



## PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION AGENDA REPORT

---

August 10, 2023  
Item 5

**TITLE: REVIEW AND RECOMMEND CITY COUNCIL ADOPT A RESOLUTION APPROVING REQUIREMENTS FOR CO-SPONSORSHIP STATUS AND REPEALING RESOLUTION NO. 98-125**

**SUMMARY**

In September 1998, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 98-125 establishing Recreation Group Sponsorship and classification and repealing resolution No 83-60 which also addressed recreation group sponsorship and classification. Upon review of Resolution No. 98-125, staff found the document to be outdated, with several areas that were not pertinent to current co-sponsorship needs. Staff researched multiple co-sponsorship policies from other cities and developed a draft policy. This draft was provided to the current co-sponsored groups for feedback and that feedback has been incorporated into an updated draft policy (Attachment 1) for the commission's review.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Review and recommend City Council adopt a resolution approving requirements for co-sponsorship status and repealing resolution No. 98-125.

**FINANCIAL STATEMENT**

There is no financial impact resulting from this report.

## **BACKGROUND**

In June 1966 the City Council adopted Resolution No. 66-92 adopting a policy for Recreation Group Sponsorship and Classification. This policy addressed the following: outlined a general policy for group sponsorship, defined the types of groups that would be sponsored and created requirements for co-sponsorship status.

In February 1983, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 83-60 that established policy for recreation group sponsorship and classification and repealed Resolution No. 66-92. This resolution established the 75% Pleasanton membership requirement for all categories, added insurance requirements and adjusted and removed language throughout the document.

In September 1998, the City Council once again adopted a resolution that adjusted the co-sponsorship policy. Resolution No. 98-125 repealed Resolution No. 83-60 and established policies for recreation group sponsorship and classifications. This resolution added language stating that co-sponsored groups submit required documents to the city prior to field allocations and that new groups requesting co-sponsorship be required to submit a three-year plan for business growth. There were also additional language changes, and some information added requiring groups to remove litter, trash and clean the facility after each use.

Since 1998, staff have found that significant portions of Resolution No. 98-125 no longer apply and that the policy needs to be updated.

## **DISCUSSION**

Staff spent time researching a variety of co-sponsorship policies throughout the state, with specific focus on Bay Area city co-sponsorship policies. Staff also met with current co-sponsored groups and discussed the policy as well as the changes staff are recommending. Based on research and discussion, staff have drafted new co-sponsorship requirements which are more closely aligned with the needs of the current co-sponsored groups and the city. Staff shared the draft recommendations with current co-sponsored groups and offered the groups a review period for feedback. Finally, staff met again with several groups to discuss their current resident member percentages and answered many questions.

The proposed changes to the co-sponsorship requirements (Attachment 1):

- Clearly outline the definition of a co-sponsored organization
- Remove general information that provided unfair requirements on new groups that do not align with the city's beliefs on diversity, equity and inclusion and were not required of current co-sponsored groups. (*General Policy items I. A.-I.*)
- Remove co-sponsored groups that were never utilized (*Types of Groups A. 2., 3. and B. 1. And 2.*)
- Clarify and update the Requirements for Co-Sponsored Status section, including:
  - Lowering the resident membership from 75% to 65% (currently four of the eight field using co-sponsored groups do not meet the 75% resident membership requirement)

- Requiring a minimum number of participants in each organization
- Clarifying how resident membership will be counted and reviewed by staff
- Update and clarify the department and city responsibilities section to include language regarding city maintenance, equipment provided, and city owned storage facilities utilized by co-sponsored organizations
- Update requirements to remove ambiguous language and to include the correct name of the Library and Recreation Department.

Staff provided a copy of the draft requirements to the current co-sponsored organizations and asked for their feedback. As almost all groups requested additional time to review the requirement changes, staff extended the feedback deadline for one month. In addition, staff met with the four co-sponsored groups that are currently not meeting the 75% resident membership to review their rosters and discuss their feedback regarding their initial requests to not lower the resident membership percentage. After extending the deadline for feedback and meeting with several groups to discuss the requirement changes the following feedback was received:

<b>Co-Sponsored Organization</b>	<b>Feedback Received</b>
Ballistic United Soccer Club	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests that the requirements for new groups to provide a three-year plan be added back to the document</li> <li>• Believe there should be a minimum number of participants required for each co-sponsored group</li> <li>• Believe that co-sponsored groups should not be charged field use fees as residents have already paid city taxes and would be double taxed for play</li> </ul>
Pleasanton Pride Lacrosse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requests a probationary period for all new co-sponsored groups that would require all new groups to maintain a higher resident membership than current co-sponsored groups</li> <li>• Requests that all co-sponsored groups be charged at the lowest rate possible for field use</li> <li>• Requests that co-sponsored groups be provided with a list of what field fees would contribute towards, i.e.: field maintenance, equipment, etc.</li> <li>• Asked for clarity on what happens to an organization if it falls below the minimum number of players</li> </ul>
RAGE Pleasanton Girls Soccer Club	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adding back original language requiring new groups to provide a three-year business plan and be held at a higher residency rate for one to three years</li> <li>• Requesting that participants on rosters be counted each time they are enrolled in a club program instead of just once</li> <li>• Originally requested that the resident membership</li> </ul>

	percentage not be lowered but have shared that they do not want any current group to lose their status, so they are now in support of the recommended 65%
Pleasanton Storm Lacrosse Club	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided recommendations for three options: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lower resident membership requirement to 65%</li> <li>2. Keep membership percentage at 75% but allow their organization to be counted differently as they provide access to boy's lacrosse for cities that do not currently have their own clubs</li> <li>3. Grandfather in current clubs and require all new clubs to meet 75% threshold</li> </ol> </li> </ul>
Pleasanton Girls Softball League	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support staff's recommendation to lower the resident membership number to 65%</li> <li>• Shared that while their organization is not currently meeting the required 75%, they could look for ways to reduce programming that has higher numbers of non-residents but want to stress that their main focus is to provide all girls with the opportunity to learn softball and the life lessons taught by youth sports</li> </ul>
Pleasanton Little League	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PLL provided initial feedback but did not provide feedback after the deadline was extended. Their initial feedback included the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ PLL would like to see an itemized listed of field services currently provided that they believe co-sponsor groups will eventually be charged use fees for</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Cricket for Cubs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cricket or Cubs provided initial feedback but did not provide feedback after the deadline was extended. Their initial feedback included the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ They were not in support of lowering the resident membership number as they felt it would impact the already over requested fields</li> <li>○ Asked to see an itemized list of additional services that will be provided to co-sponsor groups once use fees will be charged</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Pleasanton Junior Football League	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Initially asked for additional time to review as they were new to their position in the club</li> <li>• Did not provide any additional feedback during the extended feedback timeline</li> </ul>

Based on initial feedback received, staff added back language that clarified what responsibilities and services the city would provide and added new language to further clarify the section for co-sponsored groups.

After talking with many groups, staff believe there is support to lower the resident membership requirement from 75% to 65%. Staff want to continue to provide

opportunities for all Pleasanton youth to have access to our parks but understand that many organizations are finding it difficult to maintain the current 75% threshold. Currently, there are no nearby cities that maintain a threshold of higher than 60% resident membership requirements for their youth organizations.

Some co-sponsored groups expressed concern that lowering the resident membership requirement would mean new organizations may qualify for co-sponsorship and thereby overburden the city fields with play and requests for use. Staff have reached out to many nearby cities who already have lower resident membership requirements and none of these cities have experienced a large increase in co-sponsorship application.

Staff do not recommend placing sanctions on new co-sponsor groups. The city values inclusion and welcomes new sports and field uses as our community changes. Cricket has been a welcome addition to the city's co-sponsor groups and field space has been made available for all sports.

After researching several city co-sponsored requirements, creating a draft for review by our current co-sponsored organizations and amending that draft based on feedback received, staff requests that the Parks and Recreation Commission review and recommend City Council adopt a resolution approving requirements for co-sponsorship status and rescinding resolution No. 98-125.

Submitted by:



Michele Crose  
Assistant Director of Library and Recreation

Attachments:

1. Resolution of the City Council of the City of Pleasanton Approving Requirements for Co-Sponsorship Status and Rescinding Resolution No. 98-125