



Scenic Pacifica
Incorporated Nov. 22, 1957

CITY OF PACIFICA
Parks, Beaches and Recreation Commission
1810 Francisco Avenue • Pacifica, California 94044-2506
www.cityofpacifica.org

MAYOR
Deirdre Martin

MAYOR PRO TEM
Sue Beckmeyer

COUNCIL
Sue Vaterlaus
Mary Bier
Mike O'Neill

Wednesday, Dec 16, 2020 07:00 PM Pacific Time
Virtual Meeting via Zoom Link: <https://zoom.us/j/95832189618>

CORONAVIRUS DISEASE (COVID-19) NOTICE

THIS MEETING WILL BE CONDUCTED PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE GOVERNOR'S EXECUTIVE ORDER N-25-20 AND N-29-20 WHICH SUSPEND CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS OF THE BROWN ACT AND PURSUANT TO THE ORDERS OF THE HEALTH OFFICER OF SAN MATEO COUNTY DATED MARCH 16, 2020, MARCH 31, 2020, APRIL 29, 2020 AND MAY 15, 2020. THIS MEETING IS NECESSARY SO THAT THE CITY CAN CONDUCT NECESSARY BUSINESS AND IS PERMITTED UNDER THE ORDER AS AN ESSENTIAL GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTION.

Consistent with the above-referenced Orders, this City Committee Meeting will not be physically open to the public and Committee Members and staff will be video/teleconferencing into the meeting.

To maximize public safety while still maintaining transparency and public access, members of the public can observe and participate in the meeting as detailed below.

- To Observe the Meeting:
- To access the meeting by computer/smartphone, go to: <https://zoom.us/j/95832189618>
- To dial-in via phone 1-US: +1-669-900-6833
- Then webinar ID: 958 3218 9618

How to Submit Public Comments:

- **During the Meeting:** Live verbal public comments may be made by members of the public joining the meeting via Zoom (computer, smartphone/tablet app, or phone). Zoom access information is provided above. Use the "raise hand" feature (for those joining by phone, press *9 to "raise hand") during the public comment period for the agenda item you wish to address. City staff will call on people to speak by name provided or last 4 digits of phone number for dial-in attendees. Please clearly state your full name for the record at the start of your public comment. You will have 3 minutes to speak unless modified by the meeting chair.
- **Before the Meeting:** Written public comments for the record may be submitted in advance by 4:00 p.m. on the meeting date by email to: phippsb@ci.pacificaca.us and will be made part of the written record but will not be read verbally at the meeting. Written public comments submitted by email should adhere to the following:
 - Clearly indicate the Agenda Item No. or topic, or specify "Oral Communications" in the Subject Line for items not on the agenda
 - Include the submitter's full name.

Note: The format of this meeting may be altered or the meeting may be cancelled, if needed. You may check on the status of the meeting by visiting the City's website at www.cityofpacifica.org for any updates.



Minutes
Parks, Beaches and Recreation Commission
City of Pacifica

REGULAR MEETING – 7 PM

Wednesday October 28, 2020
City Council Chambers
2212 Beach Blvd.
Pacifica, CA 94044

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Knowles: called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM.

I PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by **Commissioner Kellogg.**

II ROLL CALL:

Commissioners Present: Chair Knowles, Commissioners Abbott, Kellogg, Lusson, Benton Shoemaker, Heywood, and Marchetti.

Commissioners Absent: None

Commissioners Excused: None

Staff Present: Director Michael Perez, Recreation Assistant Supervisor Beth Phipps, Recreation Specialist Kenda Seeley, Recreation Manager Jim Lange, and Community Service Coordinator Stephanie Coy.

III APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Chair Knowles called for a motion to approve the minutes of the 08/26/2020 meeting. **Motion was made by Commissioner Heywood, seconded by Commissioner Lusson, motion carried 7-0.**

IV ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA:

Chair Knowles called for a motion to adopt the order agenda. **Motion was made by Commissioner Kellogg, seconded by Commissioner Benton Shoemaker, motion carried 7-0.**

V INTRODUCTION OF NEW COMMISSIONERS:

Commissioner Marchett: introduced himself and gave a brief history of this experience as a resident of Pacifica. He has lived in Pacifica for the last 35 years where he has raised his children. He wants to give back to the community and is now prepared to be part of the commissioners group.

VI Special Presentation:

Pacifica Senior Services – Recreation Manager Jim Lange introduced himself and welcomed commissioners. He introduced Stephanie Coy who is the new Community Services Coordinator and gave a summation of her role with PB&R Program. **Stephanie Coy** introduced herself as the new Community Service Coordinator as of Sept 14, 2020. She gave a brief history overview of credentials and addressed her roll regarding the Meals on Wheels program. Recreation Manager Jim Lange highlighted many significant updates from the Managers Report such as: funding, COVID, senior programs, membership, and volunteer information.

Chair Knowles: opened questions to commissioners.

Commissioner Abbott: welcomed **Coordinator Coy** and expressed the importance of Meals on Wheels program. She asked Manager Lange about funding decreases due to COVID-19.

Manager Lange: explained the funding cuts are through the state due to COVID-19. He compared other programs and advised that he would share information to the commissioners as it becomes available to him.

Commissioner Benton Shoemaker: advised that she has read Manager Lange's Report and is pleased that the Senior Services have continued through the shutdown.

Commissioner Kellogg: thanked Manager Lange for his service and welcomed Coordinator Coy.

Commissioner Luson: thanked Manager Lange for his service and welcomed Coordinator Coy.

Commissioner Heywood: welcomed Coordinator Coy and thanked Manager Lange for his service. He noted that he appreciated the Meals on Wheels update.

Commissioner Marchetti: welcome Stephanie Coy and thanked Manager Lange for all of the senior programs.

Chair Knowles: asked for clarification on the nursing students and what the visits via phone service consist of.

Manager Lange: recapped the program, he clarified what the nursing student's role was prior to COVID shutdown and what it is now. The concern is that the nurses can no longer go into homes to assist the seniors and the seniors are not capable of taking care of themselves, especially in regards to taking their medication. He reiterated the importance of the Nursing Program.

Chair Knowles: asked about senior living conditions and the connection to Rebuilding Together.

Manager Lange: summarized the Rebuilding Together and CDA Home Improvement relationships that the Senior Program shares.

Chair Knowles: announced that they would return to the agenda item **V Introduction of the New Commissioner** due to earlier technical issues.

VII ORAL COMMUNICATION:

None

VIII ITEMS FOR CONSENT:

Chair Knowles called for a motion to accept the items for consent. **Motion was made by Commissioner Abbotts seconded by Commissioner Kellogg. Motion carried 7-0**

IX ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION:

Appeal of City Staff decision to deny Heritage Tree permit application HT-001-20 for Removal of Four Heritage Monterey Cypress (*Hesperocyparis macrocarpa*) located at 24-30 Salada Avenue.

Commissioner Abbott: had to recuse herself from this agenda item due to the fact that she lives across the street from the property where the trees are in located.

Lisa Petersen: Intro herself as the Director of Public Works for the City of Pacifica, she announced that Aren Clark, the Public Works Parks Superintendent and arborist was present for this meeting. She recapped highlights of the report that was submitted with the agenda packet.

Chair Knowles: opened up questions to commissioners.

Commissioner Kellogg: no questions now

Commissioner Shoemaker: referenced the report. She stated that Monterey Cypress trees live up to 200 years, they are native trees and are part of the character of Pacifica. She also stated that Cypress trees produce carbon which plays an important role with climate change and that their roots provide communication and nutrients to each other and other trees. She asked Director Petersen to comment on whether the trees benefit each other.

Superintendent Clark: explained that as a general rule, we tend to shy away from Cypress trees due to wind load, gravity, and storm damage. He explained the risk rating for Cypress trees and expressed his opinion that these trees are not low risk. He agrees with the arborist report regarding the condition of the trees.

Commissioner Marchetti: questioned the power and transmission lines and how safe this is considering windstorms.

Superintendent Clark: clarified that these are 30-foot trees and recapped all of the maintenance that is required to maintain Cyprus Trees. He advised that there is a need to weigh the variables for safety purposes.

Commissioner Marchetti: questioned who would be responsible for the trees if the wrong decision was made.

Superintendent Clark: commented that the courts would decide fault and that is why he favors low risk trees. He recapped Cypress Tree problems and advised that Cyprus trees are protected under tree ordinance.

Commissioner Lusson: requested more information of a Risk Rating Report and what the process entails.

Superintendent Clark: responded that arborist have to be experienced and certified to generate risk ratings. He also confirmed that there has not been a risk rating for these trees but feels the arborist report was accurate.

Commissioner Lusson: asked if the commissioners can request a risk rating to help make a better decision?

Superintendent Clark: commented that he suspects that a risk rating would

prove these trees would be deemed Medium Risk, which is what we already know.

Chair Knowles outlined appeal requirements for this meeting and explained the ten minute time restriction.

Appellant Christopher Gibbs: explained that they are not trying to remove the trees but only trying to replace them. He explained safety issues and tenant concerns. He feels that these trees are a liability for them. He is in favor of the tree replacement plan per the commission's approval. He said they are just homeowners who want to correct a dangerous situation and believes the arborist report is true and clear.

Chair Knowles: opened the floor to public comments.

Walter McDonald: stated that he owns property next door to Mr. Gibbs. He referred to the arborist report and confirmed that the tree limbs are chopped off and are not sturdy. He reiterated that Aren Clark and Kevin Kiety (arborist) agree with the findings of the report. He stated that they cannot trim the trees and have them look right.

Kevin Kiety: owner of the arborist company that was hired to assess the trees. His understanding is that a house will be built on a lot near the trees. He mentioned that this was a big concern. He described that these trees are one block from the beach and are susceptible to high winds and are a target for broken limbs. He verified that these trees consist of trucks and high canopies which pose potential problems. He volunteered to re-do a more valued assessment if required for safety purposes.

Dell: technical difficulties, could not hear.

Cindy Abbott: stated that she has lived on this avenue for 24 years and that these trees provide enjoyment and are a pleasure to the community. She supported that these are the only trees on an otherwise barren street, are a haven for wildlife, and they provide enjoyment to the neighborhood. She was surprised to hear a recommendation to remove the trees. She asked PB&R Commission to deny the appeal. She is committed to conserve the historic character of area, and that the trees do not pose a risk and are well below the height of most high-risk trees. She would like to see the Heritage Tree Ordinance upheld and conserve the historic atmosphere of Pacifica. She noted that these trees have lived together for decades and have entwined roots. She addressed the Replant Plan and feels it would be a sore solution for these magnificent trees. She senses that the trees are an enjoyment for community and have historical importance. She concluded that these trees live up to 200 years and have a lot more life left in them.

Dell: technical difficulties, could not hear.

Kai Martin: is a member of Tree City Pacifica. He noted benefits of the trees, explained runoff control, and feels the trees provide a greater sense of community and space. He request to rule in favor of trees, and deny request to remove. He mentioned that if they are cut down, a solution going forward would be to have a rule of how many trees can be cut down across the city. Suggested a replant of a 24" box minimum.

Susan Miller: explained various benefits of these trees. She wants to see the trees pruned and maintained. She request that appeal be denied.

Paul Totah: is a 35 year resident and a member of Tree City Pacifica. He

commented that California has lost a lot of trees to wild fires lately and urged the need to preserve the trees that are left. He asked for the appeal to be denied.

Ann Crow: she expressed that the trees need to be protected. Noted the many benefits of trees specifically the Heritage trees. She asked for appeal to be denied. **Chair Knowles:** closed topic to public comments.

Commissioner Heywood: posed a question to Mr. Gibbs regarding the Replant Plan.

Appellant Gibbs: advised that the plan was approved to re-plant large trees not shrubs. He advised that the plan consists of 25 gallon trees (Pine, Christmas) not shrubs. He commented that they are willing to put anything in the ground that the city approves.

Commissioner Benton Shoemaker: no additional questions at this time.

Commissioner Kellogg: he posed a question for Superintendent Clark - are all the cypress trees in Pacifica a medium risk?

Superintendent Clark: responded yes.

Commissioner Kellogg: voiced concern that we could use this appeal as an example to take down all of the trees in Pacifica due to a medium risk assessment. He asked Mr. Gibbs if his motivation to remove these trees is for building on the property, not due to the risk of the trees.

Appellant Gibbs: answered that the motivation is a safety issue.

Superintendent Clark: clarified that most of the City trees are older trees.

Commissioner Marchetti: advised that he has no other questions and that he is concentrating on the risk factor. He asked if the arborists are saying the trees are high-risk.

Director Petersen: clarified that the Risk factor was addressed in the report. She said there was a specific arborist assessment that did not deem these trees as high risk.

Commissioner Lusson: asked staff if a recent replacement ruling should be considered with this appeal.

Superintendent Clark: stated that he doesn't know exact details of the replacement ruling and wasn't involved.

Director Petersen: added that it has been the case on other properties where there was not enough property on the lot to do a 3 to 1 replacement ratio and that space allocations are a concern.

Chair Knowles: asked if there was any way to trim and maintain the trees to keep the integrity versus removing them.

Superintendent Clark: explained that he tries to save every tree that he can. He typically has to assess a tree limb by limb to determine if you can keep the tree or not. He commented that Cypress trees are problematic and difficult to maintain for homeowners if pruning has been done wrong.

Chair Knowles: commented that she cannot determine if this is the case for the trees hanging over 30 Salada. She thinks it is hard to tell if the trees have been trimmed or not.

Superintendent Clark: confirmed that there is a lot of weight on the trees that are hanging over the house.

Appellant Gibbs: advised yes, limbs have been trimmed and pruned since family has owned property and all reports have indicated that they should be replaced.

Chair Knowles: asked if PG&E expressed concerns about the utility lines that hang over the trees.

Appellant Gibbs: explained that power lines are a fire hazard. He thinks PG&E will blame the trees and not take responsibility if something should happen. He fears the responsibility would go back on him.

Chair Knowles: asked Superintendent Clark if they could trim the portion of the tree that hangs over the utility to omit risk.

Superintendent Clark: thinks that the tree has been marked with a red dot within the last year by PG&E. PG&E has been aggressive lately with clearing measures due to fire risks.

Director Petersen: wanted to bring to attention that this was all addressed in the report and is common in Pacifica.

Chair Knowles: closes comments for commissioners.

Appellant Gibbs: made his rebuttal stating that he is not asking to remove the trees, he is only asking to replace them. He is concerned about damage, liability, and safety issues that these trees will pose in the future. He restated that they are willing to do what the city is asking as far as replanting is concerned. He acknowledges the beauty and importance of the trees

Chair Knowles: announced the opening of the deliberation period. She asked for additional comments.

Commissioner Benton Shoemaker: commented that the discussion of maintaining minimum risk trees has already been discussed in the past within the commission. She understands that there is some risk with these trees but thinks it is important to uphold the Heritage Tree Ordinance. She explained that old trees hold more carbon as there is a concern about climate change and believes this is a serious time. She supports denying the appeal until the trees become high risk. She asked that our City Attorney talk to the City Attorney for Pacific Grove to find out more about their policy on medium/high risk trees.

Commissioner Marchetti: stated that he likes the trees but is concerned for safety of the occupants of home. He would like to hear from someone more qualified on the subject and is not sure either way on decision.

Commissioner Lusson: advised that there is nothing more to add. He is in support of the staff decision and suggested the appellant can take it up to City Council if needed.

Commissioner Heywood: stated that he had heard enough and is ready to vote.

Chair Knowles: advised that they will finish the discussion and deliberation.

Commissioner Kellogg: he understands the concerns from the appellant but there was not enough to reverse staff decision.

Chair Knowles: advised that she is not in favor of taking down all of the trees. She feels that maintaining the trees is important. She said it is hard to tell by the pictures and asked if anyone had further comments on the trees that overhang on Salada Ave.

Appellant Gibbs: requested clarification on what is meant by City Staff and wants to know who else has inspected trees?

Superintendent Clark: wanted to reiterate that there has been no definitive risk rating on the trees.

Director Perez: stated that the commission has been through the question

period and is now on to deliberations. At this time we cannot go back to ask questions and need to move forward with decision.

Chair Knowles: asked if there was a motion in favor to accept, deny, or modify the appeal.

Motion was made by Commissioner Benton Shoemaker to deny appeal seconded by Commissioner Kellogg.

Assistant Supervisor Phipps: did a roll call vote of commissioners.

Commissioner Kellogg: yes to the motion

Commissioner Benton Shoemaker: yes to the motion

Commissioner Marchetti: no to the motion

Commissioner Lusson: yes to the motion

Chair Knowles: no to the motion

Commissioner Heywood: no to the motion

Motion failed 3 to 3

Commissioner Kellogg: stated that he felt stuck on his decision and desired a rating that showed that the trees are medium to high risk.

Commissioner Heywood: advised that he doesn't feel the commission should make them spend money to maintain trees that are problematic.

Motion was made Commissioner Kellogg to accept the appeal with the modification that they replace the trees with the City's Replacement Plan Program seconded by Commissioner Heywood.

Chair Knowles: asked Commissioner Kellogg if that motion was for all the trees.

Commissioner Kellogg: stated that it is only for the trees that they have applied for.

Commissioner Lusson: admitted that he did not understand the Replacement Program and wanted clarification of the process.

Commissioner Benton Shoemaker: advised that she was at the Planning Commission meeting where it was discussed and nothing definitive was agreed on.

Commissioner Kellogg: asked if he could cancel his motion.

Director Perez: advised no, he clarified that there is a new motion that has been seconded that needs to be voted on.

Commissioner Kellogg: clarified that his motion was to accept the appeal and to replace it under the City's Replacement Program. His concern is that there is not a set policy. He suggested a modification of 1 to 1 with 25 gallon trees.

Superintendent Clark: Clarified that trees come in 15 gallon 24" in box and 48" in box.

Assistant Supervisor Phipps: reiterated comments from Commissioner Kellogg to replace of trees with 24" box tree.

Assistant Supervisor Phipps did a roll call vote.

Commissioner Benton Shoemaker: no to motion.

Commissioner Marchetti: yes to motion.

Commissioner Lusson: yes to motion.

Commissioner Heywood: yes to motion.

Commissioner Kellogg: yes to motion.

Chair Knowles: no to motion.

Motion carried 4-2

Chair Knowles: closed agenda item.

X. REPORTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS, AND CORRESPONDENCE FROM COMMISSIONERS:

Commissioner Abbott: rejoined the meeting. She mentioned that Sanchez Art Center working with City of Pacifica. Encouraged to come by. No advisory meeting until 2021.

Commissioner Marchetti: nothing to report.

Commissioner Heywood: nothing to report.

Commissioner Lusson: nothing to report.

Commissioner Benton Shoemaker: reminded that Arbor Planting Day was coming and Mayor will be there.

Commissioner Kellogg: nothing to report

Chair Knowles: she informed that she has been spending time in the water at Linda Mar Beach and observing crowds for the surf camps.

XI. REPORTS FROM STAFF:

Director Perez: thanked all staff for their work the last quarter. He gave updates on the Aquatics program, the summer Adventure Camps, and Childcare, Bike Park Committee work and the upcoming study session with City Council. He mentioned that he has been working with the school district and they plan to reopen to a hybrid in person program during late January. He advised that the Public Works Department is working to open the playgrounds and that the Child Care sites will be cleaning before and after children use the playgrounds. He updated the Commissioners on recent Skatepark issues such as vandalism of the new fencing. He gave a reminder of the next study session coming up and to make sure to submit RSVP's to the Doodle Poll for attendance. He introduced and welcomed four new staff members and advised that PB&R is slowly moving to the Community Center. He recognized Manager Lange's service to the Senior Services division, the department and the community while noting his upcoming retirement.

Commissioner Benton Shoemaker: asked the question, what is happening with your offices?

Director Perez: explained that there is a major issue with mold, water, and termite damage. The City is addressing accommodations for staff as well as plans to remedy these issues.

XII. ELECTION OF CHAIR AND CHAIR PRO-TEM:

Director Perez: guided the Commissioners through this process by explaining the steps.

Motion was made by Commissioner Benton Shoemaker to elect Commissioner Abbott as Chair seconded by Chair Knowles. Motion carried 7-0

Motion was made by Commissioner Abbott to elect Commissioner Lusson as Chair Pro-Tem seconded by Commissioner Benton Shoemaker. Motion carried 7-0

XIII. ADJOURNMENT:

Chair Knowles: asked for motion to Adjourn. **Motion was made by Commissioner Abbott seconded by Commissioner Kellogg. Motion Carried 7-0.**

Next Study Session: TBD

Next Regular Meeting: TBD

Respectfully submitted by,
Kenda Seeley, Recreation Specialist
Parks, Beaches, and Recreation

X

Cynthia Knowles, Chair



Staff Report

PARKS, BEACHES AND RECREATION COMMISSION
AGENDA SUMMARY REPORT
December 16, 2020

Item VIII. A)

Date: December 16, 2020
To: Members of the Parks, Beaches and Recreation Commission
From: Michael Perez, Director
Subject: Pacifica State Beach Surf Camp/School Permitting

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Discuss the various aspects of the Surf Camp School Policy, make recommendations for next steps and provide direction to staff on a plan to move forward in making changes to the policy.

Approved the staff recommendations, including:

- Suggested minor edits/changes to the existing policy for 2021.
- Extension of current CAPP program for 2021.
- Creation of a working group committee that will make recommended changes to the policy in order to create a Community Access Partner Permit (CAPP) program as well as address overall policy considerations.
- Appoint Commissioner Liaisons to the working group.

STAFF CONTACT:

Michael Perez, Director, Parks, Beaches and Recreation
(650) 738-7381, perezm@ci.pacifica.ca.us

BACKGROUND:

In 2003, the City's Public Works Department developed a Master Plan for Public Improvements at Pacifica State Beach. To address beach related issues during the implementation of these improvements, a Beach Subcommittee was formed on April 15, 2004. The subcommittee's work consisted of making recommendations and developing guidelines for the elimination of fires, beach hours of operations, ideas for the creation of a parking program, and recommendations for signage.

On April 25, 2005, the recommendations were on the agenda of the regularly scheduled City Council meeting. Council approved the implementation of a policy to support the Ordinance listed above and directed staff to come back to the following meeting with some changes and clarifications to the guidelines. At the May 9, 2005 regular City Council meeting, council directed staff to proceed with implementation of the Pacifica State Beach Surf Camp/School Policy Guidelines. The policy set a limit of three surf camp/schools, two large (25-student limit) and one small (12 student limit).

At their regular meeting on January 23, 2013, the PB&R Commission adopted changes to the Surf Camp/School Policy (attached) that included allowing one local surf shop to apply annually for a permit to increase the number of students that were currently allowed (for surf shops) from 5 to 12 at the small surf camp rate.

At the June 8, 2020 City Council meeting approximately 30 emails/letters and 13 speakers addressed concern over the surf camp permitting process. In particular, many wrote or stated that they were concerned about racial equity relating to beach access, and that the permitting process makes it difficult for non-profits, like Brown Girls Surf (BGS) and City Surf Project (CSP) to apply for a surf camp permit;

In addition, several commenters shared personal anecdotes relating to the importance of equitable beach access, their experiences at the beach and surfing, as well as volunteering with non-profits that work with diverse communities. Many of the speakers advocated reforming the surf camp permitting process.

Since this time, several meetings on this topic have been held, below is a brief summary of those meetings. Additional staff reports from those meetings have been attached to this report.

- June 22, 2020 City Council Meeting - Council referred this work item to the Parks, Beaches and Recreation (PB&R) Commission to evaluate the Pacifica Surf Camp/School Policy to determine if/how the program could be amended to allow more surf camps to operate, or to revise the permit renewal process in order to support non-profits that work with diverse communities.
- On July 22 and August 5, 2020, PB&R Commission study sessions – Discussion of the existing surf camp policy, equitable access relating to the beach and permit holders, input from the public and a proposal from two non-profits for a Community Access Partner (CAPP) program.
- August 26, 2020 – PB&R Commission meeting – Commission approved changes to the Surf Camp/School Policy to include two CAPP participants for a six-month pilot program. Commissioners also agreed to put this on their work plan, with further study sessions and meetings.
- October 14, 2020 – PB&R Commission study session was held for reviewing the City's current surf camp/school requirements, guidelines, and rules and to compare and contrast these requirements with other agencies and review the CAPP proposal (a second proposal was submitted by Brown Girls Surf/City Surf Project). Staff gave a presentation covering applicant qualification review, current guidelines and rules, introduced and read the Santa Monica purpose statement, explained the percentages on the Comparison to Other Agencies chart, and explained the projected surf camp timeline and total participant counts as broken down by season. The CAPP proposal was also summarized.

DISCUSSION

As we are evaluating the existing policy to make changes, there is a desire to move forward with the CAPP proposal more permanently. The most recent communication and proposal from Brown Girls Surf and City Surf CEO's recommends that the focus be on creating a CAPP system before overhauling the current permit system. Commissioners have expressed a desire to do both at the same time.

In recent years, staff has made an effort to get permitting information out by end of the calendar year with the goal of completing the process in January/February. With 2021 less than month

away, and because of COVID-19 related challenges, staff recommends that any large-scale changes to the program not take place until the 2022 permit year.

Recommendations:

- Permits may be granted for 2021 with some minor changes to the Applicant Qualification section, as outlined below.*
- Extend the CAPP program through 2021. (Note: BGS and CSP do not have programs scheduled for summer weekends).
- To adopt the staff recommended changes to the Applicant Qualifications of the Surf Camp to take effect in 2021.
- Creation of a working group committee that will make recommended changes to the policy in order to create a Community Access Partner Permit (CAPP) program as well as address overall policy considerations.
 - Goals - to create a CAPP program criteria and requirements - equitable access for underrepresented groups by creating a permit program with equitable access for these groups, to include integration with the current surf camp/school policy where appropriate, and to make further recommendations for the improvement of the policy as a whole.
 - Suggested work plan items:
 - Community Access Partner (CAPP) Permit – a very comprehensive proposal submitted by BGS and CSP can be used as a template for the creation of this program. (attached)
 - Overall Surf Camp/School Policy
 - Application process – Application process and review, information required for submission, request for proposals (to have one or not, how often?), review process (formation of a review committee), review of guidelines and rules.
 - Camp and/or student limits - “Load” or number of surf camp/school participants on the beach – method of calculating these numbers, calendar of usage and schedule, number of permits issued.
 - Purpose/Mission Statement – At the October study session Santa Barbara’s purpose statement was shared as part of staff’s presentation. Commissioners expressed a desire to create one as well and staff recommends the creation of a purpose statement for Pacifica.
 - Members of working group to include: PB&R staff, one to two Commissioners, representative of a CAPP school, representative of a commercial school, member of Surfrider and/or other stakeholders/partner agency, member of a beach related organization – Pedro Point Surf Club or Pacific Beach Coalition - as well as a member of the public. Staff would contact partner agencies to provide a representative and any individual position would include an application process to be determined later.
 - Timeline – the following are suggestions for a potential timeline of the working group’s schedule, to be discussed and/or modified.
 - Frequency – 1 – 2x/month maximum

- January 2021 – selection and first meeting
- Length of meetings – 6-9 months. A goal for updates may be every three months, or have a presentation/update scheduled for the June 2021 Commission meeting.
- Final presentation – too be determined/Summer 2021.
- Commission makes final recommendations – Fall 2021 for 2022 season.

Recommended Changes for Current Surf Camp/School Policy for 2021

- ***Applicant Qualifications** – all current qualifications for commercial surf camps are recommended to remain. Commission may consider adding new qualifications, some of which were discussed at previous meetings, as well as staff recommendations:
 - Copy of Certificate of Insurance for \$3 million dollar (\$3,000,000) liability insurance for current year – staff recommends adding in the requirement to name the City of Pacifica as an additionally insured/certificate holder.
 - Proof of current WSI (water safety) and CPR certification on file for each employee. This requirement should remain. Adding in that possessing a lifeguarding certification by at least one camp/school staff on duty is highly desirable.
 - Applicant and all staff must be proficient in surfing – staff recommends adding that all staff must be proficient at instructing and being good educators.
 - Schedule – while we have required vendors to submit their schedule, it is not specifically listed as part of the requirements. Staff recommends adding this as part of the policy. This will also help in keeping track of the overall beach usage by camps and assist with determining peak vs non-peak usage times.

RELATION TO CITY COUNCIL GOALS AND WORK PLAN:

This action helps to support youth services, which is a component of **A Healthy and Compassionate Community**. It also promotes **An Engaged Community**, taking actions to restore trust in city government, expanding communication and building community.

FISCAL IMPACT:

There is no fiscal impact associated with the creation of a working group committee other than staff time.

ATTACHMENT LIST:

August 26, 2020 Surf Camp/School Policy Staff Report

August 2020 adopted Surf Camp/School Policy for Pacifica State Beach

Proposed Framework for CAPP Program 10.02.20

Example of CAPP Application Scenario and Timeline

CITY OF PACIFICA
Parks, Beaches and Recreation Commission
August 26, 2020

SUBJECT:

Pacifica State Beach Surf Camp/School Permitting

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve the recommended changes to the surf camp/school policy creating a six-month pilot program to include a Community Access Partner (CAP) permit to be held jointly by Brown Girls Surf and City Surf Project.

To place the Surf Camp/School Permit Policy on the Commissions work plan in order to more thoroughly study this issue, collect and analyze information and make appropriate recommended changes.

STAFF CONTACT:

Michael Perez, Director, Parks, Beaches and Recreation
(650) 738-7381, perezm@ci.pacifica.ca.us

BACKGROUND:

In 2003, the City's Public Works Department developed a Master Plan for Public Improvements at Pacifica State Beach. To address beach related issues during the implementation of these improvements, a Beach Subcommittee was formed on April 15, 2004. The subcommittee's work consisted of making recommendations and developing guidelines for the elimination of fires, beach hours of operations, ideas for the creation of a parking program, and recommendations for signage.

At the time, concerns were raised about beach usage, water safety and congestion due to lack of regulation relating to surf camps/schools. The subcommittee spent considerable time on the topic of surf camps/schools at Pacifica State Beach. After many public forums, the subcommittee put forth a recommendation to limit surf camps to a maximum number of three, to be regulated by the Parks Beaches and Recreation Department.

This direction is addressed in Ordinance No. 692-C.S., Section 4-10.116, *"The Director may promulgate rules and regulations for the reservation, rental, and use of exclusive use facilities in all beaches, and parks. The Director may also impose reasonable time, place, and manner conditions in writing to ensure that public health, safety and welfare are protected during the use of exclusive use facilities. It shall be unlawful for any person to violate such rules, regulations or conditions."*

The Parks, Beaches, and Recreation (PB&R) Commission, after conducting a study session, concurred with staff and the subcommittee to recommend the limitation of surf camps and develop rules/guidelines for them. On April 25, 2005, the recommendations were on the agenda of the regularly scheduled City Council meeting. Council approved the implementation of a policy to support the Ordinance listed above and directed staff to come back to the following meeting with some changes and clarifications to the guidelines, specifically allowing that:

- Local surf shops, who hold a Pacifica business licenses and carry liability and workers compensation insurance, may continue the practice of employees teaching individual and small group lessons with a maximum of 5 students in

keeping with the ratio of five (5) students per instructor (minimum safety requirement).

At the May 9, 2005 regular City Council meeting, council directed staff to proceed with implementation of the Pacifica State Beach Surf Camp/School Policy Guidelines.

On November 28, 2012 and January 9, 2013, the PB&R Commission held study sessions to discuss and review the surf camp/school policy as well as to consider increasing the amount of permit holders. Representatives from each surf school and the owner of Nor Cal Surf shop attended the November 28 meeting, and each surf school was represented at the January 9 meeting.

At the January 23, 2013 meeting, the PB&R Commission adopted changes to the Surf Camp/School Policy (attached) that included allowing one local surf shop to apply annually for a permit to increase the number of students that were currently allowed (for surf shops) from 5 to 12 at the small surf camp rate.

DISCUSSION

At the June 8, 2020 City Council meeting approximately 30 emails/letters and 13 speakers addressed concern over the surf camp permitting process. In particular, many wrote or stated that they were concerned about racial equity relating to beach access, and that the permitting process makes it difficult for non-profits, like Brown Girls Surf (BGS) and City Surf Project (CSP) to apply for a surf camp permit;

In addition, several commenters shared personal anecdotes relating to the importance of equitable beach access, their experiences at the beach and surfing, as well as volunteering with non-profits that work with diverse communities. Many of the speakers advocated reforming the surf camp permitting process.

The 2020 price for an annual permit is \$1,060 for small camps and \$1,280 for large camps. Currently there are four permitted surf camps, two large – Adventure Out and Surf Camp Pacifica, one small – University of Surfing and one local shop – Nor Cal Surf Shop. These camps have been permitted to operate for many years. When an inquiry is received, groups are added to a list and told they will be contacted should a spot open up. Since the policy limits the number of permitted camps, and each year the camps have chosen to renew their permits, new camp operators, whether non-profits or not, have not been able to operate.

At the June 22, 2020 City Council meeting, Council referred this work item to the PB&R Commission to evaluate the Pacifica Surf Camp/School Policy to determine if/how the program could be amended to allow more surf camps to operate, or to revise the permit renewal process in order to support non-profits that work with diverse communities.

On July 22 and August 5, 2020, the Parks, Beaches and Recreation Commission held study sessions to discuss the Surf Camp/School Policy. Mira Manickham-Shirley, executive director of BGS and Johnny Irwin, executive director of CSP, participated in both meetings. They each shared information and background on their organizations, who they serve and how they operate. Information on their organizations was also shared with Commissioners prior to the first study session.

Also in attendance at one or both sessions, were representatives from all the current surf camp permits holders. In addition, several members of the public attended both meetings, speaking in support of the two non-profits and their mission. Leading up to the meetings, several emails were also sent, which were provided to Commissioners and will be included as attachments to this report.

Staff had the opportunity to have several conversations with both executive directors who sent a letter to the Commission, along with a proposal for a Community Access Partner (CAP) permit prior to the first study session (attached). This proposal included a draft criteria for the types of

groups that would be eligible for a CAP permit as well as a set of key features seen as necessary for creating an equitable permitting system.

Mira Manickham-Shirley spoke of the desire for equitable access to surfing for all people and shared that there are factors, which keep this from happening. She spoke of the frustration of not being able to obtain a permit and asked for reform that allows other permits to be issued. Her comments were echoed by Johnny Irwin, and they both stated they would like to see a CAP permit that would allow others to apply.

At the July 22 meeting, a few members of the public spoke in favor of the proposal, supported diversity and equitable access, advocated for youth, especially those disenfranchised and they shared their experiences with surfing and the non-profits. At the August 5 meeting, several members of the public spoke, all in favor of the proposal, complimenting the Commission for their efforts working on this issue.

In addition to equitable beach access and non-profit organizations, the study session also included discussion on the following surf camp topics:

- Safety
- Space
- Number of participants at any given time
- Scheduling
- Permit application process,
- Review of existing permits

In order to get a better picture of how the current and potentially new surf camp groups utilize the beach for lessons, staff suggested doing a survey to obtain scheduling information. Information is currently being collected and will be shared with Commission as available in the near future.

Commissioners were interested in implementing a pilot program with a CAP permit for either the remainder of the year or 6-months. However, during that time, there is a desire to work on the overall permit policy with an overall inclusive and equitable surf camp policy as a goal. Commissioners agreed they would like to see this task on their work plan.

RELATION TO CITY COUNCIL GOALS AND WORK PLAN:

This action helps to support youth services, which is a component of **A Healthy and Compassionate Community**. It also promotes **An Engaged Community**, taking actions to restore trust in city government, expanding communication and building community.

FISCAL IMPACT:

Prorated cost of surf camp permit for 6 months would be \$530 for a small camp and \$640 for a large camp in revenue. Additional staff time would have no significant impact on the budget; however, the continued work on the permit policy will be a new work item not currently on the Commission's work plan, and therefore will divert staff resources normally focused on already approved priority actions and on-going programs.

ATTACHMENT LIST:

Surf Camp/School Policy for Pacifica State Beach – redline version
Community Access Partner letter and proposal

Letters to Commission/Department (sent prior to both study sessions)

Pacifica Parks, Beaches and Recreation Department Surf Camp/School Policy for Pacifica State Beach

Applicant Qualifications:

- Pacifica business license
- Facility Use (permit) form via PB&R
- Price list of camp fees and program structure/basic curriculum and schedule - curriculum should also include discussion of surf citizenship/etiquette, appropriate to the length of the session
- Copy of Certificate of Insurance for \$3 million dollar (\$3,000,000) liability insurance for current year
- Proof of Workers' Compensation policy of one hundred thousand dollars (\$100,000) if you have employees
- Safety plan and business plan submitted with application
- Proof of current WSI (water safety) and CPR certification on file for each employee
- All applicants must have proper equipment in good condition
- Applicant and all staff must be proficient in surfing

Guidelines and Rules:

- Two surf schools/surf camps with a limit of 25 students per class
- One surf school/surf camp with a limit of 12 students per class
- Two Community Access Partnership (CAP)* camps with a limit of (12) students per class added as part of a 6 month pilot program to begin Sept/Oct 2020.
- The ratio of five (5) students per instructor (minimum requirement)
- All instructors under the age of 18 must be supervised if working with minors
- Students surfing outside the impact zone (beyond the breakwaters) and/or independently, must wear leashes
- Instructors to be identified by colored jersey with "Surf Instructor" on back (preferably red)
- Students to also wear a different colored jersey for identification and wetsuits for protection
- Individual surfing by instructors should be for demonstration and instructional purposes only
- Camp hours on weekends: 8 AM to 12 Noon; 10 or fewer students per camp between 12 Noon and sunset (weekends)
- Area of operations is restricted to the area between the north restrooms and the San Pedro Creek
- Camps/lessons will need to be canceled if water is too crowded, conditions unsafe or if only one wave break is surf-able

- Local Surf Shops who hold a Pacifica Business License, carry Liability and Workers Compensation Insurance, may continue the practice of employees teaching individual and small group lessons with a maximum of 5 students in keeping with the ratio of five (5) students per Instructor (minimum safety requirement)

- One local surf shop may apply annually for a permit to increase the number of students (up to 12) at the small surf camp rate

Day passes may be issued for other groups/events at the Directors discretion and in keeping with preserving the safety and minimizing the density of use.

*Community Access Partnership (CAP) Permit Applicant Additional Criteria

- a. The organization is exempt from taxation pursuant to Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code; (is a 501(c) (3) themselves or is a fiscally sponsored project of a 501(c)(3))
- b. The organization is in compliance with the Supervision of Trustees and Fundraisers for Charitable Purposes Act (Article 7 (commencing with Section 12580) of Chapter 6 of Part 2 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code);
- c. The organization has expertise in providing surf programming to low income or underrepresented groups who face obstacles, such as, but not limited to, transportation, cost, and disenfranchisement, to general public access and/or surfing at the beach;
- d. The organization delivers services consistent with the purpose and resource values of the park facilities granted;
- e. The organization has developed interpretive, educational and/or recreational programming to outdoor spaces with demonstrated results;
- f. The organization provides programming that is free or significantly subsidized for participants with low incomes
- g. The organization has instructors with specific training to the programming and cultural competencies to address the needs of participants served.

Access and use of beach/park facilities by eligible entities shall enhance beach/park access for disadvantaged and/or underrepresented groups who face obstacles to general public access or surf-related use of the beach/park.

Adopted by the PB&R Commission 8/26/2020

Proposed Framework for Community Access Partner Permitting (CAPP) by Mira Manickam (Brown Girl Surf) and Johnny Irwin (City Surf Project)

I. Creating a CAPP system vs overhauling the whole permitting structure. We strongly urge the PBRC to first focus on creating a CAPP permit system rather than overhauling the whole permit system all at once. Focusing on nailing down the details of the CAPP system before attempting an entire system overhaul will have the following benefits:

- Immediately address the issue of equitable access for underrepresented groups served by CAPP-eligible orgs and lay out a clear framework for equitable access going forward;
- Create a contained program in which the PBRC can test-drive new systems for a permitting process (including accepting applications, evaluating applications, sharing space between permittees);
- Lessons learned from the CAPP program can inform a larger permit policy change later on, if PBRC wants to pursue this;
- Avoid exposing commercial surf schools to a major change in their permit process during a year that has been particularly devastating economically.

II. Setting the guardrails for a CAPP Permit System. We suggest 3 measures to keep in mind when looking at creating a CAPP Permitted Spot structure:

1. **Permit sizes.** Right now there's a 12-person, 25-person permit and (technically) a 5-person surf shop permit. We suggest adding a 15-person permit size, since this is a typical group size for CAPP weekday school programs. We also suggest viewing permit size as a less important measure of beach usage, than "load" described below.
2. **The "load" of surf school participants on the beach.** The load is the amount of participants a permittee brings on the beach, how often, and when. Each permittee creates a particular "load" of participants that varies across time. For example:
 - The load of University of Surf is concentrated in the summer, but the load of Brown Girl Surf would be concentrated on off-season weekends.
 - While University of Surf and Nor Cal Surf shop have similar permit sizes, the load they place on the beach over the course of the year is different, because one group operates mainly in the summer, and the other group operates year-round.
 - While Brown Girl Surf and City Surf project have similar size permits, the load they place on the beach over the course of the year will also be different, since Brown Girl Surf offers far fewer program days (focused mainly on off-season Saturdays) than City Surf Project, which does programs on most weekdays during the school year.

When we look at the total load of the current permittee usage across the entire year, we find that there is actually a lot of time when the beach is not experiencing the total possible load of all the existing permitted spots.

Percentage of 74 existing spots being used:

- Summer Weekends (Memorial Day to Labor Day): 75-100%
- Summer Weekdays: 50-75%
- Offseason Weekends: 10%-50%
- Offseason Weekdays: 0-50%

We believe it is critical to take load into account when assessing how many permits the beach can accommodate. City Surf Project and Brown Girl Surf can work within the times of lesser load in the first few years of the CAPP program – this will minimize impact on the commercial surf schools.

We also recommend relaxing the noon-sunset 10-person limit currently in the policy. This would allow CAPP schools to operate on weekday afternoons, which are a less desirable time for commercial schools and a key time for CAPP schools.

3. **Maximum number of permitted spots on the beach *at one time*.** Right now we are assuming this number is 74, since that is the current amount of permitted spots. It is critical to note that there could be more than 74 permit spots allotted *and* we can still maintain a max of 74 (or less) people on the beach *at one time* provided there is some degree of coordination among the surf schools.

We therefore propose creating a Maximum CAPP participant limit each year for each of the different parts of the year (Summer/Offseason, Weekend/Weekday) as noted in the chart below.

Staying within this limit will require coordination and calendaring among the CAPP permit holders only. We recognize that existing permitted commercial surf schools are not enthusiastic about calendaring, and we believe that this is not necessary to stay within the maximum number of permitted spots allowed *at one time* during the initial implementation of the CAPP program.

CAPP organizations would coordinate among themselves to ensure that they do not exceed the CAPP participant max on the beach at one time. This maximum will need to be negotiated each year, based on a variety of factors outlined in greater detail below.

III. Proposal for Key Elements of CAPP system:

- An application deadline will be set every 2 years;
- To ensure grant-funded programs can succeed, application deadline and notification period will be well in advance of the permit start date. We recommend April 1 deadline,

July 1 notification for permit commencing the following year on June 1. This will allow for planning of programming around the summer and school year.

- Applications will be reviewed by a CAPP Application Review Body (CARB), which could be a subcommittee of PBRC comprised of members with strong knowledge of equity issues in outdoor programming, or a separately appointed or contracted body (see further below for details on CARB's role, criteria for membership, and proposed method for evaluating applications);
- When eligible organizations apply for a CAPP permit, they must state the intended "load" that they plan to bring to Pacifica beach.
- The CARB will evaluate applications, looking both at the applicants' quality of programs, AND the load they plan to bring to Pacifica beach.
- The CARB will make a recommendation for specific applicants to receive permits, and make a suggestion to the PBRC for the total CAPP participant max for the coming permit year (the year for which applications are being submitted) based on vetted CAPP applicants' need.
- Every two years during this time of application review, the max CAPP-permitted spots on beach at one time will be reevaluated and determined by PBRC taking into consideration:
 - Need by CAPP-eligible organizations vetted by CARB, understood in terms of proposed load across the year;
 - Need by Commercial Surf Schools, understood in terms of proposed load across the year;
 - Equitable sharing of space between CAPP orgs and commercial surf schools, based on their relative needs;
 - The maximum number of total permitted spots on the beach at one time (currently assumed to be 74);
- Based what PBRC ultimately decides will be the max for CAPP-permitted spots on beach at one time for the coming permit year, the CARB will instruct PBR to issue permits of varying sizes to the groups selected. We recommend that the CARB set the permit size based on the need of the applicant rather than a one or two size fits all category. The permit would specify the following: max group size for that group (6 person permit, 12 person permit, 15 person permit, etc), limits around LOAD for different times of the year, and the expectation that future calendaring of dates must be coordinated with other CAPP permittees.
- CARB will convene a CAPP permittee "draft day" during which CAPP permittees will agree upon sharing of tricky dates (ex// summer weekdays, offseason Saturdays), within the "Total Max CAPP-permitted spots on beach at one time ." This will take place in early July of the year prior to the permit start date to allow for program planning by CAPP permittees.
- Pricing for CAPP permits should be set according to the load. We recommend, a price of 50 cents per participant spots. For example, a CAPP organization that plans to bring a load of 500 participant spots in one year would pay \$250 and a CAPP organization that plans to have 2,000 participants spots in one year would pay \$1,000.

- Permits will last two years and then CAPP organizations must reapply. Priority in the “draft day” date sharing process among CAPP permittees may be given to existing CAPP permittees in good standing.
- Once permitted, CAPP organizations will be expected to coordinate with each other to calendar at least one month in advance to ensure that they do not exceed the max CAPP permitted spots on the beach *at one time*;
- This calendar will be shared with commercial schools who can use any unutilized CAPP spots;
- If, at some point in the future, the need for CAPP permits becomes equal (in terms of proposed load) to the needs of commercial surf school permittees (in terms of proposed load), then the maximum CAPP-permitted spots will equal half the total permitted spots on the beach at one time;

Max Total CAPP-permitted spots on beach at one time, assuming that total permitted spots on the beach at any one time is 74.				
	Year 1 (2021)	Year 2 -3 (June 2022-May 2024)	Year 4-5 (June 2024 to May 2026)	Max CAPP permitted spots (assuming CAPP demand requires it - which may not occur for many many years)
Summer Weekends	0	This would be negotiated	This would be negotiated	Half of total permitted spots on beach.
Summer Weekdays	24	This would be negotiated	This would be negotiated	Half of total permitted spots on beach.
Off season weekends	15	This would be negotiated demand	This would be negotiated	Half of total permitted spots on beach.
Off season weekdays	30	This would be negotiated	This would be negotiated	Half of total permitted spots on beach.

IV. System for evaluating CAPP permit applications.

- Applicants must meet CAPP criteria, which also incorporates existing Pacifica surf school criteria (re: group size, certifications, insurance, etc.);
- Applicants must demonstrate proven record, high quality of programming, and need for Pacifica permit. Some examples of application questions:
 - How long have you operated?
 - Who have you served in the past year?

- Demonstrate that you are serving groups under-represented in surfing. How does your group contribute to equitable access to surfing in the Bay Area?
- Why is access to Pacifica State Beach crucial for your program?
- How do you ensure cultural responsiveness in your programming? What cultural responsiveness training does your staff receive?
- Please demonstrate the impact of your programming.

V. Criteria for (CAPP application review board) CARB membership, and definition of CARB role

- Members have a strong understanding of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in the outdoors
- Members are committed to the principle of increasing access to surfing for underrepresented groups
- There is no conflict of interest, i.e. members and their family members do not stand to personally gain from admittance of particular applicants over others.
- There should not direct personal connections (i.e. former employee, etc) between the members of the board and the applicants.
- Members have a high degree of comfort with complex scheduling tasks. Their job will be a little bit like sudoku

CARB roles:

- Review CAPP applications
- Vet CAPP applicants and determine which applicants to recommend for permits
- Make a recommendation to PBRC of max CAPP permitted spots on the beach at one time for the upcoming permit year based on needs of vetted applicants
- Present this recommendation and its justification to PBRC, acting as an advocate for vetted CAPP groups.
- Based on PBRC's decision on max CAPP permitted spots on the beach at one time for the upcoming permit year, determine reasonable permit types for vetted CAPP applicants (including permit size, guidance around loads at different times of year). PBRC will then issue permits according to CARB's recommendations
- Host "Draft Day" to set calendar for high demand dates
- Possibly host a second calendaring day closer to the start of the program, to negotiate additional adjustments to dates
- Share this calendar (google calendar is probably a good choice) with CAPP permittees who are responsible for reporting their intended program dates a month in advance. (high demand dates will have been set up earlier via draft days)

Summary:

- Relax 10-permitted-spots-per-school limit for weekday afternoons;
- Agree to the idea of different permit sizes for CAPP orgs (6 person, 15 person, etc), and begin to think of "load" (how many participants, how often, when) as a more important

determinant of space-sharing feasibility than permit size. Agree to CAPP permit pricing based on load rather than permit size.

- Confirm that for 2021, maximum number of permitted spots allowed on the beach *at one time* is 74;
- Approve max CAPP-permitted spots (see chart above) for year 1;
- Confirm that all groups are comfortable with principles for negotiating max CAPP spots each year;
- Determine method for designating CARB members
- Designate CARB members to review applications
- Create Application, Criteria for Evaluation, and Rubric for assessing applications according to this criteria. Brown Girl Surf and City Surf Project are happy to help with this.
- Set up periodic reviews of the system.

Example of a CAPP Application Scenario and Timeline

February 1 2021, PBRC opens up application period for 2 year permits for the period June 1 2022 to May 31 2024.

April 1 2021. Deadline for application.

April 1 2021-May 1 2021 - CARB reviews applications.

Does initial vetting based on quality of programming. CARB uses a clearly defined and uniform criteria and rubric for assessing all applications.

Example scenario:

5 groups apply. Each has different profiles.

Applicants will be asked to provide as much detail as possible about when their desired program days are specific and when they are flexible.

(Applicants would include Brown Girl Surf and City Surf Project, who would apply alongside other CAPP eligible orgs. For the sake of this document, we've given all applicants neutral names: "CAPP School 1-5")

CAPP School 1

Proposed Load:

Summer Weekends: 0

Summer Weekdays: 2 weeks of Tues-Thurs between July 3 and August 3, 12 participant max

Offseason Weekends: 6 Saturdays in Fall, 15 participant max

Off season Weekdays: 12 Wednesday afternoons in the fall, 15 participant max

CAPP School 2

Summer Weekends: 2 Saturdays, 15 participant max

Summer Weekdays: 2 weeks of Tues-Thurs between July 3 and August 3, 12 participant max

Offseason Weekends: 6 Saturdays in Fall, 15 participant max

Off season Weekdays: Mon-Fri programs, 15 participant

CAPP School 3

Summer Weekends: 3 weekends, 8 participant max

Summer Weekdays: 2 weeks of Mon-Fri camp with 8 participant max.

Offseason Weekends:

Off season Weekdays: 3 Saturdays 8 participant max.

CAPP School 4:

Summer Weekends: 3 weekends, 25 participant max

Summer Weekdays: 3 flexible weekdays. 25 participant max

Offseason Weekends: 8 Saturdays. 25 participant max

Off season Weekdays: 0

CAPP School 5:

Summer Weekends: 2 weekends, 25 participant max
 Summer Weekdays: 4 weeks of Mon-Fri camps.
 Offseason Weekends: 8 Saturdays. 25 participant max
 Off season Weekdays: 0

May 1 to June 1 2021:

CARB has selected 4 out of 5 applicants for permits (CAPP School 5 has not been selected due to lack of evidence that they are effectively engaging with underrepresented communities).

CARB proposes number for max CAPP-permitted spots at one time number to PBRC based on need of qualified applicants, and also shares plan for proposed permits to be awarded. This Max CAPP Permitted spots at one time number will not go into effect until June 1 2022, when the permits for current applicants kick in.

CARB would do this during a PBRC monthly meeting, and would also provide justification for why the number was selected, who the group are, and why they were chosen.

The proposal would include the proposal for max total CAPP-permitted spots on the beach at one time for the coming permit year as well as the proposed permits to be awarded.

Example of info that CARB would submit to PBRC:

Max Total CAPP-permitted spots on beach at one time, assuming that total permitted spots on the beach at any one time is 74.		
	Current CAPP max	Year 2 -3 (June 2022-May 2024)
Summer Weekends	0	25 for select weekend dates (8 total days, all Saturdays)
Summer Weekdays	24	25 (15 days anticipated at this level)
Off season weekends	15	25 (all Saturdays)
Off season weekdays	30	30

Proposed Permits:

CAPP School 1: 15 is max group size: Load limits: 0 Summer weekends, 2 three-day Tues-Thurs stretch summer week days, 12 offseason weekend days, Offseason Wednesdays

CAPP School 2: 15 is max group size, 2 Summer Saturdays (no holiday weekends), 2 three-day Tues-Thurs stretch summer week days, 6 off season weekend days, Off season weekdays

CAPP School 3: 8 is max group size, 3 Summer weekend dates, 2 5-day mon-Fri summer weekday stretches, 3 offseason weekend days.

CAPP School 4: 25 max group size, Load limits: 3 Summer Saturdays (No Holiday Weekends), 3 Summer weekdays (avoiding BGS and CSP camp days), 8 offseason weekend days.

PBRC then has until June 1 (and if they need more time, this can run into June) to approve the CARB request or deliberate with CARB to determine a max total CAPP-permitted spots are for June 2022-May 2024. When taking into account the CARB recommendation, they should also consider the needs of commercial surf schools. They can also choose to increase the total surf school spots allowed on the beach at one time (which we are assuming to be 74 in 2020/2021)

CARB notifies permittees about their permits by July 1 and invites them to a “Draft Day,” in August.

During this Draft Day, CAPP permittees are able to choose their preferred dates for critical programs. This will be important to determine the allocation of summer camp dates, and off season weekend dates. Some permittees may not get their preferred dates. They will have almost a year though to plan.

Closer to June 1 2022, CARB will host a second calendaring day, when permittees can work together to make adjustments to their dates, and work out “trades” etc based on new developments that have taken place in the past year.

We recommend that the calendaring be done on Google Calendar or some other easily shared virtual platform.



Staff Report

PARKS, BEACHES AND RECREATION COMMISSION
AGENDA SUMMARY REPORT
December 16, 2020

Item VIII. B)

Date: December 16, 2020
To: Members of the Parks, Beaches and Recreation Commission
From: Michael Perez, Director
Subject: 2021 Work Plan items

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:

In past years, the Parks, Beaches and Recreation Commission has created lists to address upcoming topics, which have been referred to as “What’s Next” in annual reports to City Council. With the new calendar year coming up, below is a description of items that are and/or will be part of the Commission’s agenda for the coming year.

Staff suggests Commission prioritize items for the next few meetings, decide if they need further information, whether the item should be a study session or a regular meeting item and request any additional information needed from staff.

Surf Camp/School Policy - This item was referred by City Council and there have been several meetings on this topic. Plans for moving forward with the creation of a working group committee are on tonight’s agenda and will be discussed.

Liaison Assignments – Typically, this list is updated annually, with the potential assignments that Commissioners may volunteer to fill. The current liaison list is attached to this report for discussion and/or to for addition to a future agenda.

Poet Laureate – In 2013, the selection of the City’s Poet Laureate became the responsibility of the PB&R Commission. The Poet Laureate’s serve three-year terms. Our current Poet Laureate, agreed to continue past her term as we were coming to grips with COVID-19. Choosing the next Poet Laureate can be part of the 2021 work plan should Commission wish.

Bike Park – In November there was a PB&R Commission/City Council joint study session on the Bike Park topic, which included a presentation from the Bike Park Committee. Based on discussion and input from this meeting, the Bike Park Committee will begin working on items relating to next steps including looking closure at their survey info, using Flash Vote as another surveying method and more evaluation on site selection. There is a PB&R staff liaison to the group, and Commission have the Bike Park Committee listed as a liaison assignment as well.

Other Items – Discussion of any additional items for 2021 Work Plan consideration.

COMMISSION ACTION REQUESTED

Discussion of the topics to include prioritization, potential timeline and scheduling as well as suggestions for additional items.

PARKS, BEACHES AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT COMMISSION LIAISON ASSIGNMENTS (Updated 12/16/20)

COMMITTEE	MEETINGS	LIAISON
Beautification Committee	1 st Wednesday, 6:30 pm EOC	
Mural Subcommittee		
Economic Development Committee	2 nd Tuesday of the month, 6pm at EOC	
Library Advisory Committee		
Open Space and Parkland Advisory Committee	3 rd Wednesday, 6:00 pm PB & R Conference Room	
Childcare Services	As needed for issues/events, Contact Tracy Gilbert	
Pool/Aquatics Liaison	As needed for pool issues/events Contact Anthony Schriver	
Senior In Action Council	As needed (Senior Advisory Council meets 3 rd Monday, 10:15am if you can make it)	
Youth Advisory Board	2 nd & 4 th Wed Schedules permitting Community Center 6:00-7:00 pm Contact Sydney Bliss (738-7376) for meeting schedule	
4 th of July Celebration	July 4 th planning meetings, July 4	
Earth Day Planning Committee	As needed	
Pacifica Junior Olympics and Family Fun Fest	As needed	
Pacifica Bike Park Committee		
Poet Laureate		
Surf Camp/School Committee		
Beach Coalition Committee	Lynn Adams lynn4promos@aol.com or 355-1668	
Chamber of Commerce	www.pacificachamber.com	
Tree City Pacifica		