Esprit Park Community Advisory Group (ECAG)  
General Meeting  
654 Minnesota Street, Tivoli Room  
March 14, 2019, 6:30pm-8:30pm

Participants:  
ECAG Members: Alison Sullivan, Monica Leicht, Patrick Hoctel, Linda James, Gaynor Chun, Susan Fitch, Tracy Ravenscraft, Irma Lewis, George Slack, Jared Doumani, Denis Maurer  

Project Team Members:  
SFRPD: Steve Cismowski, LaMonté Bishop, Nathan Tinclair, Alexis Ward, Cadi Poile  
SFRPD-contracted facilitator: Steve Rasmussen Cancian  
UCSF: Leah Pimental  
Green Benefit District: Julie Christensen, Jesse Herzog  
Fletcher Studio: David Fletcher and Andrew Prindle

Notes:  
These notes primarily reflect comments made by the ECAG membership during the meeting and they are not a comprehensive record of the meeting discussion. For more complete information please see the handouts posted on the project webpage and/or contact Project Manager, Alexis Ward alexis.ward@sfgov.org with questions.  
https://sfrecpark.org/project/esprit-park-renovation-project/

Shared Guidelines for an Effective Meeting:  
• Send material ahead of time

Confirming the Shared Vision for the Park Renovation:  
• Urban refuge from the City  
• Connect to nature  
• Exercise to be naturalistic, serving all  
• Off-leash dog play area  
• Vision being supported from May 2017  
  o The money is specific to this vision  
• Keeping the park multi-use  
• Ensure the park is healthy  
• Maintain a natural aesthetic  
• Maintain the integrity of the park

Top Priority Discussion Items:  
Drainage (RPD did presentation on drainage at Esprit Park. Slides can be found on project webpage).  
• System of perforated pipes  
• Over ¼ of the system can be made useful
- One quadrant is not fully flowing
- How does grading play in?
  - The park is crowned and sheds water like the way a road is crowned to shed water to the gutters
- Does north side have worse drainage?
  - Actually, no
- What is the role of the irrigation system in the park? There is puddling even with no rain.
  - We could do an irrigation coverage test to assess this but results wouldn’t be conclusive since soil compaction is a major factor. Once the soil is compacted, it becomes like rock, and the water sits on the surface.
- What existed before the renovation?
  - We don’t think that there was anything since no demo plans were included in the drawing set.
- Can more slope help alleviate the puddling?
  - Yes, and we plan to do this in the design.
- What is the challenge for the NE corner of the park? Why isn’t it working?
  - RPD’s hunch is that it is the fibrous roots from the redwood trees that are actively seeking out water
- How deep are the pipes?
  - Shallow, likely less than 2’
- This drainage system is much more intensive than in standard park
- How much water follows out of the pipes?
  - Less than the total water in a given rain event since the pipes are perforated, the water is supposed to infiltrate, and the pipes only carry away the excess
- Cost, is there a range for fixing it?
  - We don’t think that it will need to be fully replaced. The original estimate was $250,000 but this number is not confirmed. RPD’s plan is to hire a third party, professional cost estimator.
  - RPD will hire a consultant to help camera the drainage lines and this will give us better information that can dictate the right way to fix the drain lines. There will be an impact to the park while the lines are being assessed with the cameras.

**Dog Play Area Surfacing:**
- Will artificial turf be used only on the dog play area? In the south or north side of the park?
  - How does it integrate with the rest of the park?
    - Feedback from the Jan meeting was focused on the south side, but RPD doesn’t know yet. It is not confirmed.
- Will there be any edge/demarcation?
  - Yes, there needs to be a containable, definable edge (could be berm, paved, fence?)
- Is there a synthetic product that dog owners prefer?
- When were performance standards agreed upon?
  - Recently, RPD is trying not to replicate mistakes
  - Requirements were established first, but these changed to performance standard through discussion on this project.
- Are the performance standards goals or firm criteria?
- Can you provide cost numbers on natural versus artificial turf?
• We can compare installation costs, but this won’t reflect the difference in maintenance costs. As presented in the slideshow, both materials can be affordable, but natural turf has a greater maintenance cost, and artificial turf has a greater installation cost.
• Is synthetic turf a requirement? Not specifically for all DPAs?
• Are examples shared DPA only? Or did you include multi-use area?
  - Per San Francisco Public Health Code, dogs are only allowed off-leash in a dog play area. This is why we are only looking at dog play areas as precedents.
• How would a dog play area impact picnics?
• Is there overnight irrigation?
  - Yes, to keep it clean. It is rinsed and spot checked daily.
• What is the population density of dogs in different areas? How to factor this into the decision making?
• Replacement is more expensive
• Aesthetic bad
• Unsure of where to go, prefer people not dogs, natural, don’t see any around artificial turf, but don’t like it
• What is the impact of the dog play area on 20th and Indiana?
• Keep coming back to how small the park is. Feel artificial is better in a bigger park
• Compelling case for artificial turf, but seems hard to picture
• Artificial turf changes the nature of the park
• Don’t think teachers or children would use the dog play area
• Why aren’t we getting another park?
• We need more space for a DPA
• Need more park space
• This is the only place in the community with grass
• Seen dog parks on the east coast, and they are all grass
• Like the new dog park, but it’s only a week old, and unsure of how it will seem in the future
• Performance standards given to us as a must-have seems heavy-handed to enforce only in this district
• Fluid park vision it to keep that
• Can’t afford space for only dogs
• Don’t want a separate area
• Can’t maintain the shared vision with chopping the park into sections
• Interested in knowing the design options for natural turf
• What are options for timed usage?
• Heartbroken to lose grass
• Heartbroken if park closed for 143 days of the year (for maintenance of a natural turf dpa)
• Imagine the increase usage in time

**Confirm Next Steps, Project Schedule and Close:**
• Next step is to have an ECAG meeting in April to discuss all the topics not covered tonight (see the agenda) (April 11 at 6:30)
• Schedule (see handouts on project webpage)