Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 5:32 p.m. by President Keith Pryor, presiding and Mary McCoin, secretary.

Directors present
JT Allen, Norma Brambila, Jolon Clark, James Coleman, Noel Copeland, Brian Elms, Anne Green, Khadija Haynes, Mary McCoin, Keith Pryor, Jason Robinson, Bernie Sharp, Leslie Twarogowski, Shane Wright, Darrel Watson

Directors absent
Jay April, Marcus Pachner, Florence Navarro

Approval of Minutes
At 5:34 p.m., a quorum was established and on motion duly made (Watson), seconded (Elms), and carried, the minutes of the meeting of April 11th, were approved as submitted. Ewing abstained.

Public Comments
Katie Fisher - Read the letter from INC re: Parks Designation. (Letter is included with minutes.)

Kelly Casement (910 Curtis st.) Representing herself wished to comment re: POFBA and could not stay for that section of the meeting. Casement expressed concerns about fees to maintain parks and about park's apparent need to make money off the park users. Doesn't understand why Parks would ask for more than needed to maintain when park users pay taxes for regular use of the parks.

Ean Tafoya - District 8 - Fuller Park. Civic CRT park also home away from home. Suggesting a partnership with area businesses and govt. entities to provide volunteers to clean park. Would like to state for public record that he will contribute and support these efforts. Please email him at tafoyaet@gmail.com

Manager’s Report
Lauri Dannemiller reminded the Board of upcoming public meetings and encouraged members to attend as many as possible.

Other Items
Erin Brown, Deputy Manager
Brown provided the MyDenver program update which launched officially March 27th at Washington Park Recreation Center with the Mayor and Park staff in attendance. 5347 kids were enrolled by end of April. Have enrolled an additional 844 kids so far this month. Board members
Fred Weiss
Weiss reviewed changes to draft policy (refer to hand-outs). Weiss said there had been further public outreach since April PRAB meeting with 4 community meetings. Revisions to the draft policy were made to the fee structure and the cost recovery financial model to account for distinguishing between Exclusive and Non-exclusive use of park space. Haynes asked what Parks does with the profits [in the cost recovery above 100%] Dannemiller said the revenues go to subsidize non-cost recovered functional areas or programs, actual maintenance, and children's programs.

Dannemiller thanked the steering committee (named all participants) and said she thinks steering committee model worked very well and will use in future policy development. Weiss and Dannemiller say Policy is encouraging healthy activity because we are licensing it. Basing it on cost recovery. Making activities legal.

Park staff responses to objections: 1) Fees are too high. Response: Businesses can move to tier 2 park in off-peak time so fee can be more affordable to small business. 2) Should we have commercial activity in park at all? Response: Yes, we already do (concessions, leagues, etc). This policy is the same as existing but for different types of activity. 3) Group size limit is too small. Response: Impact on park was concern and reason for limit. Think 25 limit strikes the balance sought. Pryor asked about decibel limit for PM too. Weiss said it s not a concern at this time. May revisit. Weiss added that recommendations can be made to add parks to list. Haynes asked how enforcement will be handled. Dannemiller said the groups will get a number for each zone so they can be identified. Admin citations will be used. Weiss said that space limit for exclusive use groups refers to main use not momentary uses like a 40yd dash.

POFBA Public Hearing Speakers:
Caren Elenowitz (stroller strides) - meet at Central Park six days /week except during winter. After first draft of policy, the group found their fees would be apx. $7000. After revision, fees would be $2000. Has issue for paying monies for services being rendered anyway. Says Central Park does not currently have users in the park at the time her group works out. Her group wants a lower fee closer to a $50 flat rate per month. $600/year.

Katie Fisher (INC) – Had original concerns about noise level which may be addressed with changes in new draft. Zones in parks should be vetted by neighborhoods. Zones and schedules need more consideration. INC would like policy re-addressed after this summer.

Dave Felice - District 8 - INC member and member of stakeholder group. No commercial enterprise should use a public space as their primary place of business. Too many parks and zones are included in the draft policy. Policy overwhelms the parks and provides an unfair tax advantage for certain businesses. It appears the Manager has already made up her mind to move forward with policy.

Megan Zucker (mom) - Encouraged board to read documents with regard to cost recovery.
Doesn't see how fees represent needs re: to maintenance and how activities qualify as commercial use of park. Said she feels like this policy is criminalizing the use of the park, same maintenance whether using as a private citizen. Not enforceable, not sure if it will result in harassment. Denver is going in wrong direction. Denver is outdoor-based fitness-oriented city and we should be leading the nation. Everyone is benefitting, not just individuals [associated with business].

Teddi Bryant - Wants to go on the record - HotMammas business does care about Parks. Has been running her program for 10 years. Appreciates the revision to policy with the distinction on “Exclusive use vs Non-Exclusive, and the lower fees. But when doing the math- the costs are still high and prohibitive. Monthly lower rate would be fair. Wants to be on record as saying she doesn't believe she should pay any fees for park use.

Rebecca Olgeirson – Lives in Park hill, exercises in Central Park - is worried about the fees. Said, “I know you've reviewed other cities' permitting. Consider how little San Diego charges for these permits.” Hopes Board is hearing fees are too high and that we understand how important these programs are.

Diana McHale - Park Hill resident - supports Caren and other exercise groups. Would like to see lower fees for mom exercise groups.

Danielle Vitale - has been a participant in Hot Mammamas for 10 years. Great way to exercise and also build community. Supports Teddi and others' request for more reasonable fees.

Shirley Schley - Lifetime native - Doesn't want parks to be used by entrepreneurs. Thinks if policy is pursued it should go to vote of the people.

**Board Discussion**

Board members asked staff to clarify complaints against groups like Stoller Strides and HotMommas (non-exclusive use fitness groups for new mothers). Dannemiller said the most recent complaints were the impetus for starting the policy discussion, but complaints had been made in previous years and that the issue has been on the back burner for a long time. The Board asked questions about defining cost-recovery, recurring versus one-time use and different uses of zones. Dannemiller stated that a flat fee doesn't get you to cost recovery model.

Pryor asked Dannemiller to explain process about how parks were included in Tier one and Tier two. Dannemiller said staff looked at several factors:
1) Where is business activity occurring now?
2) Where is there suitable parking? Restrooms?
3) One park in each location chosen to be Tier 1

**BOARD ACTION ITEM: Policy Motion**

**Motion:** Twarogowski moved the Board accept the POFBA revised draft policy as it was presented. **Seconded:** Haynes.

**Yes-8; No-8. Motion Failed.**
**Motion:** Elms moved the Board adopt the Exclusive Use Fee Structure in the POFBA draft policy as it was presented and that the Board adopt the cost recovery model at the 100% level for the Non-Exclusive Use. **Seconded:** Robinson. Watson: Requested a friendly amendment that the Board review policy fee structure annually. **Yes-8; No-8. Motion Failed**

**Motion:** Watson moved to table the vote on fees for this meeting. **Seconded:** Robinson. **Motion Passes (all Ayes, no abstentions).**

**BOARD ACTION ITEM: Procedures Motion**
**Motion:** Pryor moved that Central Park be moved to Tier 2 and that Sonny Lawson be added to the parks included in the policy. **Seconded:** Twarogowski. **Motion Passes Unanimously.**

**Economics Committee: Budget White Paper**
Sharp presented the Committee Report which is a review and comment of the proposed annual budget for the Department of Parks and Recreation.

**BOARD ACTION ITEM:**
**Motion:** Sharp moved the Board accept the Economics Committee White Paper as presented. **Seconded:** Watson. Copeland made a friendly amendment to strike the second sentence under the New Properties section. **Motion Passes Unanimously.**

**Other Announcements**
Pryor reminded members about the Better Blocks event in Sonny Lawson Park on May 11th.

**Adjournment**
The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary McCoin

(Signed Upon Approval at Next Month Mtg), (Recording) Secretary
May 5, 2013

Lauri Dannemiller, Manager
Denver Parks and Recreation
City and County of Denver

RE: Proposed Park Designations

Dear Manager Dannemiller,

We are very glad that DPR is undertaking the designation by ordinance process for the 30% of our parks that need this effort. We understand that it is not always a simple matter, but it is of great importance. Every neighborhood in Denver depends on its parks for natural beauty and health and inspiration. Thank you for this effort.

This letter is for the purpose of urging you to hold public meetings with interested citizens as you proceed to review the currently “undesignated” portion of Denver’s park portfolio. Of course, these meetings should precede bringing recommendations to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board.

As you know, pursuant to Section 2.4.5 of Denver’s City Charter, no land acquired by the City of Denver after December 31, 1955, shall be deemed a “park” unless specifically designated such by City ordinance.

At the January 15th, 2013, meeting of INC’s Parks and Recreation Committee meeting, Assistant Park Manager Scott Gilmore reported that at that time only about 70% of Denver’s parks were “designated” pursuant to the City Charter. He explained that the intent was to review the remaining 30% for future designation, but that you had already selected a group of parks to be recommended to City Council, which was referred to as “Round 1.” He went on to explain that a “Round 2” is contemplated for later this year, to be followed by more as time permits for Denver Parks and Recreation to review its real estate portfolio.

Toward that end, on April 1 Denver City Council acted on the first round of new park “designations” by enacting the “Round 1” set of ordinances to designate more parks. These new designations are commendable and a step in the right direction, but there is a need for a transparent and public process as you move forward to review Denver’s remaining undesignated parks.

As explained by Mr. Gilmore, it is anticipated that perhaps as much as 10% of the park system might not qualify for various reasons. Those reasons included possible perceived “problems” such as title or ownership issues, utility easements, and “pending or anticipated plans for making/expanding non-park uses within the park.”
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In keeping with and as another reminder of INC’s strong belief that neighborhoods be involved in important City decision-making processes at the earliest stages, the public should be included in the review process of Denver’s undesignated parks. This crucial so that all of the information is clear and transparent regarding what lands are or are not being recommended for designation. This public review process should include two-way communication with the opportunity to ask questions and express opinions about what areas should be recommended for designation.

While at the end of the day there may be disagreements regarding certain areas that are not recommended for designation, a clear and transparent review process will help to keep any such disagreements to a minimum.

In furtherance of this goal, we urge you to consider now how best to accomplish this public review process of Denver’s remaining undesignated park land portfolio, and to announce to the public your intentions and a time table for when public meetings might be held.

Again, thank you for your positive effort to move forward with additional park designations. We look forward to working with you in the future as the process continues.

Respectfully,

Larry Ambrose
President, INC

Cc: Mayor Michael B. Hancock
INC Parks & Recreation Committee
INC Executive Committee
Denver City Council