



Minutes
Surf Camp/School Policy Advisory Task Force
City of Pacifica

REGULAR MEETING – 6 PM

Tuesday May 18, 2021

VIA Zoom Link: <https://zoom.us/j/91956994341>

CALL TO ORDER:

Facilitator Cindy Abbott: called the meeting to order at 6:02pm. She welcomed the members and thanked them for attending.

Recreation Specialist Kenda Seeley: read the COVID announcement.

I Roll Call:

Surf Camp Task Force Members Present: Cindy Abbott, Kevin Kellogg, Cynthia Knowles, Cliff Hodges, Johnny Irwin, Stefan Mayo, Kimberly Williams, Malcolm Carson, and Nia Rivers.

Members Absent: None

Members Excused: None

Staff Present: Director Michael Perez, Recreation Assistant Supervisor Beth Phipps, Aquatics Coordinator Anthony Schriver, and Recreation Specialist Kenda Seeley.

II Administrative Business:

A. Operating Procedures:

Cindy Abbott: reminded the members to have their cameras turned on during the meetings and to use the raise hand feature or to make sure their physical hand it held high enough to see. Throughout the discussions, each person will be called upon for comments. The City of Pacifica is now using the Closed Caption Icon, she explained how to hide the subtitles.

B. Approval of Minutes:

Cindy Abbott: called for a motion to approve the minutes of the 04/20/2021 meeting. **Motion was made by Kevin Kellogg, seconded by Cynthia Knowles, motion carried 9-0.**

C. Parking Lot items:

Cindy Abbott: mentioned that the Parking Lot topics will be introduced in a PowerPoint slide later in this meeting for recommendations.

Director Perez: advised that the current Parking Lot list was sent out in this evenings packet. He explained how the items are compiled from previous meeting discussion

III Current Policy Review – 90 Minutes:

A. Operating Procedures Update.

Cindy Abbott: explained that the current policy has evolved over a long period of time and that currently there is no Purpose Statement. An example purpose statement from Santa Monica was put up on the screen and she asked the members 1) what they think about having a purpose statement and 2) Is everything on this list, what they are trying to accomplish?

Kevin Kellogg: commented that it generally captures what they want. It is vague and not specific.

Cynthia Knowles: said that it covers the main areas bullet point 4 "public safety is protected" is too broad.

Cindy Abbott: suggested modifying that language.

Malcom Carlson: comment on the last bullet where it states "opportunities for surfing lessons are maximized" it does not reflect what is the currently policy.

Cliff Hodges: advised that overall, it looks good but agrees with Malcom Carlson that maximized is not the correct word to use and suggested the word "available."

Stefan Mayo: echoed Malcom Carlson and Cliff Hodges comments. He agrees with everything else.

Johnny Irwin: commented that on bullet point four "public safety is protected," may be used for scapegoating. He would like to see a comment in the Purpose Statement that refers to promoting access and equity. He agrees with everything else.

Cindy Abbott: asked Johnny Irwin if access would fit into bullet point four where it states "instructional opportunities are diverse"?

Johnny Irwin: answered yes, maybe if it was worded differently.

Nia Rivers: stated that over all the statement is okay but that things need to be sharpened up.

Kimberly Williams: agrees that the word "available" needs to replace the word "maximized" on bullet point six and that there needs to be wording for non-profits and accessibility.

Cindy Abbott: she agrees with using "available" for "maximized" on bullet point six and that the term "public safety" needs to be updated and worded differently on bullet point four. She also agrees that the term "commercial purposes" in bullet point five needs to be changed to include all camps. She asked the members of the task force to submit recommendations to the PB&R Department with updated wording that they would like to see on the last three bullet-points.

Director Perez: request that all recommendations be sent to his attention.

Cindy Abbott: asked the members if they would be willing to send back their recommendations by June 1, 2021.

Malcom Carlson: asked that the PowerPoint material be sent out in Word.doc format.

Cindy Abbott: advised that the Overall Application Qualification Review slide and the Current Guidelines and Rules – CAPP Criteria slide will be talked about in more detail at the June 15, 2021 meeting. She asked the members if they had any questions now about any of the bullets prior to having the next meeting.

Cliff Hodges: commented that the proof of WSI or CPR has changed. He advised that the WSI certification is a certification that teaches people how to teach people to swim and does not feel it is necessary to include it as a qualification.

Cindy Abbott: asked if staff has recently included this in the wording.

Anthony Schriver: answered that the WSI was recommended by the PB&R Department and agreed that the certification is geared more towards a pool aspect and can be revisited.

Director Perez: commented that the wording of and/or regarding the WSI may have gotten misconstrued but advised that it has been a qualification for some time now. He said that it makes sense to change this back to WSI or CRP certification.

Stefan Mayo: asked if the qualifications are geared towards both commercial and CAPP programs?

Cindy Abbott: answered correct.

Stefan Mayo: asked how the last two bullets are being currently monitored?

Cindy Abbott: asked staff if they can comment on the current process to monitor proficiencies in surfing and educating and also the scheduling of classes.

Beth Phipps: explained that the surf camps give the PB&R Department a certification or sampling during the annual permitting process. Usually something comes in from a website or a tentative class calendar. She advised that these are pieces that really need to be reviewed with the restructuring process because these have been historically hard to collect from the current camps.

Cindy Abbott: asked staff if the Facilities Use Form is a final part of the application process?

Director Perez: answered yes, that it is part of the application process.

Johnny Irwin: asked if business licenses will apply to non-profits and if there is a fee, can it be waived? He agrees that the WSI certification does not apply. He also asked what the standard for the basic curriculum and surf citizenship/etiquette is and commented that it needs to be looked at and updated from an equity and access standpoint. He also asked who monitors the proper surf equipment. He commented that he does not think there is a correlation between being a good surfer and good educator.

Cindy Abbott: advised that there is not a fee for a business license for nonprofits in the City of Pacifica and asked staff if it is being required for the CAPP program?

Director Perez: advised that this Task Force is here to make recommendations and licensing is an example of that. He asked that all comments and or questions like the ones Johnny asked should be put into the recommendation that is due by June 1, 2021.

Cindy Abbott: commented that bullet point three was intentionally added regarding the curriculum, surf citizenship/equity and thought it would be an idea to revisit the notes from those previous meetings. She said that the ninth bullet regarding proficient in surfing and being a good educator may need to be reworded.

Cynthia Knowles: comment that on the CAPP Permit Additional Criteria page, it requires a 501c3. She also commented that it would be up to the company hiring to determine who is a good educator.

Cindy Abbott: explained that these additions were added in 2013.

Cliff Hodges: mentioned that proficiency at surfing and proper equipment have been a requirement all along. It was never assumed that staff was going to evaluate these qualifications, but that they were only requirements and a way to get rid of a surf school who was grossly negligent. Scheduling is always changing and very difficult to provide in advance. He suggested submitting "Use Reports" instead of a tentative schedule.

Cindy Abbott: asked Cliff Hodges if he remembers when the surf citizenship/etiquette was added to the qualifications?

Cliff Hodges: answered that he did not know the specific time but feels all schools should be abiding by that requirement.

Malcolm Carson: asked Cliff Hodges if he offers specific times slots or do they book when time is requested?

Cliff Hodges: answered that they schedule using both methods.

Cindy Abbott: advised that the task force will be coming back to these slides at the next meeting. She moved to the CAPP Additional Criteria slide.

Johnny Irwin: advised that the guidelines and rules are the same ones that they submitted earlier.

Cindy Abbott: mentioned that the goal was to not burden one organization over another with these rules. She asked if there were any questions.

Malcolm Carlson: stated that he thought a few of these bullet points were subjective. He asked how the City was determining an organizations expertise and how the organizations determine underrepresented groups, obstacles, and public access. He asked if this was necessary.

Johnny Irwin: asked if it was the third and sixth bullet point in question?

Malcolm Carlson: answered third, sixth, seventh, and then the statement at the bottom.

Johnny Irwin: answered that Brown Girl Surf and City Surf Project assess need on a sliding scale and that there are variables on how a nonprofit will charge.

Malcolm Carlson: said if they look at bullet point six and its content, are there any nonprofits who are not providing those services as well as in bullet point three?

Johnny Irwin: answered yes, if a nonprofit is providing programming as in bullet point six, they would most likely be providing the same types of programming as in bullet point three. He explained that bullet point three is focused around providing access to groups who usually would not have it, and bullet point six is focused on what a nonprofit charges.

Malcolm Carlson: responded that what is charged is either A or B and is subjective. He remarked that it is hard to evaluate what groups haven't had access verses what groups have. If a nonprofit is not charging a specific group and is bringing them to the beach, it has already been determined somehow, that they didn't have access.

Johnny Irwin: responded that underrepresented and disenfranchised can mean many different groups. The mission of the nonprofit determines access clarification. He asked Malcolm Carlson to ask his question differently because he is unclear on what the question really is?

Kevin Kellogg: asked if he could explain. He used an example of looking at the criteria using two nonprofits 1) Boy Scouts Club and 2) City Surf Club. If you look at the criteria, the Boy Scouts would be fine, they are not having to pay but it is significantly reduced and then you look at the criteria for disenfranchised groups and then you have to pick City Surf Club. He thinks the third bullet point needs to be there.

Malcolm Carlson: asked what if the Boy Scouts are from Bayview-Hunter's Point?

Kevin Kellogg: answered then it would have to be shown in the application and criteria.

Malcolm Carlson: advised that he doesn't know how Pacifica would actually determine how one group is disenfranchised vs another.

Kevin Kellogg: replied that it is subjective, which is the point and it is hard to determine.

Johnny Irwin: clarified that Malcolm is getting to where the CARB criteria comes into place. The CARB will be tasked with reviewing applications and determining access as if reviewing a grant. He suggested the people who are on the CARB group be responsible for knowing the criteria and understanding need.

Malcolm Carlson: asked Johnny Irwin why he thought it was important for Pacifica to be able to make that distinction?

Johnny Irwin: answered that it defines who is getting the permits and who isn't. The criteria is designed to determine access and define who has had access or who has not. He agreed that he is willing to opening that part up to suggestions.

Malcolm Carlson: responded that he doesn't like to see the City of Pacifica in the position of making subjective determinations no matter who you put into that position. He doesn't think there are a lot of nonprofits in a position to bring underrepresented people to the beach to teach them how to surf at no cost. As a lawyer, he would like to find more objective criteria that determines these distinctions without having to peer into the history of every different ethnic group out there, every different income group, or every different geographical area to determine that if in the past or the present they go to the beach as much as other groups do.

Cindy Abbott: reminded the members that these are going to be organizations that are coming in and wanting to do this. This is all going to be on the next agenda topic on criteria, and she sees the third bullet point as being the intent and purpose of this program for organizations that come to the City of Pacifica who want a permit. There needs to be some additional voting in the future when multiple applications hit certain criteria, but we are not there in the program yet. Decisions made by the CARB are future thinking visions regarding what criteria comes into play.

Malcolm Carlson: reiterated that he thinks the criteria is too subjective.

Cynthia Knowles: commented that on bullet point number three, the groups are the ones facing the obstacles. Since last July, it has been discussed in length, why there are not certain populations at the beach, why not all cultures are represented, and many public comments have been made. Permits have been approved and granted to the same surf camps here in Pacifica all along. She thinks that it is the nonprofits who have been disenfranchised by being denied the right to a permit. She commented that the fear of acceptance at the beach has been a concern through the process.

Cindy Abbott: reiterated that this is the key topic for the June meeting and to submit any recommendations. She moved to the next slide, Current Guidelines and Rules and briefly explained the information being presented. She asked if there were any questions? She moved to the next slide, Current Guidelines and Rules Continued.

Cynthia Knowles: asked if ratios fall out of the current guidelines, will they still be considered?

Cindy Abbott: answered correct. The numbers just cannot exceed the set number of the ratio.

Johnny Irwin: asked if there are policies around surf clubs vs surf schools regarding jerseys, lessons, and permits.

Stefan Mayo: advised that any activities that Pedro Point Surf Club arranges, has to be sanctioned beach contest events that are permitted. Other than that, they do fundraising and picnics at Frontierland Park.

Cindy Abbott: asked if the club was going to do a Surf Safari event down in Ventura, would they need a permit for that?

Stephan Mayo: answered only if they are reserving a camp spot and staying overnight.

Cindy Abbott: asked Director Perez if the Surf Day Pass covered both human and footed events.

Directed Perez: explained that there have been day passes issued for fundraisers and small onetime gatherings that fall outside of lessons. Surf Camps and Surf Clubs fall under different policies and requirements.

Cindy Abbott: asked to move on to the next slide, Considerations, Recommendations, and Revisions. She briefly went over each bullet point and gave a general explanation.

Kimberly Williams: commented that an RFP process would be the right direction to move in

as far as equitable access across the board for every camp but thinks that the process may need modifications.

Nia Rivers: had no comments or questions.

Stefan Mayo: commented that right now with the way permitting is, it is a small town feel where everyone knows one another, does the right thing, and there is a sense of community and awareness. By moving to a RFP process, the requirements would open the scope of having a Beach Marshal which would strain the City with more costs and resources to have it operate effectively. The City will need to manage more variables than it has to manage now.

Cliff Hodges: advised that he is not in favor of moving to an RFP process. There is a lot that goes into building a sound business and then saying every two or three years, the opportunity could be taken away from them is not right. The RFP sounds great when it addresses opening up opportunities, but no one discusses the downside of it when a business goes under and people lose their jobs. He mentioned that the City should also see the value in having long standing capable, and profitable companies who are committed to providing quality services at the beach in their City. He would be in favor of an RFP process if it entailed having a longer frequency and weighed heavily on the years of experience teaching lessons at Linda Mar Beach. With an RFP process, there will be schools doing this for the wrong reasons or there will be a mess of new schools who are trying to learn each other and who are trying to figure everything out every couple of years which he does not think is a good situation.

Cindy Abbott: asked Cliff Hodges what he thought would be a good frequency of time for an RFP?

Cliff Hodges: answered it would be good to look at other beach and forestry service RFP timelines.

Cynthia Knowles: she liked the suggestion of extending the frequency and stated that the RFP process was only a suggestion early on. She remembers a conversation about overhauling the permit process and thinks that is where the RFP suggestion came from.

Cindy Abbott: advised that she is giving everyone the opportunity to touch on these bullet points which will be discussed further at the next meeting.

Johnny Irwin: commented that he doesn't think this is the appropriate time to be requiring the commercial schools to do RFP's. He wanted to touch on the third bullet point, he is in favor of shifting to load.

Malcolm Carson: agrees with Cliff Hodges when he said that the RFP should be heavily weighted on experience at Linda Mar Beach and that the frequency should be raised to five or 10 years.

Kevin Kellogg: agrees with Cliff Hodges on the RFP's. He is not for an RFP and would not extend the frequency to 10 years. If the RFP process is implemented, some of the commercial schools should go through the process so that the City can determine who is interested in applying for the permits and then give them priority as a commercial school.

Cindy Abbott: advised that she is in favor of an RFP process and that the frequency should be extended to five years with the weighting of experience. She is concerned when talking about access when favoring experience. She explained that they have had proposals come up in the past where other commercial schools have showed interest in providing a commercial camp service at Linda Mar Beach. This is the time to have an overall in-depth conversation regarding all surf camps. The topics are mixed so far and need to be discussed further.

Kimberly Williams: advised that she has very strong feelings about what has been discussed so far. She wants to know if there are successful examples of National Parks and Land Management addressing diversity and equity issues with such long permitting frequencies. Getting the CAPP program off the ground is the most important part but using weighted experience with the current schools is a huge value judgement and it would only perpetuate systemic racism because you would be cementing in what has always been in place. We need to find a way to include other operators. It cannot be the same four operators in perpetuity. She does not feel that extending the frequency to five years is good. It shuts out the chance of having new operators while extending the opportunities for existing operators. She noted that they need to reach for a better solution.

Cindy Abbott: took a time check and asked the members if they want to discuss the next agenda item or talk more in-depth about this slide. The choice was to move to the next agenda item.

IV Update From Current CAPP Permit Holders:

Johnny Irwin: gave an update on his current pilot CAPP permit. Since January, City Surf has been going out to Linda Mar Beach on Tuesday's, Wednesday's, Thursday's, and Friday afternoons. They go to Half Moon Bay and Ocean Beach when waves are smaller. Groups are about five to seven max with COVID protocols. The weather for Spring has provided some tough conditions. They are looking forward to summer conditions.

Cindy Abbott: asked if they are there after school hours.

Johnny Irwin: answered that most of the students are participating in Distance Learning and have school hours until about 2:30 pm, so they are there out on the beach until about 6:30 pm. He mentioned that they have a few more experienced surf students who do not wear jerseys. They consider them more as a Surf Club or Surf Team or they forget to bring the jerseys.

Adriana Guerrero: introduced herself as the new Executive Director of Brown Girl Surf. From January – March they started their hiring process and on Saturday March 20, 2021 they started volunteer training. Since then they have had five successful programs at Linda Mar Beach with 46 participants total. There have had 14 ½ hours of program, with 13 new participants, four of which had surfed for the very first time. They will be ending their season in Pacifica on Wednesday May 12, 2021 but will be ending the full season in Half Moon Bay on June 5, 2021. She commented that they have had good responses from the community while on the beach and has been able to share about their programs.

Cindy Abbott: asked for clarification on the ending of their spring program.

Adriana Guerrero: advised that they have three program seasons. Spring, Summer, and Fall. They will be launching their summer program at the beginning of July and they will have four sessions.

Cindy Abbott: asked the members if there were any questions for Johnny or Adriana

Stephan Mayo: Welcomed Adriana and agreed with Johnny about the weather conditions.

Cynthia Knowles: thanked both Adriana and Johnny for the updates. She commented that she is a surfer and has a problem with getting past the break. She has concerns about safety but is excited to learn how to surf and stand up paddle.

Cindy Abbott: asked for additional questions or comments and moved to meeting to Public Comments

V Public Comments:

Meg: introduced herself as a long time surfer and supporter of Brown Girl Surf and City Surf Project. She has thoughts about language and wanted to clarify what underrepresented and disenfranchised means. She feels adding on an appendix might be helpful that includes but is not limited to racial demographics, geographical demographics, socio demographics, or people with physical or cognitive differences. This CAPP program is setting precedence for access and equity around the beach communities. She asked who determines crowding and who determines safety? She asked who proposed the RFP process and she feels it is a good process?

Oliva VanDame: announced herself a volunteer instructor for the organization Brown Girl Surf. She thinks about what diversity, inclusion, and equity means to this group and wonders what the push back is on welcoming more people in. She would like the members of the this task force to remember that they are representing a larger community and to think about who is in their circles, who they feel comfortable around, and who they feel safe being around at the beach, and to reevaluate why this is your way of thinking. Think about what it would mean in your community for someone else who isn't thinking in that same way as you are. She has other thoughts she would like to share in future meetings or written comments.

Cindy Abbott: closed public comments.

VI Adjournment:

Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:16 PM

Next Meeting: June 15, 2021 6:00 PM

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

X

Facilitator, Cindy Abbott

