

**NOTES
OF THE MONDAY, DECEMBER 21, 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 Dea Hurston arrives 6:27
Robert (Bob) Ames, Vice Chair	John Lomac
Ron Buckley	Paul Meyer
Laurie Burgett	Gonzalo Rojas leaves 7:18
Berit Durler	Dalouge Smith
Ray Ellis	Judy Swink
Aurelia Flores	

Members Absent

Carol Chang
Bruce Coons
Chuck Hellerich

Staff Present

Beth Swersie (note-taker)

CALL TO ORDER

- Chairperson Granowitz called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m.
- Member introductions

CORRECTIONS OF NOTES OF NOVEMBER BPTF MEETING

Aurelia noted several errors in the notes of the discussion with Stacey, and Vicki agreed to ask Stacey to review the discussion notes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Cathy O'Leary Cathy asked if we can get more of the public involved, and if there were any way to increase attendance at this meeting. Vicki said that we accept suggestions.

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT – Vicki Granowitz

No report.

WORKSHOP ITEMS

- There were no "Comments/Questions" from committee members.
- The following volunteers were identified to review city documents:
 - City Charter: Vicki Granowitz
 - Municipal Code: Ron Buckley
 - Council Policies: Bob Ames
- Relationships Subcommittee (RS) Chair Laurie Burgett, reported
 - Met twice, had good discussions, are moving towards consensus

The following represents topics of subcommittee discussion and does not intend to define decisions or conclusions of the subcommittee at this time.

 - The new entity must relate with the other stakeholders

- What will be the constituency of the new entity?
- Private, non-profit public benefit, 501c(3)
- With a formal agreement to define the relationship with the City and P&R
- Independently governed, CEO & staff employed by the entity
- Periodic interaction with Mayor and other officials
- Maintain a holistic view of the Park
- Bound by Park Charter and plans
- Act as voice of Park, advisory at first
- Prove itself to gain more authority
- Two-way single point of contact
- Work closely with existing organizations
- Some will have representation on the entity
- Others will have voices through public forums
- Open, transparent, public input
- Potential to work closely with Balboa Park Cultural Partnership
- Balboa Park Committee is advisory now, entity may one day take this role
- Emphasize capability to raise funds, especially from new sources
- Project management oversight on new projects, within its expertise
- Initial focus might be on volunteer program, Master Plan update, and Park project priority list
- Additional staff needs: Directors of Development and of Volunteers
- Entity will not handle operational issues at first
- Leverage its position and knowledge to expedite projects thru the city process

TF members' comments:

- John suggested considering how projects can be expedited when funds come in.
 - Paul stated that the subcommittee has spent a lot of time on the public input aspect, that the entity in its infancy needs to prove itself and must engage public and stakeholders. That two timeframes must be considered for how the entity will look: at the outset, and in the future.
 - Dale quotes the BPC report's statement that "serious doubts exist re current park management" – and questions how we will achieve a well-managed effort.
- Board Development Subcommittee (BD) Vice-chair Judy Swink, reported
 - Met once, discussed specific structures for governance of new entity.
 - Ray prepared an outline.
 - Two meetings are scheduled for early January.

The following represents topics of subcommittee discussion and does not intend to define decisions or conclusions of the subcommittee at this time.

- Thinking in terms of what the subcommittee needs to do so that the new entity can start out with an outline
- May draft recommendations for composition of membership and subcommittees
- Seek pledges to underwrite 12 to 18 months startup budget
- Ask City Attorney to review draft documents and possible code/policy changes
- Retain independent counsel to draft bylaws, MOU
- Consider what should be in bylaws

Possible Committees of the new entity:

- Executive Committee (EC): officers, how many members. The EC is to recruit and hire and do performance evaluations of Executive Director, establish an audit committee, draft short- and long-term strategic plans
- Board Governance Committee: to develop the structure (EC, BOD, Advisory Board, etc) and expectations of each part, to finalize committee structure, review bylaws, maintain contact with city, recruit board members and provide board training

- Development Committee: membership program, major gifts, capital projects, planned giving program, endowment fund
- Finance/Administration Committee: prepare and review annual budgets, make one- and five-year forecasts, provide HR services, oversee contracts
- Marketing/Communications Committee: plan marketing activities, outreach efforts, public speaker program
- Project Management Committee: work with P&R about using funds, selecting projects
- Volunteer/Events Committee: recruit, train and coordinate volunteers, assist in special events coordination

TF members' comments:

- Ray: there is a lot of alignment between the two subcommittees, needs to be a discussion on deliverables from each. The new entity must have the authority and ability to deploy resources if it is to raise funds and produce tangible results.
 - Bob: concerned about donor stakeholders not represented on TF, and the "open meeting requirements of the Brown Act (BA) – many do not want their philanthropy discussed in public.
 - Vicki: it is NOT the case that the BA requires that every single bit of business be discussed in public – exceptions are made for employee issues and some financial matters, and subcommittees may meet privately.
 - Judy: doesn't envision donor discussions being held in a public forum, but the board of the entity will have meetings that will require public notice.
 - Bob: other board actions may require disclosure of donor names, e.g. naming rights. This should be considered in the creation of the entity's charter.
 - Judy: negotiations may be held privately.
 - Berit: echoes Bob's concerns, address the issue early as to where the public is invited.
 - Aurelia: need flexibility – the BA has limitations.
 - Paul: it was not the view of the subcommittee that the BA in its entirety should apply to the new entity. Build into the charter those portions of the BA necessary for public comfort – a selective degree of transparency – e.g. agendas, financial statements.
 - Judy: perhaps drop reference to the BA since the entity is NOT subject to the BA. Build in the elements of the BA that are helpful without handicapping the entity.
 - Laurie: important that existing organizations and other interested parties know what the entity is doing in order to gain their trust.
 - Dalouge: what is to be the degree of specificity of what this TF submits? Framework? very specific? Develop the bylaws of the entity? The more detail we provide, the more there might be to be unraveled by the entity.
 - Vicki: how would D have the subcommittee narrow its thoughts?
 - Dalouge: example from Youth Symphony regarding Board Development – develop a profile of skills and broad communities (not specific organizations) from which to draw members; re Relationships – describe the elements of the working relationships sought, not create the actual agreements.
 - Ray: it's a fine line to balance between having a flexible/nimble framework, and having enough detail to set up something workable.
 - Judy: categories and representations vs. specific people/groups
 - Bob: there is some overlap – need a rough draft charter from each subcommittee for the TF to review and determine the assignment of overlapping tasks.
- General discussion
 - Vicki: some of the subcommittee info has gotten far afield. It would be helpful to stick with scope of work – relationship with entity and city, outside groups, inside groups; need to identify primary tasks necessary, don't want to over burden the initial Board, need focus on 6

month tasks, 12 month tasks; start with less, maybe meet with city staff see if we are going in the right direction?

- Laurie: we are still in discussion mode – these are exploratory thoughts, not a report.
- Ron: Single point of contact idea – perhaps other organizations/stakeholders will go through the new entity. There are major issues and minor issues. There are not many “shovel-ready” projects – need environmental reviews that take time. If the Master Plan is updated, a master environmental document can cover broader issues. Donors often want statues, not in sync with the park being a National Historic Landmark. If the entity takes on event scheduling and special permits, it needs to follow the same process as does the city. Regarding donations and public scrutiny, there are differences between handling major improvements and ongoing maintenance: if a donation is general (for precise plan implementation), the donor designation/recognition isn't an issue, but if for parking structure, the project is the issue - scrutiny is not on the giver but the project.
- Gonzalo leaves at 7:18 p.m.
- Vicki: existing fund raising groups need to be respected, involved, will provide continuity, as private groups there is no mandate for them to be open to the public. The BPC and the Recreation Council are land use advisory bodies created by City Ordinance, unlike fund raising groups. The new entity must be different from existing fundraising groups, otherwise just creating more of what already exists and does not meet the needs of the Park as outlined in the BPC Report. Need to figure out: What doesn't work with the other groups? no formal relationship with the city regarding public parts of the Park; no requirements for openness; projects not necessarily what the public would want. Think small, think incremental; think in terms of immediate goals, then mid-range goals (1–5 years).
- Ron: concerned that if we just give Council general ideas, it won't act. Rather, be more specific so that they have something to address.
- Vicki: Council is different from when Ron worked for the City and it is impossible to know everything they will be interested in and risk giving to much info and creating confusion. BPTF needs to give Council baseline info, and it will be up to us to make sure they know it's a priority.
- Dale: we refer to a near-term reality and a long-term vision – entity first as a support group, later as support and management.
- Vicki: “graduated responsibility” (per CM Todd Gloria)
- Judy: need to caution about talking about big projects – land use decisions remain with the City; e.g. role in event management – city reviews applications and makes decisions, entity involved after that.
- Vicki: So there may be a programmatic EIR done, which could expedite the application process.
- Ron: this will analyze the impacts in a big picture, all issues in major developments.
- Paul: The great interest in BP creates lots of detail discussion; very optimistic about what has been done; midcourse correction due. Offers this guidance – focus on framework (vs. detail); don't underestimate the importance of fundraising; tie subcommittee reports to scope of work; break reports into short term and longer term issues; pay attention to the added value to be provided by the entity; two subcommittees should communicate before the next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

- Chairperson Granowitz adjourned the meeting to order at 7:38 p.m.

Next Balboa Park Task Force Meeting:

6:00 P.M. on Monday, January 18, 2009

Reuben H. Fleet Science Center Community Room, San Diego, CA 92101

For more information please contact:

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