

**Soul of San Diego: Keeping Balboa Park Magnificent in its Second Century
Final Report of the Balboa Park Committee to the Mayor and City Council
(DRAFT)**

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

Executive Summary

1. **Question 1 Report:** Can the City of San Diego financially support Balboa Park today and into the future?
2. **Question 2 Report:** Even if it can, should the City provide all the funding for Balboa Park?
3. **Question 3 Report:** If the City wished to expand management and governance of Balboa Park, what are the alternatives to do so?
4. **Phase 2: Next Steps**
5. **Appendices**
 - a. Bibliography
 - b. Agendas
 - c. Notes
 - d. Minutes
 - e. Study Overview
 - f. Frequently Asked Questions
 - g. Web Addresses
 - h. Press Releases

Acknowledgements

Balboa Park Committee Members

1. Vicki Granowitz Chair
North Park Planning Committee Representative
2. Mike McDowell Vice-Chair
3. Jennifer Ayala Centre City Advisory Committee Representative
4. Laurie Burgett Greater Golden Hill Planning Committee Representative
5. Jeri Dilno Member-at-Large
6. Dr. Mick Hager Large Institution Representative
7. Dr. Andrew Kahng Balboa Park/Morley Field Recreation Council Representative
8. David Kinney Small/Medium Institution Representative
9. Michael L. Singleton Uptown Planners Representative
10. Donald Steele Member-at-Large

Three Foundations Who Funded the *"Soul of San Diego"* Study

The San Diego Foundation
Bob Kelly
Legler Benbough Foundation
Peter Ellsworth
The Parker Foundation
Bill Beemer

City of San Diego Mayor Jerry Sanders
District Three Councilmember Toni Atkins

Park and Recreation Department

Stacey LoMedico, Director
Kathleen Hasenour, Deputy Director
Bruce Martinez, District Manager
Susan Lowery-Mendoza, Area Manger

Balboa Park Central

Balboa Park Marketing

Jeffrey Tom

Vanessa Nieves

Marisa Aurora Quiroz

City staff who taped meeting

City TV 24

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In early 2006, a local foundation with a long history of charitable giving to institutions in Balboa Park began to look at possible options for more successfully operating and funding our City's beloved Park. They were concerned about the challenges the Park was facing in light of San Diego's increasing financial difficulties due to pension under funding, among other political and financial realities. The Legler Benbough Foundation commissioned the Center for City Park Excellence of the Trust for Public Land to produce a short study of management and fund-raising models involving public-private partnerships in five other major U.S. cities with large urban parks.

This report, entitled "*Keeping Balboa Park Magnificent in its Second Century*," completed in August 2006, generated considerable interest and discussion in the City and led to a much larger fact-gathering study to examine current capital and deferred maintenance needs in Balboa Park, to learn who the users are and what their impressions are of Balboa Park, and to better understand current management and planning issues.

Two other foundations with long ties to Balboa Park, The San Diego Foundation and the Parker Foundation, joined Legler Benbough to fund the more comprehensive effort. The Center for City Park Excellence, once again retained to produce this second report on Balboa Park, was also asked to include possible governance alternatives and funding options for the future. Their report entitled "*The Soul of San Diego: Keeping Balboa Park Magnificent in its Second Century*," raised and attempted to answer three important questions, without making specific recommendations on where the City of San Diego should go from here:

1. Who uses Balboa Park and what do they do there?
2. Is there a demonstrable need for capital repairs and improvements in Balboa Park, and if so, what is the magnitude of the need?
3. What are the issues with Park governance?

Supporting research and documentation was provided by The Keston Institute for Public Finance and Infrastructure Policy at the University of Southern California, and by the Morey Group, a company with offices in New York and Charleston, S.C., that specializes in statistical analysis for cultural organizations. A complete copy of "*The Soul of San Diego*," including the supporting documentation is included with this report and is referred to again and again.

The results of the larger study are startling. Just to mention a few key points: Balboa Park is among the most heavily used city parks in the U.S. Only 24% of persons interviewed in the Park live in the City of San Diego, and of those, the

largest percentage were Hispanic. Of non-city residents, 75% stated that the Park was the primary or one of several reasons for visiting San Diego. Nearly 69% came to the Park because of a museum, a theater or the zoo.

Although not a complete list, needed capital and infrastructure projects, totaling a minimum of \$238 million, were identified. Concerning governance, the study found that the San Diego Park and Recreation Department manages 400 other properties in addition to Balboa Park, and noted, "There is no official body with the focus on Balboa Park and the authority to help the park...be successful."

"Serious doubts exist regarding the current park management structure and these must be addressed, if there is any hope of engaging the citizenry and the donor community..." "(There is)...too little funding and too little clarity about leadership and authority—which represents a powder keg."

The authors believe San Diegans do not perceive problems with the Park because it is so intrinsically beautiful: "a walk through (the park) still inspires enjoyment for the vast majority of visitors." In fact, 95% of telephone survey respondents rated their satisfaction with the Park as "excellent" or "good."

In addressing the first three questions, the Center for City Park Excellence posed three more important questions, partially answered them and recommended an extended period of time for public review and consideration:

1. Can the city of San Diego solve these problems on its own?
2. Even if the city can tackle the challenge on its own, should it?
3. If the funding and management of Balboa Park were broadened, what are the alternatives?

When Mayor Jerry Sanders was presented with the results of the study in January 2008, he and Councilmember Toni Atkins (whose Council District 3 includes Balboa Park) assigned responsibility for a public review process to the Balboa Park Committee, insuring that the public and park stakeholders would have plenty of opportunity to participate in the next phase.

The Balboa Park Committee (BPC) is a citizen's advisory group with members appointed by the Mayor and confirmed by City Council. Representatives include members of affected neighborhood planning groups (North Park, Uptown, Golden Hill and Downtown), the Balboa Park Cultural Institutions, the Balboa Park/Morley Field Recreation Council and several members-at-large. The BPC serves year-round in an advisory capacity to the San Diego Park and Recreation Board, Mayor and City Council on policy issues relating to the acquisition, development, maintenance and operation of Balboa Park.

All meetings are open to the public and include time for public comment. Beginning with the first public meeting on March 8, 2008, and for nine months afterwards, the Committee has been gathering information from the community, interviewing experts in the various fields of governance, and acquiring details about the City of San Diego budget and finances, particularly as they apply to Balboa Park.

This, the final report of the Balboa Park Committee considering the future financing and governance of Balboa Park, includes a complete list of sources consulted, background information, observations and answers to the three questions listed above and recommendations to the Mayor and City Council for next steps.

In summary, here are the Balboa Park Committee's conclusions:

1. The City has the potential to provide the necessary financial support, but from a financial and management perspective the City has never made it a high enough priority to fully commit to the funding needed. As competition increases for limited public financial resources, a look at the past portends that the City will not provide the resources necessary to fulfill its management and operational needs, to address maintenance, repairs and replacement requirements nor to implement already approved capital improvement projects.
2. The City of San Diego should not act alone in financing and operating Balboa Park, but build on existing partnerships, identify new partnerships, increase private donations, create new sources of revenue, and provide a process that insures donations for projects and services match priorities.
3. The Park and Recreation Department does an admirable job of managing Balboa Park, especially considering the deep cuts made by the City in recent years that have led to diminished resources and increased responsibilities.
4. However, considering input from the public hearings and information on other large urban parks that have been studied, there are many areas that could be optimized and improved in the Park's administration.
5. The City should provide better planning for Balboa Park, taking into consideration the needs of adjacent neighborhoods and the region.

This should include a discussion of what the “limits to growth” are for the park.

6. There must be a balance between the current critical financial needs and the need to maintain what the public loves about Balboa Park.
7. The City should retain ultimate authority over the Park, including park policies and land-use decisions and assure the public that Balboa Park will remain a public park in perpetuity and that privatization will never be allowed.
8. The City should maintain current or higher (as in the past) levels for funding for the Park.
9. With a more focused and dynamic leadership model for Balboa Park, increased private support will be possible.
10. Fund-raising, management and governance should be expanded through the creation of a new, non-profit public-benefit charity that will work in a contractually defined public-private partnership, following steps that have worked successfully for similar large urban parks studied, augmented by a process that is unique to San Diego and Balboa Park.
11. The next step should be formation of a “Balboa Park Task Force” to better define Park and Recreation and other City functions relating to Balboa Park and to create a “Balboa Park Conservancy” (non-profit fundraising, management/operations entity), which can work in partnership with the City to “keep Balboa Park magnificent in its second century” and beyond....

This process will not be easy, but readers can take heart from our past. When the original parkland that is now Balboa Park was dedicated, the population was under 3,500, yet the town leaders created an enduring legacy—a park that was, and still is, larger than Central Park in New York.

When planning for the 1915 Exposition began, the population in San Diego was under 35,000. That expo introduced the beloved Spanish Colonial architecture to the Central Mesa, provided the first animals for our zoo, and brought millions of visitors to San Diego, beginning the expansion that continues today.

In the middle of the Great Depression, in July 1934, San Diego’s civic leaders decided to hold a second exposition in Balboa Park, which would add

almost all of the buildings now located around Pan American Plaza, the International Cottages, the Old Globe Theatre and Spanish Village. That fair opened less than 10 months later, in early May of 1935. Monumental tasks have been accomplished in a timely fashion when San Diegans put their hearts and minds to it...

#

Respectfully submitted:

November 13, 2008

Balboa Park Committee

Answering Question # 1

Can the city of San Diego provide the necessary financial support for Balboa Park in the future?

I. Introduction

The Balboa Park Committee had access to only a few resources for the generation and gathering of data beyond public documents and presentations. The committee has gathered a significant number of documents and sources of additional information for its use, but the information is incomplete. The BPC believes City staff has shown due diligence in their efforts and that the available information is sufficient to answer the above question.

II. Observations

- A. Deferred maintenance, as identified in the Balboa Park Study "*The Soul of San Diego*"¹ is only a partial list of unfunded requirements. Expenses and projects identified in the study include some cost estimates but, due to its incomplete scope, it is not a true representation of the "real" unfunded costs for the Park. This is not a problem limited to Balboa Park. Forest Park in Saint Louis faced a similar problem and one of the first priorities for the organization "Forest Park Forever", was to hire a firm to ascertain the true unfunded costs.
- B. The 2008 City budget was balanced only after cuts to City services, including major budget reductions for Park and Recreation.
- C. Future operating budgets are projected to suffer as a result of local, state and federal budget constraints. Reductions in sales tax, property tax and transient occupancy taxes are requiring mid year cuts to the Fiscal Year 2009 budget and will compound the Fiscal Year 2010 budget.
- D. Balboa Park competes annually with other park facilities as well as funding needs and priorities demanded by the public and set by the Mayor and the City Council.
- E. The current budgetary challenges significantly hinder any meaningful progress toward reducing the backlog of deferred maintenance and delayed capital improvement projects in Balboa Park.
- F. Should the fiscal budget trends continue, reductions in the Park and Recreation Budget should be expected in the future.
- G. There is no identifiable City 'windfall' of new, future revenue and no evidence of the civic or political will to increase taxes to support Balboa Park more in the future. Some of the sources of revenue currently used for the park that are likely to remain static:

1. Transient Occupancy Tax (TOT)
2. Sales Tax
3. Bonds
4. Assessments of City of San Diego property owners or businesses

H. Potential new sources of revenue:

1. Increased allocations to Park & Recreation Department from the General Fund
2. Parking fees
3. Increased user fees
4. Charging for other Park uses not currently being charged for (*Vicki, this is weak*)
5. Attendance fees
6. Special event fees
7. Full-cost recovery, including cumulative impacts from special events and other user fees
8. Developer impact fees collected for park development (including equivalences allowed under the SD General Plan)²
9. Redevelopment funds from CCDC for park projects
10. Support from San Diego County property taxes (given that 45% of park visitors are County residents, its reasonable to suggest support from San Diego County residents (footnotes 3,4)

I. Increasing staff efficiency is mentioned routinely as a way to boost funding for the Park.

J. Managing Balboa Park more like a business could reduce operational costs for the park. However, parks are not businesses and while some elements might be appropriately run with a for-profit model, overall parks are amenities that cities provide free for the benefit of its citizenry. Parks provide intangible and invaluable benefits.

K. Funding needs include:

1. Operations (staffing for administration and programs)
2. Maintenance (recurring costs for ground and building maintenance)
3. Repair and replacements (replacing or repairing existing infrastructure or facilities)
4. Upgrades (making existing facilities better or bringing them to current standards or codes)
5. Expansions and improvements (creating new park areas, facilities or other improvements to increase the user/visitor capacity of the park)

III. Conclusions

1. On the basis of available information, the true amount of unfunded requirements is higher than the costs represented in the "Soul of the Park".

2. Staff efficiencies cannot be increased sufficiently to significantly meet Parks short term or long term budgetary needs.
3. Competition for further General Fund allocations is intense. The prospect of continued reductions in funding to the City from state and federal sources are likely. Therefore, it is probably safe to conclude that budgetary shortfalls will continue to plague Balboa Park.
4. The Park might benefit from being run with business efficiency principles. Best practices from other large urban parks could be applied to Balboa Park and may result in some efficiency improvements. But profit motives related to business practices should never be allowed to overshadow the general public benefit of this public resource. (footnote 5)

IV. Direct Response to Question 1

Can the city of San Diego provide the necessary financial support for Balboa Park in the future?"

No, the City cannot provide the necessary funding for Balboa Park today and is not likely to be able to do so in the future. New sources of revenue and a sharing of public and private responsibilities will be required to provide the "necessary support" for Balboa Park in the future.

As a \$3 billion corporation, the City of San Diego has the potential for providing the necessary financial support for Balboa Park. The City, acting alone if it wished, has always had the authority to fully fund and fully manage Balboa Park. But from a financial and management perspective, the City has never made Balboa Park a high enough priority to fully commit to the funding needed in the Park.

As the competition for finite public financial resources becomes more intense in the future, a look at the past portends that the City will not be able to provide the resources necessary to fulfill its management and operational mandate, to address maintenance, repairs and replacement requirements and to implement approved capital improvement projects for Balboa Park.

The City does not currently act alone with regard to financing Balboa Park, nor is it likely to do so in the future. So, while Question 1 is somewhat flawed since it implies support from only the City's resources, it can still be answered with a "no".

V. Recommendations

- A. Prior to the implementation of new policies regarding the future governance and/or funding of Balboa Park, a top priority should be further research into several topic areas:
 1. Actual management, operating and maintenance costs
 2. Projection of future management, operating and maintenance costs
 3. Actual revenues and funding sources

4. Projection of future revenues and funding sources
 5. The true condition of park facilities
 6. Total cost of deferred maintenance
 7. Total cost of bringing facilities and areas up to current standards and codes
 8. Total cost of increasing the capacity of the park and expanding facilities through capital improvement projects
- B. At the recent kickoff of the Balboa Park 2015 Centennial Celebration, participants talked about the need for a “wow” factor that a world-class park should have. Put another way, participants were saying that “Balboa Park needs to exceed expectations, rather than just a meet a baseline condition”. Therefore:
1. Future research needs to answer the question: “Should Balboa Park only be restored to a healthy baseline or should there be a higher vision?”
 2. If there is a higher expectation, what might that include and what will it cost to reach it?

VI. Supporting Documentation

A. All the documents listed in the Bibliography: Table of Contents, “Documents Reviewed by the Balboa Park Committee,” sections cited below were used in answering Question 1

- Section II. Financial Misc.
- Section III. Financial TOT
- Section IV. City of San Diego Budget Documents

B. Documents specifically mentioned or cited in this document include:

- Soul of San Diego Keeping Balboa Park Magnificent in the Second Century*, January 2008
- Footnote #1 Appendix 2: Examples of Capital and Maintenance Needs
- Footnote #2 City of San Diego General Plan 2008: Recreation Element--Park Standards, pgs RE-17 to RE-19
- Footnote #3 Summary of Studies, page 6
- Footnote #4 Appendix 1: Figure 9, Origin of Visitors page 43
- Footnote #5 Central Park Conservancy, Best Practices November 2004

Should the City of San Diego act on its own in funding Balboa Park?

I. Introduction

(The following discussion focuses on the current financial support structure of Balboa Park, and offers suggestions of potential revenue sources.)

Balboa Park exists today as the result of over 140 years of cooperative partnerships between the city, the general public and the business community. The land for the park was privately donated to the City. Important accomplishments, events and facilities were the result of citizen initiatives undertaken in partnership with the City. These initiatives resulted in two world expositions, a world-class zoo, and the largest urban-cultural park in the United States. There are numerous recreational facilities, playgrounds, landscaped parkland and vast areas of natural open space that are all the result of the legacy of public and corporate volunteerism.

While the City has assumed and discharged its role as the manager of this city park, the City of San Diego has never acted alone in operating, supporting, preserving or enhancing Balboa Park. Over its history, a myriad of individuals and organizations from the private sector, as well as other governmental bodies outside of the City of San Diego, have contributed millions of dollars and millions of volunteer hours to support Balboa Park.

II. Observations

Although the City of San Diego currently provides the majority of the funding for the operation and maintenance of Balboa Park, it does receive support from other sources. The City of San Diego does not currently operate Balboa Park on its own. Numerous organizations and institutions provide funding, programming and operational support.

- A. The City maintains contractual agreements with many Balboa Park cultural institutions and other non-profits organizations. The relationship between most cultural or recreational institutions in the Park and the City of San Diego is symbiotic. These institutions are able to lease a facility for little or no rent while the City receives the benefit of having the kinds of cultural, educational, science and recreational institutions that would be expected in a major urban city. Most of these nonprofits provide services beyond what they are required to do in their leases with the City. Typical programs and/or services these tenants provide:
 - 1. Research programs
 - 2. Park visitor center
 - 3. Balboa Park website
 - 4. Balboa Park e-news
 - 5. Security services
 - 6. Free programs for schools

7. Free lectures and other educational programs
8. Maintenance of facilities inside leaseholds
9. Improvements to areas around leaseholds
10. Additions or improvements made to many of these City-owned facilities with the help of private funds
11. Stewardship of the cultural and natural heritage of our city and region.
12. Installation of "green technologies"

If the City had to fund these additional programs, the cost to operate the Park would be significantly higher than it currently is. Since an economic benefits analysis has never been done, the true value institutions in Balboa Park provide the City is not quantifiable.

- B. Recreation organizations and activities provide funding, services and programming support for recreational activities in Balboa Park. For example, the Balboa Park Recreation Council, a volunteer organization, provides funds for the maintenance of some of the park's recreational facilities. These funds tend to be limited to ball fields, swimming pool, tennis courts, and gymnasiums. However, all of this funding does not come close to meeting the aggregate financial operations and maintenance needs of sports facilities and recreation grounds in the Park.
- C. Sport and recreation user fees are set so low they do not cover the true cost of the activity. Whether or not they should be subject to "full cost recovery including cumulative impacts" requires further discussion and analysis.
- D. Horticultural organizations provide funding and volunteer hours caring for Park gardens that would otherwise be the responsibility of park maintenance personnel.
- E. Philanthropic support includes funding, in-kind donations and volunteer activity by individuals as well as organizations.
- F. On the downside, philanthropic organizations determine the projects they want to fund. Projects are often funded in a piecemeal way and often don't match parkwide needs or those of the general public. Donations to the Park by these organizations cannot be counted on.
- G. Private corporations often provide volunteers, in-kind and financial donations. For example, SDGE underwrote the replacement of lights on the Cabrillo Bridge and are contributing expertise and funding to make City-owned buildings in the Park more energy efficient.
- H. The County, State of California and Federal Government currently provide only indirect support for Balboa Park. The study the "Balboa Park, the Soul of San Diego" indicates that county residents are major and regular users of Balboa Park. County residents represent 48% of park users, with the County residents visiting an average of 5.8 times per year (1-2). However the County has only

contributed modestly to the financial support of Balboa Park. Apparently no discussions with the County have taken place, even though they are the most obvious entity with significant potential for assistance with funding and management.

- I. The State of California could make available either bond proceeds, grants or legislatively created "Park and Recreation District" Today's financial crisis makes this option unlikely but it does merit further study once the State's financial situation has improved.
- J. Potential sources of revenue or volunteers that warrant further analysis:
 1. Park concessions should be analyzed to determine whether they offer the right mix and location to optimize revenues. (?)
 2. User fees for special events in the park should be analyzed for possible increases.
 3. Private special events that raise funds for non-profit organizations should be limited to Park organizations.
 4. Although non-profit institutions are under financial constraints, the following avenues should be explored:
 - a. Increasing lease fees or adding entrance surcharges to help manage and improve the Park beyond leaseholds.
 - b. Increasing maintenance responsibility.
 - c. As contracts come-up for renewal ways to optimizes revenues for the Park should be considered.
- K. Dozens of Friends of Canyons groups have been formed around San Diego in the last ten years, to assist the City and County in maintaining the region's urban canyons. A "Canyon Friends" group has not yet been created in Balboa Park. These groups could augment Park and Recreation staff by contributing hours for restoration and enhancement of natural resources in the park. (3)
- L. Some parts of the Park are underutilized or vacant. It is unclear if this is a management, financial or political problem.

III. Conclusions reached in answering Question 2

- A. Although the organizations and institutions mentioned above provide some funds and are a rich source of cultural and recreational programming, they cannot meet the Park's programming and infrastructure needs entirely.
- B. Passive park use has been undervalued and since there is no obvious lobbying group to protect this resource, the push to increase revenues will put what is left of these areas at risk.
- C. Balboa Park is a regional asset and financial support from the County of San Diego seems like an obvious conclusion. A Joint Use Agreement between the City and County of San Diego may not be feasible at this time due to financial and political impediments. However, the Board of Supervisors' participation in funding and managing the park is strongly encouraged. The County should be welcomed into any further discussions as to the future of Balboa Park in terms of both funding and management.
- D. Efforts should be made to find a way to simplify, make more efficient and optimize fund raising efforts for the Park (see Question 3).
- E. The search for increased funding for Balboa Park should not overshadow the mandate to provide "free and open parklands". A process must be put into place to protect and enhance this precious resource and make sure that the "park" remains a park. (4)

IV. Direct Response to Question 2

- A. The City of San Diego should not act alone in financing and operating Balboa Park.
- B. As stated in the Land Use, Parking and Circulation Study "The Park's challenge today is balance: balancing all of the many facets that are Balboa Park and merging them into the unique place that has served the City of San Diego for over a century" (7)
- C. In addition, there must be a balance between the current critical financial needs and the need to maintain what the public loves about Balboa Park. It is clear that what makes the Park complex and challenging is also what makes it magical.

V. Recommendations

- A. The City should build on its current and numerous partnerships to (5, 6):
 - 1. Build trust with existing partners
 - 2. Identify new partnerships
 - 3. Increase private donations

4. Create new sources of revenue
 5. Provide a process that ensures donations for projects and services match the priorities of the park.
 6. Provide better planning for Balboa Park, taking into consideration the needs of the adjacent neighborhoods and the region. This should include a discussion of the "limits to growth" for the Park.
- B. An analysis should be conducted to see if Park area-use changes could benefit the Park as a whole. These changes could provide new sources of revenue or enhanced opportunities for use by the public.

VI. Supporting Documentation

- A. *Soul of San Diego, Keeping Balboa Park Magnificent in the Second Century*, January 2008, Appendix 1
Footnote #1 Summary of Studies, pages 6 - 7
Footnote#2 Figure 9, Origin of Visitors, page 43
- B. Balboa Park Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study: Implementation Strategies, November 4, 2004
Footnote#5 Principle Six: Distribute Costs and Benefits Fairly, page 23
Footnote#6 Implementation Strategies, pgs 96-100
Footnote#7 Introduction, page 8
- C. *Canyonlands: The Creation of a San Diego Regional Canyonlands Park: A White Paper* March 15, 2006
Footnote#3, San Diego Civic Solutions
- D. Balboa Park Master Plan, page 7
Footnote #4

Balboa Park Committee

Answering Question # 3

If the City wishes to expand management and governance of the park, what are the alternatives for it to do so?

I. Introduction

The Park and Recreation Department does an admirable job of managing Balboa Park, especially considering the deep cuts made by the City of San Diego in recent years that have lead to diminished resources and ever expanding responsibilities. However, after examining issues relating to Balboa Park, which have been revealed during these public hearings, as well as considering the strong aspects of other parks that have been studied, it is apparent there are many areas which could be optimized and improved in the Park's administration.

II. Observations

A. City Organization

1. There is no dedicated management oversight for Balboa Park.
 - a. The Deputy Director for Developed Regional Parks, in addition to Balboa Park management, has responsibility for numerous sites and therefore is not solely dedicated to Balboa Park. The duties of the position include large, complex areas such as Mission Bay Park and Presidio Hill, as well as citywide park maintenance.(1)
 - b. With this level of responsibility, it is difficult for Park staff to concentrate on anything other than immediate needs and funding issues. This forces staff into a reactive mode without time for proactive planning and execution of projects.
 - c. While the Park and Recreation Department has the primary oversight for the Park, several other City departments also control a variety of responsibilities/functions in the Park.
2. There is no library of critical Park documents that are easily accessible to the public, nor is there a comprehensive list of critical Park documents anywhere within the City. A library of documents would at a minimum include land use documents, planning reports, leases and special event applications.
3. Park planning and project execution needs improvement and streamlining:
 - a. Park planning is spread over two departments: the Park and Recreation Department and City Planning and Community Investment Department. There is no single source of contact.
 - b. Three different departments supervise projects within Balboa Park. This includes the departments mentioned above, along with Engineering and Capital Projects.
 - c. The planning and approval process is unclear, undocumented and never posted on the City's website, unlike the Development Services

Department, whose general processes for projects are well defined. It is frustrating for the public, leaseholders and organizations to obtain reliable information on how the process works.

- d. There is currently no process for the updating of Park-related land use documents in spite of the fact the Master Plan calls for updating them on a five-year cycle(2). There are elements in the existing plans that are clearly outdated and/or no longer appropriate with no prospect for being reviewed.
 - e. A process and policy needs to be defined that determines the limits to building expansion (vertically or horizontally) in the park.
 - f. No policy or process exists to protect our green spaces and urban forest resource. A "no net loss" policy that protects tree canopy, passive native habitats, active open space areas and public realm areas should be pursued. As an example, Forest Park in St. Louis has a defined commitment that if greenbelt is removed from the park it must be replaced somewhere else with in the park.
4. Project implementation and management should be a defined, driving force for the implementation of projects that are still viable and identified in adopted land use documents.
 5. Commitment by staff to the implementation of an identified project is sometimes lacking, possibly because there is a lack of staff and funds for implementation. A resolve to get things done is often exchanged for accepting the hurdles that prevent projects from getting done.
 6. Staff does not generally play the role of project cheerleader, consequently projects remain unrealized, heavily modified, over budget or only partially completed.
 7. Because no one person or group is identified to "work the problem," the current process relies on finding a staff person to reactively "fix the problem".

B. Decision Making Process

1. Decisions affecting Balboa Park are often influenced by larger political forces of the City or whatever is currently "politically correct". Political interests concerned with maintaining the "status quo" often stifle creative thinking and discourage and constrain boldness and innovation.
2. A specific park-centric, park-focused element is missing from the routine and long-term management decision-making process.
3. The general public has little or no voice in decision-making for "normal" park and recreation activities.
4. Park leases are inconsistent in ways that are confusing and inequitable. Further, these leases are managed by the City of San Diego's Real Estate Assets Department with little input from the public or Balboa Park

administration. The lack of routine and on-going communication between the staff of Park and Recreation and Real Estate Assets, while improved over the last two years, still causes problems for the institutions and other Park tenants as well as Park staff.

5. Specific policies and processes are in need of development, review and/or enhancement, taking into account the unique nature of Balboa Park. Some of the missing management policies include:
 - a. A clear public art policy and a process that enables artists to propose and implement work in a timely way to interact with the public or leverage current events.
 - b. A naming rights policy specific and clear to donors that balances the need for fundraising and recognition with the public ownership of the Park.
 - c. A strategy or process to optimize concessions in the park. An analysis should be done as this could increase park revenues and enhance the Park visitor experience. (3)
 - d. A "green" strategy. While there is some work being done, it isn't well organized which limits the vast opportunities for participation.
 - e. A safety plan and policies for the Park. When a project is identified, there is often no follow-up on its implementation.

6. Institutions are a critical part of the Park structure. Careful consideration should be given to the needs of current and future institutions. Important institutional issues:
 - a. Relationships between Park management and the existing institutions should continue to be enhanced and improved with a constant, open dialogue.
 - b. To keep the park viable, there should be consideration of how institutions are recruited, expand and grow; how they can keep up with changing taste and times. (*Vicki, I'm not sure we need this last phrase.*)
 - c. Nobody has time or *political immunity* (?) to review and create expectations of attendance and activities for existing institutions.

7. Relationships between Park management and communities adjacent to the park, while improved over the last few years, could still be enhanced. (4)
 - a. More analysis of community needs and interactions with the Park are needed and could benefit both.
 - b. There is no connection between the Park and community-based volunteer groups, such as the Friends of Canyon group, which could benefit the Park.

8. The relationship between Park management and the Balboa Navy Hospital, while cordial, could be improved, potentially leading to benefits for both.

9. There is not adequate commitment to the historic preservation of the Park or anyone with the clout to say "no" to proposed new projects that do not meet

the Secretary of Interior Standards for Historic Places, Structures and Districts. (5)

C. Operations

1. In an attempt to have the Park look and function well, the City staff have done such a good job of hiding the true condition of the Park that the public does not think there are any significant problems. This has unintended consequences. Due to dedicated Park staff's passion, the exact condition and needs of the Park are not obvious or easily understood. The general public, our political representatives and decision makers need to be educated on the shortfalls and needs of the Park.
2. At this time, a comprehensive report of the condition of the park does not exist. An annual "Needs Assessment" update of the condition of the park should be performed. This is done in other major urban parks around the country. The Report should address not only operations, management and maintenance costs as well as repair, protection and replacement costs, but also preservation, enhancement and expansion related to the implementation of adopted park plans.
3. An Annual "Operations Action Plan" should also be presented and made available to the public. The plan should include reasonable goals and projects that can be funded and completed during that year.
4. An annual "Project Status Plan" that shows the current status of all projects called for in adopted plans and studies should additionally be prepared.
5. No formal volunteer program exists for the public areas of the park.
 - a. A "Volunteer Coordination Plan" is needed.
 - b. Volunteer utilization could be effectively increased to the advantage of the Park.
 - c. Potential volunteers require a focused pursuit and strong organization that is currently unavailable.
6. Due to limited staff resources parking and traffic cannot be adequately managed. Although the Balboa Park Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study, (pg 88), recommends hiring a "Transportation Officer" to identify and implement programs that will mitigate problems in these areas, this position has never been funded.
7. Balboa Park does not do an adequate job of providing information and services to visitors who do not speak English. "The Soul of San Diego," Appendix 1, page 4, documents the significant number of visitors to the Park who preferred to take a survey in Spanish.
8. Balboa Park is not receiving suitable attention in some specific areas that would be expected or practiced in other "Great Parks".

- a. There is no cohesive group to focus on Balboa Park regarding the planning, funding and implementation of public art.
 - b. There is no organized process to create and/or recruit special events for the general public that are free and do not benefit any one issue or organization.
9. Development, both physical and cultural, tends to be in a limited area within the park while other areas continue to be used for inappropriate activities or not used at all.
10. The City of San Diego's Balboa Park Web site is underdeveloped (lacking basic and updated information; see City Planning and Community Investment sites) and therefore underutilized.
11. While Park and Recreation staff is very active in managing the plant life in the Park, there could be further maximization, organization and management of the horticultural resources in the Park.
12. An urban reforestation plan and implementation program is needed since the park tree canopy, diversity and health of the urban forest has been in a state of decline for many years.
13. As the population around the Park increases, the need for "open space" will be come increasingly valuable as it provides "breathing room" to our "paved and urbanized environment" and assists in the filtering of urban water runoff, which is also increasing. (6)
14. Accurate attendance numbers and facility usage figures are not kept; a better monitoring program of park use is needed. (7) Traffic counts, parking counts, park visitor attendance and revenues should all be tracked on an ongoing basis. This is important to understand user and park infrastructure needs and is considered a best practice for major parks.
15. Due to a consistent lack of proper staffing levels, management oversight of applicants using the Park for special events and other uses is a cause for concern. The lack of follow-through to ensure the applicant actually complied with the requirements of their contractual arrangements is troubling and could result in long-term damage to Park assets without anyone being accountable. This should be handled by a dedicated contract administrator, a position which is not currently funded.
16. There is likely duplication among the various City departments that provide services to the park. Without more detailed analysis this fact cannot be substantiated or disproved.

D. Finance

1. The Park is understaffed and trends are for more cutbacks, at least in the short run.

2. There is no financial plan for long term Park sustainability; therefore, the Park is subject to the economic variation that the City also endures. This lack of a financial plan also precludes "grand" planning for future projects and development, shifting the attention to immediate needs and maintenance.

3. Giving by private entities to the Park is often not optimized and the use of funds is not transparent.
 - a. Perception that dollars given to the City end up in the General Fund rather than spent on the Park discourages private donations.
 - b. There is a misperception that a donor cannot earmark a donation for a specific project or process.
 - c. It is believed that donors will give to the Park if they are assured their money is being spent for the intended purpose -- as many currently do with donations to Park institutions. There is no belief this will be true when giving money to the City.
 - d. It is a common problem among non-profits for donations to be earmarked only for specific projects, leaving little funding for operations.
 - i) Presently Balboa Park also receives little or no funding in this category.
 - ii) With a credible public relations and education/outreach program to the public, donors may be willing to contribute to a "Balboa Park Fund" as long as they have iron-clad assurances that their donations would be used solely to support Balboa Park.
 - e. The City has no public process/overview for reporting on funds donated to Balboa Park. This lack of transparency hinders individual donors and philanthropic organizations who want to be sure their funds are wisely spent.
 - f. There is a history of some philanthropic organizations in the Park taking singular credit for what was accomplished from multiple funding sources, both public and private.
 - g. No park staff is charged with assuring proper acknowledgment be provided to all contributors, including the City itself. The City of San Diego may have donated actual dollars or approved a bond and incurred the resulting costs associated with the indebtedness. It is important that proper credit be attributed for several reasons:
 - i) The impression this creates in the public's mind is that Balboa Park already receives large amounts of private funds, which is certainly not the case. In fact, most of the donations reported in the media are almost always to the institutions located in the Park, but not to the Park itself.
 - ii) Most City departments require that the City receive credit on all public documents when they contribute dollars or in-kind donations of materials and/or staff. It is not clear whether this doesn't happen in Balboa Park due to a lack of policy direction, or of manpower to assume this duty. It is also possible that staff and high-level decision makers fear alienating some donor(s).

- iii) The private sector is not solicited in any meaningful or consistent manner for additional funds to support the park.
 - iv) The unintended consequence is that donors and the general public think we do not need to implement a program that would bring significant funds to the Park.
- 4. There is currently no clear path for making donations directly to the Park.
- 5. There is duplication of efforts by non-profit organizations in the Park.
- 6. Long-term consistency provided by dedicated and accountable staff, trained to work with donors, would optimize and increase funding levels for the Park.
 - a. While every donor is important, this is critical for very large donors.
 - b. Hiring a Resource Development Officer was recommended in the Balboa Park Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study (8) to perform this function but to date the position has not been funded. This individual will ideally have a background and successful experience working with donors, including individual, corporate, and private trusts, as well as the media.
- 7. There is no annual statement of how much private funding comes to the Park.
- 8. Currently project-based donations are handled on a case-by-case basis. No formal management structure exists to administer and provide oversight to philanthropic organizations providing funding and services for public areas of the Park.
 - a. Process for choosing projects, especially major projects regardless of funding source, could be further optimized.
 - b. Identifying candidate projects has improved in the last year with P&R staff creating a priority list for some projects. While this is a step in the right direction there is a need to refine and expand process.
- 9. There is no annual analysis or implementation of full cost recovery for special events in Balboa Park; equations currently used do not include cost of cumulative impacts.

IV. Other Management Models

A. Definitions and Possible Application of Each Model for Balboa Park

- 1. Joint Powers Agreement (JPA)
 - a. Defines an agreement between two or more independent entities which consent to perform certain functions and/or take certain actions to reach one or more agreed upon goals. No power or authority is given up by any of the contracting parties, nor is any additional governing authority set up under this type of agreement.
 - b. The needs of Balboa Park cannot be met with this management model since it does not raise funds or manage.

2. Joint Powers Authority (JPA)
 - a. Defines a legal entity set up by agreement between two or more entities that creates an independent governing authority with specified powers to perform certain functions to achieve specific goals.
 - b. A JPA is not likely to be a priority for the Board Supervisors at this time; a substantial monetary commitment for consideration of a JPA for the Park would be required. Supervisor Roberts has said he will remain open to this concept if money becomes available and other more pressing issues, like the regional fire agency, are resolved.

3. Park District by Legislation
 - a. Defines an independent entity with its own governing board, which is created by an act of the California State legislature designating a defined geographic open space or Park and Recreation area. The legislation usually brings state funding with enactment.
 - b. Current state budget constraints suggest no such funds are available to create more of these types of park districts. In spite of being asked, no state legislator has stepped forward to be the Park's "angel".

4. Recreation and Park District by vote of affected property owners
 - a. A Recreation and Park District by vote would be an independent entity with its own appointed or elected directors; its funding – a special property tax surcharge--would require the approval of two-thirds of affected property owners, which is often difficult to achieve. (9).
 - b. No political will currently exists to get affected property owners to create a new district until city resolves their financial challenges.

5. Public-Private Partnership
 - a. A Public Private Partnership is created by a contractual agreement between a public agency (federal, state or local) and a private sector entity that can be drafted to insure that specific public concerns are addressed, and that restrictions are placed on the private partner to be sure that the public interest is served and protected. (10)
 - b. This is the model used by almost all cities cited in original study by the Center for City Park Excellence.
 - c. This model is already being used in the Park in that there are contracts between the City and institutions or organizations to manage, program and operate city owned structures and lands. This model has been used successfully for over half a century.(11)
 - d. Private non-profits are not necessarily bound by the Brown Act; however, language should be included in the contract between the parties that they will abide by the Brown Act.
 - e. This model is easier to change over time, not locked in. A contract can be easily modified to respond to changing needs or requirements in a straightforward manner.

(NOTE: Redevelopment as a governance model was never under consideration, but there was a request to look at the Great Park in Irvine, CA, which is a redevelopment area.)

B. Observations on Governance Models

1. No matter what model is chosen, the City needs to get the public to take more ownership of the care and funding of the Park as in other cities. The citizens in San Diego have tended to "let the City handle it". Public is unaware of the condition of the park or how the process works and, therefore, do not trust the process.
2. Most appointees to the Governing Boards of JPAs and Park Districts are legislators or appointed by defined legislators. For example, the Governor of California makes appointments to the Board of the San Diego River Conservancy (Park District). Very few members of the general public have a voice on these Boards. This can lead to a limited understanding of the needs of the resources and the public.
3. The JPA's and Park Districts in addition to their governing bodies all need to have Citizen's Advisory Committees and/or fundraising arms via 501c3s.
4. All governance models except the Public/Private Partnership would lock the implementation into whatever is written into the organizational founding document, legislative language or ballot language. To change them would require going back to the process that created them.
5. If the City works with a 501c3 via a contractual agreement, things can be changed or modified fairly easily versus other models. There is much more operational flexibility (BPC 6/5/08 discussion with Dorothy Leonard and Craig Adams) in a public benefit, nonprofit arm.
6. Under all the park models studied, fundraising was shown to increase.
7. The experiences of other great urban parks shows fundraising went up significantly, often in spite of other fundraising efforts by other institutions in these parks.
8. The three Foundations which funded "The Soul of San Diego" study, believe the fundraising potential is here in San Diego and beyond, and that the funding of the institutions and the Park itself are not mutually exclusive. (12)
9. Since all JPAs and Park Districts require a Citizen Action Committee or a 501c3, and are fairly onerous to set up, it seems best to start with the least complicated and more flexible option.
10. Starting with the creation of a City / Public / Business/Community Partnership does not in any way preclude creating a JPA or Park District at a latter time.

11. According to the Keston Institute in "*The Soul of San Diego*," without resolving the underlying management and governance issues identified in Balboa Park, any attempt to raise funds will fail. *(need footnote here)*

V. Direct Response to Question 3

- A. The current fund-raising capabilities, management and governance structure for Balboa Park are inadequate.
- B. The City should retain ultimate authority over the Park, including park policies and land-use decisions. Further, the City should assure the public that Balboa Park will remain a public park in perpetuity and that privatization will never be allowed.
- C. The City of San Diego should maintain funding for Balboa Park at the current (at a minimum) or prior (which ever is higher) level of funding for the Park. (13)
- D. Fundraising, management and governance should be expanded through the creation of a new, non-profit public benefit charity, similar to other major park conservancies examined in the first study by the Center for City Park Excellence. There are many options for creating and implementing such an entity, which would operate with the City in a Public-Private Partnership model as described above.

VI. Recommendations

- A. It was beyond the scope of work for the Balboa Park Committee to specify the particulars of a new charity. How this recommendation will be implemented should be the focus of a second phase of study. Issues that will need to be further investigated include, but are not limited to:
 1. How to resolve the fact that different skill sets are needed for fundraising, versus management and governance.
 2. Setting priorities for initial and subsequent tasks.
 3. How to ensure that a cross section of the general public representing the diversity of the region and Park stakeholders is included in the new organization.
- B. Start with the addition of management functions that don't currently doesn't exist within the current management structure of Balboa Park.
- C. A contractually defined agreement should specify the partnership roles and restrictions between the City of San Diego and the new 501C3 non-profit public benefit entity to insure the public interest is served and protected.

- D. As the new organization expands and focuses solely on the management, governance and fundraising for Balboa Park, it should be supported and protected from undue political influences.
- E. The new non-profit must respect the existing values that the public places on established land use, historic and environmental resources. They should take a leadership role in developing policy and a process that further clarifies community values and takes into account the unique nature of Balboa Park. This entity will value all donations including, but not limited to, in-kind, time and money.
- E. The Board of Directors of the non-profit should not serve as representatives of any one constituency, but rather serve for the equitable, collective benefit of all of Balboa Park.
- F. Regularly scheduled audits of the non-profit should be conducted no less than once a year. An Annual Report with financial data along with the audit will be made public. IRS reporting documents will be made easily assessable to interested parties.
- G. This new non-profit should follow steps that have worked successfully at similar large-urban parks studied, augmented by a process that is unique to San Diego and Balboa Park. This entity would focus on the public areas of the Park, but responsibility could be expanded at a later date if needed.
- H. The Public/Private Partnership governance model should be grown in an organic way, a process that has proven to be successful in other major city parks.. Successful partnerships between Cities, the Public and the Business Community which were studied, all followed this model successfully.
- I. Prior to changing management and/or governance, existing Park and Recreation/City functions in the Park need to be further clarified. *(This may have already been stated elsewhere.)*
- J. The BPC recommends the following initial tasks for the new 501c3:
 - 1. Commission reports/studies of the following.
 - a. Comprehensive conditions report of Balboa Park,
 - b. A reporting of actual funds coming into the Park for management, operations and capital improvement projects.
 - c. A study to ascertain the real cost to run the Park
 - 2. Engage the public in a review, and if necessary an update to Balboa Park's Land Use Documents. This would include a Precise Plan for the West Mesa.
 - 3. Create a financing plan
 - 4. Create a priority list of projects for the park; this process would not preclude an individual making a donation for a specific project not currently identified in this or future priority lists.

- 5. Develop a Resource Management Program to manage fundraising and people who want to donate their time to park projects and facilities. (8)
- K. As management responsibilities are added to the non-profit entity begin with the addition of management functions that don't currently exist within the current administrative structure of Balboa Park.
- L. If Balboa Park management is changed or expanded, additional responsibility should be assigned incrementally as success is demonstrated. By increasing in this way, if the new entity fails City staff should have limited consequences.
- M. Additional management responsibility should only be added in proportion to funds raised for this function.

VII. Supporting Documentation

A. All the documents listed in the Bibliography: Table of Contents, Documents Reviewed by the Balboa Park Committee, sections below were used in answering Question 3

- 1. Section V Governance &/or Funding Models for Parks Outside San Diego
- 2. Section VI Parks in the San Diego Regions: Conservancies, Foundations, Citizen Advisory Committees Joint Powers Authorities or Joint Powers Agreements
- 3. Section IX Organizational Structure

B. Documents specifically cited in this report include:

Footnote #1 Section IX Organizational Structure #10, P&R Chart

Balboa Park Master Plan

- #2 Plan Amendments, Page 11
- #4 Neighboring Communities, Page 11
- #5 Historic Preservation, Page 10
- #13 Maintenance of Effort, Page 11

Balboa Park Land Use, Circulation and Parking

- #3 L15 Enhance food services and other concessions services, page 38
- #8 Resource Development Officer, page 88

#6 *Canyonlands: The Creation of a San Diego Regional Canyonlands Park*, San Diego Civic Solutions, March 15, 2006

#7 Harnik, Peter and Kimball, Amy *If You Don't Count, Your Park Won't Count* National Recreation and Park Association June 2005

The Soul of San Diego Keeping Balboa Park Magnificent in its Second Century, Harnik, Peter

- #9 "Questions Raised," Pg 16

- #10 Little, Richard et al, Appendix 3, The Keston Institute for Public Finance and Infrastructure Policy Options; and Opportunities: Management Paradigms for Balboa Park, December 2007, Pg 8.
- #11 Balboa Park Cultural Partnership
 - a. Member Profiles
 - b. Current Balboa Park Leases: Recognized Cultural Contributions
- #12 Philanthropy & Balboa Park: Speech by Peter Ellsworth, President, Legler Benbough Foundation to Balboa Park Committee August 21, 2008

Next Steps: Recommendations for setting up second phase process

1. The Mayor and Council of the City of San Diego will support a second phase of study on a potential change in the Management and Governance of Balboa Park. This would be followed by an implementation phase. The following are recommendations for the Second Phase.
2. Purpose: to further refine recommendations adopted by the Balboa Park Committee and to broaden public participation in the discussion and decision-making process.
3. Open-transparent public process
 - a. Follow tenets of the Brown Act
 - b. Public Comment must be solicited and encouraged
4. Second Phase Working Group Membership
 - a. Committee should be limited to a manageable number of members, more than 11 but less than 20. This number is based on size of typical City of San Diego advisory committees
 - b. Committee should consist of a cross section of stakeholders from inside and outside the park.
 - c. Committee should include individuals with expertise in a variety of subject areas specific to the task.
 - d. Committee should include individuals outside the geographic areas already represented by the Community Planning Committee members currently on the Balboa Park Committee
 - e. Among those areas of experience, representation or expertise that should be considered for appointment to the committee are individuals with the following experience or representation:
 - i. Balboa Park Committee – Current or prior member
 - ii. Balboa Park Cultural Partnership – Current or prior Institution Trustee or Executive Director
 - iii. Recreation or Recreation Council Experience
 - iv. Public Land Use Advocate
 - v. Public Parkland Advocate
 - vi. Experience as current or prior Park Lessees or User Groups
 - vii. Philanthropic Experience
 - viii. Experience with creating &/or running a Non-Profit
 - ix. Financial Management Experience
 - x. Legal Experience
 - xi. Mayoral Appointee
 - xii. District Three Councilmember Appointee
 - xiii. Board of Supervisor Roberts Appointee
 - xiv. City Staff Decision Maker (Preferably the Director of Park and Recreation Dept) – Should be a voting member

5. Since the first phase of the Study was conducted by an existing committee the need for staff assistance was minimal; this will not be true for the second phase.

This committee will be made up of people who have not worked together and will have a variety of backgrounds and experiences as they relate to Balboa Park and the City of San Diego bureaucracy. In order to successfully conclude the second phase in a timely manner it will need:

- a. A facilitator
 - b. A support person to staff the committee, take notes, keep the public record and make sure the public is noticed and engaged.
6. A site will need to be set up on the City of San Diego Website to include but not be limited to the following content:
 - a. Agendas
 - b. Minutes
 - c. Documents reviewed by the committee
 - d. Documents created by the committee
 - e. Pertinent Documents from the first phase of Study
 - f. Link(s) to Balboa Park Study webpage(s)
 7. Before suggesting changes to governance and management, there is a need to further clarify existing Park and Recreation Department and City functions, process and procedures used in Balboa Park.

Bibliography

Documents Reviewed by the Balboa Park Committee: Binder Table of Contents

I. Foundation Funded Study Documents

- *The Soul of San Diego: Keeping Balboa Park Magnificent in its Second Century* January 2008
- *Keeping Balboa Park Magnificent in its Second Century: A look at Management, Fundraising and Private Partnership at Five Other Major U.S. City Parks*, prepared by the Trust for Public Land, Center for City Park Excellence August 2006

II. Financial Misc

1. Recreation and Park District Law State of California Public Resources Code, Section 5780-5700.9
2. FY05 Park and Recreation Department Revised Fee Schedule Effective 7/1/04
3. Balboa/Mission Bay Improvement
4. Mission Bay Improvements Fund
5. Regional Park Improvement Fund
 - a. Fund Amount Allocations to Balboa Park FY 07-09
6. Environmental Growth Fund Report 07-073 April 24, 2007
7. Memorandum to Councilmember Jim Madaffer from Donald Steele January 30, 2002 Regarding the Environmental Growth Fund: Revenue & Budget Issues
8. Manager's Report No 03-029: Refunding of 1993 Lease Revenue Bonds (Old Town Trolley Extension) and 1993 Certificate of Participation (Balboa Park and Mission Bay Park Improvements) Date Issues: February 27, 2006 City Council Docket March 3, 2003
9. Manager's Report No. 03-180 to Mayor and City Council Refunding of the San Diego Open Space Park Facilities District No. 1 General Obligation Bonds Refunding Series 1994
10. Letter from Park and Recreation Director to Mr. Robert Lynch February 20, 2008 Regarding Tideland Report
11. City of San Diego FY 2007 Summary Revenue and Expense Report for Mission Bay and Coastal Tidelands
12. Statement of Work Baseline Study, Burgett/Granowitz 2007
13. San Diego Unified Port District February 13, 2007 Agenda Item 18 Resolution Amending Board of Port Commissioners (BPC) Policy 452, Permit Fees for the use of the District's Public Parks, Changing the Fees for Special Event Permits
14. Grants and Gifts Business Process Reengineering
 - a. June 4, 2008 City Council Report No: 08-075
 - b. June 5, 2008 IBA Report No: 08-62
15. Real Estate Assets Dept Handout July 24, 2008 Balboa Park Committee meeting
16. Philanthropy & Balboa Park: Speech by Peter Ellsworth President Legler Benbough Foundation to Balboa Park Committee August 21, 2008

III. Financial TOT

1. San Diego Municipal Code Article 2: Administrative Code, Division 2: The City Manager 22.0201-22-0229
2. San Diego Municipal Code Article 5: Transient Occupancy Tax, Division 1: Transient Occupancy Tax 35.0101-35.0138
3. City of San Diego Council Policy Transient Occupancy Tax Policy No. 100-03 Effective Date September 12, 2005
4. Special Promotional Programs FY02 Budget
5. Special Promotional Programs FY03 Budget
6. FY 04 and FY 05 City Budget Special Promotional Allocation Comparison Chart
7. Proposed Amendment to the Municipal Code Regarding Allocation of TOT
 - a. June 12, 2008 IBA Report No: 08-64 to the Budget Committee

IV. City of San Diego Budget Documents

1. Mayor Sanders Town Hall Meeting Schedule on the FY 2009 Budget
2. Mayor Sander's Town Hall Meeting Fact Sheet, The Mayor's FY 09 City Budget *Sanders Delivers \$3.2 Billion Budget for FY 09 Protecting Care Services, Public Safety and Reforms*
3. *Mayor Sanders Set To Secure \$103 Million In Funding To Address Back Log Of Deferred Maintenance* Fact Sheet March 28, 2008
4. April 8, 2008 Budget
5. Independent Budget Analyst Report 08-44 Discussion of Park and Recreation and Library Budgets as Proposed in the Mayor's Fiscal Year 2009 Proposed Budget Date Issued May 13, 2008, for Budget Review Committee May 14, 2008
6. Park and Recreation Department Review Office of the Independent Budget Analyst April 2008 Pages 173-177
7. Park and Recreation Department FY 09 Proposed Budget April 30, 2008 Power Point Presentation
8. FY 2009 Proposed Budget Park and Recreation Department Park and Recreation Board Meeting April 17, 2008
9. Balboa Park Committee Meeting May 1, 2008 City of San Diego FY 2009 Proposed Budget Park and Recreation Department Power Point Presentation
10. Balboa Park Committee: Park and Recreation Department's Proposed FY 09 Budget Presentation May 1, 2008
11. City of San Diego Memorandum Balboa Park Infrastructure Needs April 6, 2006 to Ted Medina Director Park and Recreation Department from April Pendera, Deputy Director Park and Recreation Department
12. Budget Workgroup Report on The Park and Recreation Department April 2002
13. Final Position Reductions in the FY 09 Park & Recreation Budget, June 26, 2008
14. FY 07 Balboa Park Culture-Recreation
15. FY 07 Balboa Park Maintenance
16. FY 08 Balboa Park Culture-Recreation
17. FY 08 Balboa Park Maintenance
18. FY 09 Balboa Park Culture-Recreation
19. FY 09 Balboa Park Maintenance
20. FY 09 Proposed Mid Year Reductions for Park and Recreation Department, Stacey LoMedico, Park and Recreation Director, November 5, 2008

21. Report to City Council, Fiscal Year 2009 Budget Amendment Report, #08-166 Revised, Mary Lewis Chief Financial Officer and Jay Goldstone Chief Operating Officer, November 12, 2008 City Council Budget and Finance Committee
22. Washburn, David, voiceofsandiego.org Tough Choices: Questions for Stacey LoMedico November 9, 2008

V. Governance &/or Funding Models for Parks Outside San Diego

1. Central Park Conservancy Information from www.centralparknyc.org/aboutcpc/cpc-history/ata glance
 - a. Memorandum of Understanding
 - b. CPC Contract April 28, 2006
 - c. Central Park Conservancy By-Laws
 - d. Best Practices
 - e. A Model for Public Private Partnerships
 - f. Conservancy at a glance
 - g. Public Private Partnership
 - h. Career and volunteer opportunities
 - i. Blonsky, Douglas, *Saving the Park: A key to NYC's Revival*, New York Post Saving the Park, November 3, 2007
 - j. Hewett, Heather *Central Park reshaped a city's mindset*, The Christian Science Monitor www.csmonitor.com May 29, 2003
 - k. Who Owns Central Park? How Frederick Law Olmsted's 843 acres of civilizing wilderness became a type-A battleground. New York: the Summer Issue 2008 <http://nymag.com/guides/summer/2008/47976>
2. New Yorkers For Parks: www.ny4p.org/
 - a. *Making The Most of Our Parks*: Citizens Budget Commission June 2007
 - b. *Comparative Park Management Models*
3. Forest Park Forever Information from www.forestparkforever.org
4. Forest Park Forever Inc Articles of Incorporation
5. Forest Park Forever Inc By-Laws
6. Forest Park City of St Lewis Department of Parks, Recreation & Forestry
 - a. Information Fact Sheet
 - b. Forest Park Master Plan www.stLouis.missouri.org/citygov/parks
7. Great Park Orange County Information from www.ocgp.org (TBD)
 - a. Bylaws of Orange County Great Park Corp
 - b. Orange County Great Park Development Agreement Pgs 1-38
 - c. January 28, 2003 Press Release: City of Irvine Announces Funding Plan for Orange County Great Park
8. Great Park Conservancy from www.orangecountygreatpark.org (TBD)
9. visit-Louisville.com Information & Timeline from www.louisville-waterfront-park.visit-louisville.com/
10. Piedmont Park Conservancy Information & Master Plan from www.piedmontpark.org/conservancy/mission/
11. Pittsburgh Park's Conservancy: www.pittsburghparks.org/
 - a. Pittsburgh's Regional Park's Master Plan, Parts 1 & 2
 - b. Pittsburgh Parks Conservancy: The Voice Spring 2008

VI. Parks in the San Diego Regions: Conservancies, Foundations, Citizen Advisory Committees Joint Powers Authorities or Joint Powers Agreements

1. Mission Trails Regional Park: www.mtrp.org
 - a. Mission Trails Regional Park Foundation Master Agreement Recitals with the City of San Diego July 30, 1991 Document No. RR-278444-1
 - b. Mission Trails Regional Park Foundation Agreement Recitals July 30, 1991 Document No. RR-278444-2
 - c. Mission Trails Regional Park Overview Mission Trails Regional Park Citizens Advisory Committee, Task Force and Foundation
 - d. Foundation Overview
 - e. Donor Opportunities
 - f. Master Development Plan 1985 Section IV. Overall Master Plan: Objectives
 - g. Draft Master Development Plan 2008 Section I. History Of The Park: Origins of Mission Trails Regional Park
2. Otay Valley Regional Park: www.ovrp.org
 - a. JPA Agreement,
 - b. Policy Committee & Joint Staff Members
 - c. Citizens Advisory Committee Guidelines
3. San Diego River Park Conservancy
 - a. San Diego River Conservancy Act: Public Resources Code, Division 22.9
 - b. Governing Board
 - c. "Who Are We"
 - d. Five Year Strategic And Infrastructure Plan 2006-2011: Adopted March 24, 2006
4. San Diego River Park Foundation
 - a. History
 - b. San Diego River Coalition
 - c. Conceptual Plan Abstract & Table of Contents
 - i. Project Orientation: Vision, Goals, Issues...
5. San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority: www.sdrp.org
 - a. San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority Agreement
 - b. Revenues/Expenditure/Accomplishments 1989-2004 Prepared by San Dieguito River Park Staff
6. San Dieguito River Valley Conservancy: www.sdrvc.org
 - a. 20 Years of Conservancy Results
 - b. Excerpts from website

VII. City of San Diego Policies

1. CP 000-4 Code of Ethics 2002 Version
2. CP 000-13 Procedure for Mayor & Council Appointments
3. CP 000-16 Open Meetings
4. CP 000-21 Submission of Ballot Proposals
5. CP 000-40 Marketing Partnership
6. CP 100-02 City Receipt of Donations* Pulled currently being updated. New version should be ready within 60 days.
7. CP 100-03 Transient Occupancy Tax

- 8. CP 100-5 Fees – Public Notification
- 9. CP 100-06 Special Events (Parades)
- 10. CP 200-13 Maintenance (City Owned) Public Facilities-Buildings
- 11. CP 200-14 Park & Recreation Facility Landscape Design
- 12. CP 200-15 Valet Parking and passenger loading zone policy
- 13. CP 300-01 Utilization of Volunteers
- 14. CP 600-13 Park Development Project Notification Process
- 15. CP 700-03 Use of City-Owned Land by Youth Sports Organizations
- 16. CP 700-04 Balboa Park Use & Occupancy
- 17. CP 700-07 Park Development by Non-City Funds
- 18. CP 700-12 Disposition of City Property to Nonprofit Organizations
- 19. CP 700-13 Capital Improvements Program for Park & Recreation Facilities
- 20. CP 700-19 City Participation in Construction of Buildings for Cultural Institutions
- 21. CP 700-24 Balboa Park Architectural Standards
- 22. CP 700-41 Use of the RFP Process for Lease of City-Owned Land
- 23. CP 700-42 Recreation Councils 2005 Version

VIII. City of San Diego Municipal Codes & City Charter Sections

- 1. Municipal Code
 - a. Chapter 2 Government
 - i. Article 2, Division 2 Administrative Code: the City Manager
 - ii. Article 2, Division 40 Special Events
 - iii. Article 6, Division 0 Formation of Park and Recreation Board, Balboa Park and Mission Bay Park Committees
 - b. Chapter 6 Public Works and Property Public Improvement and Assessment Proceeding
 - i. Article 3, Division 03-04.1 Public Parks, Playground: Use of Playgrounds and Recreation Areas
 - ii. Article 3, Division 0 Utilization of the Environmental Growth Fund
- 2. City Charter
 - a. Article V Executive and Administrative Sections
 - i. Section 42 Membership Selection
 - ii. Section 43 Advisory Boards and Committees
 - iii. Section 55 Park and Recreation
 - b. Article VII Finance Sections
 - i. Section 76.1: Special Taxes
 - ii. Section 77 Capital Outlay Fund
 - iii. Section 77a Provisions for Zoological Exhibits
 - iv. Section 103.1a Environmental Growth Fund
 - c. Proposed Amendment Section 55 City Attorney John Witt February 7, 1992

IX Organizational Structure

- 1. BPC-Balboa Park Draft Organization Chart & Index
- 2. Balboa Park Trust Endowment Funds

3. City of San Diego Organization Chart
4. Land Use & Economic Development
5. City Planning and Community Investment Organization
6. Public Works
7. Community & Legislative Services
8. Business Operations/Administration
9. CFO/Finance Department
10. Park and Recreation Department Organization Chart
11. Balboa Park Cultural Partnership Draft Organization Chart
12. Central Park Conservancy Organization Chart
13. Dallas City Organization Chart Updated 06-06-08
14. Dallas City Park & Recreation Organization Chart August 08
15. Overview of Decision Making Process for Proposed Projects in Balboa Park, May 10, 2007
16. Historic Resource Board/Staff Review Process for Buildings at least 45 Years Old
17. Review Process for Designated Historical Resources and Districts
18. City of San Diego Memorandum September 6, 2002 to the Mayor and City Council from Ellen Oppenheim, Park and Recreation Director Subject Park and Recreation Department Reorganization

X Misc

1. Park Districts
 - a. California Public Resource Code 5780-5780.9
 - b. San Diego River Conservancy
 - i. CA Senate Bill No. 419, Chapter 646 October 13, 2007.
 - ii. CA Senate Bill No 419 Current Bill Status June 16, 2008
 - iii. CA Public Resources Code Section 32630-32632
 - iv. Senate Bill 1428 20080808 Amended ASN V961
2. Balboa Park Cultural Partnership
 - a. Member Profiles
 - b. Current Balboa Park Leases: Recognized Cultural Contributions
3. From Dumps to Destinations: The Conversion of Landfills to Parks, The Trust For Public Lands: www.tpl.org/
4. Piller, Charles and Smith, Doug *For-profit fundraisers collect loads, but nonprofits see a sliver: The problem affects charities large and small, and causes including child and animal welfare, health research and opposition to drunk driving* Los Angeles Times July 6, 2008
5. Rice, Janice *Association of Fundraising Professionals Responds to LA Times Report on Fundraising Inefficiencies* July 14, 2008 Taken from AFP website: http://www.afpnet.org/ka/ka-3.cfm?content_item_id=24583&folder_id=2545
6. Trust for Public Land's, *How Much Value Does the City of San Diego Receive from its Park and Recreation System?* April 24, 2008
7. Park & Recreation Right of Entry – Copy August 2008
8. Balboa Park Preferential Non-Exclusive Use & Occupancy & Special Use Permits
9. Harnik, Peter and Kimball, Amy *If You Don't Count, Your Park Won't Count* National Recreation and Park Association June 2005

Additional Land Use Documents Not in Binders or Included Above.

1. City of San Diego General Plan 2008
2. Balboa Park Land Use, Circulation and Parking Study 2004
3. Balboa Park Master Plan Prepared by Estrada Land Planning Inc, City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department & City of San Diego Planning Department Adopted July 25, 1989
4. Balboa Park Central Mesa Precise Plan
5. Balboa Park East Mesa Precise Plan 1993
6. Canyonlands The Creation of a San Diego Regional Canyonlands Park, San Diego Civic Solutions March 15, 2006