



# Memorandum

**TO:** RULES AND OPEN  
GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE

**FROM:** Tom Manheim

**SUBJECT:** NON-GOVERNMENTAL BODIES

**DATE:** 1-12-10

Approved

Date

1-13-10

## RECOMMENDATION

Amend Sunshine Reform Task Force definition of and reporting requirements for a “Non-Governmental Body” to be consistent with the work of the Non-profit Strategic Engagement Committee. Specifically, approve the following definition and requirements for a “Non-Governmental Body”:

### Definition:

A “Non-Governmental Body” is a non-profit entity that: (1) operates or maintains a City facility for City purposes with a value of over \$5 million; or (2) receives annually at least the amount of the City Manager’s contracting authority (currently \$250,000) in financial assistance from the City.

### Reporting Requirements:

Each Non-Governmental Body will be assigned to a “lead” City Department.

For a Non-Governmental Body that receives annually financial assistance from the City of at least the amount of the City Manager’s contracting authority:

- a. Post financial reports on the NGB’s web site.
- b. Submit information and cooperate with the City, which will conduct an annual financial scan that reviews the NGB’s financial condition based on its audited financial statements.
- c. If the annual financial scan identifies the need for corrective action, submit information and cooperate with the City and the lead department in preparing additional reports to the Public Safety, Finance & Strategic Support Committee with updates on the corrective actions being taken.

- d. In addition, the Non-profit Strategic Engagement Committee will meet regularly to review contract issues and develop processes to address any concerns associated with a Non-Governmental Body that receives annually at least the amount of the City Manager's contracting authority.

For a Non-Governmental Body that operates or maintains a City facility for City purposes with a value over \$5 million, the lead City Department will:

- a. Post reports at least annually, detailing compliance with contractual requirements for facility maintenance.
- b. Report to the Public Safety, Finance & Strategic Support Committee any facility maintenance deficiency that would impede the public's use of or jeopardize the physical integrity of the facility.

### **BACKGROUND**

On August 21, 2007, during the City Council's review and approval of portions of the Sunshine Reform Task Force (SRTF) Phase I proposals pertaining to public meetings, the Council directed staff to continue outreach and gather additional feedback from bodies, including Non-Governmental Bodies (NGBs), regarding the potential effect of the recommendations. Council further directed staff to report back on the topic to the Rules and Open Government Committee (ROGC). On October 24, 2007, staff reported back to the ROGC with recommendations. On April 1, 2008, the ROGC held a special meeting to complete its review of the Phase I recommendations, including those involving Non-Governmental Bodies. Staff informed the ROGC of a new *Non-profit Strategic Engagement* effort to monitor NGBs receiving City funding. The ROGC, and later, the City Council, accepted staff's recommendation that the SRTF recommendations be considered within the context of the Administration's *Non-profit Strategic Engagement* effort.

### **ANALYSIS**

The SRTF recommendations regarding Non-Governmental Bodies were intended to accomplish three goals: 1) increased oversight; 2) increased transparency; and 3) professional maintenance of City facilities managed under contract by non-City entities. The Administration believes the recommendations before the ROGC are consistent with the SRTF's goals but accomplish them in a different way by: 1) combining existing oversight mechanisms with a new, more-effective oversight mechanism that has emerged as a result of the Non-profit Strategic Engagement effort; and 2) adding additional transparency requirements.

The SRTF Phase I proposals created a definition for "Non-Governmental Bodies" and then established requirements for these bodies to ensure better transparency and oversight (Attachment A). Under the SRTF recommendations, any City contractor would be an NGB if it: 1) operates or maintains a community center or a City facility valued at more than \$5 million; or,

RULES COMMITTEE

1-12-10

**Subject:** Non-governmental Bodies

Page 3

2) provides a defined set of direct services and receives more than the City Manager's contracting authority in a year (currently, \$250,000). The defined services covered by this proposal were: 1) Police services; 2) Fire services; 3) Sewage treatment and water utility services; 4) Garbage collection services; 5) Street maintenance services; and 6) Library services.

Under the SRTF proposals, every NGB would be assigned to report to a "policy body" (essentially, City Council, Council Committee, Board or Commission), and would be required to provide annual written reports indicating compliance with contract requirements. Supplemental reports would also be required whenever a contractor made a significant policy or program change, as defined by the SRTF proposal. As the Administration indicated when the SRTF proposals originally came forward, transferring oversight of contracts from staff to a policy body would be duplicative, and time- and resource-intensive for the City and its NGB contractors. In addition, it would run counter to the professional administration of contracts, and would increase significantly the workload of the Council, Council Committees, Boards and Commissions.

The Task Force recommendations were formulated during a period when several high profile non-profits were suffering serious financial difficulties and were seeking financial assistance from the City. Because at least one of these entities also operated a City-owned facility, the Task Force sought to ensure that the definition of an NGB captured non-profits that operated significant City facilities as well as those that received significant funding from the City. The Task Force further expanded the definition to include for-profit entities that met either of the threshold triggers. The resulting SRTF recommendations imposed identical reporting and oversight requirements on four distinct categories of entities:

1. Non-profit entities that receive more than the City Manager's contracting authority.
2. Non-profit entities that manage a City facility valued at more than \$5 million.
3. For-profit entities that receive more than the City Manager's contracting authority.
4. For-profit entities that manage a City facility valued at more than \$5 million.

While the SRTF reporting and oversight requirements for all four categories were identical, each category has distinct characteristics and the City has different systems for selecting a contractor and ensuring contract performance for each category.

Consequently, the Administration is recommending different reporting and oversight mechanisms for each category. In reviewing the following recommendations, it is important to note that the City has stringent targets and oversight requirements for contractors that compete through an RFP process to provide specific City services. As discussed in greater detail below, under the Administration's recommendations, an entity would be exempted from these requirements if it: 1) was granted a contract after competing in an RFP process to provide a specific City service; or, 2) is required as a part of its contract to bring decisions before a body that is subject to the Brown Act.

### **Non-profit Entities/City Manager's Contract Authority**

The recommendations for non-profit entities that receive more than the City Manager's contracting authority are the direct result of the Non-profit Strategic Engagement Platform, which was developed to enhance the oversight and impact of City funding provided to non-profit, community based organizations (CBOs). The Platform represents a significant change in how the City approaches its contractual relationships with non-profits by providing a systematic and proactive operating framework to be used within and across all City Departments when contracting with, evaluating and supporting a CBO through grants or other funding.

The goal of this effort has been to enhance accountability and provide greater uniformity in the policies and procedures governing contract preparation, administration and monitoring. The Committee established an "early warning system" to detect any non-profit that is experiencing a level of fiscal distress that could potentially jeopardize the City's investment of funds. This early warning system would identify when a non-profit organization (that receives annually financial assistance from the City that is at least equal to the City Manager's contracting authority) is facing potential operational and financial problems. A key element of the early warning system is an annual financial scan by the City based on the information contained in the NGBs' annual financial statements.

The Administration is recommending that the SRTF's goals be achieved through the Non-profit Strategic Engagement Platform, since this program would include enhanced oversight of NGBs through the financial scan and enhanced transparency through the reporting of the scan, as well as follow up reports for entities needing corrective actions, to the Public Safety, Finance & Strategic Support Committee. Under the Administration's recommendation, "financial assistance" would include: 1) grants, which are defined as any financial award that is provided to support an approved project or activity to implement a public (or community) purpose; 2) leases at below market rates; and 3) payments for operations and maintenance. Examples of public purposes would include:

- Social services, education, recreational or health services
- Economic development and job creation /retention activities - for example CDBG grants to create jobs in the clean and green sector
- Acquisition, rehabilitation or construction of a facility for one or more of the above purposes

Under the Non-Profit Strategic Engagement approach, the following would be excluded from the definition of grant:

1. A contract that is used to acquire property or services for the City's direct benefit or use, such as Professional Services contracts;
2. Agreements having a subsidy component that is intended to close operational deficits associated with a City facility or service, including Instructor Agreements;
3. Agreements used to acquire, rehabilitate or construct low-income housing including shelters, transitional and permanent housing.

RULES COMMITTEE

1-12-10

**Subject:** Non-governmental Bodies

Page 5

The result of this definition, for instance, would be to eliminate Goodwill, which was identified as a NGB under the SRTF's proposal, but which simply received funding to cover disposal charges associated with hauling away donated items. This definition also clarifies that Business Improvement Districts and Property Business Improvement Districts – where the dollars are simply “passed through” by the City to the BIDs and PBIDs – would be excluded. Also excluded would be contracts with providers for housing voucher programs where the entity is simply a conduit for City funds to be delivered to those in need.

While the organizations covered by this recommendation will change over time, currently the following organizations would be subject to the requirements in this section:

1. Alum Rock Counseling Center, Inc.
2. Breakout Prison Ministries
3. Catholic Charities of Santa Clara County
4. Center for Training and Careers
5. Children's Discovery Museum of San Jose
6. Community Partners for Youth
7. Community Technology Alliance
8. Emergency Housing Consortium
9. Family Supportive Housing Inc
10. Fresh Lines for Youth
11. Health Mobile
12. Health Trust
13. History San Jose
14. Law Foundation of Silicon Valley/  
Mental Health Advocacy Project
15. MACSA
16. Next Door Solutions to Domestic  
Violence
17. Opportunity Fund
18. Our City Forest
19. Pathway Society
20. Rebuilding Together Silicon Valley
21. Sacred Heart Community Service
22. San Jose Conservation Corps
23. San Jose Downtown Association
24. San Jose Jazz Society
25. San Jose Museum of Art
26. San Jose Repertory Theater
27. Santa Clara Family Health Plan
28. Team San Jose
29. Tech Museum of Innovation
30. Workforce Institute

Because the Non-Profit Strategic Engagement Platform would conduct an annual financial scan of every non-profit in this category, the Administration believes it will meet the SRTF's goal of improving fiscal accountability over the City's non-profit partners in a more comprehensive manner than the proposal recommended by the Task Force. In addition, this financial scan will be reported annually to the Public Safety, Finance & Strategic Support Committee, which would ensure increased transparency. Furthermore, the non-profit NGBs captured by the financial assistance threshold would be subject to the following additional requirements:

- a. Posting financial reports on the NGB's web site.
- b. Submitting information and cooperating with the City which will conduct an annual financial scan that reviews the NGB's financial condition.
- c. If the annual financial scan identifies the need for corrective action, submitting information and cooperating with the City and the lead department in preparing

additional reports to the Public Safety, Finance & Strategic Support Committee with updates on corrective actions being taken.

**Non-profit Entities/Managing a City Facility**

Entities falling within this category would be non-profits that operate or maintain a City facility for City purposes with a value of over \$5 million. The Administration’s recommendation defines “operates or maintains” as being the sole occupant of a facility with responsibility for maintenance of that facility. The City has a well-established mechanism in place to ensure that maintenance functions for such facilities are performed thoroughly; under contract to the City, an independent facility management company conducts a quarterly inspection that includes a review of the facility’s maintenance history as well as the current state of equipment. This review identifies necessary corrective actions, which are reviewed on a quarterly basis by staff with the entity responsible for maintenance.

Under the Administration’s recommendation, the City would maintain its existing oversight mechanisms. However new requirements dictating how the Administration reports the results of its oversight would ensure greater transparency so that the public can be assured that the City is monitoring and the NGB is performing consistent with its obligations. All of the entities that fall into this category are also subject to the oversight and reporting requirements for the category of NGBs that receive more than \$250,000 annually from the City. Staff identified five non-profits that fall into this category of facility operator:

Non-Profit	Dept.	Maintenance Responsibility
Children's Discovery Museum	GS	Entity responsible for day-to-day maintenance/City replaces infrastructure
History San Jose	GS	The facilities managed by History San Jose are historical assets. HSJ has certification as a museum that brings expertise and standards to restoration and maintenance of historic facilities, and the City relies on HSJ's expertise in this area.
San Jose Museum of Art	GS	Entity responsible for day-to-day maintenance/City replaces infrastructure
San Jose Repertory Theater	GS	Entity responsible for day-to-day maintenance/City replaces infrastructure
The Tech Museum of Innovation	GS	Entity responsible for day-to-day maintenance/City replaces infrastructure

Under the Administration’s proposal, the department responsible for contract oversight of the five non-profits falling into this category would be required to:

1. Post reports, at least annually, detailing compliance with contractual requirements for facility maintenance.
2. Report to the Public Safety, Finance & Strategic Support Committee any facility maintenance deficiency that would impede the public’s use of or jeopardize the physical integrity of the facility.

Not included in this category are four non-profits that were included in the original SRTF proposal as entities that operate facilities. The Administration’s analysis excludes these non-profits for the following reasons:

Non-Profit Entity	Reason for Exclusion
Catholic Charities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Washington United Youth Center is maintained by the City.</li> <li>• Subject to NGB requirements for an entity receiving more than \$250,000 (the City Manager's Contract Authority).</li> </ul>
Mexican Heritage Corporation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mexican Heritage Plaza is managed by the City.</li> </ul>
Police Athletic League facility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Managed by the City.</li> </ul>
Team San Jose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The contract to manage the Convention Center and related facilities resulted from a competitive RFP process.</li> <li>• Subject to NGB requirements for an entity receiving more than \$250,000 (the City Manager's Contract Authority) for Convention and Visitor Services marketing in San Jose</li> </ul>

However, because Catholic Charities and Team San Jose receive more than \$250,000 in financial assistance from the City, they are included in the list of NGBs that receive more than the City Manager's contracting authority.

**For-profit Entities/City Manager's Contract Authority**

The number of for-profit companies that receive at least the City Manager's Contracting Authority in compensation for providing a City service is generally limited. Primarily they are waste stream haulers, parking operators and roadway-surfacing companies. The Administration identified the following companies that fall within this category: AMPCO, Central Parking Systems, GreenWaste Recovery, Green Team of San Jose, California Waste Systems, Garden City Sanitation, Universal Maintenance, Bond Black Top and Taxi San Jose.

All of these companies were selected as a result of a competitive RFP process and are subject to considerable oversight, with specific reporting requirements included in the contracts that govern their work. Required reporting under these contracts is more frequent than anticipated by the SRTF – as often as daily in the case of our garbage and pavement maintenance contracts. In addition, there are specific legal actions the City can take if a contractor does not meet its contractual obligations and certain approvals that must be received to change the level of service provided. The Administration recommends no change in the oversight model for this category.

**For-profit Entities/Managing a Facility**

As in the previous category, any for-profit company that operates or maintains a City facility valued over \$5 million is subject to close management oversight. As noted previously, the City has particular performance targets and oversight requirements for contractors that compete through the RFP process to provide a specific City service. As a result, the Administration recommends that an entity be exempted from additional requirements if it was granted a contract as a result of the RFP process to provide a City service.

In addition, this recommendation would also exempt an entity that is required by the terms of its contract with the City to make decisions before a body that is subject to the Brown Act. In most cases, the contracts with these for-profit companies have been granted only after undergoing a competitive RFP process. In the case of the few exceptions (San Jose Arena Management

Corporation and Logitech Ice/Silicon Valley Sports and Entertainment), facility maintenance decisions are reported to a body that is subject to the Brown Act (San Jose Arena Authority). In all cases, the contracts associated with these facilities clearly define maintenance obligations.

The Administration is also excluding from this list companies such as Palace Entertainment, Hawg's Seafood and the 4<sup>th</sup> Street Garage Banquet Facility, which operate City facilities pursuant to the terms of a lease but not for any City purpose. Moreover, one facility that was on the original SRTF list, River Street Development Group, no longer receives City funding. While the following for-profit companies "maintain or operate" City facilities with a value over \$5 million, for the reasons noted above and below, the Administration recommends no change in the oversight model for this category:

- San Jose Arena Management (SJAM) – The agreement with the SJAM requires the City and SJAM to maintain the HP Pavilion as a "first-class" facility. To ensure that this is accomplished, the condition of the Arena is reviewed by an architectural consultant that recommends improvements to the facility. The resulting recommendations are considered by a subcommittee of the Arena Authority. After approval by the Authority, these recommendations are forwarded to the City Council. Funding decisions for Arena maintenance and improvements are made by the City Council as a part of the annual Capital Budget process. Both the Arena Authority meetings and City Council meetings are subject to the Brown Act and the City's Open Government requirements.
- CourseCo – CourseCo, operating as Los Lagos Golf Course LLC and San Jose Golf LLC, operates respectively the Los Lagos and Rancho del Pueblo golf courses. The City's contracts with CourseCo were granted as a result of a competitive RFP process and contain specific maintenance standards for the facilities. Staff visits both facilities monthly for inspection and coordination of any maintenance issues. The City annually receives capital improvement plans for the facilities. It should also be noted that because the company's profits are directly impacted by the condition of the two golf courses, it has a strong incentive to maintain the facility to remain competitive with other golf courses in the area.
- Dolce International – Dolce International participated in a competitive RFP process that led to its selection to maintain and operate the Hayes Mansion. Its contract includes specific performance measures and, consistent with the contract, Dolce staff annually assesses the Hayes Mansion to identify any facility needs. A City consultant, who is an independent asset manager, then reviews the recommendation, physically inspects the facility, and assists the staff in evaluating the capital needs. Funding decisions for Hayes Mansion maintenance and improvements are ultimately made by the City Council as a part of the annual budget process.
- Logitech Ice/Silicon Valley Sports and Entertainment – The City's agreement with Silicon Valley Sports and Entertainment for operation and maintenance of Logitech Ice mirrors the Arena agreement. The contract spells out specific maintenance requirements. A professional review of the facility results in recommendations for capital expenditures,

which are then reviewed by the Arena Authority subcommittee and approved by the Arena Authority. These recommendations are then factored into the City's annual Capital Budget process which ultimately is approved by the City Council. Both the Arena Authority meetings and City Council meetings are subject to the Brown Act and the City's Open Government requirements.

- Mike Rawitser Golf Club – Rawitser operates the San Jose Municipal Golf Course as a result of a competitive RFP process and contains specific maintenance standards for the facilities. Staff visits the facility monthly for inspection and coordination of any maintenance issues. The City annually receives a capital improvement plan for the course. As with CourseCo, the company's profits are directly impacted by the condition of this facility and it has a strong incentive to maintain the facility to remain competitive.
- San Jose Giants – The City's agreement with the San Jose Giants for the Municipal Stadium does not place the responsibility for maintenance on the operator. When the company brings forward suggested facility improvements, City and/or Agency staff determine what is feasible given the age of the facility and City resources. Any decisions about facility improvements are then made as a part of either the Agency budget process, or the City's Capital Improvement Program. City Council meetings are subject to the Brown Act and the City's Open Government requirements.

## CONCLUSION

Attachment B shows the final list of NGBs that would be classified under the Administration's proposed definition, including those NGBs proposed by the SRTF that should be deleted for the reasons described above. The Administration believes that overlaying the additional requirements for NGBs proposed by the SRTF would not improve either accountability over or transparency of our NGB partners. Instead, staff recommends that the Rules and Open Government Committee approve the new definition of and requirements for a "Non-Governmental Body" described above.



Tom Manheim  
Director of Communications

For questions please contact Tom Manheim, Communications Director, at (408) 535-8170.

## Attachment A

### 1.13 Non-governmental body

"Non-governmental body" means:

- A. The contractor operates or fully maintains any community center or a City facility with a value of over \$5,000,000; or
- B. The contractor receives, per City fiscal year from the City or San Jose Redevelopment Agency, at least the amount of the City Manager's contract authority set forth in San José Municipal Code Section 4.04.020(A)(3)(c); and
  - 1. Provides direct services defined as:
    - a. Police services;
    - b. Fire services;
    - c. Sewage treatment and water utility services;
    - d. Garbage collection services;
    - e. Street maintenance services; or
    - f. Library services.

### 2.4 Requirements for Non-Governmental Bodies

- A. Every City contract and RFP or RFQ will indicate clearly whether the contractor will be subject to Sunshine requirements and fully describe those requirements. Existing contracts will not be covered until they are renewed (if the contract includes options, Sunshine requirements must be incorporated within 3 years) or amended at which time Sunshine requirements will be incorporated as specified. If a contract expires in more than 3 years, the contractor should be encouraged to agree to amend the contract to include the Sunshine requirements for no additional consideration.
- B. Every contractor subject to Sunshine requirements must be assigned to a policy body to which the contractor will submit the reports described in Section C. When a contractor has more than one contract which, in the aggregate totals the amount of the City Manager's contract authority set forth in San Jose Municipal Code Section 4.04.020(A)(3)(c), the City must assign the contractor to one primary policy body and consolidate the reports from that contractor for presentation to that policy body.
- C. Sunshine requirements to be included in contracts include the following:
  - 1. The contractor will provide written reports to the policy body indicating compliance with contract requirements annually;
  - 2. The contractor will provide supplemental written reports to the policy body whenever it takes an action denoted in the contract as a "Sunshine Policy Issue" as described in Section D.

## Attachment A

3. Upon a determination by the Policy Body that the report on a Sunshine Policy Issue requires public discussion, the contractor must attend a public meeting of the Policy Body to present the reasons for its action and answer questions.
- D. Sunshine requirements to be included in contracts must define appropriate Sunshine Policy Issues for that service. Sunshine Policy Issues should include the following types of actions, tailored to the specific nature of the service provided by the NGB:
1. Changes in revenue or expenditures that would affect the NGB's status as a going concern;
  2. Changes in levels of service of a type and scale that affects the performance of the contract in a substantial manner;
  3. Changes in allocation of service to different areas or populations that affects the performance of the contract in a substantial manner;
  4. Changes in the number or qualifications of staff that jeopardize the ability of the NGB to fulfill the obligations of the contract;
  5. Changes in activities that maintain or preserve public facilities and/or property of a type or scale sufficient to impede public use of those facilities or to jeopardize the physical integrity of the facility;
  6. Actions that place the City or public at risk of financial loss, property damage, or personal injury beyond those risks normally associated with responsible delivery of the contracted service.

**Attachment B**

**CLASSIFICATION OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL BODIES**

	Agency	SRTF	> \$250,000	Facility > \$5 million	Notes
<b>Financial Scan — Non-Governmental Bodies/City Manager's Contracting Authority</b>					
1	Alum Rock Counseling Center, Inc.		X		
2	Breakout Prison Ministries		X		
3	Catholic Charities of Santa Clara County	+	X	X	
4	Center for Training and Careers		X		
5	Children's Discovery Museum of San Jose	+	X	X	
6	Community Partners for Youth		X		
7	Community Technology Alliance		X		
8	Emergency Housing Consortium		X		
9	Family Supportive Housing Inc		X		
10	Fresh Lines for Youth		X		
11	Health Mobile		X		
12	Health Trust		X		
13	History San Jose	+	X	X	
14	Law Foundation of Silicon Valley Mental Health Advocacy Project		X		Law Foundation receives and administers grant funds for a consortium of entities.
15	MACSA		X		
16	Next Door Solutions to Domestic Violence		X		
17	Opportunity Fund		X		
18	Our City Forest		X		
19	Pathway Society		X		
20	Rebuilding Together Silicon Valley		X		
21	Sacred Heart Community Service		X		
22	San Jose Conservation Corps	+	X		
23	San Jose Downtown Association		X		
24	San Jose Jazz Society		X		
25	San Jose Museum of Art	+	X	X	
26	San Jose Repertory Theater	+	X	X	
27	Santa Clara Family Health Plan		X		

CLASSIFICATION OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL BODIES

Agency	SRTF	> \$250,000	Facility > \$5 million	Notes
28 Team San Jose	+	X	X	Team San Jose has two contracts with the City. It's operation of City facilities was the result of a competitive RFP with Specific Reporting Requirements which would otherwise exclude it. However, the second contract is for Convention and Visitors Services marketing, and as such would be included in the financial scan.
29 Tech Museum of Innovation	+	X	X	
30 Workforce Institute		X		

Non-Governmental Bodies – Managing A Facility				
1 Children's Discovery Museum of San Jose	+	X	X	
2 History San Jose	+	X	X	
3 San Jose Museum of Art	+	X	X	
4 San Jose Repertory Theater	+	X	X	
5 Tech Museum of Innovation	+	X	X	

Maintain Current Oversight Process				
1 AMPCO	+			Competitive RFP with Specific Reporting Requirements
2 Bond Black Top	+			Competitive RFP with Specific Reporting Requirements
3 California Waste Systems	+			Competitive RFP with Specific Reporting Requirements
4 Central Parking Systems	+			Competitive RFP with Specific Reporting Requirements
5 Garden City Sanitation	+			Competitive RFP with Specific Reporting Requirements
6 GreenTeam of San Jose	+			Competitive RFP with Specific Reporting Requirements
7 GreenWaste Recovery	+			Competitive RFP with Specific Reporting Requirements

**Attachment B**

**CLASSIFICATION OF NON-GOVERNMENTAL BODIES**

	Agency	SRTF	> \$250,000	Facility > \$5 million	Notes
8	Logitech Ice/Silicon Valley Sports and Entertainment	+		X	Decisions reported to a Body that is subject to the Brown Act and funding decided by Council/Board as part of the Budget Process.
9	Los Lagos Golf Course LLC	+		X	Competitive RFP with Specific Reporting Requirements
10	Mike Rawstier Golf Club	+		X	Competitive RFP with Specific Reporting Requirements
11	San Jose Arena Management LP	+		X	Decisions reported to a Body that is subject to the Brown Act and funding decided by Council/Board as part of the Budget Process.
12	San Jose Giants	+		X	Decisions made as a part of the SJRA and/or City Capital budgeting process.
13	San Jose Golf LLC	+		X	Competitive RFP with Specific Reporting Requirements
14	Taxi San Jose	+			Competitive RFP with Specific Reporting Requirements
15	Universal Maintenance	+			Competitive RFP with Specific Reporting Requirements

Removed From List					
1	Convention & Visitor's Bureau	+			Organization no longer exists. See Team San Jose.
2	Dolce International	+			Competitive RFP with Specific Reporting Requirements
3	Goodwill	+			Not Services
4	Mexican Heritage Corporation	+			Managed by City
5	Palace Entertainment	+			Ground Lease
6	Police Athletic League	+			Managed by City
7	River Street Development Group	+			No Longer Funded
8	SJ Downtown Association (BJD)/Downtown PBID/Hotel BID/WG BID/Japantwon BID	+			Funding Pass Through
9	San Jose Stage Company	+			According to SJRA, San Jose Stage Company is a tenant only and does not operate the facility.