives a subsidy from the city for operating and managing costs.

As long as the foundation keeps the park open and free to the public, the city will not become involved in determining policy for the park. Directors of the parks and recreation and the city planning departments sit on the foundation's board of directors together with members of the city council. All major capital improvements must be approved by the city planning department, otherwise the foundation has autonomy over operating issues.

1. **Agency:** Maymont Foundation
2. **Agency Description:** Richmond, Virginia based organization that cares for a city owned park and museum complex. The complex has a nature center, Civil War era estate, conference facility and educational programming.
3. **Size of the project:** The Maymont Foundation project is approximately 100 acres with over 70,000 square feet of museum, educational and conference facilities.
4. **Reason for the organization to exist:** The foundation was created I 1975 to care for and raise money to restore the Maymont estate to its former glory.
5. **Current land ownership:** The City of Richmond, Virginia

6. **Others considered for ownership:** No, the spaces must be kept public.
7. **Formal or informal partnership:** This is a very formal partnership.
8. **Costs for launching the partnership:** Would not disclose. The city owns the land and pays for 100% of the operating costs for the facility. The foundation has an operating agreement with the city. Details of which would not be disclosed.
9. **Have the partners changed since inception:** No, the same partners are in place as were on the initial day of operation.
10. **What are the advantages to this partnership agreement?:** This partnership works well for both the City of Richmond and the Maymont Foundation. The organization can utilize the city parks department for its expertise and manpower.
11. **Disadvantages to partnership?:** None. The partnership operates well as it is.
12. **Possible enhancements to partnership:** None offered, the partnership works well.
13. **Funding for the project/partnership:** Almost all of the funds needed to maintain and manage this facility are received through a capital campaign and grants. There is no admission to the park, but fees apply to activities or private functions held at the facility.
14. **Facility changes over time to adjust to programming needs:** The park has changed over time to adjust to changing programming needs. In the 1930's there were only gardens. Animals arrived in the 1950's with environmental education being established in the 1970's. In 1999, a new nature center that interprets the James River was created.
15. **Contact:** Jeffrey Platt
(804) 358-7166 ext 323

Private/Public Park Partnership

Classification: Citywide Partner

Partnerships for Parks

Partnership for Parks is a joint venture with the New York City Parks and Recreation and the City Parks Foundation. This unique organization has two main functions; first, to cultivate grassroots organizations interested in the care of parks, and second, to promote parks and green-friendly activities in the city. Through the cultivation of grassroots groups – their main focus - they have linked together a strong citywide constituency for parks and open space. They coordinate citywide volunteer events, maintains a database of parks supporters, produce a newsletter, and advocate on behalf of parks issues. The Partnership for Parks and the parks department share offices and staff. Their operating budget is split equally between the city and the private sector.

1. **Agency:** Partnership for Parks
2. **Agency Description:** New York non-profit that strengthens, supports, and starts neighborhood park groups in New York City. This organization also promotes the parks so that people will join in efforts to restore and preserve them. Both the City Parks Department and the City Parks Foundation support partnership for Parks.
3. **Size of the project:** The project/operations of the organization cover approximately 1,700 parks and open spaces in the city.
4. **Reason for the organization to exist:** Partnership for Parks was started in 1995 for two reasons. First, they were responding to decades of cuts in funding for New York City's parks. Second, the striking results of citizen-led efforts to transform parks caused this organization to believe that local constituencies needed to be formed and strengthened for every park.

5. **Current land ownership:** The City of New York
6. **Others considered for ownership:** No, the spaces must be kept public.
7. **Formal or informal partnership:** This is a very formal partnership.
8. **Costs for launching the partnership:** Would not disclose.
9. **Have the partners changed since inception:** No, the same partners are in place as were on the initial day of operation.
10. **What are the advantages to this partnership agreement?:** This partnership offers a unique perspective for the organization. They are separate, but function within the parks department. They have the opportunity to build governmental relationships that are strong and productive. The private foundation side allows this organization to be flexible with finding other sources of funding. This organization works as a “user friendly” outlet for the public to use the parks and navigate the complicated parks department user fee system. They are also allowed to create local “friends of” groups to help support the local opens paces in a particular community.
11. **Disadvantages to partnership?:** None offered.
12. **Possible enhancements to partnership:** There is a need for more staff to help with fieldwork and public relations. The overall partnership is fine.
13. **Funding for the project/partnership:** Approximately 50% of the funding for the organization comes from the City of New York and the rest from private sources.
14. **Facility changes over time to adjust to programming needs:** The largest issues that are being considered for possible inclusion in to future changes are: dog runs, more soccer fields and more areas for grass related sports.
15. **Contact:**
Carrie Graffey
(212) 360-1310

Private/Public Park Partnership

Classification: Assistance Provider

Friends of Buttonwood Park

The Friends of Buttonwood Park was established in 1987 as a park advocacy and stewardship group to help implement a park master plan. With a small annual budget, in the thousands, its staff is entirely volunteer. Being small has its advantages. The friends group has been able to adjust their focus and programming to accommodate new ideas and suggestions that have come out of the master planning process. They have added an outdoor reading space in conjunction with the public library, creating and initiating a pooper scooper law, and instituting an end to memorial statues in the park through tree plantings with memorial plaques instead. The friends group also worked to help mold a compromise to a \$9 million zoo renovation in the park that impinged on the parks master plan. There is constant communication between the friends group and the parks department. This has caused the friends group to earn the parks departments respect to the point of not doing anything in the park without the friends group consent.