



California

CITY OF OCEANSIDE

MINUTES OF THE

CITY COUNCIL

April 24, 2002

ADJOURNED MEETING 10:00 AM COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Mayor
Terry Johnson

Deputy Mayor
Jack Feller

Councilmembers
Betty Harding
Carol McCauley
Esther Sanchez

City Clerk
Barbara Riegel Wayne
City Treasurer
Rosemary Jones

The adjourned meeting of the Oceanside City Council was called to order by Mayor Johnson at 10:00 AM, April 24, 2002. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Deputy Mayor Feller.

ROLL CALL

Present were Mayor Johnson, Deputy Mayor Feller and Councilmembers Harding and McCauley. Councilmember Sanchez arrived at 10:35 AM. Also present were City Clerk Wayne, City Attorney Duane Bennett and City Manager Steve Jepsen.

WORKSHOP ITEM:

1. **Approval of skateboard elements installation at Joe Balderrama Park, John Landes Park and City owned property adjacent to the Libby Lake Boys and Girls Club**

ANA ALVAREZ, Parks and Recreational Services Manager, stated this is the workshop for skate park developments in the City. She noted that staff provided Councilmembers with a supplemental reference handbook containing information about skateboarding and BMXing. The mission of Parks and Recreation Services is to enhance the quality of life for Oceanside residents through people, parks and programs. They will be addressing those three components: people -- they will be focusing on the skaters in this presentation; parks -- development of the skate parks; and the programs.

JEFF HURLEY, Parks and Recreation Services Professional Assistant, reported that the department has done a lot of work for skate park development. This is the most significant event since the grand opening of the temporary park.

Skateboarding is very popular in California and in the United States. There are over 16,000,000 skaters in the U.S., and 5,000,000 of those are in California. Skate parks are popping up all over the place. As a result, skate parks are probably the most popular capital projects for parks and recreation services.

There had been a lot of skate parks in California in the 1970s and early 1980s. In the later 1980s, liability became an issue. People feared losing money due to lawsuits, so they shut the skate parks down. That fear was largely unfounded because injuries did not happen nearly as often as presumed, nor did the lawsuits. 1998 marked the birth of one of

**NOT OFFICIAL
UNTIL APPROVED AT SUBSEQUENT
MEETING BY CITY COUNCIL**

the most impacting pieces of California legislation. Senator Bill Morrow from Oceanside was involved in putting through Assembly Bill (AB) 1296, which amended California Government Code 831.7, the hazardous activities list. The State went from having virtually no skate parks to over 100 skate parks in 4 years. This bill had a great impact. A summary of this legislation is on page 2 of the handbook; the bills are on page 3; and historical skateboarding articles are on page 62.

California Government Code 831.7 is a hazardous activities list -- a list of certain activities and sports that would excuse cities and municipalities from liability if a participant is involved in any of the listed sports. Skateboarding was added to that list with AB 1296. If it goes through, Senate Bill 994 is the proposed replacement to AB 1296, which will expire at the end of this year.

Oceanside has taken several steps to answer the demand for skateboarding. The City opened a temporary park in January 2001, which has been very successful and popular with over 1,0000 skaters per week. It is temporary and located on leased property. There have been very few incidents at the park. Since opened, there have been 7 minor injuries; 9 possible bone breaks or wrist/ankle sprains but no femur breaks; 11 lacerations; 3 skater confrontations; 2 break-ins and 1 safety gear incident. There were no neck, head or spine injuries, which is very positive.

Oceanside passed Municipal Code Section 20.24.3 in December, which gives the City the freedom to have unsupervised facilities. Sample signage is included on page 22. They would also add additional signage that would make it very clear that this is a hazardous activity, there is danger involved, and it is at your own risk, so be aware.

Regarding permanent skate park efforts, Council passed a planning process in December 2001, and steering committee meetings continued in January 2001. The participants of those steering committee meetings were largely youth. Staff wanted this to be a youth-driven project. There were 7 youth skaters who attended all 3 meetings and spent 2 hours with staff. There were 2 Youth Commissioners, 2 Parks and Recreation Commissioners, 2 industry professionals, one parent and one teacher who all made several recommendations to staff. Staff was hoping to move forward with the short-term recommendations today. The long-term recommendations include discussions of design, site selection based on public forums, and a report back to Council once the information is collected.

Page 34 of the booklet is a letter from the Youth Commission that includes a discussion about the Steering Committee meetings, fundraising, and ways that youth can get involved to create ownership by the youth. They should know that park, in part, is their park.

DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER requested clarification on what the City's liabilities are for all those aforementioned injuries.

MR. HURLEY responded that for a skate park at this point, with the passage of AB 1296, the City is not liable for injuries of skaters ages 14 and over. For skaters 14 and under, the City might be liable, although the popular opinion is that the City's responsibility is to keep the park well maintained so that there are no obvious safety concerns. If the City decides to supervise the park, the City would be making sure that all patrons wear the necessary safety gear.

MAYOR JOHNSON asked for City Attorney Bennett to reiterate why AB 1296 would expire January 1, 2003. He recognized that the follow-up Senate Bill introduced by Senator Bill Morrow would pick up where 1296 expired. He asked what the rationale was to having an expiration date on that bill.

CITY ATTORNEY BENNETT could not answer regarding this particular statute. However, in many cases, the sunset/expiration provisions are placed into the Code because the legislature does not have sufficient information to rely on the analysis long-term. In many cases they want to give the law or particular legislation a test period to see how it

would be implemented before they decided to extend it. He would assume that because this area is new, expanding and has liability concerns, the legislature probably wanted to see how the law would work and be practically applied before they extended those provisions.

To elaborate on Deputy Mayor Feller's liability concerns, accidents do take place at skate parks. There are some protections, such as posting specific rules, provisions and safety devices. The ordinance Oceanside adopted is consistent with State law and provides some degree of protection. Our arguments are that, if a child or minor participates in this type of ultra-hazardous activity, they do so at their own risk. This provides a certain degree of comfort and protection, but that does not totally immunize the City.

An accident could occur at any of these facilities, and there are attorneys out there who will come up with novel theories to hold the City liable. Part and parcel of the City's responsibility when it enacts one of these parks is to make sure that the rules that are in place are totally complied with; that the City has adequate supervision where you have these supervised skate parks; that the helmets and kneepads are in compliance; and that there is valid parental consent -- that the parents have complied and that the children are not involved in activities that are contrary to the requirements of the park, such as not skating on wet surfaces, etc. Even still, if an accident/severe accident were to occur, it would be difficult for the City to justify immunity, as always.

MS. ALVAREZ noted the reason AB 1296 is a sunset law is that since 1999, municipalities have had a requirement to make an annual report of the number and types of accidents to the judicial council. What has been found so far is that skateboarding has less frequency in injuries than basketball, football and baseball, which is one of the rationales for the proposal of SB 994.

NATHAN MERTZ, Parks Project Coordinator, explained that staff is looking at continuing efforts for the permanent skate park, which is guided by the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee is considering a number of things such as temporary skate park location and a permanent skate park location within Oceanside. They are also looking at partnerships with the private sector. An example of a partnership with the private sector would be inviting a corporation to construct and provide services to the City's youth in the form of a BMX park or skate park. In reviewing the options for permanent and temporary skate parks, the Steering Committee created a hierarchy of criteria to rank choices for both types of parks (booklet page 31).

Today staff is looking for Council direction on the short-term plan for temporary skate parks. These would be short-term solutions to meet the standards set in the Master Plan document, approved by Council in 1996 to provide a number of skate areas in our neighborhood parks. Discussion on a permanent skate park facility will come back to Council with input from the teens and community regarding their needs, wants and desires.

So, the temporary skate park needs to be relocated because it is currently on leased land. The top-ranking site is the old Oceanside Police Department (OPD) building. There are a number of facilities at that building that continue to be used today, but there is a portion of that site not being utilized, primarily the parking lot adjacent to the shopping center. Due to the geographical area, the availability of parking, its central location and convenient transportation routes identified in the ranking criteria, this site was identified as number one. The City would have to explore this further to see if it would work at this site. According to the criteria, this was identified as a priority site.

Regarding the neighborhood parks, they have chosen 3 parks: Joe Balderrama Park and Community Center, John Landes Park and Community Center and the Libby Lake Park. Within the 1996 Master Plan, skateboard areas were identified in a number of parks throughout the City, and they would like to implement the master plan document. By identifying these 3 parks, they know through the evaluation process that they have covered a good geographic area and, at this time, it would satisfy those requirements and leave us the opportunity to fill in the empty gaps in our park area.

Using the direction from the Master Plan, they started an evaluation process for these parks which addresses:

- community needs and desires
- the least amount of impact to existing park facilities
- getting the most for our money when placing these parks on a site, and
- the ability to self-monitor these skate areas -- It is very important that the skate facilities be in a high visibility area so that the kids and residents can help monitor park activities.

They also looked at transportation, the impacts of adding amenities to the parks and whether it would add to the intensification of the park use. What they discovered at the temporary skate park at Rotary Park is that most of the kids using the park either travel by foot, bike, skateboard, or are dropped off by their parents. At these neighborhood parks, it is the intention to not provide a regional attraction at these parks, but more of a neighborhood use where most of the traffic will be on foot or skateboard, which is allowed by ordinance, or parental drop-offs. Most of the parks identified have ideal situations for drop-offs and is a high-density neighborhood where kids can easily walk to these facilities.

COUNCILMEMBER HARDING pointed out that the short-term sites of the old OPD building and Ivey Ranch are both on Mission Avenue, and that Mission has the most frequent bus service in the whole system, which will run every 10 minutes.

COUNCILMEMBER McCAULEY asked if the Libby Lake Skate Park (page 38) is a temporary site or a long-term plan, since it shows no halfpipe.

MR. MERTZ responded the Libby Lake location is not a temporary site. The ramps can be relocated or modified, etc. He will address that in his presentation.

The Joe Balderrama Park and Community Center, is located in one of the oldest communities and has one of the highest population densities. That park currently has many recreational amenities, including basketball and tennis courts, play structures, handball courts, a resource center and a community center. The use at this site is very intense. Their main goal is to preserve as much open space as possible without taking away from anything. We worked with the teens and showed them different possibilities on the park elements. He reviewed the halfpipe configuration proposed here (page 42). They also requested a couple of street-style features such as a rail slide or some sort of box.

DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER asked if the skate park at Balderrama Park is a temporary or neighborhood park. If another is located at the old OPD building, that is less than 2 blocks away.

MR. MERTZ clarified that the temporary park would be when the Rotary skate park closes down. The ramps at that park can be used with minimal maintenance, and they would relocate those ramps to another site. Through the Steering Committee process it would be either at the old OPD station or Ivey Ranch. Their preference is for these neighborhood skate facilities to remain indefinitely, like a basketball or tennis court. The City would purchase permanent steel ramps that would require minimal maintenance.

MR. HURLEY added that when they are referring to a temporary facility, they are referring to what would be a substitute for a permanent skate park. So the OPD location would only be utilized if the leased property at Rotary Park was no longer available. These neighborhood facilities are small and can remain as long as necessary. However, if these skate parks need to be removed, it would not be as difficult as removing a concrete park.

Continuing, **MR. MERTZ** stated that staff looked at many locations within Balderrama Park, to serve the community and maximize the use. The site adjacent to Higgins Street would allow for good self-management. It would be visible from the street, and there is already existing concrete. With the small addition of buffering areas and barriers, this area would be a good addition for the kids who cannot get to Rotary Park. Even if there were a temporary site at Mission Avenue, this neighborhood would have its own facility for the kids to use.

John Landes Park is one of the oldest parks in the City and has a large range of frequently used amenities such as baseball fields, tennis and basketball courts, playground structures, sand volleyball courts, barbecue grills and picnic tables. The wants and needs of the community are taken into consideration for self-management, as well as maximizing the use and not impacting other facilities. There are 2 possible sites that meet those criteria, and their first choice is located on Cedar Road, next to the parking lot. It is highly visible from Cedar, and the terrain is relatively flat, which would enable the City to lay out a concrete pad without having to construct any retaining walls.

Staff also talked to kids at the community center and to the neighbors who lived across the street. There is a large grassy portion running north/south down the middle of the park that is currently being leased to soccer teams for practice. With the dog-leg, they propose removing the grassy area. This area is their first choice to set up a skate area; it would be buffered from the street; it will have barriers to mitigate visual impacts to the neighbors; and this area will be nicely landscaped. This park is based off the Libby Lake plan.

Regarding Libby Lake, staff interviewed the youth in the Libby Lake area. The neighborhood kids wanted 2 quarter pipes and a feature in the middle that would enable them to do tricks; the flow is very 2-dimensional; and there is no cross traffic. The kids thought that would be the best. When pricing out these ramps and organizing the features, staff found that the children's request would work well with the site and the budget. The asphalt is already laid, so the City would only need to resurface it with a satin finish and install the ramps. The City would relocate the basketball court closer to the Boys and Girls Club and rotate it to run east to west to accommodate both uses. Included in the booklet is a letter (page 54) from the Boys and Girls Club Chief Professional Officer, Randall Godinet, expressing his support of modifying their lease agreement to allocate this area to the City for a new skateboard park.

MR. HURLEY referenced a list of use considerations (page 55) for these neighborhood-type parks, such as possibly having skate demos, competitions, or rental of the facilities for birthday parties, etc. These are potential sources of revenue. They would need to consider how much that would take away from free access to that facility.

Again, the criteria they looked at were: community direction, where the community wants the skate park within the park; where it will have the least impact to current uses — none of these proposed facilities disrupt a current use; what creates the potential for self-monitoring; and where we can get the most for our money. For example the concrete slab is already at Balderrama Park so that would make the cost much cheaper.

Noise is often a concern, but the State and cities have done several impact studies to show that skate park noise is not a concern. The City of Pleasanton did a study that showed the noise within a skate park is equivalent to the noise within a tennis court.

Regarding supervision and liability, based on a recent informal California Parks and Recreation Society (CPRS) survey, the majority of cities within California are shifting towards unsupervised facilities because it presents a different philosophy. Rather than having a supervised park and assuming the responsibility for keeping the pads and helmets on skaters and being liable if they are not, the responsibility is shifted to the skaters and the parents since it is at their own risk and is posted. So if a person is injured, the liability is shifted to him or her. Given the hundreds of skate parks in California, there have not been any lawsuits awarded from municipalities to skaters who have been injured in skate parks.

Insurance costs might be a concern; they are presently looking at that with risk management. It is budgeted; however, it may be possible the City will not have to pay any additional insurance costs. However, it depends on the City's insurance provider.

This project is youth-driven; it is the people in the community creating these skate parks. They will use the same model at Libby Lake for Balderrama and John Landes Parks. This is to design something the youth would like to see.

[Councilmember Sanchez arrived at 10:35 AM]

Oceanside is pioneering in skateboard development. Not because the City is building a skate park or because they might be unsupervised facilities or because the City is looking to build more than one skatepark, but because the City is looking to have multiple neighborhood skate parks that would truly serve the youth of the community, rather than just 1 or 2 large skate parks. Oceanside is planning parks that would have different amenities to make it accessible to everyone in the community. Oceanside would be on the cutting edge of this.

COUNCILMEMBER McCAULEY asked if the hike in insurance would be greater if the parks are supervised or unsupervised. It seems it would be higher if it were an unattended park, but it would also appear as though having supervision places more liability on the City. She asked which would be less of an impact from an insurance standpoint.

MR. HURLEY stated the answer to that question is a matter of opinion of the insurance provider or the court that made the ruling on an injury lawsuit. The current popular opinion is that a city is less liable when it chooses not to supervise. Many insurance providers that he had spoken with would not charge additional insurance for having unsupervised facilities.

Further, he mentioned that skate parks are specialty parks, just like spray parks or dog parks. Another specialty park, which is similar to the skate park, is the BMX park. The BMX parks have become second in popularity to skate parks, and there is a demand for that activity within the City. Staff is currently looking at a potential temporary dirt facility and discussing this option with BMX users. Staff hopes to eventually bring that suggestion back to Council. That only satisfies half of the BMXers. The other half is the freestylers who use skate park type elements. The City could consider allowing BMXers inside the skate park. It is happening in California. We are looking for Council direction on an idea to allow BMXers in our temporary facility on a 2-week trial period. This would be after we installed the neighborhood facilities so the demand on this one temporary facility is decreased by the other facilities. The City could schedule a BMX day or hours when skaters would not be permitted to use the skate park.

MS. ALVAREZ concluded with the cost and budget allocations (page 60) for the installations of the skate elements in the neighborhood parks. Staff is considering combining several types of funding, including Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, Coca-Cola revenues and the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) 597 funds for park development. The overall costs to install skate elements within existing park sites total \$81,000; with a projected cost of \$20,000 for site preparation and an overall cost of \$100,000 for the installation of the skate elements within the existing park sites. The intent to install the pre-fabrication elements in the parks is to be responsive to the needs of the neighborhood, and the children in the particular neighborhoods. In addition, it would provide the opportunity to be flexible in keeping up with the recreational trends and market.

Staff is recommending that Council approve the installations as presented at Joe Balderrama Park, John Landes Park and the Libby Lake Site as unsupervised with the proper signage. In addition, staff is looking for Council direction to do a test trial for the BMX hours in the temporary site located on Pier View Way during the summer months for 2 nights a week.

Public Input

MR. MIKI VUCKOVICH, 2527 Woodlands Way, editor with publishers of a leading international skateboarding magazine, stated in his own work he often speaks with

communities around the country about their skate park projects, either currently in development or already developed. In every case, those working on the projects were definitely excited and saw the need in their communities. Those communities that have the parks for a while are delighted with the results. In nearly every case, the facilities were a great investment for the City and a great place for children to congregate and skate together.

He had heard a lot of concerns about liability. Public skate parks have been open since the mid-1970s. Skateboarding is much less dangerous than people perceived it to be. In the 70's a lot of parks were incorrectly designed, and safety equipment did not work. Back then there were a lot of ankle and wrist injuries that forced insurance companies to raise rates at that time. A lot of those parks had closed. The more modern parks are built with more specialized terrain that is much better built, with much better safety equipment. There is still a carryover concern about liability. The best example would be to look at Oceanside's temporary skate park and see what incidents we have had there compared to other sports at other sports facilities. Also, the consumer product safety commission information showed skateboarding as being much safer with fewer emergency room visits.

Skateboarding has been booming in the last 5 years. Sports like baseball have gone from an estimated 15 million participants to 11 million. On the other hand, skateboarders between the years 1999 and 2000 went from 9 million to 11½ million and moving to 16 million. It is in the City's best interest to view the parks as not just a single location. The idea of local neighborhood parks is not only pioneering but is also very logical considering the geography of the City and the needs of the youth.

HOPE DIAZ, 328 Avenida Descanso, a parent and the director of the Libby Lake Boys and Girls Club, stated that having the Boys and Girls Club members get involved in this original work has allowed them to take ownership of the park. They have been bragging about the hard work they have done. All of the aspects of participating in that program were so important. They learned how to keep a budget and how to stay in budget. They really worked hard at this. One of their members was even on the steering committee, along with her son. Her son wanted her to ask Council to give the kids a chance to show what they can do. She has taken him to Temecula, Santee and San Diego to use skate parks, and he is looking at those areas, bringing ideas to implement at the Oceanside skate park. He is already bragging that the Oceanside skate park will be better. She lives in the community and has talked to homeowners. They have no problems with this. They would rather have their kids stay in the community than have to drive them to Temecula or farther.

Public Input Concluded

COUNCILMEMBER McCAULEY stated this is very exciting. One of the most exciting things about this whole process is that it is youth driven. The end result of this process is for the youth. There is no better way to make it something that they can, will and want to use than to let them be involved in the process. It has been a long time coming.

She agreed that Oceanside is on the cutting edge for putting these into the community parks within the different neighborhoods. She did not see many youth on mass transit with skateboards and BMX bikes, but there sure are a lot on the street. To have the parks close enough for them to get to without having to use additional transportation was a great idea. She visited the park in Temecula several years ago when Council first discussed opening skate parks. That is a wonderful park that includes a skate park, ballpark, etc. That type of concrete park is what she would envision when the City starts constructing the permanent solution. She liked the idea of having them in the different neighborhoods and community parks. She is very much in favor of moving forward with this.

Regarding the downtown park, **DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER** asked if staff had a ballpark figure of the number of skaters in the past.

MS. ALVAREZ answered that the Oceanside temporary downtown park is one of the City's most utilized parks, with close to 1,000 skaters per week. Staff was able to keep track of the skaters and the frequency of use by issuing membership cards that also contained a liability waiver. The unduplicated units of service were 1,000 per week.

DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER asked if there was a rule about skateboarding on the streets outside of the parks.

CITY ATTORNEY BENNETT explained that it is illegal to do so, but we see it all the time.

DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER is very much in favor of what we are doing here, but he wanted to make sure that no one is promoting illegal skating anywhere, which is a concern for these businesses.

COUNCILMEMBER HARDING echoed Councilmember McCauley's comments and thought that the impact of 1,000 unduplicated visits in one small skate park was overwhelming. This project requires a small amount of money to serve thousands of youth. She **moved** approval of **staff's** recommendation.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ stated that nearly 2 years ago there was a ribbon-cutting ceremony at Libby Lake. There were 15 kids who came up to Councilmembers Feller and Sanchez to discuss the skateboard park. She had also spoken to some parents about how dangerous it is for kids to tailgate, or catch rides on the back of a car. When she asked them what they would do if they had a skateboard park, they responded that they would take care of it. They immediately talked about skate park responsibilities, wearing safety equipment and that they understood that it would not be supervised but that they would be the ones taking care of it. The kids in the neighborhoods are looking forward to this because she heard them ask for a chance. She **seconded** the motion.

COUNCILMEMBER McCAULEY asked when the parks would actually be open and which one would be first.

MS. ALVAREZ indicated that staff's intention is to move forward with all 3 skate parks at the same time since these are pre-fabricated elements, although they will have to do site preparation at the John Landes and Libby Lake sites. Balderrama Park is ready for the elements and therefore will probably be the first park completed. Libby Lake Park would probably follow because it already has the asphalt and they just need to prep it. Last would probably be Landes because there was not a concrete area there yet. Staff hoped to have all projects completed by the end of August.

DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER commented that this really typifies the need for neighborhood parks.

MAYOR JOHNSON echoed that sentiment.

Motion was **approved 5-0**.

- 2. **Public Communication on City Council Matters (Off Agenda Items) --**
None

ADJOURNMENT

MAYOR JOHNSON adjourned this adjourned meeting of the Oceanside City Council at 10:55 AM, April 24, 2002.

ACCEPTED BY COUNCIL:

Barbara Riegel Wayne, CMC
City Clerk, City of Oceanside



California

CITY OF OCEANSIDE

MINUTES OF THE

CITY COUNCIL

July 17, 2002

ADJOURNED MEETING 10:00 AM COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Mayor

Terry Johnson

Deputy Mayor

Jack Feller

Councilmembers

Betty Harding
Carol McCauley
Esther Sanchez

City Clerk

Barbara Riegel Wayne

City Treasurer

Rosemary Jones

The adjourned meeting of the Oceanside City Council was called to order by Mayor Johnson at 10:00 AM July 17, 2002. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Deputy Mayor Feller.

ROLL CALL

Present were Mayor Johnson, Deputy Mayor Feller and Councilmembers Harding, McCauley and Sanchez. Also present were City Clerk Wayne, City Treasurer Jones [arrived 10:14 AM], City Manager Steve Jepsen, and City Attorney Duane Bennett [arrived 10:24 AM].

WORKSHOP ITEM

1. **Update on the satellite senior center planning process**

ANA ALVAREZ, Parks and Recreation Manager, presented the findings and work conducted regarding an assessment and conceptual development of a senior satellite center in the eastern area of Oceanside. She introduced the Steering Committee members who were appointed by City Council to take on this task. She also introduced members of the Senior Citizens Commission and Parks and Recreation Commission in attendance today. Kathy Merchant was the facilitator.

By background, the 1996 Parks and Recreation Master Plan included the development of a second senior center in the eastern area of town. The Master Plan also called for the expansion of the existing Oceanside senior citizens center located west of Interstate 5 on Country Club Lane. The existing senior center continues to be challenged in meeting the demands for services. In fact, the current senior center was built in 1979 with 9,200 square feet. Since that time, 5 different expansions have taken place. In 1997, the facility underwent its last expansion, bringing the total square footage to 15,780 square feet. There is not enough space to meet the demand.

The 2000 census showed a significant increase in the senior population, with Oceanside having the largest percentage of seniors in the region. The changes in the demographics were mostly in the eastern area of Oceanside. Council's direction to meet the demand for senior services went further back than the 1996 Master Plan, but most recently, in July 2001, Council conducted a workshop to assess the need for senior services and the potential development of a public facility in the eastern area. In October 2001, Council directed staff to initiate the planning process for a community assessment and appointed a steering committee for the development of a conceptual plan for a satellite senior center.

**NOT OFFICIAL
UNTIL APPROVED AT SUBSEQUENT
MEETING BY CITY COUNCIL**

Kathy Merchant, the facilitator for this process, will present the planning process and recommendations from the steering committee.

KATHY MERCHANT stated that her role was as a facilitator not as a consultant. While she had done several strategic planning processes for other cities, her purpose here was to manage the process and not to make recommendations. As a facilitator, she ensured that the process was open, objective and inclusive. The report to Council included many facts, figures and names because this was an important issue to people.

In managing the discussions of the steering committee, she reviewed the 4 ground rules: encourage sharing of ideas, listen with respect and without personal attacks, one person to speak at a time, and ensure inclusive participation.

The steering committee's mission was:

- To review input from the community and City Council on priorities for optimal delivery of programs and services to all Oceanside seniors, with special attention to the eastern area;
- To ensure community ownership of the process; and
- To develop a conceptual plan for the development of a new senior center, including prioritized programs, services and site selection.

They had a 4-step process for this project. The first step was completed when Council appointed the steering committee and approved the planning process. Step 2 was to gather community and Council input and for staff to benchmark best practices. Third, the steering committee reviewed and assessed data. This workshop carried out the fourth step, making recommendations to Council. The last meeting of the steering committee ended yesterday at 4:00 PM. Yesterday's recommendations were included in today's proposal.

For the data-gathering process, the first step was to conduct a survey at the Senior Expo. Staff was on hand to assist. The survey was also available at the current senior center, at the libraries, all the recreation centers and the computer center. The *Oceanside Magazine* encouraged seniors to complete the surveys. The second step involved 6 community sessions that were held at various locations to reach the targeted citizens. The community sessions were made up of 3 focus groups and 3 community meetings, and up to 50 people attended each. As part of the information gathering, Ms. Merchant interviewed each Councilmember for input, and the next step was to share that input with the committee. With that information, the committee decided to visit the sites that deserved the most attention. They visited the City Operations Center, west Rancho Del Oro Road/Oceanside Boulevard, Sepulveda and the north valley area where the former Sizzler was located as potential interim sites. They also conducted 6 steering committee meetings that included public input.

In undertaking this process, a memo dated October 17, 2001, via the staff report for item 36, spelled out the details and suggested parameters for this process. The 3 key items included the planning, subject to economic climate; a program-driven process; and site selection targeting eastern citizens.

As the process unfolded, some of the criteria changed, which was common in her experience with planning for senior citizens. The economic climate was different in October 2001 than it currently is. In identifying available property, the process revealed that it would be very expensive to buy or lease available land or facilities that the City did not already own. Finally, over the months, the citizens' input on programs and services was very consistent, although site preferences have changed and evolved with information gathered.

Based on the 5 previous sessions, the steering committee yesterday looked at a new option of a consolidated senior center. The committee addressed 3 issues: first, was whether the City would prefer to serve the seniors of Oceanside with 2 centers in 2 different locations or one consolidated center. After looking at the options, the committee

preferred having 2 permanent centers. If the City opened a satellite center, the current center would continue to exist. The committee focused on 2 sites as the ideal place for the second permanent, or satellite, center, to be located. What would happen with the current center would be decided in the future. The committee recognized the possibility that it eventually might be phased out depending on use and City finances.

She presented the 2 preferred options of the committee. Option A was for the City to have a permanent satellite center: 10,000 square foot fresh build, which would cost about \$2,600,000 to build and \$225,000 per year to operate. The goal of this facility would be primarily to deliver services to east Oceanside seniors and to operate in addition to the current senior center. The committee also looked at the option of having an interim senior center, with the idea that, if it took too long to get a permanent second center built, whether it would be a good use of City resources to open an interim site and if so, where.

Option B was a centrally located, consolidated senior center. If the City went this route, the committee suggested a 20,000 square foot fresh build, which would cost approximately \$6,000,000 to build and \$500,000 per year to operate.

Since the directive was for programs and services to drive this process, they looked first at the priority programs and services. The top priority service/program identified was transportation and parking. The steering committee felt that regardless of location, this would have to be addressed in order to select the site. The second priority was exercise and fitness. Third was nutrition, referring to a hot lunch program. The fourth priority was a resource center and pro bono services -- such as help with taxes and health consulting. Fifth was informal social interaction, which meant that there should be an area for people to hang out and visit. Sixth was mental stimulation through a variety of games, cards and discussion groups. Seventh was to provide computers and up-to-date technology for the seniors. Computers are in high demand at the current center. Therefore, in planning for the future of baby boomers who are more attuned to computers, planning for future configuration would be smart. The final three priorities were for meeting space, separate space for both men's and women's crafts, and partnerships, or ways the senior center can partner with other organizations to use the facilities or share in the programs.

Once the committee defined their prioritized programs, they looked at site selection. They set 3 criteria for considering sites: 1) Accessible to public transit with safe pedestrian crossings; senior friendly parking that was close to the building and safe; and the permanent satellite site should provide room for expansion.

Based on that, out of all the sites reviewed, the committee targeted 2 particular sites for a permanent location: the City Operations Center (COC) or the west Rancho Del Oro Road/Oceanside Boulevard site. She noted that the committee preferred to refer to the satellite center as a second senior center so it did not seem less than the current center. These sites were considered for a second center and were also discussed as good sites for a consolidated center. City demographics identified 17% of the senior population living in the immediate area near the COC site; and Rancho Del Oro Road/ Oceanside Boulevard would serve about 24% of the City's seniors. The current senior center serves about 20% of the seniors. The cost to build at either site would be the same: \$2,600,000 for a 10,000 square foot center or \$6,000,000 for a 20,000 square foot facility. The time estimate is about the same at about 6 months for a conceptual design and 2 years to implement the plans.

For interim services, if it takes longer than 2½ years, the question is how quickly Council wanted to get services to eastern seniors. So the committee looked at 2 options: 1) expanding senior services at existing recreation and community centers, which already happened at the John Landes and North River Road Community Centers, or 2) to lease a facility in the North Valley area, such as the former Sizzler; 43% of the senior citizens would be served in that particular geographic area.

The recommendation from the steering committee was for a second senior center to be located at west Rancho Del Oro Road/Oceanside Boulevard, with room for expansion. The priority program components would be transportation, nutrition and fitness. The committee preferred a second senior center rather than a consolidated center mainly

because of transportation and access, which were the overriding concerns of the community. Offering programs and services at 2 centers in 2 distinct geographic areas would serve more seniors. As mentioned, the current center serves 20% of the senior population, and 24% would be served at the Rancho Del Oro site. The City would be close to serving 50% of the residential areas. The second rationale for a second senior center was increased flexibility in scheduling and programming. Third, the future light rail and bus routes would provide access for eastern seniors to the Rancho Del Oro/Oceanside site.

The committee's concerns for the COC site was that it was too far east; getting to COC would require walking uphill from public transit; and it is a very busy intersection. If the City ever decided on future expansion to phase out the current center, a central location would be better.

The committee recommended expanding services at existing community and recreation centers in the interim for the following reasons: it is an immediate expansion of services, and it is an economic alternative to the cost of renovating and leasing a facility [\$250,000/year]. The committee felt that money could be better used to facilitate transportation or to upgrade programs and services at the existing center while the second one was built. This is a short-term alternative with a lifespan equal to the implementation of a second senior center. Some senior services could be piloted at the current location and then transferred to the new one. If establishing a second senior center would take far longer than Council felt was comfortable and they decided to lease a facility, the committee felt that the Sizzler location was an excellent site. The seniors were familiar with that area; the building was adequate; and it was near other services such as the library, etc.

Public Input

CITY CLERK WAYNE noted that Council had been provided with a copy of a petition signed by 15 people who were unable to attend but expressed their preference for the El Corazon site.

JEAN KUJAWA, 4914 Glenhaven Drive, felt that the best place for a senior center was El Corazon because of easy access to everybody. The 318 bus goes to El Corazon. A senior center should be located where the needs were the greatest. People in her area did not have anything. She thought she could get industrial businesses to donate money to a senior center in El Corazon. She and Jimmy Knott could run an "Out and About" program, but she would not reveal how to do that. We get money from the Department of Aging. We have never had any grant money for a senior center— why? We should ask for it.

Seniors in her area could not get to John Landes Park for their programs because the 311 bus route does not cross the railroad track. We have to consider the investment, the money.

TOM BUGGIE, 4840 Cardiff Bay Drive, lives in northeast Oceanside. He felt a senior center should be located near the largest number of Oceanside seniors. Oceanside seniors represent about 20% of the population. While most are spread throughout the City, there was about 30% of Oceanside seniors clustered at Mission Avenue and Douglas Drive; about 10,000 seniors live within a 2-mile radius of that intersection, including those living in Oceana and numerous mobile home parks along North El Camino Real and Douglas Drive. Therefore, the best location for a senior center would be one block north at the intersection of El Camino Real and Douglas Drive; there is a 5¼-acre parcel there that would be big enough for a 30,000 to 40,000 square foot facility, with 10,000 to 20,000 square feet of outdoor activity and parking for over 300 cars. Public transportation came to that intersection on 3 bus lines, and another bus line was a couple of blocks away. The only disadvantage is that the land is not owned by the City.

He felt that the second best location was at Rancho Del Oro Road at the northern end of the El Corazon property. This location is at the southern end of the senior cluster he just mentioned. The road and public utilities would be completed by the end of 2003. If the facility were located at the northern end of El Corazon, seniors would be encouraged to use Mesa Drive instead of Oceanside Boulevard. Mesa Drive was a quiet street with easy access to the east and west. Oceanside Boulevard between El Camino Real and College Boulevard

was like a race track with drivers often exceeding the 55 mph speed limit. Many were aggressive drivers, tailgating and weaving through traffic, which could be intimidating to seniors.

The intersection at Oceanside Boulevard and El Camino Real has more accidents than any other intersection in Oceanside. Oceanside Boulevard was primarily an industrial corridor with few residents on the street. It is over 1¼ mile west to the nearest residential area, and 1¾ miles east to the nearest neighborhoods. If the senior center were located near Mesa Drive, then the seniors would not have to deal with the problems associated with Oceanside Boulevard.

He favored a single, consolidated, large senior center to avoid duplications of programs and eliminate increased overhead costs from maintaining multiple locations. This would not preclude senior-oriented programs at the existing community centers. Building a senior center at the eastern end of El Corazon would put it near the geographic center of Oceanside. Another advantage was that the City already owned this site. At yesterday's meeting, a 20,000 square foot facility was mentioned, which is too small to support the expected increased senior population and to support expanded programs that were currently being turned away due to the lack of space. It would only be 33% larger than the existing facility. Currently, there are about 47,000 pre-seniors aged 35 to 54 in Oceanside. It was difficult to justify spending millions of dollars for such a small increase in space. A single, consolidated senior center should be 30,000 to 40,000 feet to provide adequate space for expanded programs and for future population growth. 4 to 5 acres of parking should be provided; most seniors would arrive by car. Inadequate parking would reduce the utilization of the facility. In summary, he thought that a senior center at El Camino Real and Douglas Drive would be optimal since it was surrounded by senior communities, although it is not owned by the City. A large senior center should be built on the eastern end of El Corazon.

MARJORIE FORBES, 4810 Northerly Street, lives in Peacock Hills. She was disappointed that the committee did not include anyone from any of the 3 large communities of seniors that currently have no amenities: Peacock Hills, Costa Serena and Rancho Hermosa. She noted that the former Sizzler was really in north Oceanside. From Peacock Hills, it was the same distance to the Sizzler as it was to the present senior center. She thought the best location was El Corazon because it was in the center of the City. She was not in favor of locating the senior center at the old Sizzler. She asked for the \$500,000 to be used to hire an architect and a planner to start on plans. If that money were put into the Sizzler as an interim site, the City would still not have any plans 5 years from now. That money should be spent on something for the future, like some transportation, but they should start planning for a permanent senior center.

Public Input Concluded

DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER asked how large the current facility was.

MS. ALVAREZ said the current senior center was 15,780 square feet.

DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER asked if the City had ever been awarded grants for senior citizen projects.

JOHN LUNDBLAD, Grant Coordinator, noted there were very few grants available for any type of capital programs, such as what was being discussed this morning. There were occasionally allocations either from the legislature or Congress that Council considered each year. Oceanside received grants for specific programs, most notably nutrition programs, at the current senior center. In the past, the City has considered various transportation grants. Per Council's direction, the City applied for one of them, the 5310 program out of the Federal Department of Transportation, but it only provided funding for vehicles and would not support the program itself. Staff looked at that each year, but the City needed to find the funds for operating the program. He thought Ms. Kujawa referred to the award for the new Libby Lake Community Center, which was not a grant but a long-term loan from the California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank. Most structural or capital program grants were designed for economic development.

Staff had looked for program grants for recreation centers as well but found that there was very little money available for capital investment for construction. The City could probably find funding for the establishment of programs, especially nutrition.

MS. ALVAREZ noted that the upcoming YMCA facility at Rancho Del Oro Park would be relatively close to Peacock Hills and Temple Heights. That was a collaborative effort between the City and the Santa Margarita YMCA. One of the executive director's main goals for this YMCA was to increase programs and services for the senior population.

DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER asked if the piece of property at Rancho Del Oro Road and Oceanside Boulevard was part of El Corazon or the Collins property.

CITY MANAGER JEPSEN stated the committee wanted to place the center close to the transportation corridor at the intersection of Oceanside Boulevard and Rancho Del Oro Road. That was the westerly portion of the Collins property, not El Corazon.

DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER asked if this would in any way change the padding for the site east of that.

CITY MANAGER JEPSEN explained that, as part of the grading for Rancho del Oro Road, the Council recently approved padding out a 25-acre site east of Rancho Del Oro Road. The thinking for this site was that if we were to do a senior center, it would be adjacent to the larger holdings and have access to a future park if one is to be built at El Corazon.

DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER preferred this site because a centrally located senior center at the location on the Collins property would potentially be the beginning for us to place an additional library or fire-training center there or relocate the police station to that area. The police station was currently in a temporary facility. Eventually, the City would want to centrally locate a police and fire facility. He felt this needed to be done now. He is leaning toward a larger center as opposed to a second center. He added that there was no reason to delay this. He did not know what kind of delay the passing or failing of the initiative on the November ballot would have on this project. He thought this was a good reason for everyone to consider why he or she was voting for something in November. The key issue was that he thought this should be done immediately.

MAYOR JOHNSON wanted clarification on whether the City was aggressively looking for grants or money to build a structure for the senior center. The City received grants and money from the government for programs, but he wanted to know if any city had received money for the construction of a senior center.

MS. ALVAREZ stated that staff had been aggressively looking at all alternatives. Proposition 12 funds were a very limited pool of about \$1,900,000 that may possibly be used partially for the development of a senior center. Capital funds for public facilities operated by a municipality were relatively scarce. There were very few Federal, State and private funding opportunities. The City of Encinitas saved \$1,000,000 per year for 10 years to pay for a community/senior center. Staff has been working with departments to look at all possibilities for funding the construction of a senior center, including looking into securing a Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Section 108 fund.

MAYOR JOHNSON asked City Manager Jepsen to reiterate what he said about the proposed location of a senior center on the Collins property for those who were unable to hear him the first time.

CITY MANAGER JEPSEN stated that the committee suggested locating a consolidated or satellite senior center on the western portion of what was known as the Collins property, which was the 15 to 17 acres west of the future extension of Rancho Del Oro Road. It is adjacent to, but not part of, the El Corazon holdings.

MAYOR JOHNSON agreed with most of Deputy Mayor Feller's comments regarding location and construction of a future senior center. The City needed to do it right the first time without wasting any money on an interim facility.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ had participated in one meeting and made her suggestions and recommendations at that point. She believed the City needed a second senior center. Oceanside has the largest senior community in the region. The baby boomers were on the verge of being seniors; she was one of them, and there are many. The question was not whether or not a second center was needed but where it should be located.

The vision plan for El Corazon included the property referred to as part of the Collins property. That is part of the initiative for a senior center. This was absolutely a good place for a senior center. She heard from seniors and residents, and there was a definite need for 2 places.

The second question was what should be done in the interim. She thought a shuttle was necessary for those living near Costa Serena and Peacock Hills. Frank Watanabe was actively looking into senior disabled transportation that would follow the "Out and About" program Ms. Kujawa mentioned. If the City could not have something for the next 2½ years, it better do something now. All seniors should have equal access to City facilities. The City should also serve citizens living in the eastern portion. Transportation was part of that service. While that second senior center was being built at El Corazon, the City should have shuttle service. Frank Watanabe did a presentation of a transportation program for seniors and disabled to the Senior Commission and to the Transportation Commission.

Her vote would be for a second senior center; not for just one. One senior center could not serve as well as 2. The City could go after funding, including Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) money, which was available to the City. Council could have already put some of that money away this past funding cycle, but they could certainly do that at the next funding cycle. She noted that City Manager Jepsen forgot to remind Council again that there was \$8,000,000 that could be used to build a senior center. The City could perhaps get money elsewhere, certainly through CDBG. This has been very important for the past 2 years, and this Council has actively worked for another senior center. Council needs to make this vote now, be proactive and start building at El Corazon. The initiative absolutely would not delay this program. The dedicated parkland initiative called for a senior center at El Corazon, which included the Collins property. All of the land was City-owned. A vote for the initiative would be a vote for the senior center at the Collins property or El Corazon, whatever one called it.

COUNCILMEMBER McCAULEY called for a point of order.

MAYOR JOHNSON noted the point of order. Council was here to conduct the City business and to do so in a dignified, professional way. Every 2 years, the City had elections, and it was that time again. This time of year could get a bit crazy. Some people called it the silly season. Some people used issues, such as today's workshop, to promote themselves or others for campaigns. He did not like that. He wished that the Councilmembers could leave the politics of running for office or initiatives on ballots out of discussions.

Today's workshop was about a facility that needed to be built in the City, not just for today's seniors but for tomorrow's seniors. He would qualify as a senior in 5 more years. Everyone who was fortunate to live long enough to qualify as a senior would enjoy those facilities. When talking about building a facility, regardless of who would benefit, it requires setting priorities due to limited resources. This Council, as did prior Councils, understood, respected and supported the needs of all residents, especially seniors who had blazed the way for those younger. His mom is now 78 years old and has some health problems. He would hear it from his mother if he did not support senior issues. It would be insane for anyone not to support senior issues because everyone had elderly people and parents for whom they loved and cared.

He has seen a pattern over the past year or two of issues coming before Council, pitting one person or neighborhood against another and fighting for dollars. There was nothing wrong with disagreeing over an issue or a subject matter. However, when it gets to the point of being disrespectful and nasty, it is not right. Elected officials are here to

conduct the business of the City in the best way they can. There was nothing wrong with disagreeing, but it should be done in a productive way that would benefit the City as a whole. The Mayor and Councilmembers represent the whole City. Oceanside does not have district representation; therefore, every Councilmember was responsible and accountable to every single resident in the City. It did not matter how much money the citizens had, what business they were in or what area of the City they lived in. Collectively, Council has a job to do. If we don't stop the way we are conducting ourselves, the job will not get done. Sometimes this has to be said. Every 2 years Council goes through this.

He would now hear the point of order. Keep in mind that this issue goes back to priorities and allocations of City resources.

COUNCILMEMBER McCAULEY, in her point of order, stated Councilmembers cannot use the dais for promoting or denouncing anything that would be on the election. The initiative should not be a part of this discussion either way. As soon as the comment was made, "A vote for the initiative is a vote for the senior center," it was not a gray area but went way over the line. Her point of order was that Councilmembers cannot use this dais to promote anything whether they were for or against.

MAYOR JOHNSON asked the City Attorney for clarification on what they could and could not do as elected officials when it came to items on the ballot.

CITY ATTORNEY BENNETT noted the statement by Councilmember McCauley was correct. Councilmembers should not be in the position of advocating that particular matter one way or another from the dais.

COUNCILMEMBER HARDING agreed that the site at the Collins property was the best place for a senior center. She feels the City needs both the present senior center and a full senior center at the proposed site. She hoped they would go all out when the City found the funds. She agreed that they could use some CDBG funding in the future. Even if all the space was not immediately used, it should be built now. Examples: North County Transit District (NCTD) bought their building so they could have all their staff together. Now, 4 years later, they moved back to their old building because the new one would not hold all their staff. So, the senior center should be built large. Even if some of it was not furnished at first due to lack of funds, the space should still be there. She thought it should be built at 20,000 to 25,000 square feet if possible, which would be much larger than the present center.

This site is particularly attractive because it is on the transportation corridor. She serves on the NCTD steering committee to guide the light rail that would go from the transit center in Oceanside to Escondido. They currently were working out the details. That rail would travel every half hour from 5:00 AM to 1:00 PM. In order for that service to work, NCTD would have to ensure that there were a lot of buses to get people to the trains to take people to work, so they will be adding many buses in 4 years. The rail line was fully funded and was in the final engineering stage preparing to break ground. Also, if we know ahead of time where our population concentration is that would be using that senior center, we can talk to NCTD and try to convince them to serve certain areas of Oceanside with buses. One of the problems will always be with Peacock Hills and the Oceana areas on Old Grove and Mesa is that their big buses cannot get up there. That would be the place to work on shuttles for those areas.

Staff should start looking for funding to build this center big. If we cannot furnish all the rooms now, in 15 years we will need them. She wanted to keep the current center open and have a second full-time center. She would love to have enough money to put interim satellite sites up now and still be able to go forward, but the City had to make a choice about where to spend that money. She wants to start planning a full senior center on the Collins site.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ stated she has a point of order. She was actually responding to an inaccurate statement by Deputy Mayor Feller about the initiative. She asked City Attorney Bennett for a clarification as to whether or not the initiative at all impacts a decision to build at El Corazon, which would include the Collins property.

CITY ATTORNEY BENNETT could not answer that definitely. Based upon the language of the initiative, there were some things stated that could or could not impact the senior center. It was outside his realm, so it was difficult to respond. He did say that depending on what the initiative stood for, how it was interpreted and what happened in the election, it may or may not impact whether or not the City could relocate a senior citizens center there. It also depends on how the definition of senior center plays out. For example, if the senior center's primary focus was something other than parks and recreation, such as medical or tax advice, and if the El Corazon property, including the Collins property, was ultimately determined in the election to be dedicated parkland, then placing a senior center there with a primary emphasis on medical, tax advice or education facilities may actually be inconsistent with the State law's definition of parkland purpose. He did not know the answer to that question.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ stated for the record that the initiative does say ... included a senior center... in its language, so it was not excluding it at all. Council is here to give direction to staff on this item. She believed that the majority of Council was interested in a second senior center at the El Corazon/Collins site. She wanted to add that staff should look at developing a shuttle service in the interim of the next 2½ to 3 years.

COUNCILMEMBER McCAULEY asked the public to disregard every discussion on the initiative that came from the dais today. The issue today was the need for a senior center, its location and whether or not an interim center was needed. She had heard the \$8,000,000 being bantered around at more than one meeting. Approximately 5 or 6 items have come forward, and someone stated that the City had \$8,000,000 it could use to pay for this. The City had a lot of priorities. That \$8,000,000 was the City's cushion or reserve. They could spend it, but Council needed to determine carefully how to spend it.

This location was not a new one nor did it get on the list when the new Council was elected. This Council had spoken of this location as being the prime location to build a second senior center when the City was financially able. It was always brought forward that the location would be somewhere within the El Corazon property.

She thanked the steering committee for their efforts. It validated what Council had been thinking for the past 4 years: that this would be the prime spot within the City for not only our new police station but also a senior center. She thought the City should move forward with this location. She was not in favor of a consolidated center. She asked staff to let Council know the financial implications of building a large center that may not be used completely right away versus building a smaller center that was expandable. The City did not know what effect a new center would have on the existing center on Country Club Drive. No one knew how much of the senior population would be drawn out of the current center, but if a lot of people left, then the City would be able to have a consolidated senior center in the heart of the City.

She was concerned about eliminating a satellite center now, and that concern is that no one knows what will happen with the State budget until it is finally adopted. We don't know what type of hits the City will be taking. We don't know what will happen with the energy. As you may have read this morning, there are some problems with the San Diego County Water Authority's product. There are a lot of unknowns out there. Her fear is that we say no to a satellite center, start moving forward on the permanent center and then have something come up that prevents the City from continuing, whether it is legal ramifications from outside sources or financial constraints. Then the City would be back to square one. She would like to think a little more about that.

The committee proposed a 2½-year timeline for a new center to be built at Rancho Del Oro Road and Oceanside Boulevard. Most people knew that, when we are talking about government doing something, if the estimate is 2½ years, 99% of the time it turns out to be 5 years, whether it was under their control or not. She would like a clear picture of the timeline.

She **moved** to have staff come back to Council within 30 days with a work program and a schedule of implementation on the Rancho del Oro/Oceanside Boulevard location,

with a finance plan so Council knows where this money was coming from and whether or not the City could move forward with this in spite of what may happen at the State level. By law, the City has to have a balanced budget, but the State does not. Generally, when the State wants to balance its budget, money is taken from the cities. The State does not cut their costs; they cut the cities' costs.

She clarified that her motion was for staff to come back to Council with a program for implementing an additional senior center; a timeline; the exact location and maybe a couple of options on size, whether it would be a build-out at 20,000 square feet, 10,000, etc.; what we would need regarding the cost differences from building to maximum size initially, or expanding at a later date; and a financing plan to be able to know that we can do this. Further included is that, when staff brings this back to Council, she wants a realistic time for building this center, including going to the extremes, i.e. if staff thinks it could be built in 2½ years but thinks that would be cutting it close, then also give Council the maximum time it could take. She hoped when this was brought back in 30 days, the City would have a better idea of what the State budget would be doing and how it would affect the City's budget. She did not include the shuttle in her motion because it was not on the agenda today. She thought it was a separate issue that needed to be addressed on its own since it was not just the senior center that would need transportation but for the seniors today. That is a separate issue that should be addressed to accommodate the seniors until the new center was built.

COUNCILMEMBER HARDING seconded the motion.

MAYOR JOHNSON would not support the motion. He favored option B: a consolidated senior center. He supported a shuttle system, and not just for senior citizens but also for downtown. He asked the City Manager to clarify how much it would cost to build the facility, where the money would come from and how long it would take to carry out Option B.

CITY MANAGER JEPSEN stated there was a lot of information put together for this. The size of a consolidated center would have to be determined. The existing center is 15,000 square feet, so if the City were to build another center at the intersection of Oceanside Boulevard and Rancho del Oro Road, it would probably need to be built at 25,000 square feet to be able to close the other center. It would probably cost \$200 per square foot, which would total at least \$5,000,000. If the Council were to fast track this project and they were not constrained in some other manner of having to make this part of a larger Master Plan, then the City could pad the site and begin grading right away to accelerate this project. The planning that went into this considered that everything would be laid out sequentially. There are some things that could be done sooner to fast track the project, such as authorizing the money soon for the architectural work.

He thinks 2½ years is an optimistic timeline, but if Council insisted on having a work program that laid out deadlines and held staff to that timeframe, it would be doable within that timeframe. The other thing Council would need to consider if building a centralized facility would be that you may want to design a centralized facility and not build the whole thing until it was decided what to do in disposing of the existing senior center. So you can have it both ways. We could design a centralized one that would be expandable but build it to operate 2 centers now and then come back later, once the disposition of the existing senior center has been dealt with, if that is the desire. It would be \$5,000,000 for a centralized center and take 2½ years.

MAYOR JOHNSON knew the answer already, but he felt it was important for him to articulate that information for the audience. The City had a good ballpark figure of what this would cost and a rough idea of the use and size; it is a wide range of 20,000 to 40,000 square feet. The City also knew how much it would cost to operate each year. There was no question about what had to be done; it was just a matter of the policymakers making up their minds and moving forward. He supported option B.

DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER asked what percentage of the people who currently used the senior center was Oceanside residents.

MS. ALVAREZ responded that the existing senior center serves approximately 300 people per day or about 30,000 per year. That number included duplicated service units, which meant that they counted the same individual each time they attended a different program. She did not know the unduplicated service units. The location of the site serves 20% of the senior residents who live within a 2-mile radius of the current senior center. Staff also knows that many seniors drive to the center since there was not enough parking at the site with 300 parking spaces.

DEPUTY MAYOR FELLER asked that question because many times when he would serve meals there, he met citizens from Carlsbad and Vista at the center as well. He did not think that the City discriminated against non-Oceanside residents. A number of people from outside Oceanside use the facility. That was why he was more in favor of Option B as well, although he could support the option that City Manager Jepsen just spoke of to build the site for future development in a large, padded out area and at least have the potential to build out. It could always be used for parking until able to use it as a second site. He agreed with the Mayor that he would rather see a larger, consolidated site in the center of Oceanside.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ supported the motion on the floor. She thought the shuttle was part and parcel of the draft report before Council. She noted that page 10 of the working draft stated, "If the demand for a shuttle service is sufficient, the Committee recommends the City talk with the Transit District about the feasibility of providing some form of shuttle/van services to transport seniors to appointments, shopping or other needs. A model might be the City of Vista's 'Out and About.'" Transportation was before Council today since it was rated as the top priority. She would like to include that as part of the direction since it is already being looked at by Mr. Watanabe, and he was already doing presentations.

COUNCILMEMBER McCAULEY stated that what City Manager Jepsen recommended as far as constructing a building that would be expandable was precisely what she said. She felt more comfortable building with the ability to expand if the City found that it did not need the downtown facility. She noted that Councilmember Sanchez apparently had an opportunity to read through this, but Councilmember McCauley did not get this information prior to this meeting. When reports were received at the dais, Councilmembers have to choose between listening to what was being spoken and reading the report. Transportation obviously is the number one priority, and she had no problem adding that to her motion. But, the transportation issue would have to encompass what the City would do to assist our seniors until this center is completed. So it would have to be to assist the seniors in getting to the locations available now. She would **add that to the motion.**

COUNCILMEMBER HARDING stated that **the second concurred.**

CITY MANAGER JEPSEN asked for clarification on the shuttle service. He thought Council was asking staff to look into providing a shuttle service that would provide access to this future center and the existing center. It would primarily serve the existing center in the interim until the new center was built. He asked what Council planned to do then or if they wanted to make that decision at that time.

MAYOR JOHNSON said this was raised over a year ago. Council was in favor of a shuttle system to provide services. He reiterated that he would not support the motion because he felt very strongly about supporting Option B. They are all supportive of a shuttle system, not just for the seniors but also for other residents, particularly in the downtown area.

COUNCILMEMBER McCAULEY clarified that the intent of her motion on transportation and the shuttle was that it would be in lieu of an interim center. She would be in favor of an interim center, but she thought it would suffice to provide transportation to seniors to get to the downtown center now. Council would have to look at transportation again when the new center was completed.

Motion was **approved 4-1**, with Mayor Johnson voting no.

2. **Public Communication on City Council Matters (Off Agenda Items)**

THOMAS J. DEMPSEY, 3641 Esplanade Street, spoke of inequity. He thought the Oceanside Water Department needed to be audited. Last week, they discussed little numbers, and now it is monthly and yearly. A single-family residence with a 5/8" meter paid \$52.03 for single service charges, while residents of Oceana, which had a master meter, paid \$30.20 for the same service. Single-family residential pays 58% more than Oceana and manufactured homes dwellers. These two voting blocks should not be subsidized. There are other senior family residential users who have low water and sewer usage in Costa Serena, Hermosa Homes, Peacock Hills and the Oceanside community in general who are without relief from inflated billing. Council failed its fiduciary responsibilities in that it was unfair in the current billing rates.

Council also allowed the City Manager to use the interest fund, which at this time should be \$0. It was Council's fiduciary duty to correct the inequity in billing. The corrected billing should be approved and promulgated prior to the November 2002 elections. The City did not tax its citizens, but it did overcharge the utility fees to compensate for a shortfall in revenues. All single-family residents with 5/8" meter are being ripped off. He asked Council to adjust the billing and credit accounts proportionately over an extended period of time.

ADJOURNMENT

MAYOR JOHNSON adjourned this meeting of the Oceanside City Council at 11:32 AM, July 17, 2002 to the 4:00 PM Closed Session today.

ACCEPTED BY COUNCIL:

Barbara Riegel Wayne, CMC
City Clerk, City of Oceanside



California

CITY OF OCEANSIDE

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 29, 2007

**NOT OFFICIAL
UNTIL APPROVED AT SUBSEQUENT
MEETING BY CITY COUNCIL**

ADJOURNED MEETING 4:00 PM COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Mayor
Jim Wood

Deputy Mayor
Rocky Chavez

Councilmembers
Jerome Kern
Jack Feller
Esther Sanchez

City Clerk
Barbara Riegel Wayne
Treasurer
Rosemary Jones

The adjourned meeting of the Oceanside City Council was called to order by Mayor Wood at 4:01 PM, Wednesday, August 29, 2007.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE -- Led by Mayor Wood

ROLL CALL

Present were Mayor Wood, Deputy Mayor Chavez and Councilmembers Feller, Sanchez and Kern. Also present were City Clerk Wayne, City Manager Peter Weiss and City Attorney John Mullen.

WORKSHOP ITEM:

1. Workforce planning

BRIAN KAMMERER, Human Resources Director, presented information on workforce planning, aka succession planning, which means building up the City's bench strength now. It is anticipated we will have a gap, so workforce planning is about getting the right employees with the right skills and experiences in the right jobs at the right time.

We have not really looked at succession/workforce planning in the past. However, we really need to start focusing on it now to improve the organizational effectiveness and improve the retention of top-notch employees in anticipation of workforce shortages, which may be coming up.

For the first time in history we actually have 4 different generations in the workforce, which changes the way we look at things, with the Traditionalists [up to 1945], Baby Boomers [1946-1964], Generation X [1965-1980], and Millennials [1981-2000]. These employees have different reasons why they come to work, so we need to concentrate on that and what we will be doing in the future.

We do not know to what extent the generational shortfalls are and the number of Baby Boomers that will be retiring soon. We do know that, by the time we start preparing, it will be too late, so we need to start working on this now. We cannot wait for a mass exodus out of the City and have the institutional memory leave; we need to prepare now. We also know that statistics show that Generation X and Millennial employees are attracted to organizations that provide more training and development of their employees, and it is the right thing to do.

COUNCILMEMBER KERN stated that flat organizations go through these changes. Every organization in the 1970s/80s wanted to be flat because that is what the Japanese were doing. So it was an organizational model that many adapted to. It seems like we have a great first team, but we have no bench strength. That is, we have good division managers, but below there, it is slim because there is no succession planning with an assistant. The City Manager will have to decide on how it is structured. He would like to see more of a second team in order to have someone step into the positions. For retention, we give them hope that they can succeed and move up through the organization. He asked their normal attrition rate in a year.

MR. KAMMERER responded between 5-6%; last year it was 5.57%.

COUNCILMEMBER KERN stated volunteers are the other part of this, such as the Police Department's new Explorer Program, with students/young people thinking about being police officers, etc. He and the Deputy Mayor had a meeting with MiraCosta College about reaching out to the students and preparing for these jobs that are coming up. So working with MiraCosta College and Palomar College is good. We are on the right track. He cannot worry about what happened in the past. His philosophy is about where we are, where we want to go and how we want to get there. So knowing where we are at now is helpful. Now we are planning for it. Rather than just volunteers filling the gaps, we need to recruit to bring kids into this program.

DEPUTY MAYOR CHAVEZ has a different perspective on this. In looking at information provided, he asked what the organizational opportunities are.

MR. KAMMERER responded that there are a number of organizational opportunities: promotional, recruitment strategy, an opportunity to grow and gain valuable experience, mentorship, individual training, and educational opportunities.

DEPUTY MAYOR CHAVEZ rephrased his question: do you build an organization around people that you have, or do you build an organization around the process such as cleaning streets or public service, etc.

MR. KAMMERER responded that people build the organization, and we need to provide the service. One way or the other, we will provide the service. At the same time we want to develop employees for even better service.

MS. McAFEE stated this organization has certain needs, and we look for employees who can fulfill those needs. You start with the needs of the organization, and then make sure you have the people prepared to step into those needs.

DEPUTY MAYOR CHAVEZ stated you first look at your process, build an organization around it, and then you look at your people. Four years ago when he was talking to the unions about retirement, Deputy Mayor Chavez had said that this City could make a great benefit to the public by providing services more efficiently through taking the opportunity of these senior people to look at best business practices and come in and reorganize their particular activity. The people who have been there for a long time know what is going on, but he also knows that people worry about their jobs. When we know employees are going to retire, why not use them and their expertise to design a better mouse trap. Generally, organizations like cities or military bases, etc. that have a structure that has gone on for some years are inherently inefficient because of technology. He recognizes the problem with personnel, but we have a great opportunity to look at the organization within the City. It is not a love-mentorship, love-training, love-succession planning which is all great; however, that is not his question. His question is whether the organization should be looked at for its own efficiencies. He thinks it should, so he takes a different perspective. His other item is that, if you maintain the same structure, what are the economic considerations that should be looked at in the budget process for the next couple of years in personnel costs. For example, in his organization, if he has someone with 20 years of teaching, that person will be more expensive than someone right out of school. So when someone retires and is replaced with a younger person, there is a bottom-line savings. He can spend that savings on other things, such as a portion for training the new teacher and the rest in a one-time capital investment.

The City also has that opportunity with its aging workforce. You would not pay someone coming in the same as you paid to someone with 20+ years of experience, so

there is a savings. Staff made the statement that the training was cost neutral; he did not believe it was. If it is, then we should take that money and invest it in their training. He would like to see more on the economic considerations.

He then asked what the different motivational expectations are of the different generations. He referenced a handout that was provided but that did not match a report he saw 8 years ago. People are changing.

MR. KAMMERER stated that is correct. As people mature and grow, their expectations change. What was important 20 or 30 years ago is now different. Expectations do change as generations get older.

DEPUTY MAYOR CHAVEZ stated that students and Marines back from Iraq are similar in age but have different motivational items. So, for someone who is 21 years old or 29, etc., if you are trying to get them into our workforce, it will be a different motivation then we had.

He referenced the book Balanced Scorecard which lists 4 components: people, the process/service, money, and technology. If we took this approach, his belief is that we have an opportunity to reorganize the City to make it more efficient with better technology. We can use the people who have been here for years to do that. We can look at how we will attract people to come in for that mentoring piece. Next is the money item. So this is a good presentation to get us thinking about it, but 'people' is only one component of the organization of the City. So he would not necessarily buy into this.

Looking at the various department charts, **MAYOR WOOD** reminded all that these are people who have stayed here and have stuck it out for 20+ years. We have a very strong force that has stayed here through the years, and that is not negative. They liked it here, and they remained here, which is good.

CITY MANAGER WEISS stated that part of what was presented was developing a program that will allow existing employees to prepare themselves for what may be next within the existing organizational structure. Regarding the mentioned Fire Department's recent study, that study looked at not only the existing organization, making recommendations on organizational changes to improve effectiveness and efficiencies, but also looked at operating characteristics and capital needs.

He has heard as part of the needs assessment, that there is an opportunity to look at functional organizational strategies, i.e. what can be done to improve efficiencies. He kind of heard needs assessment from Councilmembers. If Council has an interest in that, staff could bring back a proposal for outside assistance to look at the organization, not just today but in 2 - 5 years as these retirements occur, to look at what type of functional reorganization may be possible and what the efficiencies would be. If Council has an interest, staff could come back with a needs assessment with a focus on looking at functional organizational changes as we move forward, not just today but over the next 2, 4, 6, 8 years as we lose a significant portion of the workforce.

DEPUTY MAYOR CHAVEZ thinks a needs assessment is important, but it comes after we have looked at the organization to restructure it; otherwise we will just build something bigger because bureaucracy tends to grow. The charts clearly show that the City has an opportunity to look at the organizational structure without harming one person, with the ability to take their skills and knowledge and ask them to leave the City better than it was when they found it. If we just fill these spots with people, then we have lost that. Instead you will have people for 20-30 years saying they are part of the group and you owe this to me; and that is not where we should be going.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ recognized that employees want to be able to move up or move to a different department and learn more skills. Perhaps in that way, it will keep their focus on their job, and they don't get tired of the same thing or feel like they are stuck in the same position. That is why we need a needs assessment, and then how people can fit into and be trained for multiple tasking, not just have one person be taught the same thing over and over again. Then when they leave, that item does not get done. She knows from hearing from employees that they want to learn and go to different departments. However, if other people cannot move around, then they are stuck. She agrees with the Deputy Mayor in looking at the organization, technology, and preparing for the future and

for employees. She believes employees want to take the extra challenge of learning and going up. We have not had those kinds of things in place and she had wondered why.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER wanted to add that government is not created to just provide jobs. So whatever training or planning is done, a big part needs to be customer service, which is the only reason there is government. Keep in mind that we pay public employees according to their contribution to prosperity. That is an avenue to pursue, as well that they understand we are all a team trying to serve the citizens.

MAYOR WOOD had been here as an employee for 30+ years prior to being Mayor, and some of the comments are interesting. He remembers several outside studies being done over the 30+ years he was here to ask the employees' thoughts/recommendations on anything that could be improved. Those studies cost the city a lot of money with an outside consultant asking the employees, when the employees could have passed that information on for free if they were just asked. That money went in a report that subsequently was thrown in the trash by a new department head who was going to do things his own way. His point is that employees will give the information if they are asked. We can get studies and surveys from our own employees; there are certainly bonus systems that are possible. The employee groups have been here a long time, and they want the City to do well and do the best it can to provide great services. The employees should be asked, and many desire technology; they will give good input on how to improve the system if, in fact, we listen.

Council has given staff direction. This was an information item.

2. **Public Communication on City Council Matters (Off Agenda Items)** - None

ADJOURNMENT

MAYOR WOOD adjourned this Adjourned Meeting of the Oceanside City Council at 4:45 PM, August 29, 2007.

APPROVED BY COUNCIL:

Barbara Riegel Wayne
City Clerk, City of Oceanside