

Gavin Newsom, Mayor
Recreation and Park Commission
Minutes
January 15, 2009

Commissioner Lazarus called the meeting of the Recreation and Park Commission to order on January 15, 2009 at 2:06 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Present

Jim Lazarus
Gloria Bonilla
Tom Harrison
Meagan Levitan
David Lee
Michael Sullivan

Absent

Larry Martin

Commissioner Lazarus: Our President is out of town today, Commissioner Martin regrets that he had to attend a conference of the AFL-CIO which I think was honoring Larry for his years of service and the conference was outside of the state. So there will be no President's report.

GENERAL MANAGER'S REPORT

Jared Blumenfeld: Happy New Year, this is the first Commission meeting of the New Year. I'm also sorry that the president couldn't be here but we've got a lot of things happening. Some of them relate to questions that were asked at the last meeting, one relating to Park Patrol, so we had a meeting with P.D from the park Richmond and Mission District stations. We worked on communications protocol to make sure that everyone understood how the communications protocol should work. Also, in the time subsequent to our last meeting we've had recurrent vandalism at the Holocaust Memorial which has happened on three recurrent occasions and so we've had reason to have unfortunately more coordination between these entities so our focus has really been to develop protocols and to make sure for instance that the frequencies and all those small technical things are overcome so we can have good sharing of information between the Park Patrol and the P.D. So that will continue, we're going to continue having monthly meetings with them and move that dialog forward so it works better than it has to date.

Commissioner Lazarus: Jared, on that subject of the Holocaust Memorial, years ago when it was installed we had vandalism issues and I recall there was a camera put in there that was tied to the security desk at the Palace of the Legion of Honor, is that still operational?

Jared Blumenfeld: That's correct. It's operational. Unfortunately, it doesn't give you a lot a detail, It's someone with a spray can at 1:30 in the morning so you can kind of get a sense of those details but there's very little data to help you apprehend the person that did it.

Commissioner Lazarus: Is there signage--I haven't been there for a while--is there signage not in your face but discrete that people could see that says it's under 24 hour photo surveillance?

Jared Blumenfeld: I think that there. I can confirm that by the next meeting.

Commissioner Lazarus: Thank you. I'm sorry, continue.

Jared Blumenfeld: So that relates to Park Patrol. Commissioner Bonilla asked about the Gene Friend Recreation Center. Really, talking about the material condition, how it's doing. I was there relatively recently. When I was there we had iron workers and painters, it was kind of coincidental to your question but, you know, I think people are spending more time looking at it. There's a big volunteer effort and there are recently plantings that were there. The plantings that were done were so that less water would need to be used. There's new children's gardening boxes have been constructed, a new concrete pad has been installed behind the existing park walls for better waster container storage. The custodial staff who are doing a great job there and at many of the park have done an amazing job on the floor and the TMA work order system which is a really a great--I don't know how much presentation has been done on the TMA system--but it basically allows you to put requests for work and then close them out and work out when they're done, has allowed us to kind of look at what's being done and there's been an increase in the maintenance standards from 86 percent in 2007 to 95 percent in 2008. So good stuff is happening there. In terms of property management there's a lot of interest obviously on the two RFP and RFQ that went out. I want to correct a typo on the Japanese Tea Garden concession. Although there weren't--it says a total of 25 copies were purchased by interested public, although we are desperate for money we're not selling the right to but the RFP, anyone can get that. We had 10 proposals that were submitted and will be coming back to you on February 19th. On the concert which is kind of more urgent from a fiscal and from a timing perspective to get the concerts we received three proposals for our RFQ from Live Nation, Another Planet Entertainment, and C3 Presents which does the Austin City Limits event every year in Austin successfully. I want to thank Commissioner Sullivan who's agreed to sit on the selection panel. We hope to proceed quickly with those negotiations and get back with a term sheet to you and lease terms on February 5th, so the next meeting. Something that's caused a lot of stress in the community and we've received a lot of petitions and phone calls about relates to the pricing of badminton as a court activity. There's a lot of history, this kind of went through the 2004 Rec Assessment recommendations, it then went to our Commission, it then went to our Board of Supervisors that approved a fee structure. I think the issues have really been about how the fees have been applied to one sport as opposed to all of them. There was a lot of outreach done and one of the main reasons when asked folks to look at the time when we did have the class reservation system but we didn't charge money, the issue is that some individuals were booking 13 slots across the city, not showing up for them because they had no reason to, and the public was actually getting very enraged and saying you know what, how dare this person has booked 13--10 so basically hundreds of hours across the city and they didn't need to put any money down and it stops the public from enjoying them. So the goal was to create a system. We looked at deposit systems, they didn't really work within the accounting that Recreation and Park has, so it was landed that \$4 was a reasonable amount for 45 minutes, it would give someone a commercial interest in showing up and not booking across the city slots that they wouldn't use. So I'm open to recommendations on how we move forward to make sure that this issue dealt better in the community.

Commissioner Lee: I've received a number of calls from Supervisor Chiu and other about this issue and wanted to know first, when you spoke of fees you're talking about fees for all sports, not just badminton, that was approved, correct?

Jared Blumenfeld: Right.

Commissioner Lee: And the intent here is that badminton would be part of a whole menu of sports that would be charged fees. Can you talk a little bit about and clear something why badminton--there was a perception that badminton was the only sport that was being charged for. Can you clear that up?

Jared Blumenfeld: It wasn't actually a perception, it was a reality. We started with badminton and so it was first court sport so it was decided that the first sports that would be charged would be ones that happened on courts because they were city-wide, they took time for staff to put the facilities up and down and they're very discreet blocks of time that can be booked across the city as opposed to bocce ball or soccer, they get more complicated and

these are generally done--aren't team sports in the larger sense. So badminton was the first that was rolled out and planned, the second was volleyball, and the third was basketball.

Commissioner Lee: I'd like to see if possible that all three of the sports be charged come on line so that there's a sense of fairness, that all these sports are going to be charged and it's not just the one badminton sport.

Jared Blumenfeld: I think we need to create a sense of equity across those different athletic activities and so you know as of today we can move forward with that suggestion and immediately start implementing a system with volleyball and start working out a system that we can come back to with basketball which is slightly more complicated. But we can immediately start to redress that issue by dealing with volleyball.

Commissioner Lee: As I understand from listening to you the issue is not revenue generation, the issue abuse of the system, that we're currently having a group of individuals how are booking hours that aren't being used and preventing others from using the facilities.

General Manager Blumenfeld: It's two-fold I think. As we enter the discussion last in this meeting about the budget, every penny helps and to the extent that we had been charging and we had full participation at the level that we had when we weren't charging we make about \$86,000 a year at badminton, so it is material but why we choose badminton first was because we had this chronic problem of people booking courts and not using them. So the reason we had a fee schedule go to the Board of Supervisors through this Commission was ultimately to realize that we needed to have cost recovery for activities. The reason we started with badminton was because there was an abuse of the system and a potential to get cost recovery.

Commissioner Lee: Do other cities in the Bay Area charge for badminton? Are we unique in that we're charging?

Jared Blumenfeld: Across the nation I can't speak to badminton but for activities that happen on courts from volleyball to basketball most rec centers across the nation have realized and awoken to the fact that a small amount of money from a lot of people can help balance difficult financial years. So I'd be very surprised in the majority of cities and counties in the nine Bay Areas did not charge for badminton.

Commissioner Lee: I understand that in cases of hardship perhaps--and this is something I looked into, I talked to Denny about--we do have a scholarship fund that would be available and I was wondering if that information was translated into Chinese or Spanish or other languages so the public would know if they have some financial hardship issue they could apply for such funds.

Jared Blumenfeld: Yes, our website is virtually impenetrable I think so we need to do stuff to make it a look more accessible in English, Chinese and Spanish and I think in the next months and years ahead we can do that but certainly the information that is out there on the scholarship does exist in the languages.

Commissioner Lee: But I'd like to definitely see that. Particularly at these places where there is heavy usage and people are inquiring about whether there can be a fee waiver or a scholarship that they could apply for and so forth.

Commissioner Lazarus: I think the real message is if we're going to put fees on court play we need to implement the fees across the board and not have one particular sport thinking they've been singled out. That's the message from this minor bruhaha that we've caused.

Jared Blumenfeld: I was going to continue but if you have another question on that issue I'm happy to-

Commissioner Bonilla: I'll comment on something else after you finish your report.

Jared Blumenfeld: The final issue relates to the playfields initiative. Just as background, the initiative established in 2005 to address the chronic shortage of playfields. The initiative is a \$45 million program funded with \$20 million from the city and \$25 gift from the City Fields Foundation. To date the playfields initiative has renovated four parks with synthetic turf and light and added lights to one of the city's artificial turf fields. Another field renovation project at Kimball playground has already been approved by the Commission and will go to bid in the next month or two with construction starting in the spring. The final planning phase around three, the final round of the field renovations is to eliminate the ground sports deficit and to provide sufficient play space for additional teams and field sports. So now bringing the data in from the synthetic playfield task force and to really make sure that the criteria that we use mean that all the hoops and hurdles from environmental to community related are dealt with before we bring anything before this Commission. That concludes my report.

Commissioner Sullivan: I have an unrelated question. I wanted to ask about the status of the Ferry Park renovation. This was before your time Jared but several months ago we had a joint meeting with the Planning Commission about the Ferry Park renovation and I think there was consensus but for one issue that was kind of a stand-off with the Planning Commission about the pedestrian bridge and its been several months since then and I just wondered if that's going to come back soon and if anyone can comment on the timing of that matter.

Jared Blumenfeld: I can only comment that I was out there and there were homeless individuals sleeping under it. It looked in pretty terrible condition and the gardeners couldn't wait to get rid of it. So I don't know the answer to your question but I'll look into it and talk to the Planning Commission. I'm not sure if there a decision that they need to make before their body--before it can move forward or how was it left.

Commissioner Sullivan: I think the Planning Commission needs to take a position on whether the bridge is consistent with the general plan.

Jared Blumenfeld: Since the last joint meeting that we had didn't for legal reasons didn't allow this Commission to take an action. Maybe the next time when we are asked to take an action we can append this to it.

Commissioner Sullivan: This is both a question and a comment that I'd love it if we could get that back on an agenda for a joint meeting again.

Jared Blumenfeld: We'll work on the first available date we can get.

Commissioner Bonilla: Yes. I just wanted to thank you for your follow up on the Gene Friend site and I wanted to say that after you went out there I went out there and I was happy to see that some of the safety issues have been mitigated such as putting the barricade around the bikes so that elderly wouldn't trip on them and those kinds of things. So I think we're in a good position direction out there at that site. And then I'm also relieved to hear that we have the 10 bids is it for the Japanese Tea Garden, very happy about that.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Kelly Watts: This marks my one year anniversary of trying to reach out and engage you all in a dialogue regarding the future of tire waste playfields in San Francisco. In public comment I've spoken to the park Commission and the RPD management at least a dozen times as has pediatric doctor Steven Ambrose. I've each time represented myself as having years of experience with these synthetic fields. Instead of utilizing us we have instead been characterized by you and the RPD in public and in print as being fretful, misguided and even selfish dog walkers, though I've never owned one. On the other hand, with your vaguely written MOU much favor has been shown by you to clearly vested parties as well as City Fields Foundation profiteers like Susan Herch and Associates, BayCorp Building and commercial athletic leagues. Instead of debating the pros and cons various Commissioners and RPD management surreptitiously selected an exclusionary and biased task force which produced a highly flawed and misleading report with this fall was unanimously accepted by you as written with virtually no public discussion. Despite our directly calling into question almost every single one of its stated assumptions and claims as well as the credibility of your

so-called experts, to date not a single representative from this park Commission or the RFPD has shown any response or even curiosity as to the validity of what we have to offer. Fortunately we're having more success showing this administration's decidedly not green or cautious agenda regarding this issue in other media markets including to date the United Kingdom, Australia, South Africa, Italy, Spain, Canada, Germany, as well as throughout the United States. Television stations in Tacoma and Seattle that recently used footage of San Francisco's own South Sunset field to illustrate a local news story about soccer players who have been diagnosed with Hodgkin's lymphoma and other cancers. So far you have replaced over 20 acres of San Francisco's green fields with thousands of tons of unregulated, hazardous tire waste and acres of questionable plastic materials. You have stated plans for more. Will anything give you pause? The precautionary principle, the green chemistry initiative that the State of California has adopted, an illness from a player? Will not one of you set aside your political ambitions and pause, at least stand up for the health of the children and citizens of San Francisco. We have posted on web sites that just since the task force meetings, just since the closure of that, we've had moratoriums called in Connecticut, in New York, South Korea is finding lead in their fields, Texas is finding lead, Chicago is calling them in question, Redwood City--

Sally Stephens: I'm representing the Friends of Golden Gate Heights park and I came here a couple months ago, I think maybe August or September and complained about some problems we were having with the Department in getting people to return phone calls and things like that. Our community raised \$15,000 for the [unintelligible] drinking water fountain and we were having a lot of trouble and after, whether it was related to my coming here or not, but shortly after that a new person was assigned to us, a staff person, and he was just wonderful and returned phone calls, returned emails promptly and we've had a lot of--and once that started the process really went quite rapidly, and so we now actually have our water fountain installed, it's working, it's three-tiered, for adults, children and handicapped and then the bottom for dogs and it's just really great, everybody is using it. The tennis players, the people just walking, the dogs, all that sort of stuff. So I know you often don't hear nice things but I just want to say that we had a really--towards the end of it--a very good experience and we're very glad and we actually have some money left over so we're looking for other projects in our park that we might be able to contribute to, thanks.

Meredith Thomas: Good afternoon Commissioners, Meredith Thomas with the Neighborhood Parks Council, Happy New Year. I wanted to update you on our process with engaging neighborhoods around San Francisco on the development of an Open Space framework and plan associated with the rewrite of the recreation and open space element of the city's general plan. So we are kicking off our open space community workshop series. We have so far about 10 meetings that are confirmed with another 15 in the works. What these meetings comprise of is a visioning process that's at a neighborhood specific level but that also applies to identifying citywide priorities for open space including parks, green streets, plazas, things of that nature. And last night we held our first one, the Ocean Beach Vision Council was our host, it was really well-attended. Brian O'Neal who is a superintendent of the GGNRA came and gave a brief history of Ocean Beach. Supervisor Eric Mar was there to introduce the legislation forming the Ocean Beach Vision Council. And they used our open space workshop as a way to kick off their own planning process and so it was really well-attended and the unique thing about it was it stimulated without boundaries some really wonderful thinking about how open space can look for our city. I bring this up because we are entering a really difficult budget time. I don't have to tell you that, but to the extent that we can hold to our values throughout financial crises to ensure that at the end of this process but for well beyond all of our lifetimes the city has the maximum open space network it can possibly have, that's going to be success with this process. And so I would invite all of you to come and to participate. We are trying to link this experience to short term outcomes as well as the long term goal I just described. We're offering fiscal sponsorship to people who get really excited about ideas that come up in the meetings. But I hope that you'll plan on attending. And again these are the first 10. All the meetings will be listed on our website which is openspacesf.org and I want to thank you for helping support our interests in this. And again we're partnering with City Planning and the Mayor's office of greening and you folks and the Mayor's office of neighborhood services.

Jim Salinas: Good afternoon. Vice President Lazarus and Commissioners. I'm Jim Salinas, Senior, native San Franciscan, born and raised in the Mission District, lived here all my life, I want to wish all of you a Happy New Year and you and your families. Thank you Mr. Chairman, thank you. Commissioners, one of the things that obviously we have a momentous occasion happening on the 20th of this month and that's something to celebrate on that side, Commissioners, we have a lot of working men and women and struggling in this town and I hope that all of you will do whatever you can to make sure that San Franciscans are faring well. I actually have been wanting to

come here for months and say the following but I thought well, let's start off the New Year on the right foot. As Commissioner Lazarus indicated I did serve, I had the honor and privilege of serving on this very prestigious panel and I'm ever so thankful to have been able to do that. One of my goals as a Recreation and Park Commissioner was to meet all 1200 of the employees that work for the this Department and even although I didn't achieve that I made a huge dent because I wanted to go out and find out what was happening and where the problems were and where this Commission might be able to make a difference for the working men and women of this Department and also this city because you are a quality of life Commission. I'm pretty sure you all know that. I come here this afternoon because along my travels I notice some folks that were just so outstanding in this Department that were just such great representatives of this Department that just stood out. And for me as a Latino and I think representing a good part of the Latino community I've got to say that Rose Dennis is one of those individuals that all of you should celebrate because we certainly do, whether you're a Latino or not, she just represents this Department in such a way, she's a top-notch professional and we just wanted to come here this afternoon and say we're looking always forward to seeing her rising within this Department. Again, happy New Years and thank you for serving on this Commission, you do such a good job all of you.

CONSENT CALENDAR

On motion by **Commissioner Levitan** and duly seconded, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

RES. NO. 0901-001

RESOLVED, That this Commission does approve the minutes from the meetings of June 19, 2008, September 18, 2008 and November 6, 2008.

RES. NO. 0901-002

RESOLVED, That this Commission does recommend that the Board of Supervisors does accept and expend a Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) Carl Moyer Memorial Grant to fund the re-powering (replacement) of the diesel engine in the San Francisco Marina workboat.

RES. NO. 0901-003

RESOLVED, That this Commission does approve the award of a construction contract in the amount of \$649,400.00 to McGuire and Hester for the Midtown Terrace Playground and Restroom Renovation Project, 1384J, including the base bid and alternates No. 1, 2 and 3.

RES. NO. 0901-004

RESOLVED, That this Commission does approve an award of contract to Cleary Brothers Landscape, Inc. the for the Buena Vista Park Southeast Slope Improvement project in the amount of \$1,699,970.00.

RES. NO. 0901-005

RESOLVED, That this Commission does approve a request from the San Francisco Arts Commission for a temporary encroachment permit to install a temporary art project woven of natural willow branches top the pollarded trees in Joseph L. Alioto Performing Arts Piazza from February 4, 2009 until November 4, 2009.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

Ernestine Weiss: I'm running between the Planning Commission and here so I didn't hear who was recommended on the nominations. **Jim Salinas**: Jim Salinas, Senior. Once again, Commissioners, I just want to say that this Commission is a tough Commission, there's a lot of work to be done and the president certainly carries a lot of weight and you couldn't have a better nominee. I've seen Commissioner Jim Lazarus outside of the Recreation and Park Department for this city for many, many years. He makes such a great difference wherever he goes. Congratulations, quite a nomination, thank you.

Commissioner Bonilla: Yes. I never thought I'd hear myself saying this and I certainly hope I don't live to regret it, just kidding. In all honesty I would like to nominate Commissioner Jim Lazarus for President. The order of succession aside, Commissioner Lazarus has demonstrated a very strong commitment, has invested a lot of time on serving on this Commission. He's proven to be a very articulate and very strong advocate on all Recreation and Park causes. And most certainly I believe he has the ability to help guide the Department through our current budget

crisis. I think he'll be a very able and capable--I mean very able and strong leader on this Commission and I'm looking forward to having him serve as President.

On motion by **Commissioner Bonilla** and duly seconded, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

RES. NO. 0901-006

RESOLVED, That this Commission does elect Commissioner Jim Lazarus as President in accordance with the Bylaws for a one-year term.

Commissioner Levitan: I have been on this Commission for four years and the day I was sworn in was the same day that my colleague, Commissioner Harrison, was sworn in and we were reappointed re-sworn in at the same time. And I have to say in my time working with Commissioner Harrison I have found him to be somebody of the utmost integrity and hard word and personal and professional commitment to this dept. So it is with great admiration and adoration that I nominate Commissioner Harrison for vice president.

On motion by **Commissioner Levitan** and duly seconded, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

RES. NO. 0901-007

RESOLVED, That this Commission does elect **Commissioner Tom Harrison** as President in accordance with the Bylaws for a one-year term.

Commissioner Lazarus: It will cool off for electronics. Just briefly, I want to thank my fellow Commissioners and I look forward to obviously a tough year a head but also a good year. This Commission works well together. I'm sorry that Larry is not here today. I said at the outset he had to be away at a AFL-CIO meeting and I'm sure we will recognize Larry's years of service as Commission president at our next meeting, but I look forward to continuing the work that we've done together under Larry, under Commissioner Bonilla under that and some of us under John Murray. So I look forward to it.

Commissioner Harrison: I took would like to express my gratitude for all your votes and support over the years that I've been here, particularly for the kind words from my fellow Commissioner Levintan here. I pick and chose what I like to work on but some of the times I get in over my head I think and Margaret helps me greatly in these areas so I'd like to thank everyone for their support over the years and I'll continue to do what I can, so thank you very much.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE PUC AND THE RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT

Jared Blumenfeld, General Manager, presented this item. First of all, congratulations to President Lazarus and Vice President Harrison. This is an important issue and an important MOU before us. We've been working with San Francisco Public Utilities Commission for quite some time to try and work out a way of replacing potable from Hetch Hetchy and the Tuolome River basin with both ground water sources and recycled water and this framework MOU basically articulates a way forward for us to work together to achieve these goals. Just for an example, we use about two million gallons of potable water a day on Golden Gate Park and I observed in my journeys around the city the gardeners spend upwards of 50 percent of their time fixing an irrigation system that people in the 18th century would not have been proud of. So it's not a system that's working well. I think the main points in this MOU would be the installation of three new well stations and the modification of two existing well stations on our property in order to make ground water available to blend with potable water supply, the development of a recycled water facility to produce recycled water with reverse osmosis technology for the irrigation of park land by 2013, the technical differentiation here just so that you're aware of it, recycled water generally isn't potable and so it has to be transported through purple piping, a completely different irrigation system. Also, some recycled water because it isn't cleaned to potable water standards can't be used on particularly sensitive plants. And so the way that we got around this issue is through reverse osmosis which basically means that the water going through out the other end of the facility once it's built in 2013 would be to drinking water quality standards so that you don't need to lay purple piping and you don't need to differentiate what the water is used for and also in terms of community health concerns

that have arisen across the nation with recycled water and its impact on the public, those issues wouldn't exist. The price tag is significantly higher but the PUC agreed to insert that. We would have a partnership with regional water partners to maximize the supply of recycled water for irrigation use including service to Harding Park, Fleming and Sharp Park by 2010 and significantly for the gardeners and the folks that we're working with implication of a best management practice system of programs to improve water use efficiencies in the operation and management of water deliveries and the actual part of the MOU that talks about this, we talk about those best available technologies which now are of such a high level that they use evaporation transfer data from around the city and sensors to really know when things really need to be watered. They're all on computer controls like the new lighting systems that we have in places like Potrero Hill so you can see when a sprinkler head is broken from your laptop, send a gardener out to fix it, work out when places should and shouldn't be watered so the efficiencies actually save us a huge amount of money. We send the PUC about 4 million dollars a year, this hopefully will reduce the amount of money that we need to spend on water. So in conclusion we would recommend the approval of the MOU and I'm happy to answer any questions. I think the PUC voted on this MOU on the 13th, on Tuesday, and it was to my knowledge approved.

Commissioner Harrison: One of the questions that has come up in areas north of here in Santa Rosa and up that way is the idea of having pharmaceuticals which cannot be filtered out. I don't know that much about this but I'm curious to see if this reverse osmosis technology would do such a thing.

Jared Blumenfeld: The pharmaceuticals issue is one that in my other role in the Department of Environment we spent a lot of time working on and there's two options for pharmaceuticals really. One is to throw them in the landfill, the other has been to flush them down the drain. When you flush them down the drain it leads to the residues of those pharmaceuticals ending up in drinking water because we get our drinking water from Hetch Hetchy that isn't an issue. We're working on a program with the PUC to get a take-back program with Walgreens and other pharmacies so the pharmacies will take back all the pharmaceuticals and that will greatly reduce the amount of pharmaceuticals in the water, but reverse osmosis does bring it to a level that EPA would allow you to drink it. And so the trace amounts would be very insignificant.

Commissioner Harrison: I think too that along with Walgreens and other these hospice organizations because they do collect a lot of the unused pharmaceuticals. The other question is will the PUC be charging the Park Department for this water?

Jared Blumenfeld: That was part of the negotiation. I wanted to make sure that we weren't charged more because recycled water is significantly more expensive than Hetch Hetchy because of the work you need to do it before it can be used. They have confirmed that State Law says that recycled water can't be more expensive than normal water and the goal of the entire program is to reduce our water usage significantly so our goal is to pay them less. Per acre foot of water we'll never pay more than we would had it been the water that we're using today.

Commissioner Harrison: One last comment and I don't know this but they built this outfall out at the end of Sloat Boulevard four and a half miles where they I understand dump this water, so they're paying to dump it, now they're going to charge us to use on our property so it sort of doesn't seem right.

Jared Blumenfeld: The level of treatment--unfortunately, it's about nine miles out off Ocean beach, the level of treatment that is allowed unfortunately under the Clean Water Act for it to be disposed of in both the Bay on the southeast side and the Ocean Side treatment plant is significantly--you couldn't open a tap and pour that on a plant, it would die. Reverse osmosis brings it to a different level entirely. So we are helping them because they have under the Wezip program conservation goals, we're probably the largest water user in the city, they will be helping us through redoing our irrigation system and review our irrigation in all our 242 parks.

Commissioner Harrison: I must say too that in my time as a gardener these weather stations that tell you when humidity is up, they've been working on that technology for a long time, it's excellent stuff. A lot of our plants will do a lot better with it.

Commissioner Sullivan: To what extent is this a binding agreement with respect to projects that will actually involve the expenditure of dollars and the taking on of real projects or this is an agreement to agree? And also I noticed that the PUC is accepting responsibility for a number of things here and is there a quick pro quo for that?

Jared Blumenfeld: As it related to the first question they'll have to go through EIR and other planning exercises, there will be a lot of things that come back to this Commission for approval. So it's more than agreeing to agree, they need to start allocating resources to this project in their budget, they can't do that without something that gives this Commission's approval to move forward and this is something they've been waiting to do, they actually have money from other fiscal years waiting to be spent. They can't do that until they have a framework. So this framework allows them to move forward. We will be asking for compensation and it's a prerequisite before they'll move forward with extracting any groundwater they need to compensate us for that and they'll also have to compensate us for any detriment to recreational uses and for the lease of the footprint of the recycled water facility. So I think there will be two streams of revenue that will help us in both the short and long term close budget gaps through this project. Also, we'll be having a system of computer controlled irrigation replace a system of paperclips.

Richard Fong: My name is Richard Fong. I kind of like what I just heard about this recycling of water and I like very much that--why I would like it is because the cost is one thing but when we start looking at recycled water and you start looking at something like what's happening at Golden Gate Park and you start looking at all the ponds and you look at all the lakes and everything else I think there has to be much more interest in the wildlife and what's going to be happening to our wildlife at our parks. So one park that you talked about using ground water bringing it back up and everything else, so a program that something might come up from that, it could be contaminated and ground water, and you talk about reverse osmosis--I thought that was a process they used to process auto water, so when you start looking at osmosis, reverse, and another Commission talks about the pharmaceuticals I understand that San Francisco water too much [unintelligible] it's a female estrogen substance that's found in our water here, so I'm not too much into an environment which Jared I would assume, Mr. Blumenfeld would be. So when I started looking at it I'm glad that you're looking at the water issue, so when you start looking at the water issue and I looked at it when we had the Palace of Fine Arts and we had a problem with swam diplomacy, I got concerned about the health of the swans living in swan lake there. So when I get into looking at it again I say wow this is great, these guys are going to get on the ball and they're going to take care of our water here. Now, what else are you going to do? I kind of come up with the question, are you going to be putting in buffer base capacities or carbonic systems to try to keep the ph level within a narrow band that would be better for-- Other fish and other things that we have around in our parks and our recreational areas. So I just wanted to leave it more as a rhetorical question and hope that I can get responses in the future. Thank you. **Unidentified Female Speaker:** Good afternoon Commissioners and congratulations on our new president and vice president. I simply wanted to suggest that you might want to view this project as something that has its own financial tracking. I appreciate the fact that there are State laws that govern the fact that we're not supposed to be paying more. This is an extraordinarily complicated matter and I think it would behoove us to start on day 1 to look at what our dollars are and our recreation costs are, I think its only prudent and I appreciate that the PUC is going to work very hard and Recreation and Park is going to work very hard to make this a happening thing but when I hear that we're not going to be putting in purple pipe because it is possibly going to be equal to potable water I think we have to also look at the capital cost that may or may not be impacted. So just to put in a cautionary tale of whenever I hear the word dollars you know you have my full and undivided attention and I would like to encourage that we look at these project as something that we keep our eye on because we want to make sure that this doesn't metastasize into something that's going to be costing the Department more one way or the other than we're appreciating today and so I just want to encourage prudence in the future and the PUC has a lot more money than this Department so I'm afraid of the little guy getting robbed in this piggy bank. That's just my opinion, thank you.

On motion by **Commissioner Bonilla** and duly seconded, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

RES. NO. 0901-008

RESOLVED, That this Commission does approve a Memorandum of Understanding between the Public Utilities Commission and the Recreation and Park Department for the Application and Management of Water Use Efficiency Programs.

SAN FRANCISCOZOO

Tanya Peterson: Good afternoon and congratulations to both President Lazarus and Vice President Harrison. We submitted a report after President Lazarus' request. I think you've had a chance to review that. The only updates is that we did exceed attendance goals in December and also this last weekend in January we also exceeded budget expectations in terms of attendance with Saturday's number being well over 3,000, we had budgeted more for 2900 and also Sunday we were at 8,642 visitors, 5500 of which were free San Francisco families. As you recall we were closed for the first time in a long time on Christmas Day out of respect for last year's tragedy. I think you again for that opportunity, both animal staff and I were there obviously there to manage operations but it gave us all a time to reflect privately and both as a group on the tragedy and again I thank you for that moment. Other highlights are that we will be inspected by the AZA the last week of January, the staff and I are preparing for that and also it is the Zoo's 80th anniversary. While we are limiting our events with the expectation of lower fundraising we will continue some events and also marketing campaign around the Zoo's 80th anniversary. Any questions?

Commissioner Lazarus: I have one comment. Your comment about this being a tough time in this economy to raise money and obviously the Zoo had extraordinary expenses in the last year and the Zoological financial situation is tenuous, but so is the city and county of San Francisco and later this afternoon we're going to hear a pretty bleak budget story about what is going to be expected of city Departments including probably a 12 million plus absolute cut of general fund subsidy and an option of another like amount so we have to present budget estimates to the Mayor's office later this winter that might cut as much as \$25 million of general fund support out of this Department. No? It's been revised? All right, we'll get to that point. That was a few weeks ago that was the possible worst-case. Maybe it's less.

Jared Blumenfeld: 25 percent, which is 8.8

Commissioner Lazarus: \$8.8 million, pardon me, of the already declining general fund support. I'm going to say this to the Parks Trust, to the Neighborhood Parks Council, all our partners, we need more help in this Department from our partners, whether it's direct fundraising by the trust or the Neighborhood Parks Council for capital projects or direct subsidy to operations or whether the crisis is an opportunity for the Zoo to get stretch gifts from your universe of donors that could result in some voluntary agreement to slightly reduce the subsidy that the Zoo receives from the--the operating subsidy that you receive under our contract. I know that's probably something that you don't want to hear and it's something that you don't have to do but we're going to have to make significant cuts in operations and I don't want to see the Zoo have to make cuts and obviously there's some level where you can't because you've got an animal population to maintain and visitors to take care of but if the crisis--sometimes good comes out of crisis and it would be great if we together could try to find a way to encourage more public support for the institution during the coming--the July 1 fiscal year--that might result in some help on our bottom line here at the general fund support of this Department.

Tanya Peterson: We strongly agree that we are a partnership and of course the society, everything we do raises a donation back to the City. We are looking at capital projects that perhaps can work in conjunction with the city, some of which are matching funds. We have some donors interested in looking at matching funds on our playground as well as some animal exhibits. I know that playgrounds are stretched in the city. So there are ways I think we can partnership that are of value both to Recreation and Park and the Zoo. As for the management fee I'll have to run that certainly by the society board.

Commissioner Lazarus: And again it's going to have to be part and parcel of some ways to obviously replace it on your end through private philanthropy and that may or may not be possible. On a positive note we've had some communications between our staff, a donor, and the Department regarding the bison exhibit in Golden

Gate Park. And I think we're going to look to repopulate that bison exhibit and in the report I just received from staff through your staff there's some costs related besides just the contribution of bison. And so if somebody could get back to me--there were small capital recommended capital projects out in Golden Gate Park because of the need to quarantine new bison that come in which was not the case some years ago and we're not exactly set up for that at the Golden Gate Park but could be, and whether or not there's some additional expense to the zoological society from handling that quarantine period and maybe we might be able to approach the donor for a cash contribution as well as the bison contribution, so if I could get that information soon that would be great.

Tanya Peterson: Will do, thank you.

Mark Ennis: Hi Mark Ennis speaking. What I'd like to voice today is my concern over the oversight at the Zoo. Basically, that I believe it's broken and that was proven once more today earlier when the joint Zoo met and they approved two agenda items that probably shouldn't have been approved. The first was the appointing of an advisory seat on the joint Zoo committee of the veterinary seat and as one of the Commissioner pointed out, Commissioner Lee, the public has known about this issue for a couple of months but what he wasn't aware of was that last month the public voiced concern over the process of how the applications were being gathered. This position was never posted publicly so that veterinarians in the public sector could apply. Basically, the joint Zoo committee chose from four applicants that were picked by the zoological society, that does not show the Commission as being sensitive to the needs of the general public. They may have looked over some candidates that could have been just as well-qualified but instead choose a candidate that the zoological society picked. So basically how the joint Zoo is set up is there's three Commissioner that have voting power, three members of the zoological society board members that have voting power, and there's going to be two advisory seats, one which is a veterinarian which was appointed today which does not have voting power but basically was picked by the zoological society and then there's one open seat that the animal welfare Commission is going to fill. So basically the joint Zoo allowed the zoological society to pick the veterinarian advisory, I don't think that's appropriate. I think they should have opened it up more, had it publicly, made a public notification that any applicants that thought they were qualified could have applied. The second one is they voted to approve an animal transaction that actually happened before it was agendaized and brought to the joint Zoo Commission. It was pointed out by Bob Jenkins that they have the right to do that, I'm not sure, I'll have to review that myself, but I think it's inappropriate to even allow that vote to happen, the public really should be able to voice their concern about sending a giraffe--which in this case it was a giraffe--was sent to Six Flags theme park. This theme park two years ago created a situation where a giraffe died in a barn fire and we sent another giraffe, one of our giraffe's there. I don't think that was appropriate to vote on today, I think they ignored the public's view about this and I think that oversight at the Zoo is very broken and it's time for it to be fixed, thank you. **Richard**

Fong: Richard Fong. I just want to make a few public comments. I would have heard a lot about that Zoo and I've been talking to a lot of people about the tigers out there and everything else. I want to begin more on the positive, upbeat by saying it's commendable that the barrier for the tiger enclosure would have been brought up as soon as it transpired and was constructed. We go out there now, you take a good look at the tiger enclosure and the open parts to it, how that got done--a lot of that we had to bring in people from the public, public place. There was a woman there, Denise Bobo, she filed you. But I was happy that it was able to get done in the short amount of time and I'm sure you people here would have had something to say about it. That's kind of like on the positive upbeat and that's still the tiger issue. So when you start looking at the tiger issue again you still look at we have to develop a public relation public that changes the public image, bringing about participation, attendance, and other type of activities at our Zoo. But when I get to talking about it and I look at it I say what can we do. So I haven't seen too much. I wanted to try to toy around a little bit and I don't know if that's really the right word for that, just kind of look at would we be able to bring back a little back of public image. People around Chinatown I asked about them, would you come to the Zoo to look at pandas and I asked them about tigers they would say no, they get kind of frightened, but something that would be like an animal that formerly would have been a carnivore that would have been changed back all the way to herbivore, I think is very important that man and civilization and the training of animals. And there are pandas available presently. I read about it, that they had a breeding pair in Washington, D.C. but I don't know whether it's park policy whether or not to be breeding animals at our

zoos. Sometimes zoos don't want to deal with all the problems or breeding animals. Another part of the public relations had to do with are we going to continue with any type of research and development at our Zoo. I wanted to bring in red tailed hawks, bring them back to the ecology and food chain and trying to do that type of activity. That would be more the same of public relations. But of the other part that has to do with the Zoo it was a big thing that came up in the ACWC, it often comes down to the transparency, accountability and where do reporter problems come up. So if all the things I've talked about I want to try to keep what we're doing right now at good pace, keeping the tiger enclosures working right. I think it's up to grade now, it's got an electric grid overhead and everything else. Thank you.

Commissioner Lee: I'd just like to take a moment to respond to Mr. Ennis regarding the selection--I nominated Dr. Spinelli for the Veterinary advisory seat and I can tell you categorically I had no contact with the zoological society regarding the selection. There was no communication between myself and the director or any of the zoological society staff. Purely on the basis of the resume, the strength of his resume and his experience--that's why I put forward the nomination. So I really do contest any assertion that this was a process that was driven by the zoological society and I categorically say that, I've not had any conversations regarding this appointment at all with the zoological society, so thank you.

Commissioner Harrison: I echo Commissioner Lee's remarks. There was no contact. Myself as the chair had some contact with Bob Jenkins who was the VP out there who received the applications and I requested at one of the meetings that each of the members of the committee get a copy of those resumes and over the holidays they each had an opportunity to look at them. And I contacted them, each of them, to alert them to be sure to look at them before the meetings in order with the holidays they might have forgotten to do so. As far as the giraffe is concerned my understanding is that the general manager or director has the authority to have animal transactions. This was particularly necessary in this case because the giraffe in question was a female, her father was getting very interested and amorous towards her as was her brother, her half-brother, so we had to take action. The fire at that other facility certainly was not intentional.

RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT – REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS AND LEASE TEMPLATES

Rich Hillis, Director of Partnerships presented this item. So I can be brief, this item was put for you at the last meeting at Commissioner--now President Lazarus' suggestion we sought additional feedback from our leasee's as well as addressed some of the comments you heard at the last meeting. Most of the--all of the comment from the leasee was positive. We made some minor technical adjustments that you have before you. We clarified the point structure for our selection criteria and we changed the default interest to one percent a month which is standard in other city contracts and its easier to implement and clarified the requirement to keep books and records if Nessie were to be audited four years after the end of the lease term. There's one more minor change that came up since the publication is that the agenda and that's on page 15, Section 5.3, if there's an audit and someone is found to owe additional funds to Recreation and Park the language says now it would be paid promptly, so we made the change to say it would be paid within 15 days.

Commissioner Levitan: I just have a couple questions because I'm not remembering as well as I should the last time this was before us, I just have a couple sort of general question. So for example under selection criteria where we have the breakdown of how the general selection criteria, the most recent RFP that comes to mind where this was sort of discussed was the Stow Lake Carousel RFP. So in that case there was a very precise breakdown with a lot of sort of sub-areas. Are we saying that this is going to be the criteria for every single RFP?

Rich Hillis: This would be the standard. We certainly have a very diverse group of properties and they're very unique each one so we would come to you and recommend changes if there need to be changes for a particular property that warranted it. But we'd start from this basic framework.

Commissioner Levitan: I understand the principle of a template but I'm just saying for example with the Japanese Tea Garden there might be some areas where we want extra consideration of cultural experience, so I appreciate that

can fall under business and marketing but--maybe I just answered my own question. And then the other area that I want to go on record, I'll pose it as a question for the sake of this moment but I just want to say that under 5.3 under the audit are we only going to when we say applicants need to make their books available, is that only in the event of an audit or do we have access to those books for whatever reason we deem necessary.

Rich Hillis: Yes.

Commissioner Levitan: Because colleagues there have been applicants in the past that have been extremely resistant to that especially those that call themselves a non-profit and are seeking certain benefits of a non-profit status and we have had a terrible time getting access to their books. So with this we can access their books, Mr. Illis, this is what you're saying.

Rich Hillis: That would certainly be the intent, yes.

Commissioner Levitan: Thank you.

Commissioner Lazarus: I appreciate the time the staff has spent on this and I think made the appropriate changes since the last Commission meeting where we heard this. Is there a motion to approve the staff recommendation?

On motion by **Commissioner Levitan** and duly seconded, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

RES. NO. 0901-009

RESOLVED, That this Commission does approve a boilerplate RFP and Lease for the Recreation and Park Department Concession and Resource Development Division to use as standard practice in issuing RFPs and leases for concession and other opportunities.

SAN FRANCISCO MARINA YACHT HARBOR

Daniel LaForte with the Planning Division presented this item. The item before you is discussion and possible action approve a temporary dock in the Marina Yacht Harbor for use the Golden Gate Yacht Club. The Golden Gate Yacht Club is located in the outer harbor at the Marina Yacht Club and this action would approve a 100 foot linear foot temporary dock for use by the Golden Gate Yacht club and its member. The rationale behind the dock is temporary because there's been sand buildup and intrusion into the harbor which has disrupted use of other berth space that the yacht club has used in the past so that it currently cannot be used. And this temporary dock would supplant that space and allow boats to moor at the temporary dock until the Marina renovation project is construction in approximately three to five years. As part of that project there will be dredging in the harbor and a reconfiguration of the slips and so at that time the Golden Gate Yacht Club has agreed to remove the temporary dock when those new slips become available. The staff has been coordinating with our capital division as well as Larry White the acting yacht harbor master as well as the yacht club on this project and with that I would stop to answer any questions that you might have.

Daniel Frattin: Dan Frattin with Ruben and Julius, appearing on behalf of the Golden Gate Yacht Club. We have been working with Mr. LaForte for the past few months and I should probably behind by saying that we really appreciate how efficient and accessible both he and Mr. White the harbor master have been in getting this proposal before you today. The need for this project is really straight-forward. As Daniel said it's a temporary dock that's going to partially replace capacity--let me make sure that I have that the right way--it's going to replace capacity that's been lost due to sand accumulation on the breakwater. You can see here the historic configuration and this eastern most dock has been lost due to the accumulation of sand along the breakwater, you can see what the Golden Gate yacht club is left with now, they have about 155 linear feet of dock space left, that's about 40% of what's contemplated in the lease with the city. If you'd like to look on with me you have these pictures in Tab B with the letter I sent to you. The proposal now is to build a 100 foot dock which is going to be south of and parallel to the yacht clubhouse and the idea is this is an interim measure. The dock is going to stay in place only until the city carries out the more comprehensive marina renovation project that will fix the sand accumulation problem and also

permanently replace the lost dock capacity. Unfortunately that project is about 3 to 5 years off and you probably don't need to be reminded that in an uncertain budget environment that schedule can be extended pretty significantly. That uncertain time frame isn't going to work for the yacht club, they have an immediate problem, their revenues are off because few boats can come in which also means that the city is missing out on revenues, the city receives a certain share of gross revenues under its lease with the club. It also threatens many of the programs that the programs that the Golden Gate Yacht club offers, it provides free sailing lessons to high school students and it just isn't able to provide the level of service that it's members both expect and pay for. In closing I'd like to draw your attention to section 24 of the lease, this establishes the standard for building additions to the premises and it states that the city shall not unreasonably withhold its consent for improvements to the property. This temporary dock has been approved by all of the necessary environmental regulators. To our knowledge there's no opposition. I think it's a very reasonable proposal and we'd request that you accept the staff's recommendation and approve it.

Marcus Young: Good afternoon Commissioners. Marcus Young, I'm the current commodore for the Golden Gate Yacht Club. The club has been in existence for the past seven decades in or around the #1 Yacht Road. We've been in that place for a really long time and all through that time we've been an active boating, sailing, and racing club for basically the past 70 years. Our current programs at the club include one of the most dynamic and expansive racing programs in the Bay Area. Several clubs come to our clubhouse and use it as a racing venue and run races off our deck throughout the year. But perhaps one of our most proudest achievements is our junior sailing program which services about 30 children in San Francisco. It's free of charge, our kids come and learn how to sail, learn how to race, and our junior sailing foundation actually supports them as they go into college and continue racing. Currently with what's happening with our docks today at any given time it's becoming dangerous for our kids to be using the docks because the docks are being lifted up out of the water by the sand intrusion problem which basically means the boats and the equipment are now being put at perilous angles and getting them in and out of the water is becoming very difficult. This 100 foot dock which is a temporary dock is simply going to basically arrest that problem immediately but truly it's a sand intrusion problem that needs to be dealt with at least this year or we stand to lose the rest of our racing and sailing ability at this clubhouse. I hope that you guys can see to it, the Commission can see to, to approve this application. We have been working on it for about four years now and I think we've had a couple of different general managers over at the yacht harbor throughout that time, so we're hoping that today that we can get an approval on this application so we can move it forward, thank you very much.

On motion by **Commissioner Sullivan** and duly seconded, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

RES. NO. 0901-010

RESOLVED, That this Commission does approve a Temporary Dock in the Marina Yacht Harbor for use by the Golden Gate Yacht Club.

RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT CAPITAL BUDGET - FISCAL YEAR 2009-2010

Rhoda Parhams, Capital Program Manager presented this item. Just a brief narrative because you do have the spreadsheets in front of you. The agenda item here before you is a discussion and possible action to approve the Recreation and Park Department capital budget for fiscal year 2009-2010. In the way of background information the Mayor's budget instructions require that all Departments submit their capital budget requests to the city administrator's office by January the 20th, so it's due next Tuesday. The request must include all possible capital projects regardless of funding sources, projects must conform with our city's 10-year Capital Plan and all projects are categorized thusly. There are three separate categories, one is the facilities renewal which provides investments in maintenance designed to extend useful life of our facilities or infrastructure, enhancements which are large-scale multi year project such as renovations, additions, and new facilities. And then ongoing facility maintenance which is our routine maintenance on an ongoing basis. Currently for this year our immediate needs what we've decided as a group to focus on the immediate capital needs will include health and safety and protection of those Department assets that are highly at risk at this time. So in other words any ADA, things that are risk or in question of falling apart immediately. Our budget is at \$106.6 million, the request incorporates all possible Recreation and Park Department capital funding sources which include general fund, open space, the 2000 general obligation bond interest, second sale of the 2008 general obligation bond fund, Harding park maintenance fund and then the Golden Gate Yacht Club maintenance. A total of \$28.9 million of this request is in general funds and then the \$24.3 million

is divided between other funds. A brief breakdown of facility renewal has a total of 9.7 million dollars in it and that includes as I said the ADA requirements, the compliance with safety which includes the repair for retaining walls, we have some retaining walls that are in jeopardy of falling apart and we need to address those right away. There are other items that included, some work to be done, a million dollars going to proposed for repair, replacement of Kezar stadium track and then general fund obligations, a millions dollars for ADA, security lighting at \$500,000, court resurfacing at \$1.6 million, and erosion control at \$364,000. And open space projects include park renovations at \$500,000 and community gardens as well at \$150,000. Enhancements totals for our budget is \$93.8 million and those enhancements include the replacement and repair of systems such as irrigation systems, we're looking at doing a million dollars worth of work at Camp Mather for the water tank replacement there and some play structures that need to have replacement, those are the ones with the hazardous material on them that need to do some abatement on them annually so it includes that. It also includes a match from the Trust for Public Land grant to renovate the Hayes Valley playground. Categories include open space, charter set aside for the 2008 GO bond projects, so we do have a set aside for those and we are working with the geo bond project at this time. The general fund portion of this enhancement request includes work at Civic Center Plaza which is a Mayoral priority, as we said irrigation system renewals, play structure hazardous mitigation and then of course Hayes Valley and Waller Street skate park and then again Camp Mather. Open space projects includes acquisitions and then a bit of contingency and capital project management and also includes the 2008 bond projects that we are moving with design and planning at this time. Finally, the facility maintenance total is \$3.1 million and due to the budget crisis the city's administrator's office will not accept additional requests of general fund facilities for 09/10. The Department will receive the same amount it did last year so we've not increasing our budget for facilities and while we do have a need. The general fund portion of that project includes the stadium at \$705,000 for general facilities maintenance, \$600,000 for field rehabilitation--I'm sorry, general facilities maintenance is \$600,000. Field rehabilitation is \$75,000 and that is with the grass and the sod, the ongoing facility maintenance that happens on an ongoing basis annually and then of course Camp Mather repairs that go on every year, \$200,000 set aside. And then finally the Marina Yacht Harbor maintenance at \$430,000 is also included in this. We want you to note that the budget request for the open space fund acquisitions and contingency is only an estimated number and will change later as the budget process completes through the controller's office.

Commissioner Sullivan: What's the process for deciding which projects make the cut for this proposal? I know when we did the geo bond there was a very rigorous, almost mathematical process that led to the projects that were submitted and I'm just wondering how did you decide.

Rhoda Parhams: Are we talking about the geo bond or this budget?

Commissioner Sullivan: This project. How did Waller Street make the cut and other things didn't?

Rhoda Parhams: That was a project that was on the--actually what happens is the executive staff sits down with our CFO and we go through what's on the docket for the first time last year and what is required or what the public is asking for and what we think we can actually move through, what has been the process in the past, how much interest has been shown. This request came through not only through the Mayor but also through a public commitment. There's a community asking for Waller Street and we want improve and add a skate park there so we're just asking for it, it's not that it will be guaranteed but we are asking for it. We felt that it was necessary to do that because there is an actual public request out there for another skate park over at Waller Street.

Commissioner Sullivan: I just used that as an example. So the priorities are basically being set by the Department's sense of what on to be?

Rhoda Parhams: Yes, yes.

Commissioner Lazarus: What's the likelihood of this money appearing? Maybe 84 million of it which is not general fund but 29 million of this is a general fund ask, is there really budget instructions out there that lead us to believe that we're going to get \$29 million of general fund capital money?

Jared Blumenfeld: No. Unfortunately not. The political reality is that we need to have proposals in there to fight for the money that does exist. There is money and we need to be at the table with proposals that have support from the board and others. Because otherwise we have no chance of getting anything. So Rhoda and her team go every two weeks to the Capital planning meeting that includes all the different agencies from DPW to the controller's office to the city administrator and they try and prioritize need based on what they have. So to have a small amount of money and a huge amount of need we're basically saying that we would like to put these things forward to represent what we'd like to get. Our chances of getting them are increased dramatically by putting something on the table but I'm not sure they're increased to a stage that we'll every get very much .

Rhoda Parhams: So the next step in the process is that Katie and Jared will be in front of the Mayor and the budget committee folks and they'll be pushing like everybody else for our needs.

Meredith Thomas: Meredith Thomas with the Neighborhood Parks Council. I have a couple of points about the proposed capital budget next year and it's the same question that I had last year which is why court resurfacing--and at least this year there was some specification as to which parks were to get court resurfacing--why that ranks ahead of hazardous material abatement in our playgrounds? I asked you this last year. I was told by your predecessor that he needed money in case Noe Courts cracked unexpectedly in the middle of the year. However, we know quite clearly, and I'm not holding you to that statement, but I know quite clearly that there is pressure treated lumber that is leaching arsenic in our playgrounds, that we know. Whether or not a court will be damaged over time we don't know and one of the parks listed in this court resurfacing line item is on the bond. So we know we're not going to get all of this money I just don't understand what hazardous material abatement is considered number one an enhancement, that might not be a categorization the Department can control, but number two why it's a second priority rating over court resurfacing. And to ask for a million and a half dollars in court resurfacing you've got almost \$400,000 last year but to not be pushing the playground money I just don't understand and I think it's really important that we address things like toxicity and safe playgrounds. You can almost push over the swings at Larson Park and if someone hasn't already they will, especially with the new pool being opened, and the little structure at Cuyuga Playground--I mean at Crocker Amazon, the one closer to Italy Street, is really wobbly. I was told last year that the ongoing maintenance in our playgrounds exists, that the playgrounds are getting painting. Cuyuga needs to be painted desperately. I just don't see the connection between the work getting done and the priority level of the request because in all likelihood some things are going to fall off this list. So I appreciate the need to maintain our parks in a way that is safe and accessible for everyone and if there's a real need to resurface courts that's fine, I just don't understand placing a park in there that's going to be on the bond anyway but putting down to second priority abating arsenic and fixing unsafe play structures.

Jared Blumenfeld: I would agree with the speaker that that doesn't make a lot of sense. I think that the way the capital plan is done this includes money--to address the easier comment first--this has both money that isn't in the bond. So they're mixed in and blended. So some of the requests are for general fund and some are for not. So to the extent that it's in the wrong category that will be addressed. And secondly, this is a big issue for me, arsenic treated wood, what I've seen is that the paint crew basically goes around and seals all the playgrounds where there's an issue of arsenic treated wood and posts them on a schedule that they can do. That money isn't funded through the capital division but through the maintenance division and so the answer to the question is the long-term solution is obviously to replace those, and I think the replacement is what the bond that was passed by the voters last year anticipates redoing, and that's how it's divided. But to the extent that we have an absolute prioritization between fixing something hazardous and resurfacing a court we're always going to pick fixing the hazardous thing first.

Commissioner Lazarus: This has come up before too and I will say that I've raised the issue about court resurfacing in the context of some of our Recreation and Park programs when we've gone through with a bond and

redone a clubhouse or rec facility but the bond hasn't included the courts. And here we have a beautiful building with not so beautiful courts and in some cases athletic courts can pose an injury risk if they aren't properly surfaced. There have been plenty of claims filed against the city for injuries incurred on tennis courts of basketball courts through failure of the paved surface. So I think it can be a safety issue as well. Is there other public testimony.

Howard Strassner: Howard Strassner, I've asked for public comment but its much better to talk within the budget, that's what I wanted to bring up anyway. Some time ago we had a budget discussion, we talked about charging for parking, and we have a long list of projects that are going to be discussed some time this year, maybe half a years work, and is not included in the list. And then you're talking about needs for money, should you fix swings, should you fix courts, all the things you have to do and you have limited money from the city and here is a source of funding that you can get on your own. One can argue about how many millions you can get for charging for parking in Golden Gate Park and how many millions you can get for charging in the Marina but it starts somewhere so the people can see that one, you're going to use the money for good purposes, two, that they're not going to fall apart if they have to pay for parking someplace and it will just start. If we don't start we're never going to get there, you'll always have needs that you can't meet. It's so great that you have people that are so close to their facilities and are so concerned about these things, but do something for them. So I hope that gets on the agenda pretty soon, you're going to need the money.

On motion by **Commissioner Harrison** and duly seconded, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

RES. NO. 0901-011

RESOLVED, That this Commission does approve the Recreation and Park Department Capital Budget for Fiscal Year 2009-2010.

RECREATION AND PARK DEPARTMENT BUDGET – FISCAL YEAR 2009-2010

Jared Blumenfeld: Unfortunately Katie was called away due to illness at the last minute so I'm here poor substitute. You've heard lots of language about how dire the budget situation is, I'm going to try to paint you some detail about that picture and explain the process by which we and the public together can arrive at some solutions to close the gap. I'm going to paint a broader city picture which looks at why we're in this particular predicament. If you look at every category, some of these are money coming in, midyear reductions which we just had. Two and a half million dollars--even with all the money coming in the cuts are far greater and the revenue shortfalls because of the state and other money coming in from tax and property revenue is significantly down. So the shortfall at the moment is about half a million dollars, so a significant number citywide. These are the instructions that we got. We were asked to proposed ongoing expenditure reductions of 12.5%. Those were originally our instructions so we thought we were going to have to load into the system \$4.4 million and then to come up with a contingency reduction of another \$4.4. We were just told two days ago that we had to combine them, that the second \$4.4 really wasn't contingency for a whole set of reasons. The revenue projections that you just saw weren't accurate and that we had to load into the system on February 20th, 8.8 million. So the target for our Department that's hard and fast at the moment is \$8.8 million. This is a little bit of familiarity to get us re-familiarized with where the money is coming from. These are the special fund sources that Nancy and other hopefully help get us--Golf, Marina Yacht Harbor, Open Space Fund, Revenue Bonds and others and you can see there's a decrease in those number, there are about 10 million. This isn't the money that's actually impacted by the \$8.8 million cut but you can see just see year on year its decreased. These are the general fund sources, these are the important sources of money that we get and we can go through them. You can see the largest is garages, so as Howard pointed out our largest source of money is coming from vehicles. Program fees, concessions, permits, facility rentals, Monster Park is obviously a big line item which is also decreasing.

Commissioner Lazarus: Since they're not paying us anymore, change that slide next time to Candlestick.

Jared Blumenfeld: Good point. Prior year reserve that we have and general fund support is--general fund support is the area that we need to cut but all these areas are things that can help reduce our general fund reliance. This is the money that we actually contribute into the general fund and it's obviously less that we're getting back. These are the

four main sources, garages, stadium, Camp Mather and the Tea Garden, and these are the decisions that we need to weigh in on starting today. So paid parking in parks has always been something controversial. Our recommendation is that we need to pick--and we've been working with the MTA. The MTA now has fairly exclusive jurisdiction without the need to go to the Board of Supervisors or get other approval to designate where parking happens or does not happen within the city and county of San Francisco. So we will be pending your suggestions to staff at this meeting, we have proposed coming back to you on February 5th with a list of four parking spots that would potentially have significant revenue generating capabilities and they would be the Marina, Balboa, Lincoln Park which is also getting the Legion, and parts of Golden Gate Park. So some of those may be things that we decide to move forward on, others may not but we want to come forward with you and I think they could be discussed in a pilot sense. We can see how much revenue they bring in. Then we could say there's all kind of variable rate parking options that are there but it's certainly an option that's on the table. No decision will be made until both you decide on the issue and the MTA also votes on it. So that could bring in revenue. The revenue will be based on lots of different criteria and I think will involve a strong partnership with the MTA. We're also looking at the reducing the about we pay the MTA, we pay then upwards of \$120,000 a year to maintain our garages, we're going to work on trying to bring that number to close to zero. A lot of these things, apples and oranges. Obviously the increase to Kezar parking lot fees is not going to help us bridge that delta. There are issues on Portsmouth and Union Square garage rates. We could look at variable rates on the weekends and evenings, they're less and maybe in the day they're more. We certainly got direction and discussion with the Commission that we're more interested in increasing the rates for the long-term parking and less for the short-term parking. So the monthly rates may increase, 24 hour rates may increase, but the hourly rates between one and six hours may not increase at all. Advertising in garages, that was a major RFP that the MTA put out for all the new street furniture included in that but something that we hadn't jumped on was the ability to increase the advertising into the garages themselves, so without doing an RFP or any work we can collect revenue. These are all discussion points about directions that we need feedback on, some of them take more work. That for instance doesn't take very much work at all. We don't know how much revenue it will be bringing in but by the time we come back to you on the 19th we'll have those numbers figured out. Our contract for a full large concert in Golden Gate Park. One of the suggestions that came from the Commission at the last meeting was the we do one in August and one in June so that it's captured within a full fiscal year and hopefully we can bring in significant revenue from that and we will find our from Rich when we meet next on February 5th. Pushcart service, they're very popular. These are small things. RFQ for preferred vendors for events and weddings, entrance fee for to the Botanical Gardens is obviously a big political one that we need your feedback on. We have the Tea Garden, we have the Conservatory of Flowers and I think there's long been a feel, an understanding, that when things got very bad we may need to look at this and I think that time has come. Taxi stands in Golden Gate Park concourse is something that came back, we got feedback from Commissioners, it's something that we looked at. The next one is obviously very controversial which is property sales. There are properties around the city--I visited two today--some really that don't have any kind of recreational or in some cases very little park benefits that for different reasons we've gotten. Some of them on the list we didn't even know we had we just got accessed fines by DPW, they said this is your property why aren't you taking care of it. And so they're surplus property that would be a one-time obviously sale. I think we'd need to come up with a very strict policy on what that money should be used for so this would have to go to the voters in the form of an ordinance and we'd want to bring to you by the next meeting a list that we start to have public meetings around pending your decision that this made sense to do. And then Golf course green fees, other things that we're looking at that that aren't on the list as well as the impact for instance of mowing the non-athletic grass half as much as we do now, of saying we're not going to rake leaves in the autumn in winter. What can we do operationally that could reduce some of the costs of doing business. So we're also looking operationally at things that make sense and between none and when you make a decision and it goes to the Mayor's office there will be a lot of public input which I'll get to in a second. Program fee increases, CampMather fees, Harvey Milk center programming, picnic table rentals, film and photography permits, and Sally from SFDog when she met with me also talked about the idea of licensing professional dog walkers, these are all things that we can do to start bringing in money. None of them in and of themselves add up to a great deal but I think they help to bridge the gap. For the next meeting we're going to do an expenditure review of staff budget, non-salary budget and the trade off issues. You can't get to \$8.8 million by just haphazardly cutting in different places, we need to have a strategic approach. Part of that approach is what I'm going to discuss next which is a philosophy behind what we do well and what we perhaps

do less well and how we can get efficiencies in recreation but the same will be true on the other side of the house. This is the presentation that we're doing today on the 29th at Joe Lee Rec center between 7:00 and 8:30 we'll be doing a community presentation and really trying to get feedback on specific items from them. We then have another community budget meeting before the next full meeting on the 5th of this Commission and we have a PROSAC presentation on February 3rd. We then have the February 19th Commission where we hopefully will approve a budget that balances \$8.8 million, then we have the usual set of negotiations and discussions and the budget is then submitted to the Board of Supervisors on June 1st. So that's where we are, so really today I think this is some of what we maybe can discuss, are there things that you absolutely want off this list, you don't want us to look at paid parking, you want to stop the discussion now or if you don't want us to look at--we're just not ready to deal with issues like the Botanical Garden, those are directions that so we're not spending time doing that. Or for instance if you want something that isn't on this list to spend time doing we're really dedicating as much of our resources--for instance, getting parking up and running for July 1st takes a huge amount of time and effort and we need to dedicate resources on our end, we need DPT and MTA and a lot of people to come together to make this work, so we just want to make sure we're on the right direction. These are very sensitive issues. I can't underscore that we don't have many options, if we don't raise revenue we have to cut staff and services, those are the only two controls that we have at our disposal. With that I open it up.

Commissioner Lee: General Manager I spoke to you before about the issue our when we do site permits for instance at the Embarcadero we have one fee for a particular site. When there is interest in the market for smaller, a portion of the site being used, for instance in Union Square and so forth, is that something we can add to this list, a scalability to your permitting fees so that we can capture some of that revenue?

Jared Blumenfeld: Absolutely. I think two things on the permitting side. One, we have to at least achieve cost recovery. Some of the permits that we give out for example North Beach Jazz Festival, we're losing money, we lose money on that event. I'm not sure we can afford to lose money on many more events. So I think we need to at least have cost recovery on all the permits that we issue. And then some large other ones that we don't think we're losing revenue like the Red Bull Soapbox Derby in Dolores Park, we spend so much time cleaning up after those. We need to make some decisions about what level permits go. We have a decision that's a little bit different from the permit process, we need to do that and we also need to subdividing up our property because a lot of people can't afford all of Civic Center Plaza or all of JustinHerman Plaza and there's revenue to be got from sections. I think the permitting is something that isn't on here that needs to be on here.

Commissioner Lee: I have a quick follow up question. With our partners, the Parts Trust and other what have you heard in terms of any assistance that we can get in terms of helping cover this budget shortfall?

Jared Blumenfeld: Part of my task as the interim General Manager is to look at some of these relationships. I think we need to recast the relationships of our Friends groups and realize that we come first. I mean, they're Friends of Recreation and Park Department even if they're not that in name. Ultimately we're all reaching difficult times and at times there's a lot of confusion between the many different groups. Every entity that I meet I find our there's a Friends group. There's a friend of Sharon meadows, there's a Friend of Randall Museum, and there's not that many friends out there. So there's only so many people that can be sustained raising money in the name of Recreation and Park. We need to ultimately get money and say this is our expectation that we need X hundred thousand or X million dollars from these collected Friends groups to come in and help meet our general fund deficit.

Commissioner Lazarus: It comes down to there needs to be a gift line in our revenue side of our budget that every year this Department receives from our friends X hundreds or X millions of dollars that's just another general fund source that's non taxpayer generated.

Jared Blumenfeld: So maybe Jim and I can take a few of these folks to lunch.

Commissioner Sullivan: I wanted to comment on two things in the list of opportunities. The first is I'm a strong supporter of paid parking in the right places in our parks. Not everywhere but I think that's an important source of potential revenue and as Jim has said many, many times we can present that as not parking meters popping up every 18 feet but in the way that it's done better in other places. I also hope that we will do outreach to the environmental community because the parks is very much an environmental issue as well in discouraging cars. The one thing that you described that I would be unlikely to support and I don't think it's just my particular background is the admission fees to the Botanical Garden. It just strikes me as a place where people go for passive recreational use and I would really worry that if we did that it would really discourage people from using that space.

Commissioner Levitan: I want to concur with my colleague Commissioner Sullivan. You said is eloquently enough just about parking in parks I'm all for it as long as it's done right in certain park, as well as the Botanical Gardens, that doesn't feel right and I personally would struggle with that. I personally also struggle with the gold course fee increase, I feel like we keep going to that and until we can deliver a better product on some of those courses I think we may have gone to that well enough times. But I have to say Jared it is music to my ears to hear you talk about how we have to start being realistic about some of these things we're delivering that we're subsidizing. I think it's part of a bigger conversation on some level about what our core values are as a Department and maybe as a city because if that's how people want it, if they want festivals that we are losing money on then the flip side of that is we have layoffs or we increase permits and it's been the elephant in the room for years and this has come up every time we talk about the summer festivals and nobody has wanted to talk about it. So I'm sorry that it's taken this financial crisis for this to be the top but I really appreciate you bringing this to the fore because I think there's a lot to be done there. Otherwise I think this is a very viable list of sources of revenue, I think it looks great.

Commissioner Lazarus: My comments are that I think the property sale needs to get dropped off in this context. I think maybe there's the opportunity in the coming months to have some public hearings on what our property holdings are, we can calendar it here, and get some feedback from the public and there are probably greater priorities in land purchases that some of the funds could be used if in fact we have some properties that have some private sector value and we have broad consensus that we could sell those as long as we're designating that money for open space acquisition somewhere else. It's going to be a tough issue because there's always going to be living somebody living next door to that little mini park even though the mini park never gets used and we could put that money to better use on a one-time purchase or property somewhere else. But I think we probably should have those hearings and look at it. In spite of the comments of two of my Commissioners I did have the chance to go out and talk to our staff and our friends group at the Botanical Garden and I really think that we need to look at a charge there. Growing up in San Francisco the Tea Garden was free, the conservatory was free, the museums were free until the late 1960s when we started putting admission charges on for good reason, the need to bring that revenue in. The Botanical Garden never seemed to fall under that and I think it is a revenue source, it's obviously a complicated issue because if we enter into some agreement with the Botanical Garden Society to collect revenues how much do they get to keep, how much do we put back into underwrite part of our general fund cost of maintaining the garden. I think maybe coupled with that it's the perfect thing to have a triple ticket that allows people into the Tea Garden, the Conservatory and the Botanical Garden at a discount. So from a marketing point of view I think there's some opportunities. Unfortunately, as the direct tax payer general fund subsidy of our Department declines year after year that most of us have been on this Commission, it seems that in good times or bad the general fund taxpayer support for the Department gets reduced and we're just going to have to wake up to the fact that someday this is going to be a pure enterprise Department and we're going to have raise all our money. This crisis is just one more step down that road probably. Is there public comment on this?

Jared Blumenfeld: Just one more interesting item that came up from staff was that the pools are set to 82 degrees, you can literally save thousands, tens of thousands of dollars by making the pool 78 degrees.

Commissioner Lazarus: Yeah, but the human body finds a big difference as a swimmer between 81 and 78 I tell you. I'm not sure 81 is warm enough. Sounds like a suggestion from the Director of the Department of Environment.

Sally Stephens: Sally Stevens representing SFDog. I do think that at this point for this budget I don't know that you can really consider the professional dog licensing, there's a lot of things that still have to be worked out, how many dogs, how much [unintelligible] so it's something for the future. There hasn't been any kind of cost benefit analysis done on that issue and I think needs to be before it gets added. In addition in many ways it's equally an animal welfare issue as it is a park issue and so there's a lot of other concerns in the ACC and things like that. So although it's something in the future that there might be some component I think that you can't really consider that for this particular budget. Another issue, I live in Golden Gate Heights Parks, I live at 10th and Quintara and when you guys instituted the four hour parking in Golden Gate Park limit you wouldn't think it but my neighborhood got impacted fairly severely with people who worked at UCSF who had been parking in the park all day and now they couldn't and so now they come up because the #6 Parnassus bus goes right through the neighborhood. They park far enough up that they are able to--there's no zone parking where I live. And so actually there was an impact on our neighborhood and pretty far away that you might not really think of when you do paid parking in parks people will park in the neighborhoods and so there is an impact. So just kind of keep that in mind. It's nothing something that I think anyone would have ever thought that 4 hour parking in Golden Gate Park would impact the availability of street parking probably 15 blocks away, but it can. So just kind of keep that in mind when you think of that sort of thing. Thank you.

Meredith Thomas: Meredith Thomas with the Neighborhood Parks Council. President Lazarus I am happy to roll up my sleeves and help with this issue. What I find so deeply frustrating, probably more frustrating than anything else that I work on with a day to day basis, is the total absence of numbers in these conversations. I sit on a budget working group that was formed at partly our request, the Neighborhood Parks Council's request, but sort of through this body and in conjunction with the Department and we had this presentation yesterday and if we don't know how much potential revenue some of these items can generate I don't know if it's a good idea or not because there are tradeoffs for every idea and you have to understand what targets you're working towards. Similarly, you know, I don't really understand how we categorize our expenses and prioritize them. I know that yesterday when I met with Katie she says she's looking at some target reductions and one thing we haven't even touched on here today is the likelihood of some layoffs for staff. And she tossed out a number of about \$2 million might be a target reduction in staff and she said there's two places those reductions can come from, park staff or rec staff. I said I beg to differ, I think there's a third, administration. So what kind of conversation are we really having here? I have to say it upsets me so much the framework and the priority setting isn't there and the numbers aren't there for us to get our red pencils with spreadsheets and really try to work through as partners so I can go back in good faith to the community and say we really took a fine tooth comb over this process and here's what the Department needs. I'm not suggesting that the Department is top heavy, I don't know that it is and I don't know that you have too many administrators or middle managers but I sure know we're not bottom heavy, we're 200 gardeners short and so before we start the conversations about cutting line staff or is it better to cut from park or is it better to cut from rec I really want a good faith effort to look at the administration because when things are this bad citywide our parks are going to be impacted from cuts to health and human services, people will have less services, places to sleep, you know, places to turn in their needles and everything else that will end up in our parks and the gardeners and the custodians are frontline on that stuff. If the gift making process for this Department was easier and more enjoyable I'd be happy to help drive more funding to the Department. I sponsor fiscal groups all the time who really have to bend over backwards to get the Department to accept their gifts and to the point earlier about the playgrounds, I've offered three times to paint Cayuga and to buy the paint and I've been told no, we can't schedule workdays because they cost the Department overtime. Well guess what, people work during the week and Sundays aren't an option for the Department. So we're up against some major barriers that if you can let the community partner in a more effective way we can really get a lot done. You know, we can have parents sifting sand, we can have communities painting play structures and buying paint. Quickly, this Department needs to get the requisition from the Mayor's office to hire the permits and reservation officers that you can actually generate the revenue that comes through that Department.

Nancy Wuerfel: Nancy Wuerfel, I'm sitting on the working group with Meredith and I support what she's saying, especially the need to have numbers. And I want to thank Commissioner Harrison for joining us, he's been a real trooper and I'm proud to have him as our vice chair. But I really think that it is important and a way to guide the conversation if we do have some real numbers. In regards to the Botanical gardens, I do support not having that as an admission. However, there is a compromise, you can start with donations and people are generous and rather than start with having to put something together that could be contentious and you get nothing, half a loaf

is better than none so let's start with a donation box--we can do that today, I can build one in my basement. Now, land sales--I think this is also an extraordinarily controversial area is not going to produce anything for the 9-10 budget, it is a big deal. I think we need to think about this very carefully especially in light of the open space task force that the Mayor has and here we are generating all kinds of ideas that might want to be complimented and so this is a bigger political issue than you want to take on. We have to focus right now to get this budget passed. We do not want to take on I would assume any kind of controversial issues that would bring more of a spotlight about controversy at Recreation and Park, we don't want to go there. So let's not confuse things that are going to be divisive in the community, we need support at the Board of Supervisors for every dime we can get. I also would like to try to steer away from anything that has to do with picnic tables. I know that sounds funny but just the idea of seeing it on a list, it really grates. I'm sorry, are we that broke we can't just let the families go out on a Sunday afternoon? It can't be that bad, so there's got to be another way and if can just possibly work together and think politically what are we saying to the public that are paying the bills? So let's be reasonable, let's be really focused, and by the way I have some very interesting ideas I will be sharing with Jared and his staff on how the golf fund might be enhanced not through golf fees but they might be able to make a better contribution which would then enhance the open space fund which will then backfill the general fund. So I'm looking at other ways that we can get more money on the table and I will discuss it with staff first and then they'll bring it to you if they agree with me. Thank you. **Andrea O'leary:** For me I think one of the things that's most grating on my mind is that we always wait until its budget time to have these discussions. How many times have we come before you and we've said we need to talk about this, we need to talk about that. And we don't do it and we don't do it. I don't see staff setting up community meetings to talk about these things and I don't see you guys instructing them to do it, at least in this forum. So we don't talk about it. So here we brought to you the issue of picnic tables. Why should people pay for having a picnic table? I mean, it makes no sense. If you want a compromise why can't we decide how often a picnic table should be free and how often you're going to rent it out so that there is a compromise so that people don't feel that they're being gouged for everything. The donation box is a good idea, quite frankly. You can put donation boxes in my park any day. This whole idea of selling land--we haven't even had the discussion about whose land it is anyway. How many times have we said who's piece of land is that at the entrance to my park? Oh, it's not mine, it's not mine. Well, it's got to be somebody's. We can't get anybody to maintain it because nobody wants to claim it. We're willing to claim it but nobody wants to help us. We can do it on our own but they throw us out because we are trespassing. So this whole idea of who is who and what is what and how we can collaborate is a discussion we haven't even had. The whole idea of charging for programming, fees for this and that, is a discussion excuse me but I have asked over and over again that we have, and we have not had it. One particular rec center started charging the badminton people because we squawked about it that they use a tremendous amount of space for a tremendous amount of time, they don't pay a dime, they're an organized group. Suddenly they got charged. Well, they sent you guys a letter, squawked and squawked, and guess what? They're not paying a fee. But other people are paying to have their homework help even on days when there is no homework. So these are kinds of discussions we need to have. I agree that the park partners NPC, Parks Trust, need to have a conversation to you about who they want to be for us. I know that we use these groups as fiscal agents and we pay them a fee to write a check for us or to write a letter for us. They get their fee out of what we bring in. And we are bringing that money in not to enrich ourselves, not to bank it, we bring that money in for specific improvements to the parks and yet I don't see it filtering through, so those relationships I think need to be defined. Dog walkers, we've talked about it enough, we don't need to clarify anything anymore, let's get some decisions made and let's get it out of animal care control because they're doing a lousy job of it and that indeed is an expensive use of our land. Thank you. **Nancy Stafford:** Nancy Stafford, co-director of the Professional Dog Walkers Association. I had no idea this was going to be on the agenda until Tuesday when Beth Winegarner of the Examiner called me and asked me what I thought about it. We support licensing for dog walkers. It has gone through the dog advisory committee and Recreation and Park dropped the ball. And then the animal welfare Commission took it up and expanded on the requirements for licensing. We absolutely support licensing. Our concerns would be that RPD is not the Department to license us, one of the reasons being that we walk on much more land than Recreation and Park land, DPW land, redevelopment land, port land, PUC land, all different lands, although a lot of it is on Recreation and Park land they're not the only agencies and other agencies would not doubt want a piece of the pie if Recreation and Park was going to collect that fee. Animal care and control is going to need money in order to inspect our vehicles and make sure that we have a

first aid kit. We're also concerned about the cost of the permit, we want it to be reasonable, that we can afford. We're hurting just like everybody else is. I know I spend over \$7,000 a year for health insurance and being sole owner operators as most of us are, a few of us have partners, we're not large--there are large companies out there but they're certainly not in the majority. It's difficult as it is because we also have a lot of vehicle costs due to we need a vehicle in order to do our work. So we're not out there--on the contrary we are not--although some of us are doing quite well, the majority of people that I know are struggling and the majority of us get about on average of what some teachers may get but we're working five to seven days. We don't get a break in the summer, we're working seven days a week in order to get the same amount of money that teachers make in a shorter period of time. And that varies across the board. Dog walkers are making as little as 15, 20 thousand dollars a year, as much as 50, but it's all over the map and it depends on how your parameters of your business, everybody is different. The controversy that's going to be is of course over the number because you're going to hear a lot--because that hasn't been determined, the number of dogs allowed walked and the fee. But as I say we support licensing, we do, but we would like to see it go through animal care and control. **Howard Strassner:** Howard Strassner I want to talk mainly on parking. To remind this Commission that the Sierra Club has been supportive of parking for many years and some years ago I made some numbers for Golden Gate Park and I found it was \$4 million dollars ready to be picked up right off the street a year and more recently \$2 million dollars in the Marina. Now, these are based on what I as a transit advocate or anti-parking person, would think are reasonable but of course there's going to be a lot of discussion but that's something you should go through. And the other thing is to complain about people who can't get to park in a park because it either costs money or whatever the solution to that all over the city is residential permit parking, \$60 a year you virtually own a place in your neighborhood, not directly in front of your house but somewhere pretty close. So that's a solution to that. And the land sales is very interesting. Obviously, it has to be done very, very carefully. The Sierra Club will certainly want to be involved and so allowing a lot of time to describe the land being sold, where it is and allowing plenty of field visit time and a lot of advertising, maybe it works, especially using the money to acquire other open space would be very useful. Thank you very much.

Jared Blumenfeld: Can I just clarify one thing that was said. This meeting is specifically to talk about revenue generation. And the goal of today is really to bring things to you so that we can get your feedback so that we can go back and work on those numbers. It's very difficult within--as of Monday I thought we had a \$4.4 million goal and now we have an 8.8 million dollar goal and so although some of these things will take a considerable amount of time we also need to bring a budget that balances \$8.8 million gap by the 19th of February.

Commissioner Lazarus: And you have two further public hearings out in the community on January 29th and February 4th I think?

General Manager Blumenfeld: Yes. The first one will be at Joe Lee on the 29th between 7:00 and 8:30 and the second is Sunset Rec. We have the date on here. And the 4th of February is the next one, right.

Commissioner Harrison: The lady from the dog walkers group. This is just a question that I see a lot of dog walkers with multiple dogs, four and five and six, how do they pick up the dog droppings?

Nancy Stafford: I'll be the first to admit that I do miss on occasion, but when I leave the park I can say that it is cleaner than when I found it. I mean, it's true even owners get distracted. The dog poops the first time the owner gets to talking, gets distracted. That happens a lot I think that people do get distracted but I make a note of where my dogs go. I'd say I'm successful 95 % of the time but I know that when I leave my park it's cleaner and I'm out there picking up a lot more than just dog poop. I pick up trash, but that's just me, but I know a lot of other dog walkers who--because we are under the microscope because we're out there, we're very visible. I can't vouch for every single dog walker anymore than I can vouch for every single owner, dog owner, but I think that we're perceived as not doing our job when most of us are. Just because we don't pick it up at that second doesn't mean that one or two minutes later I'm not going over there an picking it up because I made a note of where it was.

Commissioner Harrison: It just seems very difficult for me to control six dogs.

Nancy Stafford: When people are not familiar--believe me, when I first started this business 20 years ago I wasn't about to take any dogs off a leash. I didn't feel confident. Now I don't like to have them on a leash because I think having a mixture of somebody on and somebody off is very difficult to control--and they stay in packs and then hang out. They're very trainable because dogs are pack animals. I know to the unfamiliar I could understand where it looks pretty overwhelming and I've talked to other owners who say oh my god how can you do that but you learn and you gain experience and you realize your limitations too. And this licensing I hope will go towards specifying the number. That's part of the licensing process to specify what's a reasonable number. I can tell you right now that surrounding communities animal care and control recommends 6. Surrounding communities have six also but many communities haven't established their number. Our organization is very split between six and eight. So many of us want eight and some of us are happy with six.

Commissioner Lazarus: We got the point. I think Tom can talk afterwards. Tom's retired and maybe he's looking for a little sideline business so if you can give him some advise on how to get in this we can talk [laughter]. Any other Commissioner comment on this? This was not an action, it was just a report for discussion. Seeing none, let's move to the next item.

On motion by **Commissioner Sullivan** and duly seconded, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

RES. NO. 0901-011

RESOLVED, That this Commission approve the Recreation and Park Department Capital Budget for Fiscal Year 2009-2010

STRATEGIC VISION FOR RECREATION SERVICE DELVIERY

Jared Blumenfeld, General Manager, presented this item. At the last meeting we told you a little bit about the process that we were engaging in to bring together a lot of the information that was done in rec assessments. Literally tens of thousands of dollars have been spent since 2000 to work out what we shouldn't be doing and how we should be doing it. So we wanted to sit down strategically with primarily SEIU 1021 and the family of rec folks within Recreation and Park to work out a strategic direction. So we've reviewed the previous documents which were numerous and voluminous, we've met with all the neighborhood service area managers. We've met with union and labor folks and we've looked at the class data that's come from the last 12 months. And so this is a document. My favorite thing about the document is that it's only two pages long in sharp contrast to the documents we've read. And so I'm going to go through it briefly but really the goal is to do a number of things, it's to work out what we do well and where we can do those things well and at the same time provide a quality of service that's predictable. Namely, if you think direct service is going to be provided it actually is going to be provided at the time stated. So I think that is what the public looks to get. And not to do lots of things. Some of them are very dubious when you look down the list. We offer surfing, we offer karaoke training, we offer cooking classes, knitting, crocheting. So of them we don't have the skills to really teach and I think labor was the first to come and say we don't have people that have professional cooking skills so I'm not sure we should be offering cooking. So we want to be the city's first ranked provider of identified lines of recreations both in terms of registered programs provided by staff and self-directed recreation experiences. So there's really a distinction here which is things that we offer and then things that we provide for that are self directed, tai chi, walking, bicycling, these are things that are happening in the park. People aren't paying for them, we're not directing them, but it's a real benefit that people have come to expect. We also want to be the city's first choice for community driver recreation that's offered by quality providers in response to identified neighborhood demand or emerging industry trends and we want a Department known for well-run, welcoming facilities that provided quality recreation choice, high performing customer service and consistent, reliable operating hours in a safe environment, so that's really the mission statement, succinctly put. This is the current position based on the previous studies and current experience, our strengths and challenges in recreation include the fact that our real estate is our most significant strength. We have 20% of the city's real estate and it's entrusted to us to take care of well and provide the services that we articulated before. We need more consistent recreation program standards. Programs need to be more market driven, the desire to reach everyone dilutes programming efforts, so there's a belief that we have a lot of political pressure,

someone wants to do some small thing somewhere and we end up doing lots of things very poorly or less well than we could. There's a demonstrated need for more projects, core primary lines of recreation programming need to be identified and clear, consistent recreation service delivery policies need to be defined. The Park Department continues to operate 19 recreation centers and 42 club houses throughout the neighborhood services with existing staff, often one deep that provide no robust presence or backup. So in some of these places you literally, if the person is ill there's no one else to open the door, to provide the service and if you have no depth it's very difficult to provide the services that are expected by the community. Recreation facilities need a more concentrated robust starting model to improve program delivery, operate on a reliable schedule and provide a higher degree of safety. So the statement of desired position is consistent with program and facility operating standards which we talked to, new partnerships to augment RPD core recreation programming and generate revenue and an outcome based management culture that focuses on high performance recreation delivery, quality customer service and accountability. And the reason I'm reading it is it's very short and each word we spent a lot of time on with labor and staff so I didn't want to short change anyone. To accomplish these goals within the constraints of existing and forecast revenues the Department proposed the following strategies, reposition Recreation and Park recreation mission from wide ranging ledger recreation to dedicated focus on specific program lines of recreation for with RPD will be the city's undisputed first rank provider, i.e. primary recreation programs. Criteria will leverage our significant real estate assets and staff competencies. So we started to work with labor and staff on a list of what we do well and what we shouldn't be doing to really get a core list of activities that say we do, we are going to do basketball and we're going to reach all these different target audiences. We are going to do soccer, we're going to reach these target audiences, so really say what we are going to do and what do well. And we'll have that for you by the next meeting on the 5th or actually before it in your packets. Recreation and Park will establish a committee comprised of staff, community members and union representatives to review annually this list of primary recreation programs and recommend any changes to the Commission. So for instance if you really decide that surfing should be one of our core competencies and is not on the list it's something that has the opportunity on an annual basis to say you know what we need to start looking at this, maybe it isn't on the core list this year but can you go back and examine that. We need to reorganize staff to delivery quality experiences and primary recreation programs both in terms of program content which is staff expertise and facility condition and customer service& .our recreation programs and facilities and we need to train staff to optimize their performance within this new organization. To facilitate the provision of secondary recreation program, i.e. those that are not Recreation and Park primary recreation programs and may be community driven or industry trends, Recreation and Park facilities will be used by qualified, clearly identified Recreation and Park partners. All partnership service delivery will be on a lease rental full cost recovery basis that generates revenue to the Department. Additionally, when appropriate a partnership may develop from a mutually beneficial collaboration with another municipal agency like rec connect. So finally, the strategic gap between the current position and the desired position is that the most significant limiting factor is the current distribution of rec staff to a greater number of recreational facilities than our resources can effectively support. The number of recreation facilities needs to be consolidated and the recreation staff must be redistributed to more robustly operate those recreation facilities that have the greatest capacity to provide the focus range of recreation service delivery that we envision. Once the consolidation of recreation staffing model is designed the shift bid process will be negotiated per the collective bargaining agreement to redistribute recreation staff into this new recreation organization. Secondly, a process must be identified to define RPD partnerships and establish criteria for identifying potential recreation partners and the arrangement by which they provide secondary recreation programs that generate revenue for the Department.

Commissioner Harrison: Just a question, what is meant by partnerships, can you give me an example?

General Manager Blumenfeld: So a partnership would be let's just say for the sake of argument that the two--there will be a lot longer list but its easier to define it--if one of our core programs is basketball and soccer and the community identifies cooking classes, they really want to do cooking classes, it's something that we don't offer but our facility has a great kitchen, we don't have the staff, we basically put out an RFP to the CBO community in San Francisco and say we've identified cooking as something we're interested in, this is the cost of the lease and the term of the lease that we would provide and we would solicit from the community people that would be interested in

providing those services that are not core to Recreation and Park but to which there's a community interest in having. It may not be a huge amount of money, some of the facilities--I was just out at Gilman where Rec Connect is--it's not a very well kept facility--or it is perhaps well kept but it's old and rundown and in a neighborhood that's not easy to get to. The rent may not be significant but the community may have a need. Also because of prop J and because of the philosophy with labor and the Department we really don't want to just be inviting people that are charging for activities that conflict with our core programming into our recreation spaces.

Commissioner Harrison: So then a chef applies, right, and so he would pay to run that class?

Jared Blumenfeld: Yes.

Commissioner Harrison: And the folks that take the class would pay for that to offset?

Jared Blumenfeld: Yes.

Commissioner Lee: Just a follow up point. So you would regulate the cost that the chef would charge?

Jared Blumenfeld: That would be in the lease negotiations, yes.

Commissioner Lee: So the Department would retain would put a cap for instance on the fees so that it would be affordable to the community?

Jared Blumenfeld: We would make sure that there was an ability to have people that could not afford in an analogy to badminton a scholarship or a way of making sure that those services were provided. So the goal is to really--and it doesn't necessarily need to be now--but if you have ideas to get them to me or to Denny who's done a great job on this, to get back ideas and we will bring it to you on February 5th for your approval but because it's kind of a large policy document for Recreation and Park we wanted to afford the opportunity just to have a discussion now and bring it to you later. So you may have questions that come up later.

Commissioner Lazarus: Have you sat down with the staff, perhaps at the management level, in looking ahead to finishing bond programs and new bond programs, what our recreation center capacity will be in terms of facilities and the type and how many hours of coverage we're really going to be able to afford and where the shortfall is. Are we going to have facilities closed for significant days because we don't have the money to hire the staff to keep all these facilities open? Clearly, we're closed somewhat now but is that going to become worse?

Jared Blumenfeld: I think it will become better and as labor and us were sitting down we agreed that even if we didn't have a budget shortfall we should be doing this because at the moment service is scattershot across the city, for instance our goal would be to have from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. seven days a week we'd want to have these rec centers that are clearly identified have programming, so you know when they're open, you know what they provide and you can go into them. At the moment it's very difficult even from our website, even from some of my travels on my bicycle, there are places that are locked when I come at 9:30, they're still locked when I come back at 10:00, they're not quite sure when they're open and I'm the General Manager and it's posted on the website that I'm coming. So I think for the public it would be really use to know that these are the primary in my neighborhood this is the rec center I go to and these are the clubhouses, they will be open, they will provide these services, as opposed to at the moment you really don't know what to expect and that was something that with labor we all agreed, we just have to do this anyway.

Meredith Thomas: Meredith Thomas with the Neighborhood Parks Council. I want to commend the Department on this proposed strategic vision, I think it's a really wise move and I'm really happy to see the Department taking a positive approach to basically scarcity, saying we recognize there's a certain amount of things we can do well and we want to do them as well as possible, so we're really supportive of this document. I have a couple of bits of

feedback on it. I would just perhaps for it to be a little more explicit that the services the Department offers will recognize an evolution of neighbors over time. It says according to neighborhood demand but it's really important that we are constantly refreshing the demographics, the trends of the neighborhood so that are being offered are important to people and relevant on an annual basis. And the other thing I wanted to mention is I hope we're all under the understanding that there's a difference between revenue and profit, so if you're contracting out the cooking class and you're recouping the cost that's totally appropriate. There may be some sort offerings which are totally optional which are things like yoga or pilates that people don't have to have where it would be appropriate for the Department to actually generate a profit on offering those services, however there are some services--after school programs and things like that--where it would really be important the Department was recouping their cost but not trying to get a profit and I just want to make sure that's clear in this document and I again want to thank you for your hard work on it, it's exciting. **Andrea O'Leary:** This is the rec in Recreation and Park we've been asking for and this is the first time I think I have seen a real concrete attempt to address this issue. I'm a little concerned that February 5th is coming to you for approval already, panic, panic, haven't even seen it. It's nice that the committee is going to include some residential people in it but suddenly you're trying to administer something that the community really hasn't weighed in on. I certainly am not the person to be on this committee but I know a lot of people out there in the community who know more about programming and more about how to run a program than anybody I've ever seen at Recreation and Park. So this whole partnership thing is great. We've been doing this as neighborhood advocates for years, I mean we worry that we're going to go out and get a grant to continue tai chi but we're scared to tell Recreation and Park about it because we're afraid they're going to throw us out but they're not really providing the service either. So we're raising the money, we're bringing the neighborhood in, we're doing what we think is the programming Recreation and Park should do but we're not really getting sanctioned, it's not being sanctioned, we're sneaking around. So looking at what the core programs are and having the community weigh in on that is really, really important. Often times communities say they would rather see their rec center closed than to have some of the bad programming that goes on in them and there are a lot of people within the community, some of whom have training and have the expertise who would like to do this sort of thing of bringing a program in and there are other things where we want the program to be offered but we don't think the people should have to pay for it and tai chi is one of those things, it's not about money. So we raised the money, we get the grants because we don't think that everything should be a revenue generating or even a cost whatever, however you quantify that. So without having read the document I'm really excited about this, I'm afraid like I said about the February 5th approval already when people just haven't seen it yet, thank you. **Howard Strassner:** Howard Strassner. I use the parks somewhat for recreation. We have tai chi in the West Portal over the metro station and we chip in and the park lets us use the tennis court, it works out very nice, we chip in for the instructor and if people come to play basketball or tennis they know they might have to wait on Friday mornings. But in another issue I don't know where it would fit in natural areas, some people consider that recreation, there's a lot of people who work with the one or two natural area people you have and spend their time pulling weeds and doing stuff and I don't know how it fits in and if that's a separate vision but certainly natural areas is part of the park and should be. **Unidentified Female Speaker:** A real quick question. Because we have this document can it be viewed as a budget since we have to make some decisions about staffing and I think there's a lot of insights in this that could guide those decisions, so I'm just raising an issue and to try to give some more import to this document if it were to be a guide to how you would resolve some budget issues I think that might be something that we could all understand and get behind otherwise things are just coming in from various points and you don't have a strategy that you're trying to achieve. If this strategy is agreed to then it ought to have some budgetary impact I think. **Ernestine Weiss:** Ernestine Weiss, I haven't seen this document and so I think that the previous parties are right that February 5th is too soon to put it through, let the public have information about it and let them respond first so I recommend that highly. **Linda D'Avirro:** Linda D'Avirro from District 11 and also the Crocker Amazon park advisory committee. I'd like to also say that I agree with many of the things that Meredith and some of the other comments. In District 11 we realize that we have very underserved Recreation and Park and in order to come up with some programming ideas we gridded the entire program for the last year in each season and posted that across all the District 11 parks and what we found is that there's a real dearth of programming yet there's the highest number of youth. Not only youth up to 15, 17 to the 2000 census, but recently we were quoted we have the highest percentage of youth under 7. So that really impacts us so I want to agree that this is exciting to see, that

you're coming up with a programming situation that might actually address the needs of the community and the demographics that are involved with that, so I want to thank you for that.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Louis Williams: For the construction that's going to be needed on some of these project we were hoping to get local 22 a union that has got equipped and trained carpenters and certified carpenters to do some of this work and hopefully we can also get the citizens that are out of work in San Francisco and put them to work so they won't be overlooked and we're all for all construction being pushed forward because we're out of work and we need some jobs and we've got some trained and good people ready to do your work, ready to do whatever you need at the Local 22. I'm a 10 year carpenter and I want to see more diversity on the job sites in San Francisco so hopefully you will hire some residents from San Francisco and also use Local 22 to do the work. **Lloyd Tebow:** Lloyd Tebow and I'm also from Local 22 and I believe in the charter it's supposed to be San Francisco's first charter, I believe that's it. On hiring these contractors there's supposed to be diversity and if you pass by these jobs I'm quite sure you'll see there's no diversity. I like to see me on the job sometime without passing by and seeing everybody else on the job. I know when you sign these contracts that's all part of the contract but after you sign the contract this guy does whatever he wants to do and nobody puts him in check so I'd like to see to board put him in check or whoever is supposed to put them in check, put them in check so there would be diversity, thank you. **Ernestine Weiss:** Ernestine Weiss. Anyway, my name for the record is Ernestine Weiss and I want to show everybody the pictures of the beautiful ceremony that we had for the plaque dedication on my birthday on Monday, it was really a lovely turnout and it went smooth and everybody was very happy to see the plaque and all the activists were mentioned and I asked for them to be acknowledged and it was really very nice and I want to thank Recreation and Park and everybody who had anything to do with it so much for finally getting this thing through because it made a lot of people happy. Second thing is Jared I just want to the Planning Commission I've been running back and forth to ask them to put through the bridge and get that over with and let's start the renovation for Ferry Park. This is so old it's since October 07 that it should have been worked out. So I understand you were negotiating with them and trying to push them through and I hope that you'll make some progress so I directly it to John Haine the head of the Department I said enough let's get it through and so between you and I maybe we will.

COMMISSIONERS' MATTERS

Commissioner Harrison: Yes, I don't know if this is the appropriate time but I think we should close the meeting in honor on Nan Neal who recently passed away, she was a long term employee.

Commissioner Lazarus: Bring it up at adjournment. I have a couple brief item. The more important one is to get some feedback now or at a later time regarding the schedule for Commission meetings. As you know this particular time on Thursday afternoons and any afternoons for that matter prevent us from having this Commission television on the city's cable channel. Our few late afternoon meeting that Larry instituted may be televised, there may be a problem sometime if the Board of Supervisors has a committee meeting that goes later in the day and we would come in after that meeting was completed. But I don't know what we think. I have strong feelings that there is a significant amount of business done here and even if its only two or three hundred people that might watch it at home they should have the opportunity to see this Commission and the business of the Department on the cable channel, that would require a Tuesday or Thursday schedule in the later afternoon as I understand from our Commission secretary who's looked into this.

Margaret McArthur: Right now Tuesdays aren't available, they may be available as soon as the taxicab Commission. That would be at 6:00 o'clock and then Thursday at 5:30 for this.

Commissioner Lazarus: So I don't think we need to make a decision now but maybe the staff needs to talk about it, whether or not--most of these meetings do take about three hours the question is do we want a 5:00 to 8:00 p.m. meeting and be able to televise that meeting or do we want to stick with the type of schedule that we've had which has most of our meetings at 2:00 o'clock in the afternoon and I guess four a year at 5:30 in the evening, it's just a question of our home life, children, things like that.

Jared Blumenfeld: A technical question, so is the issue that they--because the cameras are all here, right, so what is the issue that it can't be streamed live or is the issue that they can't record it because presumably we could record it and post it and a lot of people would--most of the people that see it isn't when it's actually happening it's the day later or something. In theory it would be nice if we could just have it taped at the normal hour and broadcast it the next day.

Commissioner Lazarus: Margaret do you know what the answer to that is?

Margaret McArthur: My understanding is that they don't have the capability to do either but I can confirm.

Commissioner Lazarus: My second point, the city put a stimulus package out a proposal that's supposedly shovel ready things or those that might be sometime during the course of this calendar year and requested the US conference of mayors, it's not clear whether or not the Obama Administration stimulus construction program is going to be an earmarked designated one or administratively processed based on some application process later. Recreation and Park wasn't on that list. Is there any updated request from the city that will have Recreation and Park projects that are ready.

Jared Blumenfeld: We talked a little bit about this. I'm in the process of actually seeing the list that was sent because every given agency apparently sent it to the governor who sent it to the US conference of mayors so the answer is no, I don't know what is happening with this list and I don't know if there's an opportunity but to the extent there is an opportunity I think we need to realize that we're on our own and if no one is going to invite us to do it we should just make sure we're submitting anyway because of all the city agencies we probably have some of the more attractive green projects that are all shovel ready so it's odd that we weren't asked.

Commissioner Lazarus: I'd appreciate some feedback from your capital staff at the next meeting. Any other Commissioners or public comment?

Jared Blumenfeld: Since Larry isn't here maybe we could talk about something that we could do for him for the next meeting to honor him or a lunch or something.

ADJOURNMENT

The Regular meeting of the Recreation and Park Commission was adjourned at 5:52 p.m. in memory of Nan Neal a long time Department employee.
Respectfully submitted,

Margaret A. McArthur
Commission Liaison