

**NOTES
OF THE MONDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2009 MEETING**

**BALBOA PARK TASK FORCE (BPTF) ON THE
FUTURE OF BALBOA PARK: FUND RAISING, MANAGEMENT & GOVERNANCE**

Meeting held at:

Balboa Park Club, Santa Fe Room
2150 Pan American Road
San Diego, CA 92101

Mailing address is:

Balboa Park Administration
2125 Park Boulevard MS39
San Diego, CA 92101-4792

ATTENDANCE

Members Present

Vicki Granowitz Chair of BPTF	Dale Hess
Ron Buckley	Chuck Hellerich
Laurie Burgett	John Lomac
Bruce Coons	Paul Meyer
Ray Ellis	Gonzalo Rojas
Aurelia Flores	Dalouge Smith
	Judy Swink

Members Absent

Robert (Bob) Ames Vice Chair
Carol Chang
Berit Durler
Dea Hurston

Staff Present

Beth Swersie (note-taker)

CALL TO ORDER

- Chairperson Granowitz called the meeting to order at 6:01 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

- Councilmember Todd Gloria thanked the members for their participation on the Task Force and spoke of bringing more focus, participation and resources to a community vision of the Park. He acknowledged the continuing efforts of Chairperson Granowitz.
- CM Gloria introduced his representative to Balboa Park, Stephen Hill.

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT – Vicki Granowitz

- Chairperson (CP) Granowitz reminded attendees and participants that these meetings are public and subject to Brown Act (BA) requirements of notification and open meetings.
- The CP assured attendees that the Balboa Park Committee (BPC) and the Balboa Park Task Force (BPTF) are not recommending privatization of the Park; that is not an option. The city will retain control over the Park and its policies.
- The BPTF is advisory to the Mayor and City Council.
- There will be many opportunities for the public to make comments.
- The BPTF's package of information includes a sheet on access to open meetings and the Brown Act: see pages 1 to 7 of www.firstamendmentcoalition.org/Brown_Act.pdf.
- Agendas will be posted 72 hrs in advance on the TF website:
<http://www.sandiego.gov/Park-and-recreation/general-info/bptf.shtml>.

- The CP will enforce limits on discussions – no cross-talk or side conversations (which may violate BA). TF members should not use Reply All to email communication from the CP.
- CP will keep TF discussion on topic, and the TF will avoid discussions that are project-specific or beyond its scope.

WORKSHOP ITEMS

1. TF Members introduced themselves, describing their occupation/volunteer experience, their experience, representation or expertise consistent with areas identified in Balboa Park Committee Report on the Future of Balboa Park, Section 6, pg 26, and their connection to Balboa Park. See <http://www.sandiego.gov/Park-and-recreation/pdf/091012bptaskforce.pdf>.
2. BPTF Background Materials are available at <http://www.sandiego.gov/Park-and-recreation/general-info/brc.shtml>.
 - Timeline of Study of Balboa Park’s Fundraising, Management and Governance, October 19, 2009
 - Keeping Balboa Park Magnificent in its Second Century – A Look at Management, Fundraising, and Private Partnerships at Five Other Major U.S. City Parks, August, 2006
 - [Soul of San Diego: Keeping Balboa Park Magnificent in its Second Century - Draft, January, 2008](#)
 - [Balboa Park Cultural Partnership, Helping to build the framework for the successful governance of Balboa Park, presented to the Balboa Park Committee October 16, 2008](#)
 - [The Future of Balboa Park: Funding, Management & Governance, adopted December 18, 2008](#)
 - BPTF Outline
 - Unofficial Balboa Park Organizational Chart
 - Determining the Baseline for Balboa Park: Statement of Work
3. The CP outlined “how we got here”, tracing the process that began in 1998/9 with concerns about roads in public canyons and the Zoo’s plans to expand further into Balboa Park, and culminated most recently in December 2008 with the BPC report The Future of Balboa Park: Funding, Management & Governance. This report recommended a second phase of its effort which is tasked to “lead to the creation of a new public benefit entity, delineate responsibilities and obligations assigned to the City and to the new entity, and broaden public participation in the discussion and decision-making process”.
4. The TF reviewed its Mission Statement:

“With appropriate public input and consideration, the Balboa Park Task Force mission shall be to make determinations and recommendations to the Mayor and City Council on:

 - **How a new, public benefit non-profit entity ("New Entity") should be structured to work most effectively in a contractually defined public-private partnership with the City to provide effective Park governance, management and fundraising opportunities.**
 - **Which City Charter, Municipal Code, Policies and Procedures provisions may need to be amended to implement the recommended public-private partnership, with suggestions on possible amendments.**

- **What actions will be necessary to create the new entity, determine the membership of the initial Board of Directors and implement the BPC recommendation, as summarized above.”**

5. Chuck Hellerich of the Balboa Park Cultural Partnership (BPCP) described the process behind the BPCP’s report on “Helping to build the framework for the successful governance of Balboa Park”, which was presented to the Balboa Park Committee October 16, 2008.

The BPCP established a task force of 20 stakeholders in the Park (trustees and some EDs of Park institutions). Its focus was on what is needed for Park as whole. The starting point of their discussion was the set of questions raised in the Soul of San Diego report, made available to the community by the Legler Benbough Foundation, the Parker Foundation and the San Diego Foundation. Issues include the lack of city funds, the lack of clarity regarding authority in the management of the Park and the lack of perception in the general community that there are problems in the Park. The BPCP concluded that there is a need for a new system of governance, management and fundraising for the Park. The report noted several alternatives for more board-based management and governance of the Park: Public Private Partnership (PPP), Joint Powers Agreements (JPA), or a new governing structure.

The BPCP has pledged its support to do what is necessary to support a new governance, management, and funding structure for Park. Its key conclusions were:

- That BP is a local and regional asset and its ownership should always be public.
- The city should continue to operate the Park, but lots can be done to consolidate and streamline management structure.
- A “PPP” is the best structure for this purpose, especially for the funding side. A Non-Profit Public Benefit Entity (PBE) with tax-exempt status would allow for tax-deductible donations.
- The composition of the governing board should reflect the diversity of the stakeholders and users of the Park, and its members should serve for the collective benefit of Park as whole.
- The working relationship between this group and the city will need to evolve over time – start small, build partnerships.
- Capital improvement campaigns and general fundraising efforts should be collaborative.
- Encourage continuation of planning effort, then implementation phase. Mantra: public process.

The CP noted that it is obvious that the city can’t pay for all the deferred maintenance and needed improvements and hasn’t been the only source of funding for buildings and improvements; the park’s institutions and various non-profits have provided assistance as well. Existing leases will be managed as they have been. We are focusing on public areas of Park.

Suggestions were made to bring in Park staff and the City Attorney’s office to get their opinions on issues related to creating a PPP, advise the TF if necessary and to familiarize TF members with municipal code, council policy and procedures and to identify policies that are candidates for change and offer draft versions of changes. Some TF members mentioned that the City enters into PPPs on a regular basis and thought it was unnecessary at this time to get an opinion from the City Attorney. Additionally the

Balboa Park Committee did a review of Council Policies, the Municipal Code and the City Charter and found no impediments; however the BPTF needs to re-review these documents.

It is possible that a consultant and/or legal expertise may be needed to implement the PPP arrangement, but the TF can accomplish its immediate mission without engaging consultants. The Mayor and Council want guidance regarding the composition and framework of the new entity and the changes in policy and codes that may be needed. The TF should not hamstring the new entity with too much detail. The Council District (Three) may be able to offer assistance.

The entity will be independent, but with contractual arrangement w/City, similar to the Mission Trails organization. The entity will work in parallel with City and help with those functions that the city doesn't do.

6. The TF reviewed its Mission Statement and raised some questions:
 - Can we rephrase the statement and/or state it more succinctly? The CP suggested that the TF leave the mission statement as it is, but that it might edit the scope of work and the deliverables to be more clear.
 - Are we being asked to clean up the organizational chart of the Park? Or to insert new entity into it? The CP said that the org chart is not to be fixed – it just shows problems.
 - What will a new entity do that city is not able to do? Existing non-profits serve their own interests, and it is hoped they will work with new entity. The new entity will not be an umbrella, but a coalition.
 - What will the constituent parts of the new entity be, and what will be its principal function? Should we reach out to other constituents – e.g. other government agencies?
7. The TF discussed some procedural questions:
 - What do we do if we have qs or ideas to discuss? The CP responded that they should be sent to her a week in advance of a BPTF meeting so they can be included in the Agenda as to meet Brown Act 72 hour notice rules.
 - Suggestions regarding deliverables should be sent to the CP.
 - Subcommittees can meet to put together materials for distribution (as long as there are fewer participants than a quorum of the TF).
 - The general public will have access through materials placed online, except for internal work product.
 - Will there be support to help us with questions re entity structure? The CP responded that the three supporting foundations have been and will continue to be helpful, and that the TF has the some analysis in the materials on the CD including a critique provided by New Yorkers for Parks (NYC) and will be receiving an a report by the Trust for Public Lands which will look at the structures in place at five major U.S. city parks.
8. The TF discussed deliverables:
 - The new entity must have abilities and strategies to implement strong fundraising. Should one of the deliverables deal with existing entities and new entities to generate kind of fund-raising that is necessary?
 - The CP suggested that we can come up with questions for next phase. For example: the Tourism/Marketing District was established by a similar process: first a task

force, then a transitional board, then the current setup. It is not necessary to solve all of it now.

- Part of the mission is to set up an entity that the public will be comfortable with for fundraising, but there will also be questions of management and governance. It will be necessary to discuss extensively what stays with the city and what the new entity will do.

9. Recommendations for tasks for next meeting:

- The CP will send out an email about subcommittees that we should have and poll members about which they want to be on. Get it ready to go after discussion at next mtg.

10. Miscellaneous discussion:

- The CP defined “management” as the relationship between the city and new entity, who’s in charge, and what are tasks for new entity; “governance” as the relationships among organizations in the Park.
- The intent is for the PPP to be concerned with everything outside of current contracts and leaseholds, but it can make recommendations for changes in future leases.
- The CP said that the new entity is to deal with what doesn’t work now. The City is expected to continue to fund at current level (at a minimum).
- Retired city employee Janet Wood found whatever was available – that became the “conditions report” that is in The Soul of SD.
- Management and governance will have to be discussed at length – consider whether these are appropriate for new entity. The City’s continued role in land use decisions via the BPC is to be maintained.

ADJOURNMENT

- Chairperson Granowitz adjourned the meeting to order at 8:28 p.m.

Next Balboa Park Task Force Meeting:

6:00 P.M. on Monday, November 16, 2009

Balboa Park Club Santa Fe Room

San Diego, CA 92101

For more information please contact:

Vicki Granowitz, Chair of the Balboa Park Task Force at (619) 584-1203