

Resolution Regarding the LMTF Stewardship Plan

Water Committee

6/26/03

The Water Committee of the Lake Merced Task Force has adopted the following resolutions with respect to the Stewardship Plan:

- 1) We support the Steering Committee action to propose the development of a General Policy that will guide individual project development. Further, we agree with the Recreation Committee recommendation that no new projects be undertaken at Lake Merced until that General Policy has been adopted. We believe that should be accomplished within at most 90 days.
- 2) We hope that the committee charged with the development of this General Policy will continue to review and consolidate the many plans and programs pertaining to Lake Merced. These include the Task Force Stewardship Program and the Comprehensive Management Plan for Lake Merced as well as:
 - a. For the Recreation and Park Department: the Capital Improvement Plan, the Significant Natural Resource Area Management Plan, the Strategic Plan, as well as a variety of Action Plans.
 - b. For the Public Utilities Commission: the Capital Improvement Plan, the Recycled Water Plan, the Groundwater Management Plan, the Wastewater Management Plan, and the Westside Basin Management Plan.
- 3) While no new projects should be undertaken during the development of a General Policy, we expect and recommend that the various Task Force Committees can and will undertake high-priority projects in their areas of interest in parallel with the development and consolidation of the various detailed plans described in paragraph 2).
- 4) Finally, we recommend that new emphasis be placed on “Assuring that an implementation plan is prepared that identifies resources, time-lines and responsibilities in sufficient detail to assure successful implementation” of these high-priority projects, as called for in our original Memorandum of Understanding.

Ross Wilkinson of the Lakewood Tenants Association submits the following proposed resolution for a vote at the LMTF meeting of July 9, 2003 (a brief discussion follows the text of the proposed resolution, which is in quotations):

Resolution Regarding Membership

"Resolved that, as the rules that have been approved at the meeting of April 9, 2003 provide that members must be 'stakeholders in the well-being of Lake Merced' and as the Rules Committee, in presenting the draft of such rules explicitly noted (sec. 3) that "It was believed that it was not the intent of the membership to grandfather all of our groups in perpetuity, and that clarification was needed,' the Membership Committee is directed to obtain from every current member the letter described in section 4.2 of the rules including the 'concise description of the organization's stakeholder interest in the Lake' and to submit a report at the next quarterly meeting of the LMTF containing the verbatim descriptions provided by each member along with a recommendation by the Membership Committee to LMTF for acceptance or rejection of each such statement as conforming or not conforming to the rules.

"In assigning this task to the Membership Committee, the LMTF members at large note that the Membership Committee minutes posted on our website and titled 'minutes 3/5/03' (which, despite the title, also contain minutes of a later meeting) appear to reflect a decision/recommendation by such committee to allow any organization to become a member of the LMTF without meeting the requirement in the rules (4.2) to demonstrate a 'stakeholder interest'. The LMTF membership further notes that, per our rules, the authority of the Membership Committee, as to member qualification and acceptance, is advisory only and that authority for definition of membership qualification requirements and the actual acceptance of individual members rests solely with the LMTF members collectively. As such, the LMTF membership at large reject the above decision/recommendation of the Membership Committee and specifically direct the committee members to abide by the rules as written and accepted."

My organization notes that the term "stakeholder interest" may need explicit definition in the rules to enable the Membership Committee to fulfill this request. Such a definition will require careful consideration and precise definition. My organization concurs with the obvious intent of the rules in restricting membership to some extent and believes that, as a lobbying organization, such restrictions are necessary to give validity and weight to the recommendations of the LMTF. Restricting membership and, therefore, voting rights would not necessarily preclude participation by other interest groups as "partners" nor would it prevent LMTF from inviting representatives of any entity from speaking at LMTF events.

I will be out of state during the meeting of July 9th but my alternate, Mona Cereghino will be there barring unforeseen circumstances.

Respectfully submitted,

Ross Wilkinson
Lakewood Tenants Association