The following transcript is provided for your convenience, but does not represent the official record of this meeting. The transcript is provided by the firm that provides closed captioning services to the City. Because this service is created in real-time as the meeting progresses, it may contain errors and gaps, but is nevertheless very helpful in determining the gist of what occurred during this meeting.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Thank you for being here on time, we always want to honor those who show up on time. We'll begin with the review of the work plan. That was an official call to order by the way. And I would like to out of courtesy change item number 5 and bring that forward, before we begin with 1. The reason being, is the person who's involved has to leave early and we want to show that courtesy. And then Kip, would you like to explain the need for Sunshine for article 7.

>> Yes. We moved as quickly as we could after council's directions on the neighborhoods commission to assemble a work plan for the neighborhood commission, and in doing so we are technically in violation of the sunshine ordinance. So in order to hear that work plan today, we would need you to vote in approval of a waiver of that, which would require a 2/3 majority of the committee.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Which we have. With that, may I have a motion to approve? (inaudible) And second, and we're all set. So with that we're ready to begin. Let's go immediately to item number 5, and welcome to us. Matt Cano, our deputy director.

>> Thank you very much and thanks for the schedule accommodation. We definitely appreciate it. My name is Matt Cano, deputy director of Parks, Recreation, and Neighborhood Services, and with me is Claudia Chang, our recreation superintendent overseeing our capital budget and capital grants program. Today we're going to provide you a brief status report on the status of our capital-funded grants in the Parks, Recreation, and Neighborhood Services department, as well as the park bond program. With that, I will turn it over to Claudia for the grant portion of the presentation.

>> Thank you very much. I wanted to provide a few highlights of activities that occurred between April and September of this year. First of all we applied for grant reimbursements. We applied for funding in the amount of $17.5 million for three grants. We did receive $350,000 for the Lower Silver Creek trail Alum Rock to Highway 680. We were denied two other grants, and one of them was for the San Francisco Bay trail for $240,000, and then another $17 million grant for the Bay Trail Reach 9/90. There is still one grant application that is pending, and that is for the Penitencia Creek reach 1. On the next slide I wanted to highlight some of the upcoming grant

opportunities. One of them will be for the environmental enhancement mitigation program. This grant offers a total of $10 million each year. To local, state and federal government agencies and to nonprofit organizations. Eligible projects must directly or indirectly relate to environmental impact of the modification of an existing transportation facility. Or construction of a new transportation facility. We will come back to you to the City Council in December to apply for two grants. And one of them will be for the Coyote creek trail. And the other grant application will be for the Thompson creek trail. Another organization that we will be applying for a grant is for the one Bay Area grant, this program invests roughly $320 over a four year period. It's a new funding approach that will integrate the region's federal transportation program with California's climate law and the sustainable community strategy. We will seek city council's approval to apply for the grant in January. The urban greening grant is the last of three grants for urban greening planning and projects. Examples of the grant program's objectives include improving air and water quality, protecting natural resources and agricultural lands, and improving transportation. We will seek city council's approval to apply for the grant in February. And the last item is, we are also monitoring federal transportation opportunities. We are are working with our legislative partners to monitor discussion is about the federal transportation bill. There may be opportunities for bicycle transportation projects like trails.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Thank you for that Julie. I'd like to compliment your department on your ongoing and wonderful prolific attempts to get as many grants as you possibly can. And I'm hoping that in the future one of those might be for a softball complex. Is that in the works?

>> That's coming up in one more slide after this.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Then I'll wait. I have to put in the pitch as much as I can.

>> Absolutely. Claudia is going to share with us a couple of grant projects that are under way or recently completed on this slide.

>> On the left-hand side is a picture of the lower Guadalupe river trail. It runs from Gull Street to Highway 880. The first phase along the airport from Highway 880 to Trimble road is expected to open within the week. The

second phase which is highway 101 and Gull Street should be done in March. The picture on the right is the highway 237 bike way project. This is on the north side of highway 237 between Coyote Creek and Zanker road. This project was completed in June, and this .8 mile paved trail project was designated as part of the regional San Francisco Bay trail and the Juan Bautista de Anza national historic trail.

>> Thank you. And I just have two more slides. The status of our park bond program in 2000, we had $228 million park bond that was passed by the voters. We've completed 93 of the 95 projects that were funded by that bond. The two outstanding projects are both very large. One is the soccer complex. And I'll cover that in the next slide. And the second is the softball complex. Total money remaining, we have $14.5 million allocated towards the Coleman soccer complex which is moving forward right now. Then we have two line items remaining in the bond program. But that is actually appropriated to the softball complex reserve at $9.7 million and another bond contingency reserve at $7.5 million. The bond contingency reserve can be used on any eligible bond project. It could be completely used on the softball complex, it could be used for a community center, a park, soccer, it could be used for any park eligible project under the bond language, it is pretty broad. At this time we are not planning on making a formal recommendation on the use of the reserve until we have a definitive recommendation on the bond softball complex. Which I'll cover in a second. The proposed soccer complex site which was passed by council in June of this past year is next to the airport at the FMC, old FMC site adjacent to the earthquakes stadium which broke ground a couple of weeks ago. Right now we've awarded a design-build contract for the soccer complex. The first design build partnership meeting between the future operators of the complex who are going to be the San José earthquakes are going to operate for and behalf of the city, and the contractors and our parks department was actually held last Friday so this was well under way and we should see dirt flying soon. The complex will be open in spring of 2014. So we're very excited about this moving forward. Regarding the softball complex we are still in the determining stages of what to -- what formal recommendation to make to the city council. There's four sites that we had mentioned before that we were looking at specifically. Shady oaks which is in council district 2, the Arcadia site in council district 8, Columbus park which is two existing softball fields and council district 3 in Alviso park which is an existing park in council district 4. In addition to these four sites we've also been approached by a company, I can't give the name right now but we may be -- we are hoping to come forward to council very shortly in collaboration with the office of economic development. There's a company that's

approached us to possibly place a softball complex at Singleton landfill, and this could be a possibly entirely privately financed site, could be a combination of financing. We're in the very preliminary stages of that right now and we're hoping to bring an informational memo or an actual council memo very soon to discuss the beginning stages of that project with the city council. It's because of those discussions recently that we do not have a recommendation on the softball site formally for the NSE committee at this time. The criteria -- this is a list of the criteria that we've covered with your committee before about what we will use in ultimately determining where to place a softball complex such as the impact on the community, the ease of transportation and parking, environmental impact, visibility of the site as well which has come up before, it needs to be very visibly prominent that it is a softball complex. With that we'd be happy to take any questions on the status of our grants and bond program.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Gentlemen? Do I have a question?

>> Councilmember Rocha: The last slide, talking about a criteria for the softball complex. Now, what I don't see there is cost. And it sounds like we put a little bit of time and put the other ones on the back burner in terms of locations based on the potential opportunity here to have it privately financed. So if that's not one of the criteria, then I'm a little curious as to why we've put them all on hold and spent time on one option.

>> I apologize for it not being on there. Cost is absolutely a criteria.

>> Councilmember Rocha: No, it doesn't have to be. I just was wondering, if it's not, then how do we make that decision?

>> It is a criteria. We are still looking at the other sites and trying to bring this to conclusion. So we haven't completely, completely back-burnered it. But the reason we haven't been able to come to a conclusion and bring it home is because of this other possible good wrinkle has entered into the conversation. But cost is absolutely a huge factor that will come into play. So we'll add it to the list in the future.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Who is working on this, is this park staff or do you have other departments involved?

>> Park staff in collaboration with Nancy Kline's team and Office of Economic Development are working closely together on this.

>> Councilmember Rocha: So some of the other alternative sites have been suggested, such as the fairgrounds or some of the other sites that were listed. There's been in exploration of those sites and the viability of those while we have these discussions?

>> We've had no formal recent analysis of the county fairgrounds site, although it has been discussed many times over the years as an ideal place for a softball complex if we're able to have land control. But at the staff administrative level we've not had any formal conversations recently with the county on that.

>> Councilmember Rocha: When is the last time we had done additional site analysis on the softball complex?

>> The fairgrounds specifically or --

>> Councilmember Rocha: Any other site besides the ones listed here.

>> Probably a little over a year since we really took the map out, started -- what we've done is taken the map out, looked at okay, here is the sites that we've kind of tried and failed at over the years and the county fairgrounds is one of those that I think has been discussed over the years and narrowed it down to these four sites that we thought were most viable to be under city control and where we didn't have to pay for them. The reason the county fairgrounds isn't on our list is because we at that time weren't aware of any ability to gain site control. Doesn't mean we're not open to any additional sites that can fit. We'd really love to get four softball fields in one location. Understood but when we say we don't know of any, if we're not having conversations we're not going to know of any ores options, we're left with these until we proactively looked at options or talked to folks. We're going to be on this one site until one plays out or to not and then in a sense we've kind of lost a year

for looking at other sites and we've had these dollars for a significant amount of time. I'm just concerned as we kind of play out the ones that we are known we continue to not look at other opportunities with -- that may be in front of us.

>> Yes, thank you for the feedback. Although we haven't sat down on the map and kind of pin pointed other opportunities, it is on the forefront of our mind every day and every conversation as we talk with hopefully the large community based park will have in North San José in the future it is on our mind every day as we have all these conversations that if a site large enough for a three or hopefully four field softball complex comes up that we will take advantage of it. So we definitely haven't done a formal holistic identify those sites but we do think about that every day and so if any -- so we are continuing to look I would say at other sites as we are having our conversations. But no formal conversations with the county on the fair ground site for some time.

>> Councilmember Rocha: The slide that had the dollar figures associated with the soccer and softball complex we had looked at -- the agreement that we have for the soccer complex as I understand it we're going to be spending less dollars than what's attributed in that case?

>> The total budget for the soccer complex is actually about 15.4 million. The reason it shows 14.5 is, some of that was spent in the total fiscal year. The total budget for the project is about 15.4 million. I'll need to follow up with the committee on that exact number. Excuse me. That includes -- that's the construction contract where warded to Interstate grading and paving but the total amount includes soft costs.

>> Councilmember Rocha: I guess that was the hard cost not the soft cost.

>> What was voted in council was the award to Interstate grading and paving.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Thank you.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Before we vote we have a card from Mr. Wall.

>> Thank you, madam chair. With reference to the discussion of Columbus park as being a location there comes with it a noise component because it's underneath the flight path of San José international. However it is uniquely situated to be an outstanding soft ballpark because of the land that can be controlled and also the expansion of this park which is in the WPCP master plan that project is flawed and should not be further discussed high density living projects is unacceptable and has a material influence to the provision of parks for the necessary population. If you are going to increase the population, you should be increasing parks. And I abhorrently deplore this waiver of park fees just to entertain developers to build this type of horrendous living projects. Lastly and I don't know if this is possible but can grant money be banked? Excuse me, we see with grants there are obligations but also stipulations to how these grants can be used. Now, one stipulation for example, you can only use the money for city owned property. Where property for parks and trails routinely butt up against properties like Santa Clara Valley Water District. Therefore I think we should talk to our friendsful Roxann in Sacramento and our friends at Patton, Boggs to see if we can get some forms of waivers or inclusionary aspects to these grants be them federal or state that allow the use of these grants to build parks and trails across other jurisdictional properties. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Thank you. And with that, I need a motion to approve. We have that and a second. Have that. All those in favor? Aye, signify by saying aye. That takes care of item number 5. We are ready to go to item 1, and with us today to present this is Susan Wolf our new deputy director, Dan Wax, division manager, and Tracy Gotz, recreation supervisor. Welcome.

>> Thank you, honorable chair and members of the committee for having us today. We have two items, and the first we'll start with is our Sr. nutrition program update with Dan and Tracy. We got to get you up.

>> Okay, we're going to walk you through a little bit of history in terms of what's transpired with the senior nutrition program, give you some information about the regional kitchen model that the city has realized, provide a bit of analysis on the program and then importantly, as important, provide you with transportation update in terms of what we're doing with transportation. What you have in this slide is in effect a background of what's transpired

over the course of the last two years and as many of you also recall we went through a process where the program was slated for elimination back in the fiscal year 10-11 and then a senior nutrition task force, again co-chaired by Councilmember Constant, as well as supervisor Liz Kniss, was developed, where out of that process a recommendation came forth to the city to acknowledge a vendor model different from the model that was currently in place at that time. We then contracted with Bateman senior meals program, or company, to offer the meal program through our sites. And they took over in November of 2011. The following month, senior transportation was slated for elimination. Just this past February, the model that Bateman was operating under was modified, and we'll give you a little bit more detail in terms of what that looks like. And then in May, a positive step developed in that we were able to provide alternative meal selections, for our seniors at our sites. And again, over the course of the past year and a half about, the program has stabilized to a number of about 800 meals per day. What this slide shows you is current participation numbers back from November 2011. Can you see they're all for the most part at around if 800 level with some dips. The dip back in December 2011 was primary due to transportation impact we weren't able to realize. Going through you can see increase in March, April and May. We're realizing that in May probably that increase was a result of that alternative menu option that was provided to the seniors and for the past four months or so it's been stabilized at about 800. Tracy now will speak to the kitchen model, a little bit of analysis of the program, transportation update, and also engage you in some questions at the end of the presentation.

>> Thank you. So as Dan mentioned earlier in February the regional model changed for Bateman model and so our current regional kitchen model consists of two City of San José cook onsites and Bateman cook onsite and they deliver to the remainder 823 meals. So to analyze the services provided by this new regional model, city staff employed the four methods up there. So in August and September we held focus groups, at the focus groups staff from Bateman senior meals, the city of Santa Clara dietician and the last round was held at Almaden, Camden and Berryessa. All of the city of San José's nutrition sites are invited to attend and we rotate to encourage maximum focus groups was positive, they made mention of the improvements that they have seen from this last round of focus groups to the previous one. During this round there was some mention of dissatisfaction with the vegetables being cooked being too mushy at their sites and since that time we have worked with Bateman senior meals to cook the vegetables at their own sites with the exception of Alma and they should be cooking their own

vegetables next week. So besides the focus groups, staff conducted site visits, we conducted site visits to other county of Santa Clara Sr. nutrition sites. We visited three cook on sites and six catered sites. We noticed catered sites but overall at the county of Santa Clara catered sites the food was comparable to the City of San José catered sites. Our staff also Don does ongoing visits to senior nutrition sites. We go once a week or once every other week to taste the food talk with the participants and monitor the program. Our third analysis is the county survey. They do a participant satisfaction survey and we did one in February and August of 2012. And we've maintained a satisfaction rate of 83%. And then the fourth analysis was comment cards. Comment cards are available every day for participants to fill out and provide feedback on the meal they had. From July to October we collected 2661 comment cards, 90% the ratings were good or better and 10% were poor ratings. Information from comment cards are going to be shared with Bateman on a monthly basis to monitor and improve the food quality. So update on the transportation program. As directed by the Mayor's Budget Message we have implemented point to point van transportation service for this fiscal year. Along with the van service we are implementing mobility management model to assist seniors at all of our sites in coming to and from senior nutrition program. So mobility management model consists of the healthy walk groups, subsidized VTA passes, friendly rides, carpool incentive programs, outreach fare transit, limited taxi service and then there's also a new program that they're kind of starting is a bike to independence program that I think they'll be piloting at cypress within the next month or two. So during the coming months staff will continue to provide community outreach to our sites and surrounding areas to educate seniors about mobility management options available to them. So next steps: Whoops, one more slide. So the last slide is on our next steps. (inaudible) [Laughter]

>> And with our next steps we're going ocontinue monitoring food quality. We do that through on going site visits, we're going to continue our dialogue with participants and the contractor to improve participant satisfaction. We're going to continue our dialogue with Bateman our provider and our senior services. As noted in the information memo that was provided to you 59% of the seniors on the county satisfaction survey responded that they come to senior nutrition for friends and activities with food being rated at 25%. So even before the change in service the socialization and interaction that our participants receive by being a part of the program is a major component. So our efforts will be directed to evaluate our current senior services to assess if we are meeting this expectation and review how we can improve this component within our current model. Thank you. Any questions?

>> Thank you. I'm not sure at this point, I know that councilmember -- this guy right here, has worked with Liz Kniss on the county level, the city puts $550,000 into the program and you're working with Liz for the rest of it. So would you like to speak at this time?

>> Councilmember Constant: Thanks. Yes, I definitely agree with the concluding comments that the socialization is an important factor. When we had the task force we kind of started with that premise, that we didn't want to lose the socialization portion, let alone all the sort of wrap around stuff that comes from that, the services that people can get connected with, and the meal just is kind of the focal point to get people to all the other things. And I think we all see that when we visit our senior centers in our districts. I was out at mine this morning. The one thing that I think is still sticking, we have made a lot of progress in the food, the transition to the model that we have now has gone well, I'll say it ended well, there are points in the middle that we all know were probably not as smooth as we would like but that happens when you're making major service delivery changes. But I think that we are meeting our goal of providing the meals. Which is good. The big thing that we still have to really wrap our arms around is this transportation issue. You see the numbers at cypress are significantly lower than they were before. And in talking with the seniors this morning, you know, we had I think it was 26 people that were availing themselves to the van transportation service. And then when that went away, going to our other models public transportation and et cetera, we're down to two of those 26 that are the only ones that are participating. So we lost 90-plus percent of the folks. And it's a visible difference when you walk into the senior center on nutrition day. The chart I think it showed us at 55 average participants. And if you added 24 to that, I mean that's a 50% of the folks that -- there's 50% capacity that's gone or a third of what was being served before. And the public transportation is great if you have a senior center that's on the line of a public transportation. Where cypress is almost there but it's two blocks away. And when you're 80 years old, 90 years old, and have many of the issues that you're facing at those ages, or some of us at younger ages, you getting those two blocks can be quite a challenge in the best of times. Let alone the days that we see right in front of us with the weather, and things that are going to be facing. So I think that's something we really have to wrestle with and I know it's tough because it's -- there's a little different -- slightly different demographic in each of the senior centers. Some are more dependent on public transportation. Some are more dependent on their own vehicles for however long they will be and then there's

those that have nothing that they can depend on, especially now that we don't have the vans. So saving the nutrition program was great and I'm glad the task force was able to accomplish that but now, we have this other problem that we need to deal with. It's not going to be an easy answer especially, that we're going into another deficit year, which you won't have to fight with, lucky person. I'm not asking for an answer right now because I know we don't have an answer but I know that we need to keep addressing it to figure out how we can get people to the actual center.

>> Thank you for those great comments.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Thank you, Councilmember Constant. Are there others that wish to speak?

>> Councilmember Chu: Region 1 and regional 2, are the menus the same for any given date? I would assume within the region, then, the menus are the same, right?

>> So for region 1 and region 2 and then the Bateman region, they all have different menus.

>> Councilmember Chu: Region 1 has different menus.

>> So region one has totally different menus than region 2.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Thank you for the report and thank you for your work on this issue and I want to thank Councilmember Constant for his past work on this and current work I guess on this issue, it's important to a lot of the councilmembers and obviously a lot of the folks in the community and staff as well which is why you folks have invested so much time on it. Forgive me for not having the exact language in front of me about the last time we had some direction from council, I'm not sure it was on the budget or transportation issue but we had asked for some sort of direction I think from you as to how to maybe enhance the program beyond just the transportation ways that we might want to increase the participation level. And Councilmember Constant spoke a little bit to it when he talked about the wrap around. In my mind I was thinking about the related services the

staffing and the dollars aren't there which are absolutely mandatory and required for improving the service or enhancing the services or those complementary programming for senior programs at the community centers. Should our budget look better this next go-around I'd like to be prepared to invest in some of those as opposed to waiting a whole 'nother year as we work on those. Forgive me if I'm wrong the ways that we can do it so we've got mid year coming up and then we'll have budget hearings as soon as Christmas is behind us. I'd really like to get some feedback from the staff as to how maybe we can enhance this program and again if that's just an investment in the senior nutrition program, great. But we might also want to think about those wrap around programs that we provide so that we can get folks more engaged and that's in marketing, everything. I think there's an important issue and I think you heard from the council and a lot of my colleagues that we also see as a priority issue. I'll stop there and maybe you had some direction to council last time around.

>> We found in the community centers speaking to seniors the need for reduction of social isolation and connections they make at the centers is really important. We have worked on new programs and new models, we have recently been talking with the county to talk about more mental health assistance and looking at ways we can support gerontology, people are aware of more senior issues in particularly, specific continue to find great speakers, and continuing to support those hours before and the hours after the senior nutrition program and that's something we continue to work on. I don't know that we are perfect yet. But we are certainly working, continuing to really focus on what we can do to make those connections strong.

>> Councilmember Rocha: I recognize that the dollars not there to really enhance the programming but I think to my earlier point, look at mid year if it is a positive view on our financial situation, I would really like to see us prepared come budget hearing to recommend some enhancement or return of some of the programs that we have since eliminated and whether that's staffing or just the programs themselves I think that would be really helpful for us if we are going ocontinue the investments program which I think we should and always should, like to see us try and make some work to grow it as opposed to being comfortable with the status quo. Unless my colleagues are comfortable with where we're at, if we are satisfied with where we're at, that is one of 11, my goal is setting the bar a little bit high ir. I think that's great in partnerships with the county, potential fundings for that

kind of community centers that's exactly the kind of stuff that I think is wonderful work. So as far as the next update when do you plan to come back to this committee or the council or --

>> We -- it's at your pleasure.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Okay.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Good answer.

>> Councilmember Rocha: In the normal progress --

>> We'll come back next week if you want it. -in the normal progress of things what would you expect, annual or what's best for you folks?

>> We normally come back annually to report out. We'll be updating you with information throughout the end of the year as well.

>> Councilmember Rocha: What was the previous one? You had listed out your time line in terms of what's been done. What was the last time you were here, do you recall?

>> I'm sorry, the question again?

>> Councilmember Rocha: The last time you were at this committee with an update on the senior nutrition program?

>> Oh boy, I think it's been January, February.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Councilmember Constant suggested six months ago was what he recalls. He's probably right on that. If I may ask, can we have a discussion of this again as we enter into the budget study sessions, maybe in March, April? I don't want to put you through any new work but I really want to emphasize, really looking to you how can we enhance the program based on all your experience in PRNS over the years, we might have an opportunity and I'm optimistic about our budget situation, thank you.

>> And often a related note, we also visited and presented similar presentation to to the senior citizens commission as well as the parks and rec commission, as recent as September and October. So we did receive some of their input as well and incorporated into these findings.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Wonderful Thank you very much, what are the next steps that came in terms of the next steps or what are the next steps that you have listed? Because the next steps to me, not -- I guess to be a little blunt, they kind of look alike what we're doing already, or what you normally do which is great. But beyond the standard way we've been monitoring this, is there any other way you're looking at this going forward?

>> At this point I think we're looking to continue our again conversation we county around opportunities for enhanced food, opportunities to make sure we can -- where we can build, again, more quality foods and get additional funding perhaps from the county, we're working on that and then also continuing really having the conversation with our seniors around if wrap around services to understand what specific areas they're looking for nutritional pieces, more i be assistance helping my family. So in those areas where we can continue in that light we will do so, as well.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Great -- I'm sorry.

>> On an operational level this is a little more detail than you need, but we are going to be meeting with our entire gerontology team next Friday as part of a retreat, to look at programs and delivery of services over the next several years. We are engaging our staff as well to identify what the needs to be because they literally the ones having the hands-on experience with the seniors.

>> Councilmember Rocha: This is an internal city meeting, great, wonderful, thank you for the work on this when we started when we moved, great improvement and it really speaks to a lot of the work you folks have done. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Pyle: And Pete, you get to have the last word.

>> Councilmember Constant: Only one word? So first I wanted to say that I agree with what Don is saying. As we move into the budget year, looking at whatever options that might be available for us to do, to enhance services or to -- I hate to say enhance because I think we still need to round out the services that we have. And particularly I'd like to see some focused discussion around the transportation. Because I think that is the limiting factor for so many people. But in my haste to talk about the program and to highlight some of the areas for improvement I really didn't say how amazing it was, when you consider where we were before we started the task force, we sat there and said we're acknowledge the fact that we've come a huge way. And I know in talking with the seniors at the community centers they know we've done a lot and they appreciate it. But it's an evolution. And as was pointed out by a couple of us, the Bateman experience in transition has been a transition and an evolution and I just keep reminding people that where we are now we're not perfect. We know we're not perfect. We don't have the money to be perfect but it's a whole heck of a lot better than when we had a zero on the line item of the budget. And we continue to work it out and probably we'll round out smooth those rough edges,to so we can give just a little bit more. And I think for me that little more is transportation.

>> And just as a file note too, the aging services collaborative that we are partner with has been critical with all the various nonprofit, private, public partners that we're working with, have been a real asset in thinking and brainstorming with us as well.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Great, I have three people who wish to speak, will take them.

>> Just one second Kip Harkness City Manager's office, what we would status update on senior nutrition but focus really on option he for improvement to the existing services, enhancement of the services, including looking at transportation wrap around services and other options with an eye to other partnerships .

>> Councilmember Pyle: You are so immigrate. We can't act on it yet. We'll begin with David Wall.

>> I'd like to thank all the effort that's been put in. I've followed this from behind the scenes for some time. I want to put forth that maybe perhaps that the county and the City of San José are running joint programs and maybe there has to be some discussion whether who's going to take over and run it as a seasonal entity. Because of funding issues. And wrap around program issues as well. There seems to be a lack of charitable giving. Ability for charitable giving here at City Hall. For example, each year city employees are given a list of where they want to have their charitable giving going to. I think an option for senior nutrition program also should include the disabled. There's a lot of disabled people that need to be included in this. I'm not one of them. I think that you have to come to terms as decision makers how much money you do not have and how much more money you do not have with the passage of measure D. You're not in any enviable situation can what so ever. and I'll come up with other ideas for the public record, thank you very much.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Thank you David and the next person would be, okay, that would be, I'm sorry, Angelica Cortez who is here from the Silicon Valley council of nonprofits. Yes, here is better, so we can hear you very clearly. Welcome Angelica. And there is a switch you'll need to turn on. Do you see it there?

>> Good afternoon, thank you, I'm Angelica Cortez with the Silicon Valley council of nonprofits. And I'm here today to thank the city for continuing these vital services and meals for our seniors. And just to give a brief update, that the county has increased its allocation for its per meal rate for senior nutrition at CBO sites such as UIKAI, POSO self-help for the elderly and Catholic charities so thank you again.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Thank you Angelica and next would be Richard McCoy.

>> Good afternoon, committee members, Rich McCoy here, vice chair of the senior commission but I'm not representing the senior commission today. Throughout the past year and a half I've had the opportunity to visit many of the senior centers throughout the area, Seven Trees, Alma, all that. There was a lot of time in the beginning when they didn't think that Bateman would be able to do the same quality of meals that they had on site. That's changed. The food has gotten a lot better over the past years. The seniors are very happy with the salad availability and the sandwiches, alternative diet. They are happy with what they have I have to agree with practically everything that Councilmember Constant said in regards to thinks vision of the program. Transportation is the biggest issue, if we can't get the seniors not centers to enjoy the meals they're not going to be able to before from them and if issues about distance the two blocks to the VTA are all other issues of big concerns why the seniors can't attend. I think if we could solve those problems we moo break through that the are happy about no more soggy vegetables also one of the meetings I attended with Bateman, I was surprised to hear the nutritionist from the city and the county seniors would like would not be available on the menu such as hot dogs and casseroles and things like that. So if they can be added to the menu it would be great. Thank you very much for your work and we hope we can get the senior program going again next year.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Thank you, I think you had a proposal ready to go. About.

>> Councilmember Constant: I made the motion.

>> Councilmember Pyle: All in favor, aye, that is approved. Thank you very much we're ready to move on now to our next item. Let me get my organization going here. Item 3. Are which is one of my favorite topics of all time, San José family camp.

>> Councilmember Constant: Skipped 2.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Sorry, I'm pushing the gun here. Community center reuse. Sorry.

>> We can try family camp. We love family camp.

>> Councilmember Pyle: So with us again is Suzanne Wolf, our deputy director, Mary O'Meara and Jeremy -- is not here.

>> He's in the audience.

>> Councilmember Pyle: And we're ready to go. You're welcome to come up Jeremy.

>> So with that we'll walk through today our updates on reuse and ask for specific action he before the committee that will be cross referenced to the city council. As you know, council of policy 7-12 was adopted in 2008 at which time we started with 17 reuse sites that expanded in 2010-11 with six high need centers washington, Alum Rock, star bird and 40 reuse sites we have today of which 14 are satellite centers which are between 15 and 20,000 square feet and 26 neighborhood centers that are comprised of 10,000 square feet or less. And typically those are the shelter buildings that you can see in our park sites. With that I'll turn it over to Mary Meara to talk about our recommendations and next steps.

>> Good afternoon, our registers are to add capitol park and Spartan Keyes neighborhood centers to the reuse facility inventory. Capitol park, which was formerly under SNI is now being overseen by the Asian American community services which are providing excellent services to that neighborhood through ESL classes, cultural and fitness programs. Spartan Keyes in the mayor Mayor's Budget Message, allocated funds for the remainder of the year to ensure strong provisions would be made for it for reuse site which we identified Catholic charities as the site provider for spartan Keyes. In addition to the after school programs they are providing at this site, they are also overseeing first five, our second harvest food distribution and neighborhood association meetings. The smooth transition of these services providers at capitol parks and spartan Keyes which resulted in minimal disruption to the community was result of our resolution 75-687 which enables our department to quickly execute program and service models at reuse sites. This resolution has proven very beneficial to our reuse programs and we would like to have it extended to 2012 through 13. In summary, our department will complete a new RFI process to identify service providers for Hammond park and Erickson. Hammond is located in -- it's a shelter

building, in Mary Jane Hammond park and Erickson is a modular located at the site of the former Erickson school. It is very important for us to maintain strong relationships with the providers and the community centers. In September, we had the reservice providers and the community center supervisors come together and meet each other to discuss ways how we can work better together. We shared program updates, and discussed ways of exploring how we can support each other's programs and promote it. So we're working together as a team for the community. We're always working to maximize our capacity for rental opportunities at both our reuse centers and our community center hubs. It's our desire to increase the community's awareness of the reasonably priced so they can use them for their weddings, scenarios and et cetera we will acknowledge the great use importance of the reuse service providers and centers to our community and will continue to monitor performance and compliance through the staff visits the sites monthly and we also receive biannual reports on what's happening at their centers. Our department is very committed, we really appreciate what they do, and we want to continue to develop those services and support them in any way that we can. And so our staff and team are there to work together and to get feedback from them and it's all again we look at it as one for the benefit of the community.

>> Thank you, Mary and with that we do recognize that the models of the community center reuse and our hybrid models is really an efficient model and we want to work with that model, in an ongoing manner to provide maximum programming with the most efficient resources possible. With that we'll be happy to take any questions you have.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Thank you, I'm sure we have some.

>> Councilmember Constant: Thank you. So just a quick question, and you probably don't have the answer right now, that's fine, you can follow up with me individually. But when we had district realignment, I ended up with the sliver of district 6 that should have I always been district 1 but anyway Hammond park neighborhood. That community center there we don't really have anything going on. And have we discussed any reuse possibilities for that small center, and you know, what's the potential for moving forward on something like that?

>> Right. That's Mary Jane Hammond park that we are look to do a new RFI at, do more outreach. We have more collaboration with the provide are for that site.

>> Councilmember Constant: Okay.

>> And the neighborhood associations meet there monthly so they're making use of that meeting in addition they have social events throughout the year at that center.

>> Councilmember Constant: Yes, they are pretty active group. We're trying to get them fully integrated into District 1 but we'd love to see whatever we might be able to do there but of course preserving neighborhood use because that's a biggie out there. We don't have many parks in District 1 so we got to keep our hands on all of them.

>> I just have questions on those two items in terms of Erickson. In your mind what do you see as potential uses or of those two pretty small buildings that would still be able to maintain the community aspect that Councilmember Constant spoke of?

>> Mary Jane Hammond park has to be honest shelter building with a few amenities. Erickson is a small 900 square foot modular building without a restroom. There's no T-1 lines and also it was built by RDA funds and our use agreement or lease agreement with the school district expires in 20.

>> Councilmember Rocha: So what type uses do we see as potential?

>> We had a Derrick center, that was the original one that had applied or some form of childcare and they backed out early in the process.

>> I think we would look for neighborhood based programming small modular building.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Actually speaking of both. What in your mind would we have at Mary J. Hammond that would still maintain our public access ?

>> Most possibly working with the Boys and Girls Club. It's a ADA, implications to, but the after-school programming and youth programming I think would be a strong and needed service in that community.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Yeah, that's actually where my parents still live, three blocks down the street from there, they're 40 years there and I did my summers and after school in that community center room doing many different programs. Unfortunately they didn't do tutoring, I could have used the tutoring clearly but they didn't provide it at the time so I think that's a great suggestion and I would be really interested in seeing that so thank you for the work on this. There was another question that I had. Page 3 capitol park neighborhood center. The second sentence, as a result of recent budget action this site was returned to the PRNS reuse was that part of our last budget process?

>> It was. Actually it was a PRNS reuse center, then we had it continue on with the SNI program, now it's back. Continuing the same with Asian American community services. This formalizes that process.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Big look back at the reuse that we've undertaken not by choice as I understand it. Are we going to do an overall analysis to look at the revenue that we're generating as opposed to what we're spending to manage them ourselves, to get a sense of, are you moving in the right direction. And maybe you do that, maybe I missed that at the budget study sessions, but for me, it is nice to know that this choice and this decision is the where right one, and it's working as it was hoped. Financial factors before we continue this without ever doing an analysis or is that too big an analysis for you folks to undertake?

>> I mean it is something that we really do undertake ongoing. Whether or not we look -- back to similar what Napp spoke to, refining what we can do in that area to maximize programming is what we continue to look at and whether we can pull back and take an additional strategic approach that is certainly a good registers.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Well I'd like to see something in a budget study session that would hopefully be within the realm of possibility to take a look at the revenue we're actually generating on all the reuse sites and what we had projected on assets anyway because as I understand it some of these we are still paying whether it is electricity or power or sewer how they run those leases, I think it would be a good working as we hope and not just continue this effort without ever taking that step. So if I could include as a recommendation whenever we approve the as it goes to council, I see November 22nd, maybe we could save it for the council meeting and look to my committee colleagues for any other suggestions but I think that might be helpful and again I may be the loan voice in that effort so I'll deferring to my colleagues and see what they have to say. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Pyle: And Councilmember Chu.

>> Councilmember Chu: Thank you, madam chair. Follow up on Councilmember Rocha's question on revenues generation. If I remember correctly, the you time board put it to the reuse program. Did the purpose was to keep the lights on. And to have some vendors that would come in and services to that neighborhood. So keeping the lights on, is pretty much the main goal and not to really generate any revenues from those sites. Am I correct?

>> In that we want to were those sites that can be effectively bringing in additional revenue towards our 40% cost recovery goal that is a great programs and services to all neighborhoods. And where we have focused our city resources on hub sites, and localized all of our staffing efforts into the hubs we wanted to still provide as many neighborhood services as possible so the collaborations we have with the nonprofits have been a very effective tool for us to provide those services. And I think as we move forward we recognize, we'll always have a strong partnership model and a strong city model in looking at where we've become most efficient is really that ongoing exercise that Councilmember Rocha spoke to how we continue to look at that what's happening in the demographics of each community.

>> Councilmember Chu: Are we generating revenue so far out of this reuse program?

>> I'll answer that question but I want to give you a quick little brief history. Originally the reuse program was designed literally to provide access to space, meaning the reuse sites to potential vendors who in effect could provide services and at no cost to the city. That has evolved really over the course of the last four, five years to a point where now we're not only generating some revenue and we'll come back with that analysts but we also have in effect leases with some providers that are providing the city revenue to operate those facilities that are benefiting the local community. We also have the opportunity for a city to operate rental programs, rental consist as we mentioned earlier so that provides some revenue and then also we are running some programs out of those sites through the city, through some city means to provide those services to the community. So the reuse program has evolved from literally providing a space for a vendor to give services in effect at no cost to a point now where we are in effect generating revenue and the programs have enhanced, been enhanced over the course of the last four years.

>> Councilmember Chu: Do we have any budget for tenant improvement for the reuse site?

>> Do we have a budget for tenant improvement?

>> Councilmember Chu: Capital improvement, tenant improvement.

>> There have been some arrangements with providers that they have actually provided some -- well, what's the right word they provided some additional capital improvements to the facilities.

>> Councilmember Chu: Okay. Could --

>> At their cost.

>> Councilmember Chu: Just be more specific, the old Alviso school site, it's really needs a lot of tenant improvement or capital improvement. Do we have the funding for that Alviso old school site?

>> Angel Rios, acting director of Parks, Recreation, and Neighborhood Services. The way we handle reuse sites is we prioritize the budget based on the actual need with a priority on ADA compliance. The reality is that our top priority sites are hubs, our community center hubs which we have one in every district with the exception of council district 1 and then based on availability of funds we basically provide maintenance at all the other sites. As I mentioned with direct emphasis on ADA compliance and safety. Backtracking just a little bit to your previous question around revenue. Dan wax is correct, when we first launched facility reuse it was really to keep the lights on. It was really a stopgap measure in response to a very tough budget situation, right? So the transaction was simply one of free space in exchange for service. It was literally at that level. We've evolved it to the point that now we have also added other sites which are also good fee generators. So what we've done since then is for instance this past year we've generated $750, 000,000 in additional revenue that we have also brought into the General Fund to offset the cost. You add that to the cost avoidance of not that's another 1.5 million. So you could see the money from a budget response standpoint really has proven pretty effective. And then there are some other sites that are also very good business sites, and we've leased them out and we're generating some rental income as a part of that. We continue to evolve this. Back to Councilmember Rocha's question which I think is a great one, and that is, we're doing the analysis around, as things begin to stabilize, what are the sites that make sense for us to bring back online for the city to operate, which are the sites that are probably best suited for community partnerships such as we currently have today.

>> Councilmember Chu: And to answer my question regarding to the old Alviso school site. We don't have any funding available to do any renovation or to or to really make sure the building is safe.

>> That's correct, with the old Alviso site we don't currently have the budget. That is one we have to look at very closely. That is a site that's filled with a number of different issues and that's the one that we basically -- that's probably one of our most problematic site on our inventory list.

>> Councilmember Chu: We don't have anybody to even start addressing some of the issues.

>> We've actually conducted some preliminary analysis of that site. We've actually even had a number of discussions with other third parties, potential vendors who are willing to come in and perhaps even pick up the costs for capital improvements. We have about two prospects we continue to pursue those and if we have any -- make any progress with that we'll be coming forward with the recommendation to enter into a joint participate with them where we would give them access to the space in exchange for them picking up the capitol improvements.

>> Councilmember Chu: Thank you, keep my office updated.

>> Absolutely, absolutely.

>> Councilmember Pyle: And with that do I have a motion to approve?

>> Councilmember Constant: Yes, I'll make a motion to approve the recommendations with the cross reference that's required in incorporating Don's request, as well, which I think you got, right?

>> Do we just want to ask us to tell us what the motion was?

>> Councilmember Pyle: That's what he just did.

>> The direction as I have it is to return during the budget process with an analysis of reuse sites that includes two key elements, one fiscal analysis, previous costs under the old model and comparing that with current costs and revenues in the new model in a very clear way. Second, service and sites of the old models people served current levels of service number of people served types of programs offered in a way that allows you to do that, look at both the previous model and the current model where we are on both those models and direction how we will go forward.

>> Councilmember Constant: I am not sure how you get what I'm thinking so well. Just a personal request. I notice that the West CPC site and the Korean federation was on the list but I was gone for a couple of months

with my back. I just want someone from your office to connect with me or Jarrod from my office so we know what's happening there.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Thank you we have a second. All those in favor? Oops before we vote, David Wall we need to hear from you.

>> First of all I'd like to thank Councilmember Rocha and Councilmember Chu for their financial questions what I heard from staff borders on back-pedaling and I don't like it. I will make my inquiries through public request for information and produce an analysis. I think overall financial analysis for each community center should be a little bit more broad an more focused to what Councilmember Rocha had in mind. I'd like to see which ones are revenue neutral to the city, what the Office of Economic Development and try to make money for these places and if these place he are not serving the city revenue-wise have OED put them up for sale. The other issue that might be even more helpful to the governance to of of this program is to create an enterprise fund for all these community centers, so you really can't touch the money, that the money stays within the community center funding and you'll be able to do your funding that way. Out of this, I'd just like to thank Councilmember Rocha personally for the analytical detail. The back pedaling can cost staff very dearly on the public record. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Pyle: All right and with that thank you very much presenters for a good job. We're ready to move on to my favorite. We got to vote first. Yes, all those in favor, of forwarding as stated, in favor? That is approved. And with that, we now have Steve hammock who is our deputy director, cart Capagon who is our recreation superintendent. Tell us all what's happening at family camp.

>> Okay, good afternoon, committee members, councilmembers, Steve hammock a PRNS deputy director and I'm here with art capagon our program manager for family camp at Yosemite. Just a quick review back. About a year ago we got direction from the city council on how to move forward with family camp. And part of that direction was to come forward to the NSE committee to give not only a pre-camp update and also a post-camp update. Today is the post-camp update to tell you about the 2012 season that just finished up master plan and told you about the five year permit that we acquired from the forest service so we're happy that not only that, five

year permit was met with the approval of the master plan and the environmental document we did send that in a FedEx package up to U.S. forest service in -- up by Yosemite and they are very pleased with our product. They will move that through their environmental product, which is the N heEPA process and they'll come back with us. But we've worked with them every step of the way so we don't expect any surprises after they approve that. So with that I'd like to turn it over to art and to let him tell you about how the 2012 season went forward.

>> Thank you. This year, the 2012 season started out with a slight challenge. The U.S. forest service were delayed in approving our operating permit. By three months. Unfortunately, that was a critical three months. As a result of that, we were not able to market and commit to being able to operate the camp. We were finally able to -- well, they were finally provided us approval in March. That's three months beyond what we typically begin our marketing. As a result our occupancy was only at 41.76% this year. The lowest we've ever had. On a positive side, because we did -- we were aggressive in terms of our management of the program, and we tried to reduce our expenses as much as possible. We did generate $545,536 in reference on the capitol side we did depend just under 37,000 in terms of our forest service fees and because of direction by council, to create a capitol improvement fund, we were able to collect $37,380. So even with that we're on the positive by $396. So literally, we really did look at our lower attendance records when we started getting our reservations, accordingly we reduced our expenditure, as much as possible. We did have staffing levels that reflected our peak attendance periods. We were successful with that. I do want to mention part of our success in camp this year was our partnerships. One was friends of family camp. They were very, very active in helping us get camp together. Closing it down and during the year, helping with projects onsite. That actually benefits the city and the friends of family camp through their volunteer effort we can reduce cost in terms of staff labor they do small things that typically require a lot more staff time on our side. They also provide campership dollars. This year is the most they've ever provided, $4500. We actually expended $4,157 and that provided camperships to 12 families. And what a campership is, is a family who qualifies for a free reduced lunch can get up to 50% of their stay funded by the campership. The parks foundation also was very active at the beginning of the year to help create incentives. They provided $1,000 in matching funds to help people to register early. Additionally, this coming year, we are actually now partnering with the county of Santa Clara parks. County of Santa Clara parks has an online registration system now, that they use to reserve their pick any sites, campsites and other amenities within that

department. We looked at that system and we're partnering with them to have them provide us with the online registration program for camp. Literally we are in negotiations with them now. We're looking to have this up and ready for the coming year. In exchange for the partnership, the only way the county could partner with us was if there was a public benefit. So the public benefit is, any county resident will now receive the same reduced rate or discount rate that City of San José folks get. And so what that also does for us, it takes our population, and almost doubles it. City of San José just under a million, with the entire county of Santa Clara that almost bumps us up to 2 million in terms of a market we can advertise to. We can jump onto their marketing streams and their group of folks that participate and take advantage of their park system. One other thing that I should mention. Camp is a unique place. Once most of the campers are gone, there's a small skeleton crew wrapping up camp. As soon as most of the campers left, the wildlife moved in. And we had a very, very large male bear, come through, 450 plus. And right after that we saw a mother and a cub come through. Very interesting. Little scary at times, especially with a big one. But they came through and staff saw them during the day, typically during the evenings and dusk. And now that it's gotten colder they've moved on but that's something reality in camp for us. Any questions?

>> Councilmember Pyle: No casualties, right?

>> No, none at all.

>> I want to add one more piece. We continue to work with San José State as well, in terms of their internships and their marketing and it was hard to get started because of the long delay in getting a permit. But we are still engaged with them very heavily in not just camp but a lot of programs we're doing. So that ends our report.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Well, I'd like to take chair privilege at this point to say a lot was accomplished this year despite the fact that you had the permit delayed. And you're now settle up to be able to strike next year early. And get more campers there. I think the fact that you changed the name so that everybody knows it's at Yosemite, makes a huge difference. Because there are a lot of people who like to stay there and go try climb up the -- why anybody would do that I don't understand. But they do, climb up the neighboring mountain. So and it's just so

much for people to do. I'm glad that San José State university is involved as well. That's a wonderful thing and of course the county. I'm -- how much do you expect that you'll benefit from the county involvement?

>> Well, we're hoping that with the increased marketing and exposure, at least 20% more. Hopefully we can double, especially from the low occupancy rate this year.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Wonderful. And if all councilmembers help promote it in their districts and the county supervisors help, I don't see how we can lose. With that are there questions? Councilmember Chu.

>> Councilmember Chu: One quick question, thank you, Madam Chair. Have we ever considered partnering with the schools, the high school or the elementary school, during the off-season to be a destination point for their science camp or -- day camp?

>> We have explored that a little bit in the past years and the real hindrance is the distance. It's three hours away from the City of San José. And many of the schools like going to Santa Cruz right over the hill which is much closer. But we do have a high school, maybeck high school out of Berkeley that comes up every year or every other year and they bring up the entire high school and they take over camp for about a week. The entire school comes up. It's very interesting to watch. They do their entire curriculum there. They cook their own meals. The students help with the meals. It's very nice to watch. They've been doing this for a really long time.

>> I would say that is an excellent niche market that we want to continue to explore. It's a very good point.

>> Councilmember Chu: Thank you.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Pete.

>> Councilmember Constant: So just want to be careful with the county. It seems like every time we start something with them that sounds good, it ends up in a lawsuit. Hopefully, that doesn't happen here. So changing,

we essentially changed nonresident to resident. Because I would assume that most people who have always used our camp lived in our county or a vast majority. How does that affect the numbers in the business plan that we saw that was based on a percentage of nonresidents versus residents use?

>> I can tackle that. Not all of our users were in the county, though. There was a pretty high percentage but there were also people from up and down the peninsula and then also out in the Central Valley as well. In fact many members of the friends of family camp are from not within the county. But we feel that there is enough -- we need to build this and we need to get the momentum going back again. Having camp stop for in 2010 we lost momentum that we had. And this is going to take some years I think so we can get the occupancy moving forward. We feel that our numbers if we can increase camp even with the reduced or resident fee if you will that we will be able to be cost recovery much quicker much faster and build that niche so people actually go to online when they're talking about their summer vacation during the holidays and be able to click that button. We want to get some data to do the signals but we have to start the process to see the occupancy, how many tents we can get occupied in the summer.

>> Councilmember Constant: I think it would be quite frankly more useful to take the business plan that we have and convert those numbers to see where it puts us. Because we have a business plan that was approved, and it had those projections and if we can take and say two-thirds of the nonresidents or whatever percentage are estimated to be Santa Clara County residents, what's that going to do to our numbers? Because the cost differential was pretty big and when you extrapolate it out over the number of people in the plan there could be a big financial delta and that's something that I think we really have to look at. And if we haven't looked at it it's something we need to do soon, especially when we get close to committing or have committed with the county. Because I don't want to end up seeing where we're less cost recovery but we have a lot of people because a lot of them are paying less money. That's my concern that the numbers match out. I mean I have a lot of concerns that you've heard many times. I'm not going to repeat all those but I want to make sure we don't compound a problem inadvertently.

>> looking at what that business plan showed and then converting those numbers like you said. We will do that we're actually in the process of doing that but also too that our fees and charges, we understood through this last, past, summer that people were not -- there were too many different charges that came forward. And in was some dissatisfaction with that. So we need to look at that too, as part of this overall review. So like any business plan it needs to change in terms of the times we're in and we're doing that as well right now. But we feel like going online and partnering with the county just in a general statement is going the to be a benefit at this time.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Okay. Are you finished?

>> Councilmember Constant: Yeah, I think that's it. Just I think it's a box we need to check going forward.

>> I agree.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Okay. Don?

>> Councilmember Rocha: One question. Our collaboration with the local congressional folks when we were pursuing the extension and now as we're pursuing the grants, I think those are federal grants that we have our eyes set on is that the case or sit state?

>> They're both. In times when grants were good, which was about six to eight years ago there were plenty of grants for vinyl education and improvements that actually included capital improvements to create places where kids can come and youth camps can go to. Those dried up but we want to be positioned to be able to access those when they come back again.

>> Councilmember Rocha: So here's a -- I don't know if it's -- letters of support given that our local congressional folks were very helpful, do we have letters of support from those folks, talking about the value of this asset so to speak? I mean, that's something I know staffing wise, hard for you folks to do all the work that you're doing but that might be something that a councilmember or two or three can help reach out to a congressional individual

that we have a good relationship with, I'm pointing to Councilmember Pyle in her great work last time around, and get some support from our state folks to include in these grant proposals. I know that doesn't completely help but it doesn't hurt. Perhaps that's not appropriate when you're submitting these proposals.

>> Another excellent statement. We have done that in the past. We have gotten letters from both state legislators and Congress people, to support any type of grant application. There was so much of that being done that actually some of the grant applications recently said, don't include that. But we can in fact get that when the grants become available. And we've got the connection with our local Congress folks here that of course Councilmember Pyle had made for us to get us our permit. We go back to them for sure. And ask for those letters.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Actually since they passed so handsomely. At the last election.

>> Councilmember Rocha: I can't remember the term for that, also helped in that unfortunate gay when Councilmember Pyle is no longer working in the council floor with us. Thank you. And thank you for your work on this, really fantastic work, appreciate it.

>> Councilmember Pyle: I'll still be behind the scenes ready to pitch in. I wanted to mention a couple of things. One had to do with complaints from my district, what happened the prices are too high. They are not high if people can be persuaded to look at the mid-week rates. Is that something you can emphasize in your advertising for camp?

>> We can. Actually there was a major shift in terms of our attendance. Typically Fridays Saturdays and Sundays were peak times in terms of attendance. Everything did shift in terms of the pricing to mid week. What that did for us is it spread out everyone in camp in terms of from day to day. Literally if you wanted to go up to camp at the last minute there really were no days you couldn't go. And that wasn't typically what would happen. Unless you got into camp that first registration day, pretty much the weekends were gone. With the changes it allowed more choice in terms of when you could attend.

>> Councilmember Pyle: And she'll probably kill me for doing this but my chief of staff Kathy Sutherland electrician duties and skills et cetera, right?

>> Correct, really appreciate it.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Put in a plug for them. And so we are ready to, I believe we are ready to hear from David Wall in reference to item 3.

>> I'm just here basically to thank you Madam Chair for all your efforts over the many, many years, excuse me for your support for San José family camp. I also want to underscore the fact that I wouldn't have anything whatsoever to do with Santa Clara County. This is a very, very bad business model. And it shouldn't be thrown out here killed aat the committee as far as any cooperation with the county. I would also like to see some permanence put into a CIP program with reference to funding that's dedicated funding that allows for a generous preventative maintenance program and expansion of any type of activities that remitted to structural improvement, sewer service and what have you. As far as grants from our good friends in Washington that have just been reelected that may have forgotten City of San José I would think that our Patton, Boggs should get a letter to remind them to listen to us from San José very well and other than that, or private education type models for occupancy, should be explored. This is a -- because these people will be paying premium rates in addition to premium CIP rates. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Thank you. And with that I'm looking for a motion to approve.

>> Councilmember Constant: I'll make a motion to accept the report with a suggestion that once things get worked out with the county I think you would benefit the entire council to get just a short info memo. .

>> Councilmember Pyle: I know you're going to faint mr. Wall but I think we should include the fact that we need to bring Patton, Boggs into the conversation conversation and ask them to help us in Washington. Thank you. He

is falling over as we speak. We have a motion and second, and thank you, that's approved. Ready to move on now to hear more about our park ranger status. Thank you very much for your presentation and with that we have Steve hammock our deputy director and Cindy Rabon our park manager. Welcome.

>> Okay, thank you and again thank you to Councilmember Pyle for putting this on the agenda. This wasn't originally on the agenda for NSE, we had this on here it is really timely and we appreciate it and we want to talk about this program as much as we can. Going back to the ranger history, it really started almost 40 years ago. And it started for some of the same reasons that we're having issues today. Unfortunately. There was activity in the park, specifically in Alum Rock back in the 1970s where there was the behavior that was unwanted or just unresponsible in the park setting. The park ranger program started to build this is back in 1972. And since that time the rangers really have been the face of our regional parks. Stetson hat, badge, green Jeep and you know kept conditions in the park really to a safe and respectable level where anybody could come and enjoy the park setting. Up to 2003, 26 full time equivalents, a ranger staff that would be here seven days a week, also would move out from those parks and onto our trails to make sure and ensure that our recreational areas were safe and clean and give important information to what direction you were going and what you would see that way and also an interpretive view of the natural environment. We moved from that point to the point we are today to the point where we are just about 11 FTE and a great many of those folks are part time employees not full time employees. We have six full time equivalents. Occurred back in 1972. Back again. We can't control some of the activities in the parks without having the eyes and ears out there on a regular basis and we've heard a lot about the issues resource management and the damage that's been done and really if you look back, even the short as two or three years ago. When we did have fixed post positions and we had staffing on the Guadalupe river parkway let's say, those problems did exist but they didn't exist at the level where it's really degrading the environment. So you know our history in the range resources and the range program-d ranger program is very deep, a lot of connection with West valley college and a lot of other areas. We are here today to actually ask Cindy to give us a little bit of information about how the ranger program is deployed today. Like I said, we have 11 FTEs so how are we trying to spread that out amongst all the regional parks and trail system that we have here in San José. If I could turn it over to Cindy. Cindy Reven the our parks division manager cindy.

>> Hi. First I would like to direct you to page 3 of the report and give you an update. There was an error in the matrix as far as the FTE allocation where the full time rangers are, as well as with the fall budget adjustments, the add of the .93 part time rangers in Almaden lake from the conversion from the swim program so if we look at the matrix it currently shows that there is a full time ranger allocated at Guadalupe river park and that is incorrect. There are two rangers at Kelly park and there are zero rangers full time allocated over at Guadalupe river park. So as we started the fiscal year the resources were allocated at the regional parks based on a criteria of high visitation, being revenue generating sites, having large bodies of water, and safety. Safety of those areas and patrol. And so when we looked at the FTE distribution, we put one full time range over at Almaden lake. We had two at Alum Rock because of the visitation, the rugged terrain, up in that area, two at Kelly park, because of the high visitation, Happy Hollow park and zoo complex, the park rangers serve as the first responders and part of the AZA accreditation and so we needed the full time rangers April at that facility based on that as well kelly park. The Alum Rock rangers during the lower parts of the season were to also go through and patrol Overfelt gardens, to help deter the truancy, because it's adjacent to independence high school. As well as the Kelly park rangers were supposed to pull out of Kelly park periodically and go towards the Guadalupe river park. Two part time benefited rangers in our program, one was allocated at Kelly, the other at lake Cunningham. And then the part time rangers, we had them distributeat the regional parks to help keep the four regional parks where the high visitation was in the summer season to help keep a presence there and to help keep the revenue programs moving forward. So that was the mindset. The part time rangers during the middle of the summer, we started to see additional unwanted behavior. We were receiving calls for service along the Guadalupe along with some of the neighborhood parks where we were having folks having their dogs off-leash or drinking or just camping in the parks. And so we redirected some of the resources mid stream and pulled one of the full time rangers out of Lake Cunningham, the only full time ranger out of lake Cunningham and they worked in partnership with some of the part time rangers to keep Cunningham staffed, also work at Almaden lake, and to patrol some of the trail out there. Also, to hit some of the hot spots, Ryland parks, the Cahills, some of the other ones where we were having plenty of concerns coming from our constituents about unwanted behavior. So she would go through and patrol and train some of the part time rangers on how to do that. We had some success but it was like a cat and mouse game. We also started to pilot in cooperation with environmental services around the encampment cleanup in two major areas along the creeks. At Coyote creek through Kelly park to monitor the encampments after the I'll call

them cleanups happened, they started monitoring that area along the Guadalupe from Julian to Hedding. So with the part time rangers and the full time rangers they would go through those areas three to four times a week at time allowed and at some point it got down to only maybe twice a week because of the staffing allocations. We were successful at maintaining a pretty good cleanup of those two piloted areas. With additional resources it would help mitigate that permanently. And so we also had you know some challenges. And the challenges in itself were staffing. When our department, when the city downsized, some of the other agencies upsized. And we lost some of our part time rangers and our full time rangers moved on to other agencies. So our resources for filling all of our needs were dwindling and then our part time rangers that we do have some have multiple jobs. Some are firefighters, some work for other agencies and so we would get them on their days off. And as what's happening with one of our full time rangers who has been picked up by the county, his schedule has changed recently so now he's going to be working back with us on Saturdays to help monitor out along the Guadalupe river park. So that's going to be an added resource for us. Other challenges we've had is just you know not having an -- a regular supervisor to monitor the program and to keep it engaged and moving forward. It's a collateral duty for several folks and having a dedicated supervisor for the program is something that we're hoping to achieve and may be coming forward within if next budget process. So in moving forward we're looking at the ranger program just in general and how to revamp it and build forward. What are the strategies that we need to satisfactorily keep our parks safe and monitored as well as our trailways. And then the work that the rangers do currently, can they be done by others? You know, volunteer work, do we have rangers who are park rangers be full sworn police officers? We have a program where if you are park rangers, full time and part time, part time are not sworn. They do not write citations, they do not have any of that ability. So our department is going through and looking at those elements and hope to bring forward some things in the next budget process. So I'm going to turn it back to Steve.

>> So the next steps are taking a look at what are optimum if you will program going forward with all of these conditions, that we're seeing, and how do we build a program that addresses that in the most efficient way? And we've talked a lot about the program that we've got going on now, stakeholders are at the table, environmental services, fish and game, water department, all talking about these conditions along the waterways. That we're really mitigated at one point in time when we did have a sufficient ranger program. As the county has done in some of their areas. And so how do we get back to that? And that's the question, that's the budget challenge. We

really want to have a ranger program, I can just tell you in the broader sense that is a four-core program area where they focus on public safety and law and compliance, rule and regulation compliance, they also work with resource management so the idea of getting volunteers together and trying to restore a creek reach like along the Guadalupe where it's been really torn down from all the camping. That's things rangers can do and they should do. Working in general maintenance, working on the creek cleanups, how to deal with that work with maintenance staff. And then like I mentioned before, having the person out there that makes the place feel safe, gives information, does educational programs, and interpretive programs, work with our participant like the conservancy or the GRP or Happy Hollow. Those are really important tasks. And if you look at that with a broad stroke, the rangers can do all that work. But we are now putting out fires as you heard what Cindy said. Moving forward we hope to go into the next budget cycle, really define more what we need, work with the water department, see what we can do there and try to make some movement so we can restore some of this and not let things get out of control. That ends our report. There's a lot to talk about but we'll keep it at that and take any questions.

>> Councilmember Pyle: You need to keep in mind it's not you. It is the problem. We made the cuts on the budget and therein lies the majority of the problem. So you're friendly. With that do we have questions? Not here? Questions?

>> Councilmember Rocha: Want to say that we're on board with you as far as I can tell as far as the value of this program. Thank you for your work in trying to maintain what we have.

>> Councilmember Constant: Motion to accept.

>> Councilmember Pyle: I'd like to ask a couple of questions if I may. As you know I spoke up about a problem we had last week and I'd like to thank the police force, because they are the ones that came out and said this is a problem that has incredible overtones for huge problems. And so they came out and helped eescort the people who are there out of the encampment. That was a pretty interesting way to do it. Each person brought with them their belongings. No need to store, no need to do much of anything. They were able to work with others to find a better place for these people to live. So with that, I'm worried that we can't wait seven months for park

rangers. We can't wait until we get more money to do this. We've got to think in terms of emergency funds. Because we are also talking about the potential for violence at these encampments. They have the capacity to do so. And innocent people being involved. The trails are continuing to deteriorate, the water quality is shot. We have the lowest water quality, I thought it was in the United States in reference to what was happening. And so I don't know away can be done about that. We know that there's a relationship between the number of encampments and the number of rangers. Would you agree with that?

>> Yes, I would absolutely agree with that. And it's not that far back that we have to look to see that in fact along the Guadalupe things were much better when we had fixed post positions. I do want to point out that our goal would not be to have to escort those people out ranger patrol would come by and not allow that to happen.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Absolutely. So if there's any way to have emergency legislation or appeal to people on the state level for help from that, they do have a majority in Sacramento right now, we should take advantage of that. So I'm hoping that we can find some way to tap into some kind of emergency funds even though there's a pay back in future years, we need help now.

>> Thank you.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Since there are no other -- there is no other input, someone said they had a motion. But we need to hear from David Wall. Can I have it right after David?

>> I'm qualified expert for the section of the Guadalupe river from Coleman to Hedding. Rest assured I am not sympathetic whatsoever as to the report that I have heard today, as a matter of fact it is so damning as far as being mistruthful that my ire is very, very irritated. Right now you can see from Coleman, encampments right down on the creek itself that have threatened people as they walk along the trails. There are no number of park rangers unless they are sworn and fully armed that can deal with this element. Therefore it is my recommendation that any of our park rangers that can carry weapons that they be transferred immediately with reference to their background checks to the San José police department and basically ladies and gentlemen you have to get --

budgetarily you can't afford this model. You have to go to a police model where police dedicate patrols to the park or better yet ask President Obama for two marine rifle corps to clean these people out. I can't even go down there anymore because of my physical limitations but even then it is very very tenuous. And asking people to leave by the parks people invokes all this inventorying of their property. To hell with that. other social deviants should be dealt with in a very harsh and firm manner. And as far as the parks report today on this matter I don't know what level of chastisement that the office of City Manager will have but I hope it is significant because I am not sympathetic to any of the words I have heard today with reference to the park rangers what they could do 30 years ago and what they can do now. Because we've had several decades of society that doesn't hold people accountable to their own personal activities and account for their actions in the community. And park rangers are fully out gunned in this matter. So therefore turn it over to the San José police and we'll talk on open forum later about a specific issue. Thank you.

>> Councilmember Constant: Third time I'll make a motion that we approve this or accept this report.

>> Councilmember Rocha: I'll third it.

>> Councilmember Constant: You're not leaving, are you? No you got up with your binder.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Second.

>> Councilmember Constant: Because I have to leave, too.

>> Councilmember Rocha: Second.

>> Councilmember Chu: Third.

>> Councilmember Pyle: All right, all those in favor, yes, that is approved.

>> Councilmember Constant: It is apparent that we are going to lose quorum. Can we take the neighborhoods commission update, I have a meeting at 3:30 that I can't be late for. We have to approve it but the three of us can do that if you need to go. We only neat three of the four but I want to make sure you have enough to take action.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Attendance has to be better at the next meeting. With that we'll carry on to the neighborhood commission presentation.

>> To the point Kip Harkness City Manager's office at the direction of city council we have put in place and you have approved the ordinances that extend the pilot project until the end of the scarlet. As part of your direction we bring forward today for your consideration a work plan to chart out the course between the first meeting in December on December 12th to the last meeting. And we have three basic items with the fourth tack on. The first one is active management in the budget process in a way to give timely feedback to you. Second is their own internal thoughts and direction and recommendations on the future of an effective neighborhoods commission and how that would be structured and how that would work and third one we have added is in our staff work plan which is identifying barriers and opportunities to improve volunteers, use of volunteers and volunteer capacity. Small related item on the next page number 4 is make sure that they are available as we do a number of executive recruitments that are underway or about to be underway to provide feedback on things like such as the criteria of the selection of the next police chief and other relevant neighborhood serving executives.

>> Councilmember Constant: Great job, motion to approve.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Second? All those in favor, aye, that is approved and there was no card on number 7. All right. So moving backwards here. We will go back to D-5. Which is the status report on grant and bond-funded, number 6, I'm sorry, there we go. All right. Betsy, you're on. Thank you for being patient.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Oh, no problem, I'll be brief. Many of you in other committees, this is my annual review of the next cycle of legislative guiding principles to all of the committees before going to Rules and the full council next month. What you have before you are some items that have been added related to this CSA. I have to say this

CSA or your committee's priorities have been very much fleshed out probably over the last three or four years. So there's very little to add or edit. However I do want to comment that at the same time this process is taking place we are putting together our legislative priorities for 2013 which will be attached to this and that will be where you see specific issues including continued advocacy for funding for family camp as an example, that will be in the priorities that the parks and recreation department have submitted as well as other issue areas which are specific to certain issues. This is the foundation through years for internal staff review and then taking recommendations to the rules and full council oron particular legislation that is introduced in the two-year cycle which will be beginning December 3rd in Sacramento and in Washington when they're sworn in, in January.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Okay. So today our goal is to approve the guiding principles.

>> Betsy Shotwell: The ones that have been -- well, if there's anything you wish to add or contribute to the document and then as well as the ones that were added in the cover memo which were very few, but very important, including under support efforts to keep San José State, were added regarding support for, funding for youth violence prevention initiatives also increasing programs that reduce and control blight and graffiti that was particularly relevant for the memo going forward today as well as the whole area that will be happening perhaps at the federal level depending how the Congress and the administration deal with the quote fiscal cliff issues that they have going on in Washington, D.C.

>> Councilmember Constant: I hope they have a bungee cord on. I want to reemphasize because it's asked a few times why we pursue what we pursue and how come some things don't go through committees and you and Roxann get to charge ahead it's because of this document that we approve yearly both through committees and through the council. I think it's important that we reemphasize that because a question seems to resurface every six months or so on the council, why are we doing this without doing that and this is why.

>> Betsy Shotwell: Thank you very much.

>> Councilmember Constant: I don't have anything to add other than a motion to proof of approve and accept.

>> Councilmember Pyle: I did want to point out the fact that under support efforts to keep San José safe, seek federal and state funding to help with public safety throughout the parks, trail systems and recreation system, is that something Patton, Boggs might be helpful in pushing forward?

>> Betsy Shotwell: Well, this is looked at through the lens of both state and federal and then depending on the programs and what authorizations might be out there, where you can link these issues to particular funding opportunities. Of course without earmarks in the mix they're fewer and farther between but that doesn't mean you can't perhaps link onto some larger authorization package that type of funding. And again that's what I work with the parks department on and all other departments when these grant opportunities present themselves, when and if they do we have to move quickly.

>> Councilmember Pyle: We have a motion to approve.

>> Councilmember Chu: Second.

>> Councilmember Pyle: All those in favor, that is approved.

>> Councilmember Constant: I'm going oleave.

>> Councilmember Pyle: D-7 we have nothing. Open forum and for that we have Mr. Wall.

>> Nothing Eh, Councilmember Constant? Catch me down at the Guadalupe river tonight. The San José police assigned to my district know what's going on down there on that section of Guadalupe river, between Coleman and Hedding street. They need direction by council to go down there and clean this business out. These encampments are not like the San José family camp. These are base camps of depravity, criminal activity of all sorts and sizes. I've personally witnessed prostitution acts down there when I could walk down there. Drug dealing is rampant, I've had a seven and a quarter inch circular saw blade whisk past me into a tree. I'd had

ammunition loads I don't know if any of you have been given that recommendation by the San José police. I have not followed through it because -- for a variety of reasons. These places down there are not family oriented type places. And for council or -- or for any other person to think well, you know, they're just hard-luck stories, hey, life is full of hard-luck stories. Most of these people if not all of them deserve to be rounded up and put into stockades and trashed out by either the mentally ill, they're criminals, illegal aliens or what have you. So that, in part, I want to say also, holding the Water District accountable and liable for their property, I'm sick and tired of giving them a Mulligan on that. They've for years gotten away with not patrolling their own property with their own funded security personnel as a function of their clean water financing. And two, the use of environmental services department personnel with reference to how the employees are funded, because of the restrictions placed on their funds, I have an objection to that for these creek cleanups unless they're solely out of integrated waste fund and General Fund. Storm drain fund that's not part of it. I don't want to see that done down there because of Prop 218. Other than that I would like to thank this committee for all the effort that it does. And I want you to start thinking about setting up an enterprise fund for the offices of City Attorney. They are on the endangered species list over there and they're also not very well paid and I don't like that.

>> Councilmember Pyle: Thank you, Mr. Wall, appreciate that, with this we are adjourned. Thanks for being the first to come and the last to stay.