



PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, February 17, 2010 at 6:30 p.m.
700 Alma Street, Menlo Park, CA 94025
Burgess Recreation Center,

CALL TO ORDER at 6:30pm.

ROLL CALL – K. Breisch, J. Cebrian, A. Kirkpatrick, P. Maurano

Not Present – K. Blythe, N. Naclerio, J. Tooley

Others Present – Starla Jerome–Robinson, Assistant City Manager; Nancy Nuckolls, Program Manager; Kent Steffens, Deputy City Manager

A. PUBLIC COMMENT #1 (Limited to 30 minutes)

None.

B. CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Approval of the Minutes dated [January 20, 2010](#)

Moved / Seconded (Cebrian / Breisch) and passed unanimously to approve the Minutes dated January 20, 2010.

The commissioners agreed to discuss the Agenda item C2 prior to item C1.

C. REGULAR BUSINESS

1. CIP – Starla Jerome-Robinson, Assistant City Manager and Subcommittee [\(CIP\)](#)

The Commission was introduced to the Capital Improvement Plan prior to the meeting in order to allow feedback. The commissioners were asked for their opinion and suggestions as the deadline for final recommendation is February 23. Assistant City Manager pointed out that the priorities structure could be changed but within the same budget.

Further Discussion:

Gymnastics Center Renovation -

Paula Maurano and James Cebrian had no objections to the draft plan. Paula noticed that the Gymnastics Center renovation is not going to be part of the five year plan. Kent Steffens explained that the estimate made in 2008 for the gymnastics renovation was 11.5 million. With \$5 million available in Measure T fund, another \$6.5 million would be necessary to renovate the building.

Flood Park Improvements -

Kent Steffens explained that the Flood Park improvement would need between \$6 and \$8 million and that there is no funding for that project. The engineers looked at the layouts to see what would fit, but there are no resources to maintain the current fields. Kent pointed out that there is a dialog with the County on the status of the park. He feels that if the park is given to Menlo Park, it would add expenses to maintain the field.

Hillview Park -

Kent reminded that \$600,000 of Measure T Fund was spent on the field, and the project was put on hold because of the changes in the School District's plan. The School District decided

to move around the existing buildings and one of them would be on the field, along Elder Street. The gym / multipurpose building will remain at the current location. The new playground will have to be upgraded to meet the new codes since it is on the school property. It is estimated that \$500,000 would cover the renovation of Tinker's Park playground and installation of a new turf field.

Belle Haven Pool –

Proposed amount of \$200,000 will cover the fiberglass repair. It is delaminating from the surface and the pool might not be functional if the basic repairs are not maintained.

OHCC Basketball Court Resurfacing –

There was funding to resurface the gym, but the project is taken off the priority list. Kent made it clear that the draft CIP document is showing the future funding. The project may be placed on the draft if new resources become available.

Willow Oaks (Dog Park) -

The engineers are looking into putting in turf instead of grass. The dog area has simply been fenced, so the condition of grass is worsening with more users. It is a challenge to maintain the grass and the park could eventually be closed. The staff is looking into a better way to maintain the park.

Jack Lyle Park Restrooms -

The commissioners suggested reinstating the project; possibly by pushing \$50,000 from Willow Oaks and using that for the Jack Lyle Park restrooms. The staff explained that the sum is not realistic; it is more likely to come up to \$200,000, based on the restrooms installed before. Only design would cost \$50,000 and running the sewer and power lines and other things would add expenses. The commissioners asked that the restroom project be moved to the next fiscal year. The staff clarified that some projects would have to be pushed off; for example the Kelly Field improvements are fully funded and running, but might have to move to the next fiscal year. The staff is looking at what projects to take on, but with limited number of personnel and resources it is not realistic to run multiple projects within the same fiscal year.

After the Commissioners agreed to propose the Jack Lyle Restrooms Project to the CIP, Andy Kirkpatrick noted that they should step back, since so many field projects are scheduled and running. Kirkpatrick added that the commission should look closely at what to work on within the coming fiscal year and keep an eye on things that need to be done. Paula Maurano asked to have a plan of what the County wishes to do with Flood Park. Paula feels that the Flood Park project should not be pushed away and would like to see the analysis of the possible field use if the turf was added. Kent Steffens said that incorporating Flood Park would be a challenge, since there is no staff to maintain it.

The commission came to an agreement to see the Jack Lyle Park Restrooms Project on CIP for FY 2010/11.

2. Recommendation to the City Council to Maintain Menlo Children's Center as a City service as long as revenues cover 90% of budgeted costs or the Center remains within budget for that fiscal year and to approve the draft RFP for contracting out MCC if needed ([Staff Report](#) / Nancy Nuckolls and Subcommittee)

Nancy Nuckolls started the presentation with what happened in the past year and a program overview. Nancy reminded the Commission that there was a concern about the level of General Fund subsidy used for the program. On page 2 she pointed out a first quarter review and the current operation budgeted for FY09/10. Midyear 09/10 indicates a 111% cost recovery rate.

To sustain the numbers, new programs were added. The summer camps will start later to maintain the enrollment. Those programs are just getting kicked off the ground and are expected to build up.

Marketing is another area that improved as well. The program is advertized weekly on Craig's List and featured in local parent magazines. Center tours are offered weekly in addition to a public open house event.

Nancy also mentioned that the staff needs to continue to evaluate the operational efficiencies and implement changes in order to maintain the target budget levels. A satisfaction survey was distributed to parents with children enrolled in the program. The results of the survey, in attachment C, are showing that parents are satisfied or very satisfied with the program, facility, staff and fees. The results are also giving information on what the classrooms should work on to improve.

Starla Jerome-Robinson explained that the 2006 RFP was used to create the draft for 2010. There was an option to cover either afterschool or preschool, and in accordance with the City Council, the document covers both options, separate and together. General questions were sent to 10 child care providers to acquire information and observe their interest. The criteria used to select the providers was based on having at least 10 years of operational experience, operating at least two centers, having a quality program and being local. Three responses were received.

Further Discussion:

Paula Maurano pointed out that the Mid-year Budget Review is showing the direct cost and not the fully-loaded cost. Paula feels that the report presented to the City Council should have the fully-loaded cost. The staff explained that the analysis is showing the direct cost including all personnel (salaries and benefits), training and travel costs of service providers; the purchase and maintenance of equipment and furniture; departmental and food supplies; advertising and miscellaneous cost of the program. In addition, the expenditure budget includes some non-direct costs, including personnel costs associated with the departmental administration and supervision of the program/service; utilities, credit card fees and insurance. The budgeted costs do not include administrative, supervisory or maintenance costs incurred by other departments for services such as payroll, accounting, City Manager's Office functions, and building and grounds maintenance. These costs are budgeted in the appropriate overhead departments (Administrative Services and Public Works). Therefore, the overhead costs of the MCC program, identified in the citywide Cost Allocation Plan and included in the 2008 Full Cost Analysis of User Fee Services, are not included in these analyses.

Kristi Breisch recalled that the original request from the Council was to give a recommendation whether the City should bear the cost of the program. It appears that MCC is heading in the right direction, so we should make a recommendation. Paula Maurano mentioned that the direct cost numbers are misleading. Andy Kirkpatrick made a comment that the staff did a remarkable job, but is worried about sustainability. Andy suggested seeing if the numbers are going to sustain another 6 months.

Paula Maurano replied that the program needs to get accredited and that the City should issue an RFP. Paula mentioned that the numbers look good but they don't make the reality. The parents need a good program and more cost effective. Andy Kirkpatrick feels that the program seems to be running well and that unless there is some sort of structural issue, there is no reason some other group of people would run it better than the current staff. Andy feels that they should keep pressure on the staff and have the program stay profitable. James Cebrian suggested giving one more month to MCC, encouraging the staff to run the program more efficiently and see the fully-loaded cost analyses. Andy agreed and would like to see more transparency in the coming month. He mentioned that

if the RFP is to be issued now, the transition to the new provider wouldn't take place before fall 2010. The parents might be concerned and staff unmotivated, which would have an effect on the program. Kirkpatrick added that the RFP should be sent out only if the commission is convinced that the City can not run the program.

Motion and second (Kirkpatrick/Cebrian) and passed 4:1 (Maurano dissenting) to see what the MCC staff can do to improve the program in a month, to see the new analyses based on revenue and fully-loaded cost in the same timeframe and the projected impact.

3. Changing the Commission's regular meeting time to 7pm

The commission agreed to discuss it at the next meeting since the commission members requesting the time change were not at the meeting.

D. REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

E. INFORMATION ITEMS

None.

F. PUBLIC COMMENT #2 (*This item is optional*)

There were no public comments at this meeting.

G. ADJOURNMENT at 8:02pm.

Submitted by Jelena Gaines.

ATTACHMENT

[Letter from Elizabeth Ouren](#)

