

Sponsorship Policy Matrix- Nov. 1, 2023

Submitted By:	Section	Question/Statement	Staff response
Hay	General Question	*Would this policy apply to events such as the Farmers Market, or only events independently hosted/fully coordinated by the City/City staff etc?	This policy only applies to City coordinated events, programs, and services. The Farmers Market and other 3rd Party events would not qualify under this policy.
Hay	General Question	<i>*Why are we only reviewing the Disqualifying Criteria and not the rest of the document?</i>	Staff are seeking input specifically on the Disqualifying Criteria, it is anticipated that Commission input in this area will influence alterations to the Definitions section as well as other areas. Staff is happy to receive any input provide across sections.

Hay	Definitions	<p>Specifically, defining "Person" as "An individual, corporation, partnership, governmental entity, business entity, or organization" is problematic, both within the document itself and in general ... a Person is a human, an individual. A Person cannot be a partnership nor an organization. The word "Person" is only used twice in the document - once to define it and then once in the following definition of Sponsor, so there is no need to define a term which is not used in the actual policy.</p> <p>Defining "Person" also makes the following Disqualifying criteria (and perhaps others) difficult to evaluate:</p> <p>B. Religious or political organizations. Is an organization a person? We have defined a Person as an organization. So...does this mean we would disqualify a Religious or political person?</p> <p>I would recommend removing Person from the document and simply defining a sponsor as "An individual, corporation, partnership, governmental entity, business entity, or organization that provides funds, goods, or services to the City in exchange for recognition, acknowledgement, or other promotional considerations or benefits with respect to a City program, event, facility, or service."</p>	<p>The term "Person" was defined to be a "catch-all" for the various potential sponsors.</p> <p>In section 3.0(B), the statement refers to organizations. Organizations is not a defined term, and would not include an individual. Based on this section- an individual would not be disqualified.</p> <p>Staff may recommend altering Section 3.0 (C): Changing the term Organizations to Sponsors or potential Sponsors. Which would include individuals.</p> <p>Staff note the Commissioners input and recommendation, and will review as the policy takes further shape.</p>
-----	-------------	---	---

Hay		<p>It is worth noting that we currently DO allow religious or political sponsors, correct? I saw political booths at the Summer Celebration, and if my memory serves me correctly, I've seen religious organizations with booths at past events. The draft policy would eliminate the possibility of such sponsorships going forward.</p>	<p>Currently community groups purchase booth space or partner with the City in other ways. This is different than being a sponsor as we do not publicly recognize those groups as sponsors under this policy.</p> <p>This policy would not alter the ability for the community groups to participate, it may however limit their ability to be a sponsor and promoted as such.</p>
Hay		<p>*Regarding schools - this would mean that MISD, French American School, non-religious preschools like Sunny beam and Early World could have booths at community events, but many other schools could not - JCC, St. Monica, Patti's play school, Emmanuel Day school, etc.</p>	<p>Under current practice and this policy, all of the groups mention would be allowed to participate- by signing up for booth space or taking part in many other ways- this differs from being a recognized Sponsor of an event.</p> <p>Under this policy many of these groups would still be permitted to be a Sponsor. But would require additional review based on the specific organizations as staff doesn't have details on the operations of each at this time.</p>
Struck	Staff Report	<p>Is it anticipated that the City would create others that would cover areas other than "recreation"?</p>	<p>At this time, the policy is focused on Recreation, though it may be the future desire of City Council to expand this policy's scope.</p>
Struck	Definitions	<p>Sponsorship – are there any overlaps or conflicts with the recent</p>	<p>The Park Area Naming Policy under section 4.0 Duration of Name states: "The naming of Park Areas shall be approached with the intention that names are permanent unless they fall under a time-limited sponsorship agreement or for other reasons as determined by the City Council."</p> <p>Staff doesn't see conflict between the (2) policies, but rather that comprehensively they provide strong guidance.</p>

Struck	1.0	There is a statement that the City <i>encourages</i> (or will encourage) sponsorships. Are there examples of how this <i>encouragement</i> is (or will be) implemented?	Staff does communicate with the business community encouraging engagement in events and programs through sponsorships. Additionally, staff utilizes a sponsorship guide and online presence to promote opportunities. These guides highlight the benefits to being a sponsor to encourage participation.
Struck	3.0	Formatting – To provide the community with a more understandable format, the current ten (10) criteria could be sub-classified as follows: *Nature of business or organization- Criteria A,B,C,D, & E *Other F,G,H,I,&J	This will be reviewed upon drafting of additional sections.
Cohen	3.0 (A)	It seems like the wording of this section might disqualify restaurants, grocery stores, apartment complexes, exercise facilities, and other businesses that are regulated for compliance by various authorities. If that is broader than what is intended, perhaps alternative wording should be considered.	Staff do not intend to disqualify restaurants, grocery stores, apartment complexes, exercise facilities, and other businesses. The provided examples in 3.0(A) highlight the types of businesses to be disqualified. Based on Commission input following the meeting, staff will further engage legal staff to ensure appropriate language.
Cohen	3.0 (B)	1. Would the following kinds of entities be disqualified from sponsoring as religious or political: a. Jewish Community Center(JCC) b. Churches, places or other Places of worship. c. League of Women Voters d. Planned Parenthood	Staff would review applications for sponsorship and determine if an organization would be disqualified based on this criteria. If the primary function of the organization is political or religious than it would be disqualified- for example a church or the "Campaign for John Doe". If the primary function is for example recreation or another industry it would not necessarily be disqualified...unless upon review it is disqualified due to appearance that the City supports a particular religious or political point of view as shown in Section 3.0(C).

Hay	3.0 (c)	<p><i>*Can you please define (or give an example) of what "associated with the City" means in C.</i></p> <p><i>Is being a sponsor considered "associated with the city" ... if so, then we don't even need to state this if we have B. as a disqualifying criteria.</i></p> <p><i>If we eliminate B. so that religious and political organizations may be sponsor, then we need to clarify what "associated with the City" means in C.</i></p>	<p>Associated with the City in this sense would be the sponsorship relationship.</p> <p>Section 3.0 (B)- automatically disqualifies religious or political organizations.</p> <p>Section 3.0 (C)- Allows for disqualification of an organization which may or may not be political in nature, but rather that if the appearance of association with the City demonstrates the City supports a particular religious or political point of view.</p> <p>Staff recommend retaining both Sections 3.0 B & C</p>
Struck	3.0(D)	<p>Should "weapons" be added to the list of disqualifying activities as follows: "Commercial enterprises whose business of alcoholic, tobacco, marijuana <i>and weapons</i> products." This edit would provide consistency with Criteria A and H.</p>	<p>Staff support this addition.</p>
Cohen	3.0 (D) & 3.0 (H)	<p>Is there some duplication between Sections 3.0(D) and 3.0(H)?</p>	<p>Section 3.0 (D) Refers to the business Section 3.0 (H) Refers to the Sponsorship Agreement and what is not allowed to be promoted.</p> <p>For Example: a gas station applies to be a sponsor (they aren't otherwise disqualified), but as part of their Sponsorship Agreement seeks to promote a sale they are running on chewing tobacco. This would disqualify them from sponsoring.</p>
Hay	3.0 (D) & 3.0 (H)	<p>*D. and H. are similar- I think D. could be eliminated, as any enterprise described in D. would be covered by policy H. Maybe you can give me an example for why D. is included in the policy.</p>	<p>See response above</p>

Struck	3.0(F)	This criterium may fit better in section 2.0 depending upon how that section is developed by re-focusing the wording to a positive statement of meeting City policies, etc.	<p>Staff seek to implement criteria based on qualifying and disqualifying criteria- not necessarily a positive or negative statement.</p> <p>Staff view a distinction between evaluating conditions as being consistent and inconstant with the City’s mission, values, policies, and/or planning documents.</p> <p>Staff recommend retaining as disqualifying, which would provide a lower threshold to potential sponsors.</p>
Cohen	3.0(J)	I understand the sentiment behind this and mean no disrespect to City Manager Bon, but is this absolute discretion in the City Manager an appropriate way to deal with this, without any reference to standards for such a decision?	Staff believe it is reflective of the purpose of this policy to allow the City Manager to act in the best interest of the City by disqualifying potential sponsors for reasons not contemplated in this policy.
Struck	3.0 (J)	“Any other reason as determined by the City Manager in their sole discretion, <i>and such determinations made publicly available.</i> ” It is important to be transparent if the City Manager makes such determinations, and to inform the community as it relates to future activity.	Staff recommend retaining recommended language. And if circumstances arise, updating disqualifying criteria accordingly.