

City of San Diego
Park and Recreation Board
Workshop
October 29, 2015

Minutes

“WE ENRICH LIVES THROUGH QUALITY PARKS AND PROGRAMS”

Meeting Location:

Recital Hall – Balboa Park
2130 Pan American Plaza
San Diego, California 92101

Mailing Address:

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

Members Present

William Diehl, Chair
David Baron
Bruce Brown
Vicki Granowitz
Bobby Hughes
David Kinney
Martin Moreno (Arrived
at 6:15)
Dennis Otsuji

Members Absent

Robert Chavez
Hazel Ocampo

City Staff Present

Herman Parker, Director
Andy Field
Heather Ferbert
Samir Mahmalji
Mark Nassar
Jim Winter
Jane Witzke

CALL TO ORDER – The meeting was called to order by Chair Diehl at 6:05 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES -None

ADOPTION OF AGENDA

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

A motion was made by Ms. Granowitz and seconded by Mr. Baron to adopt the agenda. The motion was unanimously approved (7-0-3); two absences and one late arrival

Consent At this time the Board may consider adoption of one or more items on the adoption agenda as “Consent” items.

REQUEST FOR CONTINUANCE - None

WORKSHOP

301. Park CIP Streamlining

Presenter: Andrew Field, Assistant Park and Recreation Director; Mark Nassar, Deputy Director, Architectural Engineering and Parks, Public Works Department

Mr. Field presented a PowerPoint presentation that outline the CIP Streamlining process as proposed for the amendment of Council Policy 600-33.

Comments/questions from members:

- Mr. Diehl asked who the point of contact is that decides which category the project fall in? Would that be the Area Manger, Mr. Field or the Director? Mr. Field stated that they would be looking to the community plans and the facility financing plans for the project to have been discussed at some point by the community at large. The planning groups have that roll of adopting those plans. When we look at the projects in determining which category they fall in to, they will first look at the council policy. The “we”, I am talking about, will be something of a tripartite, it will be a combination of Mr. Nassar, Ms. Shifflet and myself. The three of us will look at the project to see which category we think based on our interpretation of the policy is appropriate. There is room in the policy to have a project more forward, by the authority of the Director, to the next category. It will however not go back, if it is a category three project, it won't go back to a category two project. If it is a category one and we feel it needs more input, we can move it up to a category two project.
- Mr. Otsuji stated that he like the direction this policy was going, and the process will need to start with the scope of work and the understanding of the scope of service with the Project Manager and the consultant will be very important. This needs to be understood before going to any of the Recreation Councils. Secondly, at the Park and Recreation Board level, it is important that you review the makeup of the Park and Recreation Department, if you do decide to eliminate any of the other committees because you can make up what you may lose or may not lose at that level and you do the same thing at the Recreation Council, that way you won't lose much as you go down the path and gives everyone an equal chance to express their options. Clear understanding by everyone at the beginning is highly important. Mr. Field commented that they are working internally on assuring when a new park workshop has gone forward, that the scope is clearly laid out, so there is no ambiguity for Mr. Nassar or his staff.
- Mr. Brown comment, from a Recreation Council standpoint, that it is frustration when going through this process, that there doesn't seem to be anyone who keep them apprized of the project, unless they take a proactive roll to inquire. Mr. Brown feel the Project Manager should be taking on the responsibility to keep the community informed of the progress of the project. Part of this process has to have a re-emphasis on community communication and being informed of the progress. Mr. Nassar commented that it is a very important point and that one of the main project of a Project Manager is to manage information and to control change so that the expected outcome is reached. When Project Managers go to the Recreation Council, they establish a budget, a schedule, based on the scope of work, that is agreed to and the expectation is that everything should proceed to that target, unless there is a change. Project Mangers should be notifying the Recreation Council if there is a change that takes it off course from reaching the target of scope budget or schedule. Mr. Brown stated that this is not happening and needs to be re-emphasized. Mr. Nassar commented that they are developing websites that will have a project's schedule and all information uploaded. Mr. Nassar will advise staff to make a better effort to keep everyone informed.
- Mr. Kinney is in favor of streamlining this process. How will the board be formally notices of the GDP amendment? Will this be in the form of a memo that is emailed to the Board? Mr. Field stated that as currently proposed, it would be a memo or a report that would be given to the Park Board and that would come in the form of an email and a

webpage update, where they would be kept archived, and then once they have been posted, internally procedures that ensures that the five (5) business day period is tracked. Rules and responsibilities would also be identified between Public Works, Park and Recreation and Park Planning to make sure that this happens seamlessly. The goal is to have a trigger after the five (5) days have gone by that declared the GDP to be approved by the Park and Recreation Board or to have it be heard at the next meeting. Mr. Kinney asked that is one of the board member thought it was important enough to come before the Board, would that be enough for committee to do that? Mr. Field stated that the way the policy is written, yes. Mr. Kinney wanted clarification under Major Projects, it say Action Items, he is correct in assuming that they would not be followed by a workshop? Mr. Field stated that the workshops would be at the Recreation Council level and the results of that workshop would be brought forward to the Board. Mr. Kinney has a problem with the Area Committees not be involved with the major projects.

- Ms. Granowitz wanted to clarify that there are only two Area Committees and this does not include the Balboa Park Committee or the major committees. The Area Committees are the ones made up of all the Recreation Councils. If the memo idea is going to work, in terms of the five (5) days, it can be looked at as the same as what the Board put on the consent agenda, but to make that work the Board needs to have adequate education in order to make good decisions. New Board members will need to get this education on different types of parks and what goes into parks. Internal directives would need to be put in place to state what type of training new Board member would receive or Park Board retreats to provide education on parks, so that new Board members can make informed decisions. If Design Review Committee is going way, then there needs to be more professionals on the Park and Recreation Board. Ms. Granowitz feels that Joint Use and Tot Lots should be handled as minor projects with a bump if they are requested as major. These two types of projects can be very simple and not complicated. Ms. Granowitz agrees with Mr. Otsuji, that the scope of work needs to be clearly defined.
- Mr. Diehl agrees with Mr. Brown that the Area Managers for each recreation area are underutilized as far as keeping the Recreation Councils notified of the status of projects. The Area Managers should be aware of all the projects going on in their area and should be the center point for the Recreation Council to interface with on projects. Mr. Otsuji also agrees.
- Mr. Moreno needs some clarification on the CIP Prioritization Policy, is that just financially or also timeline and would that affect which type of tier a project would go to? Mr. Nassar stated that the Council Policy is not just financial, it's all resources. It help to identify what projects to budget for and put in the CIP budget. It looks at all asset types and classifies them, ranks them and then based on that ranking where the limited funding would be applied. This doesn't affect which tier a project would go to.
- Mr. Kinney wanted to second Ms Granowitz suggestion that Joint Use and Tot Lots could be moved to the minor projects.
- Ms. Granowitz wants to reiterate the Area Manger issue. The people doing long range planning were not going to talk with the Area Managers and feels that this is a real problem that other departments has so little value or respect for the Park Area Managers when they know what is needed and they know our parks. So if there is something that we can do as a Board to emphasis the importance that other departments need to talk to our Area Managers especially on Community Plan Updates, then something needs to happen. Director Herman Parker stated that Park and Recreation would work with Public

Works and our internal staff on this issue. Ms. Granowitz also stated that the turf issues need to be worked on. Mr. Field commented that the Department is well aware of this issue and are working on the issue.

ADJOURNMENT – The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

Next Meeting: **November 19, 2015 at 2:00 p.m.**

(NOTICE LOCATION CHANGE)

**Balboa Park Club Ballroom
2144 Pan American Road West
San Diego, CA 92101**

Submitted by,

Herman Parker
Park and Recreation Director