

City of San Diego
Park and Recreation Board
Minutes
Thursday, October 19, 2017

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

Meeting Held at:

Balboa Park Club Ballroom
2150 Pan American Road West
San Diego, CA 92101

Mailing Address is:

City of San Diego
202 C Street, MS 37C
San Diego, CA 92101

Members Present

David Kinney, Chair
Nick Anastasopoulos
David Baron
Jon Becker
Raymond Bernal
Marcella Bothwell
Bobby Hughes
Katherine Johnston
Dennis Otsuji

Members Absent

Ron Cho (Excused)

City Staff Present

Andy Field, Assistant Director
Rosa Abrego
Mike Armenta
Ryan Barbrick
Scott Bentley
Charles Daniels
Rumi Doherty
Sarah Erazo
George Freiha
Tim Graham
John Howard
Danielle Knighten
Georgette Manela
Mark Marney
Bruce Martinez
David Monroe
Kevin Oliver
Kathy Ruiz
Shelly Stowell
Nancy Zamora-Hudson

CALL TO ORDER – The meeting was called to order by Chair Kinney at 2:05 p.m.

Chair Kinney noted that the Board would meet as the San Diego Regional Park Improvement Fund Oversight Committee at the conclusion of the Park and Recreation Board Meeting.

Chair Kinney announced that there was now a full 11 Member Park and Recreation Board. He welcomed the new Board Members Ray Bernal and Marcella Bothwell and requested that they introduce themselves.

Mr. Bernal represents District 8. He is a member of the Memorial Park Recreation Council and Little League. He enjoys the parks and feels that they are vital to the community. He expressed his appreciation and looked forward to representing the City in general.

Ms. Bothwell represents District 2. She is a retired surgeon and has an MBA from UCSD. She expressed her interest in the financial analysis of parks and the fiscal responsibility of tax payer money. She serves as the Director for Pacific Beach Town Council. This year she

was involved with organizing Concerts on the Green for Kate Sessions Park. She noted that it was very rewarding to be involved with the community.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 21, 2017.

MOTION: MOVED/SECONDED Mr. Otsuji/Mr. Becker

A motion was made by Mr. Otsuji and seconded by Mr. Becker to approve the September 21, 2017 meeting minutes. The motion was approved (6-0) with Mr. Baron, Mr. Bernal and Ms. Bothwell abstaining.

NON-ADOPTION AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENT

This portion of the agenda provides an opportunity for members of the public to address the Board on items of interest within the jurisdiction of the Board. (Comments relating to items on today's Agenda are to be taken at the time the item is heard.) Comments will be limited to three (3) minutes and is not debatable.

Speakers: Susan Mournian
Gary Levitt

- Ms. Mournian presented regarding a Fraud Hotline Investigation conducted by City Auditor Eduardo Luna associated with recreation center charges. She recommended oversight and partnership with volunteer groups in order to improve the situation. As a taxpayer and citizen, Ms. Mournian expressed concern. She felt the Board had the right to take a position on items that affect the community. She expressed that the Board is more than just an advisory body. She would be providing copies of her letter to the Board at a later time.
- Mr. Levitt presented regarding the renaming of Del Mar Mesa Park to Elizabeth Rabbit Park. He commented that there was not wide community support. Mr. Levitt noted that the item was not presented to the Del Mar Mesa Planning Board. He requested that the Board investigate the process by which the park was renamed and that the decision be reconsidered. He noted improper public notice. His letter is attached to these minutes.
- Chair Kinney thanked the speakers and requested that Park and Recreation Staff report back on these non-agenda items at the next Board Meeting on November 16th.

REQUEST FOR ITEMS TO BE PLACED ON CONSENT AGENDA

The Chair may entertain a motion by any Board member to approve any agenda item as consent when no speaker slips have been submitted in favor or in opposition to the item. Items approved on consent are approved in accordance with staff's recommendation as reflected on the agenda and described in the Staff Report to the Park and Recreation Board, unless otherwise noted in the motion. At this time the Board may consider adoption of one or more items on the adoption agenda as "Consent" items.

MOTION: MOVED/SECONDED Mr. Becker/Ms. Johnston

A motion was made by Mr. Becker and seconded by Ms. Johnston to place Action Item 101, the House of Charm General Development Plan on the Consent Agenda. The motion was not unanimous and thus was not approved.

APPROVAL OF THE CONSENT AGENDA - None

REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE - None

COMMUNICATIONS - None.

(Limited to items not on the agenda. Each one will be limited to three minutes and is not debatable.)

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Community Parks I Area Committee

- Mr. Otsuji reported that there were two action items at the Community Parks I Area Committee Meeting. The first was related to the proposed changes to the Recreation Council Fees. Recommendation was to draft a letter for review and approval by the Committee. The second item was related to the Memorandum from City Attorney's Office regarding Funds Collected by Recreation Councils. A recommendation to draft a letter for approval by the Committee was also made.

Community Parks II Area Committee - No Meeting/No Report

Balboa Park Committee

- Ms. Johnston requested to reserve her comments until the House of Charm General Development Plan item was heard because it was the most notable item at the Balboa Park Committee Meeting.

Mission Trails Regional Park Citizens' Advisory Committee - No Representative/No Report

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT - None

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- Director Herman Parker was not able to attend. Assistant Director Andy Field welcomed everyone. He commented that the Department was busy with fall events, carnivals and other Halloween events. There would be an event update on the Park and Recreation website. He provided Board Members with the Play All Day Brochure. He noted that the program would develop a series of parks at various school sites over the next five years.

ACTION ITEMS

101. House of Charm General Development Plan

Presenters: Charles Daniels, Park Designer, Park and Recreation Department
Jennifer Luce, Principal, Luce et Studio Architects

The presentation outlined the following:

- Background
- Discussion
- Project Description
- Requested Action
- Consultant Presentation

MOTION: MOVED/SECONDED Ms. Johnston/Mr. Baron

A motion was made by Ms. Johnston and seconded by Mr. Baron to approve Item 101, the House of Charm General Development Plan. The motion was approved unanimously (9-0).

INFORMATION ITEMS

201. Golf Operations Division Business Plan Update

Presenters: Scott Bentley, Assistant Deputy Director, Golf Division,
 Park and Recreation Department
 John Howard, Golf Course Manager, Park and Recreation
 Department

The presentation outlined the following:

- Background
 - Discussion
 - Business Plan Update
 - Future Outlook
- Ms. Johnston requested repair of the Mission Bay Golf Course fence along Grand Avenue/Mission Bay Drive, improved signage and removal of weeds from the adjacent waterway. Mr. Bentley explained that the fence had not been repaired due to pending insurance settlements. He also noted that the waterway was a Transportation and Storm Water Department asset. Mr. Field responded that the Department would work with the Golf Division to find more immediate solutions.
 - Mr. Baron expressed his enthusiasm for Foot Golf at the golf course and he encouraged others to take advantage of it. He thanked staff for generating positive revenue and a great playing area for all.
 - Ms. Bothwell and Mr. Otsuji inquired about the renovation of Mission Bay Golf Course as it related to the DeAnza Cove Study. Ms. Bothwell asked whether the improvements were on hold. Mr. Field explained that the DeAnza Special Study process still continued. A workshop was scheduled for the Mission Bay Committee and the item would be presented again to the Board. Ms. Bothwell thanked Golf Division Staff as well.

202. Update on Recreation Council Proposed Transition

Presenter: Andy Field, Assistant Director, Park and Recreation Department

As a follow-up to the September Board meeting and in anticipation of a City Council discussion planned for October 31, 2017, Mr. Field presented the

following items related the past, present, and possible future roles of recreation councils:

- Recreation Councils - Historical Background
 - Recreation Councils - Roles and Responsibilities
 - Recreation Councils - Funding Sources
 - Reason for Proposed Change - City Attorney Legal Opinion
 - Options - Need to Ensure Continuity of Services
 - Potential Changes - Proposed City Council Resolutions
 - Potential Changes - Impact of Proposed City Council Resolutions
 - Public Outreach - Recent and Upcoming Meetings/Workshops
 - Status Quo - What Happens if City Council Declines Changes
 - Future of Recreation in San Diego - Partnership with Communities
- Ms. Bothwell thanked Mr. Field for his presentation. She expressed that everyone understood this was a legal issue and needed to move forward. She noted that Recreation Councils were vested in their community and asked for clarification as to how their advisory role would play out. Mr. Field explained that Park and Recreation Staff would continue to work with the Recreation Councils. The City Charter defines Advisory Boards and Oversight Committees roles. The Department would like to establish how to get as much input as possible from the community.
- Mr. Baron asked what would happen to Little Leagues' field use after January 1st. Mr. Field explained that everyone would continue to be able to get permits as they do currently. If the City Council does not approve the actions requested of it on October 31st, Park and Recreation would not be able to collect the permit surcharge on behalf of the Recreation Councils after the special use permit expires on December 31st. Additionally, the Recreation Council may not be able to provide contract service classes.
- Mr. Otsuji asked who would pay for the new system and where the money was going to come from and how it impacted the fees being charged today. He felt this needed to be addressed in coming discussions. Mr. Field explained that the money is currently derived from permits and contract service classes, and if the City Council makes changes on October 31st, the most significant change would be for the City rather than the recreation council to collect funds, and the City would deposit those funds into accounts earmarked specifically for each recreation center.
- Mr. Becker asked whether the funding mechanism needed positions would be brought before Council on October 31st. Mr. Field said that the Department would not be asking for the positions until a later time, and any position requests would not be funded in any way by the recreation center funds.
- Mr. Bernal asked whether the City Attorney's Office representatives had been invited to these meetings. Mr. Field confirmed that they had been invited and declined to attend.
- Chair Kinney commented that he understood that this was a legal issue. However he found it difficult that Recreation Councils had not been provided

with the input on how they could function and change in accordance with the legal requirements. He suggested that perhaps they could find ways to function as non-profits or other similar legal arrangements.

- Chair Kinney encouraged the Board to attend the upcoming community meetings. On behalf of the Board, he offered that the Board would be happy to host any workshops regarding the future role of Recreation Councils.
- As a point of order, Ginny Barnes requested that the Park and Recreation Board Meeting Agenda items be posted on the website in advance as per Brown Act guidelines. She also expressed concern that public handouts/reports provided reflected inaccurate information when compared to the PowerPoint presentation. Chair Kinney pointed out that the color headings had not clearly copied onto the black/white copies provided to the public. Mr. Field provided Ms. Barnes with a color copy and clarified that all reports and PowerPoints were available to the public on the Park and Recreation Board website. To prevent this outcome in the future, staff will provide handouts and reports at upcoming meetings in color.

Speakers: Neutral (1)
 In Opposition (5)

- Marilee Pacelli spoke as neutral and expressed her concern over the rushed timeline and potential hiring of staff for a service that had been done for free.
- Susan Mournian spoke in opposition. She confirmed that the Community Parks I Area Committee letter had been drafted and forwarded. Her letter is attached to these minutes.
- Pat Warren spoke in opposition.
- Glenda Gates spoke in opposition. Ms. Gates expressed concern about how a recreation council could partner with the City for any type of event, since the City Attorney may decide any future funds raised fall into the definition of City funds. She also expressed concern that other funding models, such as Pepsi machines and recycling, were taken away from recreation councils in the past.
- David Rodger spoke in opposition. Mr. Rodger mentioned that the current model works well and is efficient. He is concerned that staff did not seek recreation council input.
- Ginny Barnes spoke in opposition. She read and distributed her letter in opposition. Her letter is attached to these minutes.
- Mr. Otsuji requested that Council Representatives and City Attorney's Office Representatives be present at the October 25th and 26th Area Committee Meetings.
- Mr. Field offered to have Ms. Zamora-Hudson forward the letter from the Committee Park I Area Committee to the Board accordingly. He also made further clarification as to the time and meeting locations as being October 25th at 7:00 p.m. at the War Memorial Building Auditorium at Balboa Park; and October 26th at 7:00 p.m. at the Nobel Recreation Center, 8810 Judicial Drive in San Diego.

- Mr. Baron asked for increased SDPD enforcement of unsafe and illegal activities in front of the Adams Recreation Center, including homelessness, overnight lodging, and drug use. Mr. Monroe stated that he would contact the Community Relations Officer (CRO) to follow up on this activity.

Details of the reports and PowerPoint presentations can be found on the Park and Recreation Department website at: <http://www.sandiego.gov/parkandrecboard/reports>

WORKSHOP – None

ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was adjourned at 4:26 p.m.

Next Meeting: **Thursday, January 18, 2018**
Balboa Park Club Ballroom
2150 Pan American Road West
San Diego, CA 92101

Submitted by,

Andrew Field
Assistant Director, on behalf of
Herman D. Parker,
Director
Park and Recreation Department

Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board
3525 Del Mar Heights Road, Box 246, San Diego, California 92130
Phone 858-361-8555 e-mail gary@seabreezeproperties.com

October 19, 2017

Herman Parker, Park and Recreation Director
202 C Street
San Diego, CA 92101

Dear Mr. Parker:

The Del Mar Mesa Planning Board passed the following motion at its October 12, 2017 meeting regarding the re-naming of the new Del Mar Mesa Neighborhood Park and requests that you review the process by which this occurred.

Attached for reference is City Policy 600-33.

The Del Mar Mesa Community, as a semi-rural community has no park and recreation council of its own. Throughout the park planning process, the Del Mar Mesa Planning Board has served as advisor to the City Parks, Development Services and Planning Departments in the design and construction of the Del Mar Mesa Neighborhood Park. Despite establishing this precedent and receiving the Planning Group's assistance and time commitment to the process at that time, this board was left out of the park naming process.

History: The Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board was formed in the mid 1990's in an effort to preserve the rural nature of this special place while still accommodating development. The Del Mar Mesa Preserve is home to highly valued endangered species, plant and animal. The Del Mar Mesa Community Planning Board is an extremely active board with a well-deserved reputation of negotiating complex projects—landmark compromises that city staff, wildlife agencies and developers have agreed to. Every single development project was poured over and negotiated with individual developer groups to ensure the best use of land with habitat impacts minimized. Thousands of volunteer hours, by about a dozen and a half residents and board members is a testament to what we have today.

Our park planning process underwent the same kind of process, except the project has extended to almost 20 years. During all that time, our board has been involved in EVERY step of our park planning---- siting, design, funding, permitting, and now construction. The board, in many instances, had to fight to keep the financing and construction momentum going.

So, despite our board being notified for years on every bit of City of San Diego minutiae, no matter how irrelevant to our community, and representatives from city parks and facilities regularly updating us on the progress of our park—— that very neighborhood park was named WITHOUT this board's knowledge or input. No other relevant community-wide groups were notified. Zero.

The Del Mar Mesa Planning Board and other involved members of the community "discovered" the new park name was officially approved at the board's September 14, 2017 meeting. We were shocked.

As a result of this action, at the October 12, 2017 meeting of the Del Mar Mesa Planning Board, the following resolution was passed with a vote of 6 in favor, two against and three abstentions:

The Del Mar Mesa Planning Board officially requests that the Deputy Chief Operating Office for Neighborhood Services Investigate the process by which the name of the Del Mar Mesa Community Park was approved, including whether there was proper public noticing of city park council meetings, why the groups most involved in the park planning, financing and implementation were not involved, and why the Parks Department failed to advise the petitioners to obtain Planning Board and other relevant community group support.

Had the meetings been properly noticed and the Planning Board consulted, all residents of our community's opinion would have been considered and taken into account before a final decision was reached.

This has caused a huge division in our lovely and until now, contented community. It is important that the city understands that "wide community support" was not obtained in the naming of this park, but driven by one neighborhood in close proximity to the new park. This park represents our community's "crowning jewel" of all our planning efforts.

The community's official planning board and the majority of the community should not have been left out of this important decision. We ask you to review and reconsider this process.

Thank you for your attention and follow up on this issue.

Respectfully,



Gary Levitt, Chair



Lisa Ross, Vice-Chair

cc : Kevin Faulkner, Mayor
Barbara Bry, Councilmember District 1
David Graham, Deputy Chief Operating Officer Neighborhood Services
Kathy Ruiz, Deputy Parks Director, District 1
Hillary Nemchik, City Council District 1 Representative
Sara Toma, Community Planner
Dan Monroe, Senior Planner
Steve Hadley, District 1 Representative

October 17, 2017

Herman Parker, Director
Parks and Recreation Department
202 C Street, MS 37C
San Diego, CA 92101
Via Email Only

Re: Recreation Council Operating Changes

Dear Mr. Parker:

We, the undersigned, represent the recreation councils of Area One Committee Members known as CP-1. We protest the decision of the Park and Recreation Department to reorganize the fifty-two volunteer recreation councils from a community centric focus to a centrally administered system. The initial cost of this reorganization has been estimated to be \$424,502. This is not a refinement of the existing organization. Instead, this is a taking from the volunteer citizens of San Diego. The existing recreation councils have contributed time, talent and treasure towards the improvement of their respective recreation centers and communities.

Currently, the fifty-two volunteer recreation councils manage funds at no cost under the Special Use Permit system created and approved by park staff and the city attorney over the past sixty years. The suggested change will not improve or make safer money handling or community oriented events which are designed and executed by volunteers and staff to meet individual council needs. The change appears to be the result of a legal opinion solicited by Parks and Recreation Department. The opinion is based on a case with different facts and designated as "unpublished" by the Fourth District Court of Appeals. As an unpublished opinion, it does not carry the force and effect of State law and applies only to the case in which it was rendered. An unpublished opinion refers to an opinion the court has specifically designated as not for publication. These types of cases may not be cited as precedent because the judges making the opinion deem the case as "less important". The fifty-two volunteer recreation councils were not informed of the issue until September 2017 in hastily called "briefings" which only provided a draft document for guidance and information to the recreation councils.

Since those briefings, various communications by Park and Recreation staff to interested parties have revealed nothing substantial about how the fifty-two volunteer recreation councils might continue as partners with the Parks and Recreation Department. The single constant is Parks and Recreation's desire to cancel all Special Use Permits on December 31, 2017 requiring all recreation council funds to be surrendered. Effectively, all fifty-two volunteer recreation councils will then cease operations as fiscal agents. All fees and surcharges will be held in revenue accounts solely and exclusively managed by city staff. How a "recreation advisory group" would function within this system remains "to be determined." CP-1 committee members are concerned about indemnification for any new "recreation advisory groups" which is currently part of the Special Use Permit for Recreation Councils. There are no

guarantees from Parks and Recreation present indemnification for individual recreation advisory group volunteers will continue.

Nor do we know if recreation advisory groups will be able to use recreation centers free of charge for their meetings. Without that benefit an advisory group could pay \$50.75 per hour for the privilege of offering suggestions to the park department.

Please reconsider the decision concerning the fifty-two volunteer recreation councils.
We look forward to your response regarding this issue.

Sincerely,

Susan Mournian for
Area One Committee Members CP-1

cc: Honorable Mayor Kevin L. Faulconer
Honorable City Attorney Mara Elliott
Honorable Council President Myrtle Cole
Honorable Council President Pro Tempore Mark Kersey
David Kinney, Park and Recreation Board Chair
Members of the Park and Recreation Board
Scott Chadwick, Chief Operating Officer
Stacey LoMedico, Assistant Chief Operating Officer
David Graham, Deputy Chief Operating Officer, Neighborhood Services
Marshall Anderson, Director of Council Affairs, Office of the Mayor
Jen Lebron, Director of Public Safety and Neighborhood Services Policy, Office of the Mayor
Parks and Recreation Management Team
Parks and Recreation Staff
Area One Committee Members CP-1

Good Afternoon,

October 19, 2017

My name is Ginny Barnes; I served on this City's Park and Recreation Board for 12 years as well as many other committees associated with this department. I worked with the city attorney's office to craft the By-Laws and the Standard Operating Procedures for Recreation Councils that are currently in place. I am a former member of the Carmel Valley Recreation Council.

I am very frustrated as to how the issue of Changes to Recreation Council Operations is playing out. Information was disseminated to City Council, you the Park & Recreation Board and Recreation Council members without any discussion of alternative or other options. The City has relationships with many Non-Profits; tennis, museums and the Balboa Park Conservancy to name a few. These groups use City property to run programs and activities. Maybe a similar model could be structured between Recreation Councils and the City to fulfill concerns of the Park & Recreation Department and the City Attorney.

When asked to have you, the Park and Recreation Board, take a stand on this issue we were told that you are an advisory board and "this particular item has no action for them to approve." I strongly disagree! Historically, the Park and Recreation Board has been given the opportunity to review and comment on any anticipated changes to Recreation Council operations. When did this change and more importantly... WHY?

It seems the message is that since this is a legal issue what you say will not make any difference. Again, I disagree. It would be appropriate for you to send a message to City Council that completely changing a relationship which has been in place for over 60 years between the City and Recreation Councils, merits discussion and/or exploring other options.

The Budget and Government Efficiency Committee's Area of Responsibility includes the Annual Budget, financial reports, fees, performance measures and analytics, information technology, enterprise resource management, purchasing and contracting, managed competition, revenue, corporate partnerships and development, fleet services, risk management, equal opportunity contracting, prevailing wage, living wage, San Diego City Employees' Retirement System, personnel, civil service and human resources.

The issues of "Changes to Recreation Council Operations" includes but are not limited to fees, purchasing and contracting, managed competition, and living wage. These issues should be vetted through the Budget and Government Efficiency Committee.

I encourage you to take a position on this issue and recommend it be vetted through the Committee process. This is supported by the City's Municipal Code 26.31 under Park and Recreation Board - Powers and Duties. Your duties are to advise the City Council on recreational activities in the City of San Diego as well as "Periodically review the recreational program of the city in relation to the needs and desires of the citizens".

Thank you.