

City of San Diego
Regional Park Improvement Fund Oversight Committee
Meeting Minutes
Thursday, February 19, 2026

“TO PROVIDE HEALTHY, SUSTAINABLE, AND ENRICHING ENVIRONMENTS FOR ALL”

Meeting Held by In Person and Teleconference:

This meeting was held at Balboa Park Club – Santa Fe Room and remotely using the Zoom Webinar platform and was streamed online. The public was invited to join the meeting by phone or computer, as well as invited to submit “Public Comments” in writing via a webform. The form was made available on the Parks and Recreation website at <https://www.sandiego.gov/park-and-recreation/general-info/boards>.

NOTE: Both verbal and written communication were used by Committee Members, City staff, and presenters during the meeting. City staff also used the screen-share function to allow viewers to view content shared by the speaker which included PowerPoint presentations and websites.

Before the meeting was called to order, City staff read instructions to the public regarding technical procedures for making live public comment during the webinar.

Members Present	Members Absent	City Staff Present
Nick Anastasopoulos Jeremy Bloom Marcella Bothwell (Chair) Dr. Andrea Dooley Rick Gulley (Vice-Chair) Daniele Laman Allison Soares Agatha Wein	Dr. Judith Munoz Evelyn Smith	Michelle Abella-Shon Ryan Barbrick Benny Cartwright (Virtual) Andy Field Ana Grow (Virtual) Maricris Lumibao Justin Nguyen Elvi Ricafort Gabriela Verendia

CALL TO ORDER – The meeting was called to order by Chair Bothwell at 4:31 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JUNE 26, 2026

MOTION/SECONDED:

Ms. Laman/Mr. Gulley

A motion was made by Ms. Laman to approve the minutes, and the motion was seconded by Mr. Gulley. The motion was approved 8-0-0 with the following vote: Yea: Nick Anastasopoulos, Jeremy Bloom, Marcella Bothwell, Dr. Andrea Dooley, Rick Gulley, Daniele Laman, Allison Soares, and Agatha Wein. Recused: None. Abstained: None. Not Present: Dr. Judith Muñoz and Evelyn Smith.

Public Comments: None.

Board Comments: None.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 15, 2026

MOTION/SECONDED:

Mr. Gulley/Dr. Dooley

A motion was made by Mr. Gulley to approve the minutes, and the motion was seconded by Dr. Dooley. The motion was approved 8-0-0 with the following vote: Yea: Nick Anastasopoulos, Jeremy Bloom, Marcella Bothwell, Dr. Andrea Dooley, Rick Gulley, Daniele Laman, Allison Soares, and Agatha Wein. Recused: None. Abstained: None. Not Present: Dr. Judith Muñoz and Evelyn Smith,

Public Comments: None.

Board Comments: None.

NON-ADOPTION AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT: None.

CONSENT AGENDA: None.

REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE: None.

COMMUNICATIONS: None.

DISCUSSION ITEMS: None.

INFORMATION ITEMS:

201. Fiscal Year 2025 Mission Bay Lease Revenue Statistics

Program Manager Ryan Barbrick from the Department's Capital Improvements Program and Grants section presented the Fiscal Year 2025 Mission Bay Lease Revenue Statistics.

Public Comment: None.

Board Comment:

Chair Bothwell asked about the concerns raised on leases that have not been updated. She asked if there have updates to their concerns or are staff in process checking these late rent payments. Mr. Barbrick responded that the Department will get back to the Board on this question.

Ms. Laman added that she asked before about the SeaWorld rent payments received if late fees were included to the payments. Mr. Barbrick responded that the Department will get back to the Board and we will need to work with Real Estate Assets to find out the updates on the leases and late rent payments affecting the revenues.

202. City Council Policy 800-14 Prioritizing CIP Projects – Application to P&R Projects

Senior Engineer Sheila Bose from Engineering & Capital Projects Department presented the City Council Policy 800-14 Prioritizing CIP Projects – Application to P&R Projects.

Public Comment: Mr. Moty from Kensington-Talmadge Community Planning Group provided in-person and written testimony as shown in the following letter.



P.O. Box 16391, San Diego CA 92176

February 17, 2026

Marcella Bothwell
Chair, Park & Recreation Board
City of San Diego

Re: Council Policy 800-14

Dear Chair Bothwell and fellow Board Members;

We greatly appreciate how staff's presentation affords the public much greater visibility on how Council Policy 800-14 is implemented. Our overarching comment, and we believe staff would agree, is objective scoring should be used whenever possible, and not undermine or perpetuate existing park deficiencies.

Factor 1: Health Impact

This factor assesses points for the health impact caused by an existing facility's closure for repair or removal. These same health impacts would occur by the absence of the facility, but absence scores no health impact points.

Factor 2: Level of Service

The Parks Master Plan (PMP) has established a new metric for measuring Level of Service (LOS) and is the primary plan for park development in San Diego. It should be used more explicitly for scoring purposes. In those communities where PMP scores have been determined, they should be used to quantify the need as a percentage of the deficit and the City should endeavor to quickly switch over to the PMP as its sole LOS scoring method. It is detailed, consistent, and less susceptible to manipulation.

Related to LOS, the presentation makes it appear that a new facility must be specifically identified within the PMP or Climate Action Plan (CAP) to qualify for the 18 LOS points. Is this so, or is this just a misreading of the powerpoint? We believe the PMP and possibly the CAP as well, are only relevant as policy guidelines, in which case that should be stated.

Lastly, we would like point out that actual need has now been reduced to a mere 18% of all possible points. When paired with the additional points possible under Factor 1, Legal and Safety, 30 points are available for communities who have park facilities in need of repair, versus 18 points available to communities which have no park facilities.

Factor 2: Population Growth and Density

These numbers are easily determined, and specific, separate parameters for growth and density should be established and published, such as “above” or “below the city average”. Additionally, a baseline year should be identified for growth calculation purposes. For example, 2000 or 2010. In many smaller communities, growth can be quite “chunky” and a shorter time period may not account for all the growth a community has experienced.

Finally, it should be acknowledged that these parameters implicitly ignore a community’s park deficit except in Structurally Excluded Communities.

Factor 3: Communities of Concern Identified by the Climate Equity Index

Please note that Climate Equity is identified as a scorable component for both Factors 3 and 4. Furthermore, Environmental Justice has now been added as a state-mandated criteria for park investment. Consideration should be given to better implement the overlapping Climate Equity and Environmental Justice requirements. It’s a source of confusion and over weights similar aspects of the scoring system.

Factor 4: All Sustainability and Conservation Metrics

It appears that these are scored so points are maximized for the largest facilities. While understandable, it should be noted that parks in urban communities simply do not have the space for large scale features within their limited footprint. Some consideration should be given for the overall size of the proposed park facility. Otherwise, Factor 4 is nothing more than a form of systemic bias against park deficient, urban communities.

Approval Process: Park & Recreation Creates Needs List

There is a glaring black hole in the objective nature of the park project approval process which is the Park & Recreation Department’s ability to block an otherwise meritorious project by simply not forwarding the project for Engineering and Capital Projects for scoring.

Respectfully submitted,

David Moty
Chair, Kensington Talmadge Planning Group

Deborah Sharpe
Member, Kensington Talmadge Planning Group
Park Planning Supervisor (retired), City of San Diego

Board Comment:

Ms. Laman asked Ms. Bose about priority scores and what factors could help move these projects forward. Ms. Bose responded that they score these projects as objectively as possible. The scores are then forwarded up to the management chain, where they help inform decision-making by the Mayor and the City Council. Ms. Laman reiterated what Ms. Bose responded that project scores can be influenced by advocacy by lobbying the Mayor and City Council. Ms. Bose confirmed that this is correct.

Chair Bothwell asked Director Field how the 300-plus Capital Improvements Program (CIP) projects are identified and prioritized to move forward in the process. Director Field responded that many data sources and inputs help identify needed projects, including:

1. The **Facility Condition Assessment** evaluated and scored all existing park buildings and facilities. The **Park Amenity Condition Assessment** evaluated and scored most other park infrastructure, such as playgrounds, parking lots, walkways, and park furniture. These assessments were last completed in the 2014-2019 timeframe. Information gathered from these assessments remains relevant. Many of the buildings and amenities identified as failing or rated as poor condition during that process still need replacement, and those infrastructure needs have not been forgotten.
2. The **Unfunded Park Improvements List** collects park needs primarily from:
 - a. Projects identified in community plans, facility financing plans, impact fee studies, and similar documents typically that identify missing park amenities or features that are desired by the community. These plans often highlight gaps. Examples include a community park that lacks a playground or an undeveloped piece of City-owned land that has not been developed into a park. Several projects currently in the CIP fall into that category.
 - b. Projects that originate from priorities identified by City Council offices, community planning groups, community recreation groups, nonprofit organizations such as town councils, stakeholder groups, and other park patrons. These projects can include new park amenities, repairs within existing parks, land acquisition, or upgrading City-owned lands. These priorities are reflected in City Council memoranda, which are collected and distributed by the Office of the Independent Budget Analyst three times a year. Staff also receives input annually from both planning groups and recreation groups consistently, especially when the City asks them for their input on unfunded needs in their communities. Many of these identified needs ultimately become part of the Park Improvement List.

To articulate the scale of these needs and estimate associated costs, the City prepares the Five-Year Capital Outlook, which is issued annually by Engineering and Capital Projects Department (E&CP). This document provides a five-year perspective on the City's overall infrastructure deficit across all asset categories. This has consistently ranged between \$7 to \$8 billion dollars across all asset categories. Parks and Recreation Department's share of that

deficit is approximately \$600 million. While significant, this amount is still overshadowed by other asset categories, such as the City's drainage needs, which is estimated in the billions of dollars, along with needs to address street infrastructure deficiencies as well. Because the overall needs are so extensive and available funding is limited, much of the City's discretionary capital funding is directed toward drainage and roadway projects, many of which are emergency in nature and cannot be deferred due to public safety risks.

Most of the funding available for park-related CIP projects comes from the sources already familiar to the Board: Regional Park Improvement Fund (RPIF), Mission Bay Improvement Fund (MBIF), and Citywide Park Development Impact Fee (CPDIF). These three funding sources are the primary dedicated revenue streams for park improvement projects.

Scoring of projects is elevated to the Capital Improvement Program Advisory Committee (CIPRAC), which includes representatives from every department. The role of CIPRAC is to determine whether a project has the necessary funding and scope to move forward.

Out of the hundreds of projects listed in the Unfunded Park Improvements list, only a few will be considered for designation to become a capital improvement project. Park staff review funding opportunities, safety needs, risk assessment, community interest, and similar factors to establish whether a project will proceed to the next review level. If a project makes it to CIPRAC, that committee will then evaluate those projects to determine whether a viable funding plan exists and whether the proposed scope is feasible, understanding that scope may evolve over time. CIPRAC will evaluate and may narrow the list further, providing a reality check on what can reasonably proceed based on funding and Citywide needs.

Director Field added that only a few projects advance to the next level because there is limited funding available. He noted that staff works to advance projects that are most likely to make a meaningful impact on the department's infrastructure deficit. These are typically projects requested by the community and those identified as being in poor or failing condition, or that do not meet required codes such as accessibility standards. He emphasized that these projects provide the greatest benefit for the investment.

Once projects move through the CIPRAC process, staff receives updated cost estimates based on CIPRAC's review and the preliminary engineering work completed by staff, including E&CP Deputy Director Nevien Anton and Ms. Bose. As everyone has experienced over the five years, costs have risen significantly, and capital projects are no exception. Projects typically take three to six years to move from initial concept to construction. During that time, they must undergo extensive code reviews, compliance checks, and other required steps to confirm feasibility. Because of these long timelines, a project that received CIPRAC approval six years ago may now have a substantially higher cost. This is why staff often return to request additional funding to ensure the project can still move forward despite rising construction and material costs. All of this is done in compliance with Council Policy 800-14.

Chair Bothwell thanked Director Field for his detailed response, noting that his explanation of the process was very helpful in understanding how project scoring is conducted. She also commented that without the three dedicated funding sources, not much other funding would be available since discretionary funding often goes to drainage and roadway projects.

February 19, 2026

Regional Park Improvement Fund Oversight Committee Minutes - **DRAFT**

Page 7

Director Field explained that the P&R typically only receives discretionary funding (such as General Fund, Commercial Paper, Capital Outlay, or Infrastructure Fund) when a Councilmember works with the City Council to vote/direct those resources to P&R's projects through the annual budget process. That is atypical, as other asset types typically have higher priority needs due to public safety risks and often receive the limited available discretionary capital funding.

Chair Bothwell shared that this lengthy process with limited City funding proves that accessing private foundation funding should be made easier. It should not take three years to obtain the right of entry (ROE) permit from the City. She also shared the importance of private foundation contributions to the park system, which can make a difference.

203. Benchmarking Soft Cost Averages

Senior Engineer Sheila Bose from Engineering and Capital Projects Department presented the Benchmarking Soft Cost Averages.

Public Comment: None.

Board Comment: None.

WORKSHOP ITEMS: None.

ADJOURNMENT - The meeting was adjourned at 5:16 p.m.

Copies of the reports, attachments, PowerPoint presentations, and audio-video recordings can be found on the Parks and Recreation Department website at <http://www.sandiego.gov/parkandrecboard/reports>.

Next Calendared Meeting: March 19, 2026 at 2:00 p.m.

Submitted by,

Andy Field
Director
Parks and Recreation Department