

National Parks Conservancy and as a Trustee and Treasure for San Francisco's Committee to Save the Cable Cars. Dale is a graduate of the Milton Hershey School, Boston University School of Communications and the Institute for Organization Management at the University of Santa Clara.

#### **Dea Hurston**

Dea Hurston is an arts advocate and arts supporter who serves San Diego as a member of the City of San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture. A former teacher and businesswoman, Dea also serves on the advisory boards of San Diego Repertory Theatre, Common Ground Theatre, Mo'olelo Theatre, Mainly Mozart and Vista Hill. Her commitment to mentoring female artists, artists of color and organizations that are lead by women as well as sharing her expertise in the areas of fundraising, board development, audience development, educational outreach, and issues of diversity culminated in 2006 when she received the Salvation Army's Woman of Dedication Award. She has a degree in education from Concordia College.

#### **John Lomac**

John Lomac has worked in San Diego as a Lifeguard II with the City of San Diego, a real estate broker, and was the Executive Vice President of the San Diego Association of Realtors from 1998-2005. He is currently co-chair of the Mission Hills Town Council's Business Enhancement Committee, a board member of the San Diego Presidio Park Council, and C3. John received a BA in Political Science and History from San Diego State University, an MA in Political Science from the University California Los Angeles, and a secondary school teaching credential from San Diego State University

#### **Paul I. Meyer**

A graduate of Harvard College and Harvard Law School, Paul Meyer is a retired partner of Latham & Watkins LLP. Before settling in San Diego, Paul served three years on active duty as a Captain in the US Marine Corps Reserve. A former President of the Board of the Old Globe Theatre, the La Jolla Chamber Music Society and the American Jewish Committee, Paul is also a member of the Board of the San Diego Foundation and a member of the Foundation's Arts and Culture Working Group. He is currently Chair of the San Diego Charitable Real Estate Fund. Paul is a member of the American College of Real Estate Lawyers and has repeatedly been named as one of *The Best Lawyers in America*.

#### **Gonzalo Rojas**

Gonzalo Rojas has spent over thirty years in higher education and has extensive experience in student academic preparation, college access, affordability, and retention and success. He was the former Director for the Office of Collaborative Programs and College of Education at San Diego State University. Gonzalo is currently Chair of the College: Making it Happen statewide task force and a member of the Coordinating Committee of the Chicano/Latino Inter-Segmental Convocation. He serves on the Board of the Sweetwater Education Foundation, is a member of the South Bay Forum as well as a former Trustee of the Promise Charter School and has extensive experience with community and grass-roots organizing. Gonzalo received a BA in history from UCLA in 1968, an MS in education from UCLA. He completed doctoral coursework at SDSU and Claremont Graduate School.

**Dalouge (Douglas) Smith**

Dalouge Smith has served as President and CEO of the San Diego Youth Symphony and Conservatory since 2005. He was previously Associate Director of Mainly Mozart San Diego, and production stage manager at Lamb's Players Theatre in Coronado. Dalouge is the author of the arts advocacy blog "Dog Days" at the national website artsjournal.com. He currently serves on the boards of the Balboa Park Cultural Partnership and Balboa Park Central. In 2007, Dalouge received the 1<sup>st</sup> Annual Herbert G. Klein Visionary Award for Exemplary Leadership from LEAD San Diego and was also named one of San Diego Metropolitan Magazine's 2006 "40 Under 40" young leaders. Dalouge is a graduate of UCLA where he earned a BA in World Arts and Cultures.

**Judith 'Judy' Swink**

Judy Swink had a 40 year career in Library Science including universities, various branches of the San Diego Public Library and as Resource Librarian for the Serra Cooperative Library System. She later developed a subspecialty as a researcher and editor, translating two journals written in French by an early homesteader in the Julian area then researching his family history. She has been active in the Mission Beach Town Council and the Save the Coaster Committee. Judy participated in the development of the *2002 Sea World Master Plan* and the *1994 Mission Bay Park Master Plan*. She has been a member of the Mission Bay Park Committee since 1994. Since 1993, Judy has been a volunteer with the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Park. Judy has been a Board Member of C3 and she currently chairs the C3 Parks & Open Space Committee. Judy earned a BA in French from Roanoke College (VA) and a Master of Library Science degree from Catholic University of America.

**Appendix C: Balboa Park Fund Task Force Agendas**

**PUBLIC NOTICE  
AGENDA**

**BALBOA PARK TASK FORCE (BPTF) ON THE  
FUTURE OF BALBOA PARK: FUND RAISING, MANAGEMENT & GOVERNANCE  
MONDAY, OCTOBER 19, 2009  
6:00 P.M.  
BALBOA PARK CLUB, SANTA FE ROOM  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101**

**Committee Members:** IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND THIS COMMITTEE MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT VICKI GRANOWITZ AT (619) 584-1203.

**CALL TO ORDER**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** (Each speaker will be limited to three minutes (3 min.) and is not debatable.)

**CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT** – Vicki Granowitz  
The Brown Act

**WORKSHOP ITEMS**

1. Member Introductions (Maximum 2 Minutes per Member in the Following Areas)
  - a. Occupation/Volunteer Experience
  - b. Experience, Representation or Expertise Consistent with areas identified in Balboa Park Committee Report on the Future of Balboa Park, Section 6, pg 26
  - c. Connection to Balboa Park if Any
2. Pass out BPTF Background Materials
3. How we got here:
  - a. Timeline
  - b. Overview 1st Phase Reports & Conclusions
4. Review BPTF Mission Statement
5. Review & amend, if necessary, BPTF Scope of Work
6. Management Matrix Report
7. Discuss Potential Need for Subcommittees
8. Next Steps

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Notice of Next Two Balboa Park Task Force Meeting:**

**Monday, November 16, 2009  
Monday, December 21, 2009  
6:00 P.M.  
Balboa Park Club Santa Fe Room  
San Diego, CA 92101**

---

**PUBLIC NOTICE  
AGENDA**

**BALBOA PARK TASK FORCE (BPTF) ON THE  
FUTURE OF BALBOA PARK: FUND RAISING, MANAGEMENT & GOVERNANCE  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 2009  
6:00 P.M.  
BALBOA PARK CLUB, SANTA FE ROOM  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101**

**Committee Members:** IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND THIS COMMITTEE MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT VICKI GRANOWITZ AT (619) 584-1203.

**CALL TO ORDER**

**MEMBER INTRODUCTIONS**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** (Each speaker will be limited to three minutes (3 min.) and is not debatable.)

**CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT** – Vicki Granowitz

1. Handouts
  - a. Forest Park Forever Strategic Plan 2009-2013
  - b. Governing Urban Park Conservancies
2. Objectives

**INFORMATION ITEM**

1. **Stacey LoMedico, City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department Director:** Comments on Balboa Park Committee's Recommendations for a new Non Profit for Funding Raising, Management & Governance:

**WORKSHOP ITEMS**

1. Questions &/or discussion of BPTF Materials from Oct meeting
2. Review & Adopt a Scope of Work
3. Formalize Subcommittees
4. Next Steps

**ADJOURNMENT**

Notice of Next Two Balboa Park Task Force Meeting:

**Monday, December 21, 2009  
6:00 P.M.  
Balboa Park Club Santa Fe Room  
San Diego, CA 92101**

---

**PUBLIC NOTICE  
WORKSHOP AGENDA**

**BALBOA PARK TASK FORCE (BPTF) ON THE  
FUTURE OF BALBOA PARK: FUND RAISING, MANAGEMENT & GOVERNANCE  
MONDAY, DECEMBER 21, 2009  
6:00 P.M.  
BALBOA PARK CLUB, SANTA FE ROOM  
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101**

**Committee Members:** IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND THIS COMMITTEE MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT VICKI GRANOWITZ AT (619) 584-1203.

**CALL TO ORDER**

**APPROVAL NOVEMBER 16, 2009 NOTES**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** (Each speaker will be limited to three minutes (3 min.) and is not debatable.)

**CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT** – Vicki Granowitz

**WORKSHOP**

5. Committee Members Comments/Questions
6. Identify Volunteers to Review City Documents
  - a. City Charter
  - b. Muni Code
  - c. Council Policies
7. Subcommittee Reports & Committee Discussion
  - a. Relationships – Laurie Burgett
  - b. Board Development – Judy Swink/Ray Ellis
8. Next Steps

**ADJOURNMENT**

Notice of Next Two Balboa Park Task Force Meeting:

Monday, January 18, 2009  
Monday, February 15, 2009  
6:00 P.M.  
Reuben H Fleet Science Center  
Community Room  
San Diego, CA 92101

---

**PUBLIC NOTICE  
WORKSHOP AGENDA**

**BALBOA PARK TASK FORCE (BPTF) ON THE  
FUTURE OF BALBOA PARK: FUND RAISING, MANAGEMENT & GOVERNANCE  
MONDAY, JANUARY 18, 2010  
6:00 P.M.**

**REUBEN H FLEET SCIENCE CENTER: COMMUNITY ROOM  
1875 EL PRADO, BALBOA PARK (OFF PARK BLVD)**

**Committee Members:** IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND THIS COMMITTEE MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT VICKI GRANOWITZ AT (619) 584-1203.

**CALL TO ORDER**

**APPROVAL November 16 & December 21, 2009 BPTF NOTES**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** (Each speaker will be limited to three minutes (3 min.) and is not debatable.)

**CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT** – Vicki Granowitz

**WORKSHOP**

9. Committee Members Comments/Questions
10. Update on Review of:
  - a. Council Policies
  - b. Muni Code
11. Subcommittee Reports & Committee Discussion
  - a. Relationships – Laurie Burgett
  - b. Board Development – Chuck Hellerich
12. Next Steps

**ADJOURNMENT**

Notice of Next Two Balboa Park Task Force Meeting:

Monday, February 15, 2010, 6:00 P.M.  
Reuben H Fleet Science Center  
Community Room  
Monday, March 15, 2010, 6 P.M.  
Balboa Park Club Santa Fe Room

---

**PUBLIC NOTICE  
WORKSHOP AGENDA**

**BALBOA PARK TASK FORCE (BPTF) ON THE  
FUTURE OF BALBOA PARK: FUND RAISING, MANAGEMENT & GOVERNANCE  
MONDAY FEBRUARY 15, 2010  
6:00 P.M. TO 8:00 P.M.**

**REUBEN H FLEET SCIENCE CENTER: COMMUNITY ROOM  
1875 EL PRADO, BALBOA PARK (OFF PARK BLVD AT PARKING LOT AT BACK OF BUILDING)**

**Committee Members:** IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND THIS COMMITTEE MEETING, PLEASE CONTACT VICKI GRANOWITZ AT (619) 584-1203.

**CALL TO ORDER**

**APPROVAL January 18, 2009 BPTF NOTES**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** (Each speaker will be limited to three minutes (3 min.) and is not debatable.)

**CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT** – Vicki Granowitz

**WORKSHOP**

**13. Discussion of Findings/Recommendations For Report**

- a. How should the New Entity be structured internally? Identify make-up of an initial Board of Directors and the tasks necessary to create the new entity
- b. What should be the relationship be between the New Entity and the City of San Diego Should the "head" of the New Entity be a City employee or be solely under the direction of the New Entity?
- c. What should be the "Internal Relationships" between existing park organizations/stakeholders and the new entity
- d. What policy issues might need to be addressed and resolved during a negotiation to define the contractual relationship between the New Entity's public-private partnership with the City? ;
- e. Muni Code, City Policies and City Charter sections review Working Group. Identify which might require amending and recommend changes.

**14. Next Steps**

**ADJOURNMENT**

Notice of Next Two Balboa Park Task Force Meeting:

Monday, March 15, 2010, 6:00 P.M.  
Monday, April 19, 2010, 6 P.M.  
Balboa Park Club Santa Fe Room

---

**PUBLIC NOTICE  
WORKSHOP AGENDA**

**BALBOA PARK TASK FORCE (BPTF) ON THE  
FUTURE OF BALBOA PARK: FUND RAISING, MANAGEMENT & GOVERNANCE  
MONDAY MARCH 15, 2010**

**6:00 P.M. TO 8:00 P.M.**  
**BALBOA PARK CLUB, SANTA FE ROOM**  
**SAN DIEGO, CA 92101**

**Committee Members:** IF YOU ARE UNABLE TO ATTEND THIS COMMITTEE MEETING, PL EASE CONTACT VICKI GRANOWITZ AT (619) 584-1203.

**CALL TO ORDER**

**APPROVAL February 15, 2010 BPTF NOTES**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** (Each speaker will be limited to three minutes (3 min.) and is not debatable.)

**CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT** – Vicki Granowitz

**WORKSHOP**

**15. Draft Final Report**

- a. Format
- b. Executive Summary
- c. New Entity Creation, Structure and Start-Up
- d. Relationship
- e. Foundational Information Recommendations
- f. Review of City of San Diego Foundation Documents

**16. Next Steps**

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Notice of Next Balboa Park Task Force Meeting if Necessary: Monday, April 19, 2010, 6:00 P.M.**  
Balboa Park Club Santa Fe Room

---

## Appendix D: Balboa Park Fund Task Force Notes

### 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](http://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

9. 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>.
10. 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
11. 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”.
12. 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.”**
13. 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.

14. 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?

15. 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 a report by the Trust for Public Lands which will look at the structures in place at five major U.S. city parks.

16. 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.

17. 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.

18. 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

**NOTES - REVISED**

**of the Monday, November 16, 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	Aurelia Flores
Robert (Bob) Ames, Vice Chair	Dale Hess
Ron Buckley	Chuck Hellerich
Laurie Burgett	Dea Hurston
Carol Chang	John Lomac
Bruce Coons	arrived 6:09
Berit Durler	Paul Meyer
Ray Ellis	Gonzalo Rojas
	Dalouge Smith
	Judy Swink

**Members Absent**

none

**Staff Present**

Beth Swersie (note-taker)

### CALL TO ORDER

- Chairperson Granowitz called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.
- Member introductions

### PUBLIC COMMENTS

Virginia Silverman expressed disappointment that representation doesn't appear to include other users such as the recreation community, special events users and philanthropic organizations. She fears that focusing on arts and culture stakeholders will overshadow interests of other users. [See Chairperson's Report, second bullet, which addresses this concern.]

Steve Hill, representing CM Todd Gloria, announced several meetings:

- Saturday, November 21, 9 am to Noon, City Council Budget and Finance Committee, Public Budget Forum. Hoover High School, 4474 El Cajon Boulevard.
- Tuesday, November 17, 7 pm, Councilmember Gloria, presentation on the budget, LGBT Community Center, 3909 Centre Street.
- Wednesday, November 18, 6:30 pm, Councilmember Gloria and Councilmember Faulconer, town hall meeting on the planned Mission Hills Hillcrest branch library, Top of the Park Penthouse (Park Manor Suites), 525 Spruce St 7th Floor.
- Saturday, December 12, 10 am to noon, Councilmember Gloria, community coffee to discuss Balboa Park issues and other City related matters, Hall of Champions.

### ACCEPTANCE OF NOTES OF OCTOBER BPTF MEETING

No corrections. Judy moved for acceptance, Ron seconded, unanimously accepted.

### INFORMATION ITEM

Stacey LoMedico, City of San Diego Park and Recreation Department Director: Comments on Balboa Park Committee's Recommendations for a new Non Profit for Funding Raising, Management & Governance: Q & A

Stacey gave background regarding the funding of the Park & Recreation Department (P&R):

- Funding is primarily from the General Fund via the budget process, which almost funds Police, Fire & Safety, P&R and General Services.
- Enterprise funds provide funding for specific areas of recreation use, e.g. golf courses.
- User fees are charged for special events and certain activities, e.g. swimming. The funds received do not go to the Department specifically, but back to the General Fund.
- With the current \$179 million deficit at the city, all departments have been asked to reduce their budgets by 27%.
- Annual budgets cover day-to-day operations, but not capital improvements or most deferred maintenance.
- The General Fund money that the Department receives is less than it was years ago, but fees have not increased in five years.
- Positions have been reduced; matching funds have been eliminated, special events support (e.g. stage) and administrative services clerical support have been reduced, among others.
- There is no longer a Marketing/PR person, special events person, fundraiser.
- Hours at recreation centers have been reduced from 65 to 40 per week.

Vicki asked for Stacey's perspective on creating another 501(c)3:

- S: this is not the first such study – it is time to get public input and decide on something once and for all. Make it better, create a fundamental structure and do it well. Make recommendations for P&R to review before it goes to the decision makers. Have a strategic plan and a "one-vision focus". That's what donors want to see.

Vicki noted that P&R staff wasn't supportive at the beginning.

- S: they were misinformed and thought that park services were to be privatized.

Gonzalo asked what Stacey sees as the relationship between P&R and the new entity.

- S: a direct partnership that will work together on a single strategic plan.

There was brief discussion about CIP funding, deferred maintenance, unfunded needs. Vicki said that this task force is to make recommendations about what the new entity is to be involved in.

Chuck asked Stacey how she viewed the role of P&R and the Director of P&R.

- S: the director needs to be intimately involved through the entire process.

Paul described an organic process to get to a partnership between the city and the new entity: the new entity needs to prove itself so that the public trusts it, needs to respect all park users, should select modest projects to prove its stewardship. He asked what Stacey would put first.

- S: would like to see options presented by the task force, would like it to be sensitive to the work of city employees, among other needs is staff to coordinate volunteers – there is only one volunteer coordinator now, but many people would like to volunteer.

Aurelia asked what internal procedures the TF might overlook, and what departments are important.

- S: reiterated the importance of the TF to make recommendations for P&R to review. P&R is a direct service provider and works very closely with Purchasing and other city departments.

Dea referred to Stacey's comment that jobs and programs that had generated funds were lost in the last 10 years. She asked what types of gifts were received and how they were used.

- S: Programs: "adopt-a-park", matching funds, volunteer involvement and resultant corporate support; Items: dog-poop bag dispensers, benches, park equipment.

Dalouge noted the complexity of research needed for community groups to get information for projects – the number of people and places that need to be consulted. He suggests that the TF build into the new entity an ability to work beyond P&R into the City.

- S: Points of contact are needed, for volunteers, contributors, who know the city and P&R, preferably one person in the entity.

Dalouge asked what capacity P&R has to work with the entity.

- S: P&R doesn't have that capacity due to all the reductions to operations. We have about 300 employees and all of them are already multi-tasking. The Department has lost approximately 181 positions in the last four years.
- Dalouge suggested that the entity would need to fund-raise for a P&R liaison.

John asked about the golf course leases and fees.

- S: The city owns three golf courses (Torrey Pines, Balboa Park and Mission Bay) and has leases at others. The golf courses fund their own capital improvements, maintenance and services from the golf enterprise funds (user fees). No general fund monies go to the golf courses operations.

John asked how the Real Estate Assets Department folds into other structures.

- S: P&R is a client of READ – READ is a service-provider to P&R. For example, Marston House: when the group that had been leasing it turned it back to the city, P&R worked with READ to develop a short-term agreement with an outside provider. P&R does not pay READ for these services.

John asked about revenue sources in the Park.

- S: there are the leases with non-profits, but they are based on the value of the facility to the general public, not necessarily on fair market value. Also, the money doesn't stay in Balboa Park, it goes to the city's General Fund.

Judy noted the need for individuals dedicated to certain tasks. She expressed concern over the loss of institutional memory.

#### **CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT** – Vicki Granowitz

- Handouts
  - Forest Park Forever Strategic Plan 2009-2013
  - Governing Urban Park Conservancies
- Vicki noted the variety of backgrounds and expertise of the TF members, that there are members from the park institutions and from the general public including Recreation Councils. She suggested that a part of the work of the TF would be to develop a common language and the

ability to understand each other's perspectives in order to work together. She has taken care to have representatives from both institutions and general public on each Subcommittee (see below for composition of subcommittees).

- Vicki reminded the TF of its goals: to forward the recommendations of the BPC in sufficient detail for a level of comfort with the public and the city council, but without giving too many specific directions. The Council will take the TF recommendations and appoint a "Transitional Organizing" Committee, much like with the "Tourism Marketing District" process. Council appointed the members and gave them a year to create a new corporation specific to that industry. This committee would be responsible for the legal process to create the new 501C3 for the Park. Ray asked if the TF could be more aggressive in leading the process. Vicki said yes, but it needs to make sure that recommendations are not project-based.

### WORKSHOP ITEMS

- Vicki announced subcommittee chairs, vice chairs and members for the Board Development/Structure Subcommittee and the Relationships Subcommittee:
  - Board Development/Structure Subcommittee (BDSS)
    - Chair: Chuck Hellerich
    - Vice-chair: Judy Swink
    - Members: Ray Ellis, Ron Buckley, Carol Chang, Gonzalo Rojas
  - Relationships Subcommittee (RS)
    - Chair: Laurie Burgett
    - Vice-chair: Paul Meyer
    - Members: John Lomac, Dale Hess, Berit Durler
- The BPC did a preliminary review of Council Policies, Municipal Codes and the City Charter and those who are interested will do a further review of these city documents.
- John asked about the types of relationships to be considered. Vicki suggested they start with the smallest increment.
- Bob suggested looking at "deal points" between a 501(c)(3) and the city (e.g. examples in other cities). Vicki again suggested starting small.
- Paul asked about the TF's responsibility in thinking about the financing of the new entity and of the park in the long term. He mentioned that these entities in other parks had begun as effective fund-raising mechanisms. He asked if the RS should look at relationships with other fund-raising groups and the philanthropic community. Vicki said that this is something the RS should determine.
- Chuck suggested the subcommittees establish a timetable so that they know how much they are going to do.
- Ray said that they would meet at the subcommittee level and come back to the TF to discuss their thoughts.
- Ron asked how soon the subcommittees should come back to discuss their ideas. Vicki said the sooner the better.
- Judy said that issues would formulate themselves in discussions.
- Carol commented that the mix of institution representatives and general public representatives would bring different points of view, some overlapping, and that they will find convergence through discussion.
- Vicki offered assistance to the subcommittees in finding meeting locations and posting the meeting times.
- Ron asked to see lists of park users and interested entities. Vicki said that information is on the CD, in the Jones & Jones Land Use/Park and Circulation Study. The report discusses what can be done in the park with and without a plan amendment.
- Chuck asked if we could have discussions with someone knowledgeable of other cities' park plans. Vicki introduced David Kinney, ED of Balboa Park Central (formerly House of Hospitality). This organization brought out Doug Brodsky from Central Park Conservancy 2 years ago, and last year Forest Park Forever spoke to the Balboa Park Committee on the topic. David offered his assistance. In general, since this has been done and many of the BPTF members heard one or both presentations and have been given the documents from other parks, it is unlikely that other visitors will be brought out at this time.
- Vicki will be working on FAQs for the website, reports to the public, and educating council members.

- Dalouge asked about a timeline, and suggested the subcommittees have their preliminary reports by the January TF meeting. Vicki suggested that the December meeting be for the subcommittees to meet.

**ADJOURNMENT**

- Chairperson Granowitz adjourned the meeting to order at 7:58 p.m.

**Next Balboa Park Task Force Meeting:**  
 6:00 P.M. on Monday, December 21, 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

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

**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.

- o Gonzalo leaves at 7:18 p.m.
- o 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).
- o 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.
- o 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 too 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.
- o Dale: we refer to a near-term reality and a long-term vision – entity first as a support group, later as support and management.
- o Vicki: “graduated responsibility” (per CM Todd Gloria)
- o 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.
- o Vicki: So there may be a programmatic EIR done, which could expedite the application process.
- o Ron: this will analyze the impacts in a big picture, all issues in major developments.
- o 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

---

#### **NOTES**

**of the Monday, January 18, 2009 meeting**

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

#### **Meeting held at:**

Reuben H. Fleet Science Center  
Community Room  
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  
Robert (Bob) Ames,  
Vice Chair  
Ron Buckley  
Laurie Burgett  
Carol Chang  
Bruce Coons  
arrived 6:22

Chuck Hellerich  
Berit Durler  
Ray Ellis  
Dale Hess  
John Lomac  
Paul Meyer  
Gonzalo Rojas  
Dalouge Smith  
Judy Swink

**Members Absent**

Aurelia Flores  
Dea Hurston

**Staff Present**

Beth Swersie (note-taker)

**CALL TO ORDER**

- Chairperson Granowitz called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

**CORRECTIONS OF NOTES OF NOVEMBER BPTF MEETING**

November 16<sup>th</sup> minutes approved (Berit/Carol).  
December 21<sup>st</sup> minutes approved (Berit/Judy, Chuck abstained)

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

None

**CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT** – Vicki Granowitz

No report.

**WORKSHOP ITEMS**

- Ron Buckley: Update on Review of City Charter, Municipal Code, Council Policies that might be relevant to the establishment of this entity. [The following is a preliminary overview of relevant items. A more complete report will follow.]
  - Municipal Code
    - Preparation of Annual Budget  
This is also a Charter section (see Charter Section 55.2 below).  
Regards the distribution of funds to Balboa Park and other City regional parks from the San Diego Regional Parks Improvement Fund which is wholly or partially derived from excess Mission Bay Park Lease Revenues
    - Special events  
This will need to be addressed if the entity undertakes the scheduling and coordination of special events.
    - City Endowment Board - how does this apply to a new entity?
    - Park & Recreation Board and Balboa Park Committee - how does this apply?
  - Council policies
    - 000-40 Marketing Partnership Policy
    - 600-33 Community Notification & Input for City-Wide Park Development Projects
    - 700-07 Park Development by Non-City Funds
    - 700-24 Balboa Park Architectural Standards – this should have been amended or repealed upon the adoption of the BP Precise Plan.
  - City charter – not desirable to amend – process requires 2/3 approval of the voters
    - Section 94 Contracts – requires bidding process and purchasing agent involvement. Will need city attorney recommendations as to whether this applies to this entity's implement/contracting work is subject to these provisions.
    - Special taxes, environmental growth fund, others – not particularly germane

Dale – asked if the policy re: lease revenues from Mission Bay Park says anything about income at BP?

Ron – no, nothing specific about BP. Charter Section 55.2 says that a certain amount of lease revenues in the Mission Bay Park go to BP deferred maintenance and capital improvement.

- Relationships Subcommittee (RS) Chair Laurie Burgett reported.
  - Laurie presented the Subcommittee's Draft Report – see attached document.
  - Notes about the Report:
    - The report was based on discussion, boiled down notes, simplified.
    - Some mbrs not at all meetings
    - 4.1.3 – “in the spirit of the Brown Act” is controversial
  - Input from other committee mbrs
    - Berit – concern about conflict of interest — it's critical that representatives from organizations in the park think of themselves as representatives of ALL of BP, not just as a stakeholder in a particular organization. Must be able to set aside loyalty to a particular organization. There should be a COI statement signed by all members, leave organization involvement at the door.
    - Ron – re 3.1.5 “change to an approval authority over time”?
    - LB – the ability to comment on projects may turn into authority to approve, but the entity needs to prove itself first.
    - Paul – after we hear both reports and match them to deliverables, we will end up with recommendations and statements of principles, e.g. that ownership/discretionary decisions remain with/at the city. The city will learn about entity as projects are assigned under its initial MOU, subsequent MOUs, start small organizing volunteers; maybe at some later date, entity entirely funds and manages something, it may take on approval authority. Are we seeking approval authority in areas people would think should be with city?
    - Gonzalo – we can't anticipate projects, maybe in the future, the entity can relieve the city of some authority.
    - Paul – have a section on inviolable principles, make clear approval authority is relevant to particular projects the entity is asked to undertake
    - Gonzalo – should we say where to locate entity – e.g. in park, in city? Nice to have in park, maybe not necessary.
    - Vicki – we'll come back to this.
    - Judy – should be explicit statement that city will retain all land use decision making authority.
    - Chuck – perhaps we've jumped down the road with the mission of the entity – gnarly issue – what is the role to start with? the more governance, the more BA application. Discussion has gone beyond formation to startup functions. #1 function is fundraising. Does city even want to download governance? Fundraising function needs large private element.
    - John – page 2 - what was thinking of subcommittee re relationship with county?
    - Laurie – there is no relationship now,
    - John – this is about money, county residents use park.
  
- Board Development/Structure Subcommittee (BD) Chair Chuck Hellerich, reported.
  - Chuck presented the Subcommittee's Draft Report on the New Entity board/Committee Structure – see attached document.
  - Notes about the Report
    - Chuck – composition of the proposed board is driven by users of park – spread out over broader region.
    - Dale – there was considerable discussion of Short-term ST vs. Long-Term LT -- ST support, LT management.
    - Ron – the admin/liaison capacity of the organization needed to meet what is requested of it would increase overhead expenses.
  - Input from other committee mbrs
    - Bruce – how to manage such a large board?
    - Chuck – other boards are as big as 75 – we took a rough average. Will need a strong Executive committee to manage between meetings, need committee structure. Executive committee – no size specified, depends on what organizing board establishes
    - John – who hires ED?
    - Ray – probably organizing board (vs. executive committee)
    - Project management – when the board identifies project/tasks to undertake, this committee is to coordinate/manage.

- Ray – funding organization vs. operational organization? Carol helped us get on point – from beginning funding with tight set of outcomes to go back to donors with these successes, e.g. work with city to fund a program to recruit, train, etc, volunteers. Be a well-managed funding organization.
- Gonzalo – is the “down the road” expectation that it becomes more of a managing entity?
- Chuck – that brings us to next element – **MOU** (last page of subcommittee report)
  - should be reviewed regularly as scope of activity increases.
  - Element #4 – we don’t want the city backing away from its current obligation of maintenance efforts.
  - Summary at bottom – notes that other conservancies undertake some form of master planning.
  - Own bank accts, no commingling of city/entity funds
- Judy – organizing board is very ST, e.g. 6 months to a year, mbrs of organizing bd may or may not continue on full board – probably not, depending on skills.
- Dale – management of capital improvement projects – e.g. funder may demand that project be managed by entity, other requirements to assure the private funder that project will happen.
- Ray – there will be a formal agreement, flexibility in MOU to allow that arrangement
- Chuck – do you staff up to manage capital improvement projects? Funding needs to be available to do that. Some projects can be implemented without staffing up.
- Carol - how much management should full board engage in? e.g. volunteer recruitment – do we want to be responsible for running volunteers? Distracting and diversionary. Tell city this is a value, donor will give \$, city to come back with plan. Later maybe we will be doing these things, but not at beginning.
- Bruce – address in MOU
- Paul – brilliant report. Principal area of question – full board and its large size – should size of final board be approached with flexibility – e.g. let organizing board recommend size? Considering projects to be undertaking. Organizing board drafting bylaws. X to Y # of mbrs. Will we keep 45 mbrs engaged at start? Can we evolve to larger size?
- Carol – should committee members be on board? Smaller board, bring in committee members not seated on board.
- Paul – attraction of large board – raising money – engage donors immediately? Maybe advisory board that adds to privacy of potential donors? Many don’t want to go to monthly mtgs. Leave it to organizing board to decide.
- Chuck – what we say is recommendation to organizing board.
- Ray – best practices from many other boards, talent-driven rather than placeholders.
- Vicki – how do we make this different? E.g. her biggest concern was that the public is not left out of decision making, then, fundraising side.
- Vicki - wants it to succeed. We need donor side. New entity, subcommittee for fundraising – too simplistic? Is it possible we need two entities – one: governing board (public, policy, strategy, governance), second: supporting board = fundraising board. Governing board identifies priorities, Fundraisers do fundraising. Gets done in hospitals, two kinds of boards.
- Berit – concern re BA, public organization, involvement in Fundraising (FR). Example: hospital models – two boards – main does govern/etc, foundation board responsible for Fundraising. Public input is very important to feel part of process.
- Separate 501c3, mission to raise money. Allows major funders who won’t sit thru public hearings to raise funds.
- Vicki – how is this different from other boards – it need large amounts of money raised.
- Gonzalo – doesn’t know big-money people. Two boards = trouble. Have one bd with FR within it.
- Berit – functions are very different. ED, President of Governing Board would also be on Foundation board; many people would be on the board with commitment to raising money.
- Carol – to set up one board will be complex, setting up two, really hard. Hospital board not analogous, private, no BA/transparency requirements. Fundraisers want to have control over money, not to be in public eye. Need to manage process within one board.
- Vicki – wants to be fair – experience in BP – decision-making made outside of general public. Wants process to be very public. Was focused on that. Hearing that there are privacy vs. BA issues.

- Bob Ames – scenario – wins lotto, high act of civic virtue – wants legacy – goes to 501c3 – gives \$\$\$ - wants to re-name plaza after him – chair would say ridiculous – someone else may be able to talk to donor to get better outcome – need way to have these conversations out of public view without imperiling msn of organization. Vicki’s methodology – governing organization (major decisions, out in open, transparent), another vehicle not subject to public scrutiny to raise money.
- Ray – those are multi-mill\$ (hosp) – this org needs to operate transparently and publicly. BA impairs/limits properly vetting some issues (e.g. pension bd). Don’t even mention BA, not necessary.
- Chuck – reiterate that very few of these organizations start out with governance issues, they start out with funding, may evolve into governance.
- Laurie – structure shown can work – need governance/visioning/strategic planning to direct funding priorities. Transparency there. Remove words “in spirit of BA”. This dovetails well with Relationships Committee ideas.
- Paul – disagrees. Both subcommittees have paid attn to new entity. Vicki’s question reminded him that this is public/private partnership. Committees have been fleshing out private part because public part exists already. Let city know that.
- What doesn’t work for Paul – we are not like a hospital district – no public board – city/BPC is public part. BPC as public forum - new entity is private part. Do we need public side of new entity? Our report needs to recognize that public is well represented by city/BPC.
- Bruce – re Paul’s first subject – there should be a decision-making board and an advisory board – 40 people too big to get through a mtg. – board needs to be light on its feet, make quick decisions. Large boards can’t make decisions in a timely manner.
- Dalouge – master plan/precise plan – successful conservancies have those tools and adhere to them strongly – so public interest has been addressed. If those plans need to be updated, need to get city to do that, so we can do fund-raising.
- D – In terms of this as a fund-raising entity – what is difference between this and others that already exist? Are we duplicating something that is already going on? Why a NEW entity?
- D – Ideally this entity has management of the projects it is funding.
- D – Not clearly articulated: how is initial organizing board is seated? We need to be explicit about this or there could be problems. Organizing board should decide size and scope of work of full board.
- John – importance of master plan. City is behind game in implementation of MP because of funding issue. This is a fundraising mission – transparency – can’t be done as in past – public side – organizing committee. Needs to do more work before going to 45 people. Look more at organizing committee – and what is new entity going to do when they raise money?
- Next Steps
  - Vicki- where from here?
  - Judy – at next TF mtg – more focused discussions on subjects raised tonight. What other tasks should organizing committee undertake before moving on to full board. Concept of two entities. If there were two entities – Fundraising committee would fund projects that have come from govern board. Donors might come in with projects, but would have to go to board. Or go to BPC for discussion.
  - Paul – three assignments as he sees it:
    - 1 – brief new section proposed with commentary about why our new entity is different? What will it bring to table?
    - 2 – one page starter sheet – how public input will remain critical part of Park project planning process
    - 3 – ask two subcommittee chairs to merge reports – overlapping ideas –
  - Berit – concern about comfort of donors – but this group is public/private so subject to BA?
  - Vicki – initial bd will be subject, but next entity would not because not created by legislative body.
  - Chuck/Laurie/Dalouge will work on combining reports
  - Judy – good to have non-committee person working on that.
  - Judy – this to lead to responsibility of organizing board to set up scope of full board.

**ADJOURNMENT**

- Chairperson Granowitz adjourned the meeting to order at 8:07 p.m.

**Next Balboa Park Task Force Meeting:**

Monday, February 15, 2010, 6:00 P.M.

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

**NOTES**

**of the Monday, February 15, 2010 meeting**

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

**Meeting held at:**

Reuben H Fleet Science Center  
Community Room  
1875 El Prado, Balboa Park (off Park Blvd at Parking  
Lot at back of Building)

**Mailing address is:**

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

**ATTENDANCE**

**Members Present**

Vicki Granowitz, Chair of BPTF	Aurelia Flores Arrived 6:34
Robert (Bob) Ames, Vice Chair	Chuck Hellerich Dea Hurston
Ron Buckley	John Lomac
Laurie Burgett	Paul Meyer
Carol Chang	Gonzalo Rojas
Berit Durler	Dalouge Smith
Ray Ellis	Judy Swink

**Members Absent**

Bruce Coons  
Dale Hess

**Staff Present**

Beth Swersie (note-taker)

**CALL TO ORDER**

- Chairperson Granowitz called the meeting to order at 6:05 p.m.

**ACCEPTANCE OF NOTES OF JANUARY BPTF MEETING**

No corrections. Berit moved for acceptance, Carol seconded, unanimously accepted.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS** – None

**CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT** – Vicki Granowitz.

**WORKSHOP**

**17. Discussion of Findings/Recommendations For Report**

- Chuck – example: Forest Lawn Conservancy – 25 member advisory board to advise on policy, planning issues, public input process. Accommodates donor privacy.
- Bob – Central Park conservancy agreement fulfills landlord functions such as leasing, maintenance, usually held by city.
- Chuck – scope of responsibility of the non-profit – specifically didn't want to be part of leasing and maintenance functions.
- Ron – wants to temper some of the language - e.g. re governance, maintenance. Public input – general public needs some way to solicit support of the entity.
- Vdg – suggests the TF work thru document vs. deal with new issues
- Vdg – first, what to call things

- Paul –instead of “governance”, say “carrying out its contractual obligations”?
  - Carol – could also say that instead of “maintaining, enhancing, restoring”
  - Gonzalo – no, “carrying out its contractual obligations” is not clear, use of those words “maintaining, enhancing, restoring, governing” IS clear
- a. **How should the New Entity be structured internally? Identify make-up of an initial Board of Directors and the tasks necessary to create the new entity**
- Vdg – start with **II. NEW ENTITY CREATION**, etc.
  - Chuck – “Organizing Committee” – city is driving process, Organizing Committee is to be appointed by the mayor. It will take the first steps to get the non-profit formed and operating. Need people who can bring talent/expertise to get organization running. Organizing Committee will probably be the first BOD, hire ED, recruit full board.
  - Ron –**II.A.2.b.** “Organizing Committee Composition Required Elements” – is that correctly phrased? **YES.**
  - Paul – questioned **II.A.1.e. (a)**: is it relationships “between the NE and a, b, c” OR “among a, b and c”?
  - Chuck – yes, correct (a) to read “between NE and existing park stakeholder groups”.
  - Judy in **II.A.2.b.**: put “Organizing Committee Composition Required Elements” in quotation marks to set it off as a phrase.
  - Vdg – is everyone ok with **II.A.1.**? **YES.**
  - Vdg –is everyone ok with **II.A.2.**? **YES.**
  - Chuck – summary of **II.A.3. – Organizing Committee/Initial Board Actions** – chronological, linear.
  - Ron – initial group recruiting others, do we need to develop a list, get direction re projects, programs to attract interest of those to serve, donate?
  - Vdg – there is a list
  - Dalouge – re **II.A.3. and II B.3.** – both are lists of initial tasks for Organizing Committee – can they be combined?
  - Vdg – there are other places also,
  - Laurie – yes we can consolidate them.
  - Dalouge – re initial tasks, keep funds separate from city, what are the mechanics? They will need fiscal sponsor, or to be sure that they can establish accounts prior to being 501c3.
  - Ray – can find a fiscal agent in interim
  - Chuck – when can they establish accounts? add “to arrange fiscal agent if needed”?
  - VDG **II.A.3.** is now ok.
  - Gonzalo – refer to final group as “permanent board”?
  - Judy – looked up online, common term, even though’ it rotates after establishment
  - Vdg – ok? **Yes**
  - Dalouge – switch references to full board, then organizing board?
  - Berit – likes it as it is, vdg also.
  - Ray – organizing board → permanent board – it’s a sequence
  - Dalouge – not finding one place of concise list of actions of permanent board
  - Judy – some of that will be determined by the organizing/Initial Board
  - Laurie – composition and structure right now.
  - John – how does the Organizing Committee transition to the Initial Board?
  - Chuck – Organizing Committee is appointed, it establishes the entity, recruits members; it ends at the appointment of the Initial Board.
  - Chuck – **II.B.** Organizing Committee: characteristics, size, initial tasks are really of Organizing Committee/Initial Board
  - Paul – f/up on Dalouge’s comment re **II.B.3.** – initial tasks of Organizing Committee – include a “needs assessment”? I think at most, should be to identify initial projects to be considered.
  - Chuck – some kind of needs assessment for MOU
  - Paul – for Initial Board (vs. permanent board) – move this out of initial tasks for Organizing Committee and into section for initial tasks for full board
  - Ron – same for “prioritize/identify timeline and costs for needs assessment”?
  - Vdg – call it Organizing Committee? Vs organizing board
  - Ray – the trigger is 501c3 – Organizing Committee becomes Initial Board
  - Carol – rolling along, need to do this in sequence



- Ron – when do we move beyond Organizing Committee? To bringing on 20 more board members? After MOU?
- Vdg – wait, let's back up
- Judy – clarify: Organizing Committee, then 501c3, then Initial Board, need to separate the two. Organizing committee achieves certain ends (e.g. 501c3), then it becomes the Initial Board, independent of city decisions for next steps. Some of the earlier steps need to be moved to Initial Board.
- Vdg – say somewhere that there is Organizing Committee/501c3/Initial Board
- Chuck – there are host of issues re board size, composition, need to evolve – start with 9 (good size) – organize themselves enough to recruit board members and funds to entity. How far can WE go to define that? These issues will be determined by the board: define projects, who they are, where their funding comes from.
- Ron – council will ask when we go to full board?
- Ray – hard to get 45-member board until the Initial Board hammers out its tasks.
- Vdg – council members and staff want to have something up/running by end of year.
- Judy – permanent board will want final say on MOU and operating budget – start developing them
- John – MOUs are evolving items – takes long time to get reviewed by city atty. Start asap,
- Chuck – **II.C.**
- Berit – in **last bullet of II.C.1.**, eliminate “minimum of 2 of 3”
- Chuck – leave metrics requirements up to future board, some potential members don't have money
- Berit – leave it silent
- Vdg – **ok, take out parenthetic part**
- John – national advisors? Is this typical?
- Ray – lends credibility on national level
- Judy – perspective of someone outside, not local, can be valuable
- Chuck – board size – removed number from earlier discussion – to be determined by entity, start small, then grow as needed.
- Vdg – change acting board to permanent board
- Chuck – committee structure of permanent board
- Dalouge – comment on section – extremely detailed, prescriptive vs. general guidelines to this point – this presupposes things that should be determined by organizing board. Perhaps change to list of suggested committees in appendix, vs. in body.
- Carol – show these as what could happen, not what must happen
- Chuck – important to lay out for public and city what entity will look like, properly structured. Detail describes what could be a very functional entity.
- Carol – address it by calling it a suggestion rather than a prescription.
- Judy – not to take it out – shows what we're aiming for – say 'suggested new structure', even vs. recommended. So layperson can see it, many skip appendix.
- Berit – just list appropriate committees, not tasks
- Gonzalo – keep all specific info, say suggested
- Judy – keep all specific info for everyone to understand – for broader public
- Vdg – ask Ray his thoughts
- Ray – more info, better keyed, easier more effective for next group. “suggested” in #3, “recommended standing committees”
- Bob – add subdivision under executive committee – make it clear that the executive committee has authority of the board – “if board is not available, the executive committee has authority to act in place of the board”
- Chuck – that would be in bylaws
- John – is Organizing Committee tasked with hiring ED, or Initial Board?
- Chuck – one of first tasks of Organizing Committee – recruiting to start immediately
- Judy – IRS provides 18-month organizing process
- Carol – separate out Organizing Committee, Initial Board,
- Gonzalo – how quickly will funds be generated? May have to wait til funds raised.
- Laurie – executive committee – always responsible for hiring ED.
- Paul – new ED will sign employment contract, leave job/city, seems obvious that corporation needs to exist, therefore permanent board needs to exist, so there can be a binding contract
- Bob – also has funds

- Paul – permanent board needs to sign contract, inconsistency in current draft, Organizing Committee starts process by looking for candidates, but need existing 501c3 with permanent board to enact contract.
  - Ray – recruiting process will be long one, start in Organizing Committee, Initial Board to permanent board is a process, not overnight, overlap of initial/permanent board during hiring of ED.
  - Paul – Organizing Committee = Initial Board = first permanent board?
  - Judy – use language to differentiate between initial and permanent bd
  - Laurie – city appoints Organizing Committee, articles/501c3 ---
  - Paul – initial permanent board
  - Vdg – we’ll work this out, let’s move on
  - Dalouge – are we using an appendix to list details of committee structure?
  - Vdg – no, using phrase “recommended”
  - Aurelia – so much detail?
  - Dalouge – no list of recommended priorities for permanent board.
  - Bob – that’s the prerogative of permanent board – difficulty recruiting bdmbrs – leave to permanent board
  - Dalouge – need some language re purpose of the permanent board.
  - Vdg – the standing committees outline priorities
- b. **What should be the relationship between the New Entity and the City of San Diego. Should the “head” of the New Entity be a City employee or be solely under the direction of the New Entity?**
- c. **What should be the “Internal Relationships” between existing park organizations/stakeholders and the new entity?**
- Starting at **III. RELATIONSHIPS, etc.**
  - Judy – **III.A.1.a.** – include that the formal agreement is an MOU
  - Gonzalo – **III.b.1.a. first bullet:** “there is no assurance that this New Entity will be successful” .... change to “in order to ensure the success of the New Entity”
  - Paul – **III.A.1.e.** – “this relationship could change to an approval authority over time”. Rather: “this relationship may EVOLVE”, but the approval authority wouldn’t be transferred.
  - Bob – coordination of events, seems there is potential at some time that issuance of permits become responsibility of this entity. Is this “approval authority”?
  - Laurie – this relationship will evolve over time by use of MOUs etc. (e.g. operational, decisions)
  - Vdg – leave it in or take it out – “approval authority”
  - Chuck – board is not just advisory.
  - Vdg – wait to see if covered elsewhere
  - Dalouge – **III.A.1.f.** – specifically acknowledge Balboa Park Committee somewhere; 2nd – in this section or in MOU piece: “single point of contact”, 3rd – access to City Council, Mayor, P&R, no mention of entity’s reporting responsibility to city here and on **Elements in MOU.**
  - Laurie - correct, it was not addressed
  - Gonzalo – supposed to relieve city of some functions, need some language that one function is a single point of contact in both directions.
  - Vdg – over time, yes. Adding single pt of contact with city, with public.
  - Paul – new entity should NOT be single point of contact now – it would be disrespectful of existing groups, maybe later with track record. Suggest it be called a regular point of contact
  - Judy – replace single point, two way?
  - Paul – new entity should try to represent broad park community
  - Ron – stakeholders – general – who?
  - Judy – users
  - Paul – language could be read to mean that the BPCP is yesterday’s news, we are the only point of contact.
  - Chuck/vdg – that was never the intent
  - Ray – new entity needs to have a point of contact at city
  - Berit – **III.A.1.f.iii.** – ‘should’ vs. ‘shall’ – makes it stronger, with expectations between city/entity
  - ?? – included leases?
  - Laurie – that is sensitive
  - Vdg - not include leases, maybe agreements

- John – shy away from management for five years, stick to fundraising at first – city has different ways of getting revenues.
  - Laurie – should entity have input re use of buildings coming up for lease?
  - Vdg – utilization vs. ?
  - Berit – this is positive in that this is the organization that leases go through – cover somewhere that as leases come up for renewal they be treated equitably – should entity be involved?
  - David Kinney (BPCP) mission of new entity – fundraising – crucial – not mission, but how it achieves its mission – go back to stated mission of TF
  - Berit – this could be an organization that might assist in equitable treatment
  - Chuck – **III.A.1.h.** – advocate for improvements in governance - put it here?
  - Ron – entity stands as advocate vs. city
  - Chuck – same is true re leases
  - Judy – REA does negotiations for leases, but there is a public interest in knowing about leases under discussion – this could be a forum for discussion – opportunity for general public to know about them. Way to approach without intruding in process.
  - Gonzalo – encourage a process
  - Vdg – leases are a big issue that we could get stuck in. Maybe eventually, but not immediately
  - Laurie – all it says is that the city will consult with entity re leases
  - Vdg – premature
  - Carol – move on to **section B**, will come back to these
  - Ron – attempt to create overarching vision – conflicts with what BP Committee does
  - Vdg – this much confusion – trying to do too many things. BPC came about because part of 600.33 process, vs. this group – can’t resolve all park peeves with this now.
  - Judy – leave out leases, approach later
  - Carol – vision statement - Internal relations: we took out “there is no assurance, etc.”
  - Dalouge – **second bullet in III.B.1.a.** – insert opportunities for cultural enjoyment.
  - Carol – **III.B.1.b.** number of stakeholders – ok
  - Bob – **III.B.1.c.** – expressly state what areas of activity are not part of public process
  - Vdg – noted, later discussion
  - Bob – annual report – annual audit data – redundancy – every 501c3 files form 990, which includes that stuff.
  - Vdg – need more discussion re what’s posted, not posted.
  - Ron – **III.B.1.e.** – projects initiated by stakeholder to be presented to new entity.
  - Gonzalo – this is for open, public areas of park?
  - Vdg – yes
  - Dalouge – problem is anyone can bring projects to city – no coordination
  - Carol – **III.B.2.** vision between New Entity and stakeholders outside Park
  - Dalouge – add “advocacy”
  - Bob – **III.B.3.a.** – last word – “spent judiciously” vs. “appropriately”
  - Laurie – people don’t give money to city because they don’t think it will be spent appropriately.
  - Ron – **III.B.3.b.** – revenue streams?
  - Laurie – example: a concession that doesn’t exist today,
  - Carol – grants
  - Dalouge – **III.B.2.b.** – relationships with neighboring communities
  - Carol – “friend-building”
- d. **What policy issues might need to be addressed and resolved during a negotiation to define the contractual relationship between the New Entity’s public-private partnership with the City?**
- Paul – Appendix A: Elements in Memo of Understanding, #4: Can we establish a formula for maintenance efforts by city?
  - Vdg – that has been debated.
  - Chuck – new entity can ask what they want, city can say no.
- e. **Muni Code, City Policies and City Charter sections review Working Group. Identify which might require amending and recommend changes.**
- Ron distributed an updated report, which was not discussed this meeting.

**18. Next Steps – Draft Report to be revised.**

**ADJOURNMENT**

- Chairperson Granowitz adjourned the meeting at 8:11 p.m.

**Next Balboa Park Task Force Meeting:**

6:00 P.M. on Monday, March 15, 2010

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

---