

**ATTACHMENT 2.** Delivery and operating options (not exhaustive)

<b>Delivery Model</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Challenges</b>
City-run	Designed and operated by PRC or Engineering Operations team	Full control over design, maintenance, and programming; alignment with City priorities and standards.	Higher demand on City resources; requires dedicated staff or integration into existing programs.
Community-run	City leads delivery of infrastructure but does not operate the facility (e.g. Sumas and Poplar playgrounds)	Maximizes use of City-built infrastructure with minimal operational demand; empowers community ownership and creativity.	Limited oversight of programming quality or alignment with City goals; potential issues with equitable access.
City-Led with Program Partnerships	The City leads delivery of the infrastructure but partners with non-profits (e.g., HUB Cycling), schools, or community groups for programming.	Leverages external expertise and reduces staff resource requirements; supports diverse, inclusive programming.	Requires ongoing coordination and clear agreements to manage roles, responsibilities, and risk.
Co-Delivery with External Partner	A non-profit, school district, or private partner co-funds and co-manages the project with the City.	Shared financial and operational responsibility; potential access to new funding streams (e.g., grants).	More complex governance; shared decision-making may affect project timelines or consistency.
School-Based	Facility is located on or near school grounds to maximize integration with existing youth programs	Easy access for students and families; supports educational curriculum and recreation programming.	May limit public access outside school or program hours; requires strong partnerships with School District or internal departments.