



**NOTICE OF MEETING
ALAMEDA RECREATION AND PARK COMMISSION
MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING**

DATE: Thursday, April 14, 2011
TIME: 7:00 p.m.
PLACE: Room 360, City Hall, corner of Santa Clara Avenue and Oak Street, Alameda, CA 94501

1. ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Joe Restagno, Commissioners Mike Cooper, Bill Delaney, and Bill Sonneman
Absent: Vice Chair Lola Brown and Commissioner Gina Mariani
Staff: Dale Lillard, ARPD Director

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approve Minutes of February 10, 2011 Recreation & Park Commission Regular Meeting.

M/S/C DELANEY/SONNEMAN (unanimously approved)

“That the minutes of February 10, 2011 Recreation Commission Meeting is approved.”

Approved (4): Restagno, Cooper, Delaney, Sonneman
Absent (2): Brown, Mariani

3. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS, AGENDA

None.

4. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS

None.

5. NEW BUSINESS

**A. Provide Direction to Develop a Policy on the Hanging of Banners –
(Discussion/Action Item)**

Director Lillard stated that currently there is not an official policy to hang banners in parks, but we receive multiple requests from a lot of non-profits in town, or the non-profit does not even ask and goes ahead and installs their banner.

What the Recreation & Park Department would like to do is set some established criteria (e.g., Alameda based 501(c) 3, etc.) with a length of time. Some suggested criteria would be types of groups' eligible, approved sites, length of time, types of banners, etc.

Chair Restagno asked if the policy would prohibit people who are having day events at the park from putting up smaller banners for picnics or something they are having in the park. Director Lillard no, as long as the banner comes down the same day.

Director Lillard stated that the problem is when they leave the banners up for three months or more. Commissioner Sonneman asked if that happens a lot. Director Lillard stated yes, staff is removing them all the time.

Director Lillard stated that at this time ARPD is giving youth groups 30 days before their registration period.

M/S/C SONNEMAN/DELANEY (approved)

“That ARPD staff develop a draft Policy on Hanging Banners in the Parks and bring it back to the Commission for approval at their June 2011 meeting.”

Approved (4): Restagno, Cooper, Delaney, Sonneman
Absent (2): Brown, Mariani

B. Information/Update on Budget Status – (*Discussion Item Only*)

Director Lillard stated that there is a \$6 million budget short fall in 2011/2012, \$7.5 million short fall in 2012/13, and \$9 million shortfall in 2013/14 if nothing is done to contain the loss. Health care costs have gone up 14% and the payment to the pension system has also gone up approximately 2%. The 2008 market crash hurt the pension system investment portfolio. PERS came back to the cities asking for an increase in contributions because they did not make the investments that they had anticipated.

Eventually there will be a two-tiered pension system, but unfortunately it will take 20 years to see the benefit. The Acting City Manager will talk to all bargaining units to try and get some concessions (e.g., members picking up costs, furlough, etc.). Even if bargaining units agree to a concession, the City cannot make up \$6 million in concessions. There will be some cuts. The Department has been asked to do a 5% budget cut and a 10% budget cut scenario.

A 5% budget cut for ARPD is some reorganization of the administration office and we lose half of the free playgrounds. We can absorb the 5% and still keep doing most functions (e.g., down grade some positions, move some things around, etc.). We would still operate five of the ten free playground programs.

If asked to do a 10% budget cut, the Department is looking at cutting four to five full-time positions and 10 free playground program sites. These suggestions will go to

Council and they will make the final decision. Also, if the bargaining units do agree to furloughs then maybe the cuts would only be 5% and not 10%.

Chair Restagno stated that ARPD has very affordable programs and is usually on the low end of what is charged by other outside agencies. If the Department is going to be losing out because of the budget issues does it make sense to increase prices? You would have to do the cost benefit to determine if it decreases enrollment, then the increase does not make sense. We could charge a lot more. He would rather save to keep the parks open and to keep programs going. Eventually, the parks will still be maintained but we will not have anything else.

Director Lillard stated that the parks will always be maintained. There will always be a need for trash pick up, bathrooms cleaned, grass mowed, etc. Hopefully there will be some concession by the bargaining units and there will be some balance between the two.

Director Lillard stated the Department will be stuck with the 5% cut. Even if fees were raised today, it would not generate enough funds in six weeks.

Chair Restagno recommended that staff look very hard at the areas where they think they can generate more revenue and it will not compromise the overall revenue by raising the price. Director Lillard agreed and stated we might be able to then raise additional fees in the fall.

Chair Restagno asked to see the PNL as it relates to ARPD. Director Lillard stated that it is on the City's website. There are two separate budgets: General Fund which includes all park maintenance, Mastick, and free events/playgrounds which is approximately \$1 million for Parks and \$1 million for Recreation. Then there is the Trust Fund which includes all revenue producing programs (e.g., day care, day camps, rentals, adult sports, etc.) which generates \$2 million to cover all costs of programs, plus whoever is administering the program. We will never get any revenue from the Park Maintenance Division side.

Director Lillard stated that he wanted to inform the Commission so that they were aware of the situation in case some Commissioner's received questions/comments from the public regarding the cuts.

Commissioner Sonneman stated that the City needs to look at the budget very broadly rather than just raising recreation fees.

Commissioner Delaney stated that Chair Restagno's comments are well taken and it sounds like what we charge is much lower than the average. But, the reality is we need to bring fees up. Director Lillard stated that history has always been (Council policy and City policy) that anything of special interest or adult programs were to be 100% cost recovery and people paid. Any children programs, senior, or disabled programs were General Fund items.

C. Information/Update on Krusi Park Renovation – (Discussion Item Only)

Director Lillard stated that the RFP selection and interviews have been completed. An architect (Carducci & Associates out of San Francisco) was selected. We have a scope of work and a tentative contract which is now in the City Attorney's Office for review. It is anticipated that the review will be completed the week of April 18, 2011 and that the contract will go to Council for approval sometime in May 2011.

Once approved by Council, the design process will begin and a couple of public meetings will be held at Otis School. Conceptual Plans will be done for the public meetings, go to Council for approval, then the bid process will be done. We are hoping to begin construction this fall.

D. Information/Update on Park Master Plan - (Discussion Item Only)

Director Lillard stated that the Phone Survey has been completed. There were 400 residents who were called. Eighty-seven percent of residents stated they used the park recently. Surprising, the highest type of facility response that was received was for trails and open space. Fields were ranked a little bit lower.

Director Lillard did mention to the consultant to wait until the first community meeting is held because the field people will attend. The most surprising find of the Phone Survey was that the sports complex and fields were way down the list.

The consultant is half-way through the inventory of the parks. They will provide staff with an inventory of the current conditions of everything, with suggestions on the types of improvements needed, a cost attached to the improvements, and then some projections for the next 20 years.

After the Public Meetings the consultants will come back to the Commission for an update.

Commissioner Cooper mentioned that the importance of having the Park Master Plan done was so that ARPD could apply for grants, etc. Director Lillard stated that having a Park Master Plan is tied to applying for grants and receiving/charging developer fees. The Master Plan is to help prove what is needed.

Director Lillard stated that staff feels that is why prior developer fees have been too low.

6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

7. REPORTS FROM RECREATION COMMISSION AND RECREATION AND PARK DIRECTOR

A. Park Division

See Activity Report dated April 12, 2011.

Director Lillard provided an update on the Emma Hood and Encinal Swim Centers. AUSD released the Needs Assessment Report. The cost to bring the Swim Centers up to code would be \$4 million. No entity (City or AUSD) has the \$4 million needed for

repairs/upgrades.

There was a Joint-Use Meeting between City Council and AUSD Board. Those in attendance were Mayor, Vice Mayor, AUSD Superintendent, AUSD Board President, and AUSD Board Member Margie Sherratt.

Director Lillard stated that the cost to maintain the pools is approximately \$500,000. This is to run both sites. The actual use time of the pools is split 25% AUSD, 25% ARPD, 50% Non-Profits/Swim Teams. The Non-Profits only pay \$20,000. The Non-Profits should be paying \$250,000, divided over the three teams would be \$80,000, which is not realistic and would put them out of business.

AUSD is supposed to come back with a revised joint-use, short-term agreement with a new split that all groups would need to sign. To get to the point of either fixing the pools by selling a bond, etc. or try to build a new pool.

Even if there was an agreement today the pools are in such bad shape we cannot guarantee that they will run.

Commissioner Delaney asked if there was a chance that you had the \$4 million and fixed the pools, would they stay up and running for the next 20 years. Director Lillard stated that \$4 million would only bring the pools up to code.

Commissioner Sonneman stated that he prefers the idea of one new pool. But, agrees there needs to be some sort of joint use agreement in place.

B. Recreation Division

See Activity Report dated April 12, 2011.

C. Mastick Senior Center

See Activity Report dated April 12, 2011.

D. Other Reports and Announcements

8. STATUS REPORT ON ONGOING PROJECTS

None.

9. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS, GENERAL

John Revada, Jr. stated that he was at the Commission Meeting because his friend Staff Sergeant Eric S. Trueblood was killed in Afghanistan in March 2011. Staff Sergeant Trueblood was an eight year Army veteran, resident of Alameda and a very good friend of his. Mr. Revada would like to put something in Franklin Park in his honor.

Director Lillard asked if he knew what Mr. Revada would like to install. We have the authority to install small items. We do install a lot of benches with recessed plaques which would be the easiest.

Mr. Revada asked if a statue could be installed. Director Lillard stated that would be more difficult. Something like that would have to go to Council for approval.

Commissioner Delaney asked Mr. Revada if Sergeant Trueblood was the fourth Alamedan to die in Afghanistan in military action. Mr. Revada stated yes, since 2004.

Commissioner Delaney asked if there was any chance that something could be done slightly larger rather than doing something for just that one individual.

Commissioner Sonneman suggested doing something at Veteran's Memorial Park. Director Lillard stated that is not City property. It belongs to Harbor Bay Island Homeowners Association.

Director Lillard also suggested that we could possibly install some kind of plaque in the lobby of the Veteran's Building.

Mr. Revada stated that the reason he wanted to do something in Franklin Park is because Eric liked Franklin Park and did a lot of barbecuing in the park. Director Lillard stated there is an official policy about placing markers, etc., in parks. It gives ARPD the discretion on memorial items like benches, etc. What the City is trying to avoid is the look of a headstone.

Director Lillard suggested that Mr. Revada go look at a couple of memorial benches that were installed at Shoreline Park to get an idea of what is possible. The benches are durable and do not get vandalized.

Mr. Revada asked about installing a sculpture. Director Lillard stated that we would have to go to Council for approval for something of that nature.

Director Lillard suggested that Mr. Revada go look at the benches at Shoreline Park. Then come to the ARPD Administrative Office and speak with the Park Manager who has ordered and installed a number of memorial benches and he will be able to help Mr. Revada.

Chair Restagno stated that the Commission wants to make sure that the memorial fits in the park theme.

10. ITEMS FOR NEXT AGENDA

11. SET NEXT MEETING DATE: Thursday, May 12, 2011

12. ADJOURNMENT