DATE: November 9, 2017

TO: City Attorney Mara Elliott

FROM: Councilmember Lorie Zapf  
Councilmember Chris Cate  
Councilmember David Alvarez

SUBJECT: Recreation Councils

Please find below questions and concerns we have regarding proposed changes to Recreation Council Fee Structures and Governance following the October 31, 2017 City Council hearing.

We would appreciate answers to these questions in advance of the December 6, 2017 Public Safety & Livable Neighborhoods Committee.

- As mentioned at the October 31, 2017 City Council hearing, Herman Parker, Director of the Park and Recreation Department, indicated the current Special Use Permit (SUP) provisions are inconsistent with the legal requirements applicable to the use of City funds. Would you please outline those inconsistencies and any corrective actions that can be applied to the SUPs, Municipal Code, and/or other governing documents?

- What prompted the change in interpretation of the current SUPs that prevents your office from authorizing a new SUP with Recreation Councils?

- What is the feasibility of granting a short-term extension of the SUPs until a solution with appropriate public input can be presented?

- Given that the City Attorney signed off on at least one SUP renewal in March, why is a temporary renewal not possible now? What has changed since March?
• In the past, Recreation Councils have been able to continue operating until the new SUP is signed, well after the expiration of the current SUP. Why is it now crucial to stop the SUPs immediately?

• The City has authorized SUPs with other non-profits for the operation of City-owned facilities. Currently, the Mayor has the authority to enter into contracts with non-profits under $1 million annually. What prevents him from entering into contracts with each Recreation Council as he has with other non-profits? Does your interpretation of the legal inconsistencies for Recreation Councils’ use of City funds apply to other SUP holders?

cc: Mayor Kevin Faulconer