INTRODUCTIONS/WELCOME

- Greetings and ground rules reviewed by meeting facilitator, Tina Garcia.
- Mary reviewed the scope of work the bond will attempt to achieve in Lafayette Park. The project will mainly focus on the parks infrastructure including but not limited to modernizing the outdated irrigation and drainage systems, rehabilitating landscaping, improving park accessibility, and repairing deteriorated stairs, retaining walls and paths. The scope also calls for renovating the tennis courts, modernizing the children’s play area, and providing for basic user enhancements like signage and site furniture.
- Mary explained that Lafayette Park budget is one of the biggest in the Bond at $10,200,000 with $7,714,200 going to construction.
- She then updated the group on the baseline renovation schedule. The scheduled has been modified since it was last presented. The new schedule provides 8 months of planning [rather than 6], 12 months of design, 16 months of actual construction, and finally 4 months to close-out the project.
- There was then an explanation of the public input process. This meeting is the second of three planned community meetings. The focus of this meeting is to collect feedback on design options.
- Mary then introduced Lizzy Hirsch, Landscape Architect from the Department of Public Works.

DESIGN PRESENTATION

- Lizzy began the presentation with a series of slides illustrating the design team’s findings related the sites conditions, including a general site analysis and overview of key site elements such as views, lawn and planning conditions, infrastructure conditions and historic features.
- The site plan was broken down into a functional area and circulation diagram to illustrate how the site is currently being used. A revised site plan was then presented that showed the proposed adjustments to the functional areas and circulation based on the conditions assessments and the feedback received at the first meeting.
• Lizzy described the primary accessible pathway that will wrap the site from Washington Street, past the restrooms and play area, across to the dog play area and the courts, and then finally to the meadow. The path will follow the contours of the site as much as possible, with some low retaining walls and built in seating. Low level path lighting will be incorporated along the path if funding is available.
• Lizzy then walked through each of the primary site functional areas. Each area was described and a series of photo images were provided to illustrate how each proposed functional area might be developed.
  ➢ Central Plaza: The plan proposes to flip the main open plaza and the picnic areas to create a buffer zone between the new play area and the neighbors along Washington Street. The plaza will include a seating area and trellis feature to provide additional screening to the north. A second off-leash dog play area is proposed for the lawn area to the north of the plaza. The picnic area is now located south of the play area, and will be dotted with shade trees. The restrooms and gardener’s office building will be upgraded to meet current code requirements. The office building could become a dedicated concession in the future.
  ➢ Off-leash Dog Play and Courts: A new accessible path with seat walls will serve the dog play area and courts. A low, planted fence will be installed around the dog play area to keep dogs and balls off the sloped area. The courts will be fully renovated with new fencing and screen, play surface and nets.
  ➢ Amphitheater. In honor the site’s historic ties to the San Francisco Mime Troup, the incorporation of terraced lawn to create a theater-like atmosphere is proposed.
  ➢ Summit. The summit area will be replanted with shade appropriate landscaping. Seating areas will be provided at key view locations and the park maintenance functions will be relocated to a location sheltered from view. A second picnic area is proposed to encourage active use of the space.
  ➢ Landscape. The park landscape will be redesigned to incorporate low-maintenance planting that is tailored to the park’s varied climate zones.
• Mary introduced Jeffrey Miller who presented the details around the proposed renovation of the children’s play area.
• Jeffrey began his presentation with a review of the existing conditions at the children’s play area. He touched on the existing deficiencies, and the goals for the redesign, including; the need to provide play value to both preschool and school age children, to provide functional play elements that meet current code requirements related to safety and access, to create a unique and interesting play experience, and create a play area that is integrated into the framework of the adjacent park spaces.
• Jeffrey outlined the play area concept plan that included the playground, picnic and belvedere area, adjacent seating areas and gathering space. The formal play area will be enclosed by a low fence. Seating and landscaping will be provided within the play area to create a natural feel.
• He then described the various play features proposed:
  ➢ The Gorge. This play feature incorporates rock climbing, poles, nets, slides and a bridge to create a complex play experience for all ages.
➢ The Dry Creek. This unique play feature consists of a rock creek bed that will snake through the play area. Children will feed the creek using a series of hand-pumps to create a fun water play experience.
➢ The Tower. This custom play element will provide climbing and sliding play for older children
➢ The Tot-play Area. This area will provide various play features scaled to needs of the preschool set.

• Mary then introduced Paul DeFreitas, architectural associate from the Department of Public Works. Paul presented the concept for the consolidated maintenance complex.
• Paul reviewed the program for operations and maintenance on the site. This includes Cushman and tool storage, work spaces for gardeners, and green waste and material handling areas. He illustrated where these functions are performed on the site currently. Based on feedback from the previous meeting, the team’s understanding is that the community and operations would like to see these functions consolidated and relocated to a less visible location on the site.
• The proposed plan is to consolidate these functions into a single location, nestled in a grove of trees between the tennis courts and the summit. The proposed complex will include a large debris waste holding area flanked on both sides by customized cargo containers to store the park maintenance equipment. A custom designed exterior treatment of wood lattice will encase the containers to create a more natural, less industrial, visual impression.

BREAKOUT SESSIONS
The meeting attendees and Project Team split into two groups to discuss in detail the two primary user/interest focused topics related to the park renovation. These included; 1) the Children's Play Area, and 2) the Overall Park Improvement, including landscape, park infrastructure, and the various passive and active programmed spaces [other than the play area]. Participants were encouraged to budget their time so that they can participate in both groups.

PARK IMPROVEMENT PLAN BREAKOUT SESSION: Discussion led by Lizzy Hirsch. Group comments are summarized below:
• Why the concessions stand? Will it bring trash? Will it make it less natural?
• Does architectural style work with community?
• Is there money in the budget for flexible rather than fixed furniture?
• Will Rec & Parks run programming at amphitheatre?
• Storage container below the path
  o Maybe one small storage container
• Are storage containers sufficient for maintenance staff? (See Marianne’s preference)
• Lighting plan?
  o Prefer lighting along access area path to Sacramento Street and in dog areas
• What is the plan for the perimeter wall?
• Accessible path and picnic areas eat up a lot of grass space
  o No one wants to lay next to a path
  o Answer: ADA accessibility
• Eliminate the path through Lafayette Beach (the one that bisects or the one closer to Sacramento Street)
• Make storage uninviting for encampment
• How will storage be locked?
• Would like lighting in overhang
• Locks need to be attractive
• Safety of rocks
• Light the paths (along accessible path)
  o Solar-powered lights?
• Can you run wiring for lights in project even if lights not a part of project?
• NY example – seating/lighting innovative and unconventional
• Memorial plaque will stay
• Traditional trellises and benches and bins
  o Rounder shapes
• Where will the trash bins be?
• What size will containers be?
• Tree removal?
  o Only the unhealthy ones
• Sloped areas are planting spaces
• Times set for off-leash dogs?
• What kind of grass? Maintenance issues?
• Community garden – must be accessible
• What is purpose of amphitheatre?
  o Space for community garden there?
• Consider alternative uses for amphitheatre area
• NERT staging area – separate discussion with RPD
• Will amphitheatre be used?
• Picnic tables in picnic area? Enough space for picnic areas?
• Eucalyptus tree removal on summit?
• Concessions? Are they common in SF?
  o Will be community driven.

PLAYGROUND BREAKOUT SESSION: Discussion led by Jeffrey Miller. Group comments are summarized below:
• Neighbors want grass area that is flat and dog-free
• Basketball court a possibility? Making one tennis court a multi-use sport court?
• What is the appeal for teenagers in the playground/at the park? Incorporate a sports element.
• Expand picnic area – BBQ pits a possibility?
• Neighbors will miss the sand
  o Marianne mentioned possibility of a sand table
• Value the flatness in the park
  o Maybe only incorporate one hill for rolling down in the younger kids area
• Ensure no standing water in water element to prevent mosquitoes
WRAP UP
- A representative from each breakout group reported on the key issues and comments generated during their discussion.
- Mary asked the group for any parting comments or questions; none were recorded.

FINAL THOUGHTS FROM RPD
- The meeting wrapped up with Thanks to all that participated, and a promise that the Project Team would be back in the fall to present the final design.