

**PROSAC Meeting**  
**November 4, 2015**

**Chair:** We are calling to order the November Park and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee. We have quorum and for the record we are recording so please for the sake of the person transcribing the recording, for the public, members if you would identify yourself and speak one at a time so that when this is transcribed we have a record of who spoke on what issues.

We should all have an agenda. We do have two new members and what we normally do for new members is each meeting for the record we go around and introduce ourselves and what district we are representing. For this purpose we'll skip you and come back to both of you so that you can tell us a little bit about yourself and your interests.

With that I would like to start to my left for introductions.

**Les Hilger:** District 1.

**Winnie Chu:** District 7.

**Robert Brust:** District 8.

**Patricia Delgado:** District 9.

**Linda Shaffer:** District 10.

**Richard Ivanhoe:** District 5.

**Anthony Cuardo:** District 7.

**Richard Rothman:** District 1.

**Denis Mosgofian:** District 5.

**Tom Valtin:** District 9.

**Nick Belloni:** District 2.

**Steffen Franz:** District 2.

**Chair:** Linda D'Avirro, District 11. And our two new members that have joined us please start.

**Heather Fuchs:** I am representing District 4. Interests—well, lots of them. I am mostly here at the moment to absorb. I'm interested in becoming more involved. I'm always interested in government and this would be a really great way to just become more involved. I know that Linda was talking about certain projects. I didn't say that at the moment I have one particular passion but I certainly feel excited. I would love to hear more about what's going on and if everyone has some sort of pet project that would be really interesting to know maybe [unintelligible] or some separate time I would love to hear what's going on a little bit more in detail.

**Chair:** Thank you.

**Jordyn Aquino:** I am also a representative of District 4. Heather and I we used to intern for Supervisor Katy Tang when we were both in college. Since graduation I have been an employee of San Francisco Public Works. I work for Information Technology there so I get to work really closely with the different projects awarded with Public Works and in relation to San Francisco Recreation and Park and just by helping all the contractors that the Departments work with I've been really interested in a lot of the development around playgrounds in the different districts around San Francisco. In District 4 I live off of 47<sup>th</sup> and Judah so I spent a lot of my time at Great Highway, a lot in community involvement, I'm really interested in that, community participation so any opportunity that I have to be involved and to play a part in the well-being of the public I'm very interested in that.

**Chair:** They have been both given orientation binder and I mentioned to them as I do with new members that I would like to sit down with them and go over the binder because we are a public charter group there are certain rules, Sunshine rules and the Brown Act, that sort of thing. But there are some items that might be helpful to know as I did when I started. So we will make contact with you, give you a time to set up and then we'll have lunch or coffee. I appreciate it. Welcome aboard. Hopefully you'll stay with us a very long time.

Okay, so is there any public comment on this item? Being none, public comment is closed. I'm going to have a quick Chair's report but before I do I would like to change the agenda, I would like to let our Supervisor Mark Farrell speak before Capital and Planning. I'm sure you have a very busy schedule and I just would prefer you speak first.

So I'll make a real quick Chair's report. Two things. One is I sent out as a request to members your terms, what is on record with the Rules Secretary and Rules committee and sent that around and that caused quite a few questions because these dates may or may not be accurate. But also as Les pointed out because these dates show that you are expiring, the position is technically open and if you would like to remain on the committee you need to contact your Supervisor and ask them to re-appoint you. Otherwise as Steffen found out this week and almost had a heart attack, people can apply for a vacancy because it's showing a vacancy against that seat and that was the case with Steffen even though he wasn't leaving. So please go through your Supervisor and have you be reappointed. It looks like I would say every single one of us with the exception of Nick, Kim Hirschfield and Denis and Richard who apparently got updated and Tom Valtin, that's it. The rest of us are up for being reassigned.

**Denis Mosgofian:** Do we really have a quorum? [laughter]

**Chair:** Thank you for that. So please do that and the second thing I want to announce is thanks to the fact that we had an audit and that was brought forth by my Supervisor, Supervisor Avalos, I'd like to let you know that when you were here the last time this came up, Supervisor, that \$500,000 has been redeposited to the Open Space Acquisition Fund. It was all that lost interest for the last decade. So as a result of the audit done by Harvey Rose and Associates that determined that the Open Space Acquisition Fund is not earning interest. They have redeposited it as of last month, about two weeks ago. So thanks to all of you.

**Denis Mosgofian:** I have a question. Where did that \$500,000 come from?

**Chair:** It came from the General Open Space Fund.

**Steffen Franz:** So they took it out of the General Open Space Fund and deposited it into the Acquisition Fund.

**Chair:** So that is the end of my report. So is there any comments from anybody?

**Robert Brust:** Am I correct am I automatically termed out on the Committee?

**Chair:** There is at least one member that is serving longer than eight years but according to the charter you serve a maximum of eight years and that may change. You can vacate. I think there's a minimum of time to vacate your seat before you can be reappointed. Let me check on that.

**Robert Brust:** Does the Supervisor if he chooses just contact the clerk and fill out another form?

**Steffen Franz:** Yes, you do need to fill out a form, send it to your Supervisor, it goes to the Rules Committee [simultaneous comments]

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** We'll just tell everyone as a bit of background there when it's a district seat and the district Supervisor supports it as a courtesy. I've never seen a fight over that. We fight about a lot of stuff but not this.

**Chair:** Is there any public comment on the Chair's report? Being none, public comment is closed. So we are moving on with Item 4 and welcome Supervisor Farrell.

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** Thank you very much and thanks for having me. It's good to see you all again and welcome.

So I don't need to tell this group about the importance of parks here in the city of San Francisco. As I talked to you before I was lucky to be born and raised in San Francisco and grow up using our parks as part of my childhood. In the summers I was—I considered myself a park rat up at it was then Funston, it's now Moscone on Chestnut Street in the Marina. I played on every single

sports team that existed there, I was part of the latchkey program that existed back in the day. I ended up becoming a park director there part time in the summers at the end of high school and in college.

Actually, when I started as a Supervisor I realized that I had retirement already accrued in the City and County of San Francisco. I don't accounting and it was a big mistake, they said no you were a Recreation and Park director I said oh my goodness, yeah I guess that's why. So to me and then now my wife and I are raising three small kids in the city, we use our parks all the time and I don't care if you're a parent, a little kid, a senior. This cuts across all age groups, all demographics. It's about the quality of life in the city. That's why we're all here.

My experience the last three years of chairing of our budget committee inside City Hall has been very enlightening. Among the one or two that I care about the most in terms of parks is that our city budget has gone up our parks Department revenue has essentially stayed flat. If you look historically that trend is actually worse. And in this city right now as we continue to have more and more people live in our city every single year and manifest itself and all the road congestion we have, the affordability crisis we have a number of issues. We also have a greater frequency and intensity of use of our existing parks.

I came to you last year with the Francisco reservoir proposition regarding our open space fund. I think we need to be buying new plots of land to build new parks but our existing parks are being used with more and more intensity. We saw it a lot last summer with all the trash around Dolores Park and the newspapers and so forth. And so not even increasing our funding for our Recreation and Park Department just to keep up with that to me is tantamount to saying parks are not a priority.

And so I worked with our Parks Alliance very extensively, worked in negotiation with our Mayor's office as well to craft a ballot measure, it would be a charter amendment, for next—and I've introduced it to the Board of Supervisors for next June, that would lock in the current funding for our Recreation and Park Department but also for the next ten years increase of \$3 million a year. It is not the end-all, be-all solution by any means. What I have done in the meantime is I have taken the summer months and a bit of the fall year to go around to neighborhood groups across the city in each one of your districts to ask people what they care about in terms of the parks. This isn't something Mark Farrell thought about in his office and it going to wield and dictate. This is something that's meant to be community based, how we use the proceeds here, the additional proceeds. We had a wide range of answers from tree maintenance to getting rid of the raccoons that were appearing in District 7—I'm sorry, the wolves, sorry coyotes.

The main thing that really surprised me actually was a lot of the sentiment was generally just fix the swings, you know, fix the things that are there right now. We had a report done by our Controller's Office, over 99 percent of the maintenance calls done by our Recreation and Park Department are done on an emergency basis. We do zero preventative maintenance. It doesn't matter if you rent or own a home or a place where you live I mean think about thinking about preventing—setting money aside to do roof maintenance or you're painting your home once in a

while, you do things like that or your car. You know, it's really a tragedy that we don't do this but we don't have the funding to do this.

So this is largely what the funds will be going towards. So we design it so for ten years there's a \$3 million increase a year and then for the following five years which matches the lifespan of the existing Open Space Fund it will increase as the city revenues increase those given years. So if the city receives revenue increases 3 percent the fund will increase 3 percent and that's meant to kind of match the rise of the budget in those years. And we work extensively again with Parks Alliance, with Phil who is put in an interesting position because the Mayor wasn't a big fan of this to begin with but was very much a part of the discussion and has come on board as a sponsor of this as well. It's important from my perspective to do this even though it's a Mayoral Department to do it somewhat in conjunction with him if we can because it makes the execution of this all the more smoother.

So we are where we are. I have six cosponsors. I want to hopefully get everybody as a cosponsor on the Board of Supervisors. I believe it's very important. Unfortunately it does have to go to the ballot, a set aside does, it will not increase property taxes but it will slice off a piece of our budget for the Department. For me it's just a matter of prioritization and I think after three years and seeing what's happening across our city to our parks I think it is high time to do this and overdue to be quite frank..

So that's what I'm proposing. I would love PROSAC's support. It would mean a ton. It got approved by the Recreation and Park Commission which is great and when we have done polling on it already to make sure we weren't futilly wasting our time, it's polled anywhere between 70 and 80 percent across the city depending on the district which is great so I think this has wide support and will pass at the ballot but we need all the support we can get and I'm doing this because I believe it's important, I believe parks matter to all of us.

So that's what it is and I'm happy to answer any questions.

**Chair:** Robert Brust and then Richard Ivanhoe.

**Robert Brust:** Briefly, the amendment we saw in October we're on record as supporting with one change, we would like the life extended how much? 15 years. And that's where we are right now and if you make any more substantial changes we would probably have to come back and look at it and I think some of the people around here have some ideas already but like you said I would really like to have this go through. This is really important and thank you for taking care of that for us.

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** And let me just tell you in terms of the sunset date, look—if it's up to me we never sunset this. This is that important. However, this was part of these negotiations to get the Mayor's Office and six Supervisors onboard, it is important on process that one of the entities to have it coincide with the Open Space Fund sunset date and then have probably in ten years' time have a larger discussion about kind of a more complete package and so that was part of the process. It wasn't my first choice. We had it going for I think another thirty years

originally and that was met with some resistance and so it was part of making it more onboard which ultimately from my perspective I think it's important to do so.

**Richard Ivanhoe:** District 5. I think we all support increased funding for Recreation and Park. I guess my concern is I didn't see anything in the language that said it would go to deferred maintenance and I don't know how you cannot make it do that, I don't know if that was a negotiation problem, a legal problem, or just not in there for some other reason.

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** That's a great question. I think the general sentiment is, and I agree with this, when you put something in the charter if you want to change a comma you have to go back to the voters. So given that over time, over the course of fifteen years we also looked at what the anticipated labor cost increases will be to the Department. You know, \$3 million a year doesn't cover that then it's actually a net loser for the Park Department and they don't want that. They think anything between \$1 million and \$1.5 million a year will actually be for labor cost increases. So it's net a little bit less but net over fifteen years is going to be about \$200 million of new money to the Recreation and Park system, so it's a big deal.

Because this is a charter you want to be as—you don't want to be very proscriptive about uses. There's always changing times, you don't know what happens, you know you could have a flooding. You could have a lot of things that you might want to use and you want to be pliable. What we have included in here and what actually quite frankly the Parks Alliance was a great proponent of and by the way Margaux Kelly from my office has been hugely involved in making sure that the Recreation and Park Department—it's lot more kind of hooks in them to come forward with strategic plans and an update to it every year so that we can talk about where those funds are being used and deployed. Not only for what purpose, where geographically, we all care about equity in the city of San Francisco, we want to make sure it goes to every single district and so while it's not proscribed in there because what happens is a lot of people say well I want those trees and I want this and you know it's going to be part of the mayor's annual budget process, it's just going to be more available and that's the way we're going to handle it.

What I will say as well is both Phil from the Recreation and Park Department as well as the Mayor's office asked me to go around the city and say please tell us what people are saying in different neighborhood groups and parks groups and so we've done that. We have a little bit more to go but we've been in every single district and the maintenance in the main thing and everybody gets that and quite frankly there is a spending plan that's not part of the charter amendment that is 90 percent all about maintenance so I have all the confidence in the world that's where it will go but because it's a charter amendment we don't want to put it in the charter.

**Chair:** Are there other questions? Denis?

**Denis Mosgofian:** District 5. Supervisor, I was completely shocked when I read the lately incarnation of the charter amendment compared to when you presented it here in July I believe and at that point we were looking at a doubling of the open space set aside to 5 cents, \$35-40 million a year steady which in ten years is \$400 million in fifteen years is \$600 million and I did the math on the compound and if \$3 million is compounded in ten years it's \$165 million. But I noticed that in the new version and I wrote out six questions actually. I could not understand why

entire sections were deleted from the current language in the charter amendment. The way the charter reads it specifies the number of directives for how the money is to be spent, indicates some priorities, and that language was deleted and I couldn't figure out why. So actually I have those questions I could easily read them to you but I find that it didn't make any sense to me to take out language, there's deletions in this piece right here all the way through it, there's whole sections that were deleted and then the question is why were they deleted? So here's one. Let me read from my notes because they're copied right out of this. Why does the charter amendment specifically delete subsection C1 and 2 that state that the actual net increase of Department generated revenues compared to the previous fiscal year should be dedicated to capital and of facility maintenance improvements to Recreation and Park facilities? And then it goes on further, why not the sentence but not limited to capital or facility maintenance improvements. So I didn't understand why you would take the language out.

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** It's tough for me to follow along on verbal comments so I don't know how to respond particularly.

**Denis Moskofian:** Here's the problem I have. In reading through language like this you're supporting it, you're pitching it and when we're listening we're all park supporters and we all want to believe that what's being proposed it going to serve except that what you originally proposed made a lot of sense but what I'm looking at here doesn't provide that kind of specificity and so I went back and I looked up 1975 open space fund language which specified up to 40 percent should be dedicated to maintenance. It specified a number of other particular expenditures, directives, and then in 1988 and 2000 it still had some of that specificity. By the time you get down to this piece of legislation it doesn't have that specificity so given that and given that instead of having a very robust support for the park system it's gone way down to \$3 million to me it looked like bait and switch. The earlier one was very big, very bold, very supportive and did not talk about the leading kind of language that had been deleted and this one is down to \$3 million with far less and deletions of language and it doesn't look like anywhere near the kind of commitment that you're verbally presenting to us. I've been around long enough in the city I was born here as well played in playgrounds as well that I want to hear a real—I want to see it in language. I was a contract negotiator for eighteen years, I look at language. I don't care about the money as much as the language and I don't see it and I wondered why good language seemed to be deleted.

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** So if you give me the language I'm happy to look at it and talk about why we went through the language itself has been deleted.

**Chair:** Can I also ask are we at a point where today's discussion can be added to the amendments or is that too late to hear from us?

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** Oh no, you're welcome to suggestion. We're going through the committee process right now and we certainly welcome any amendments or thoughts around that. I think like me address one thing you mentioned around the dollar amount, there was a desire on my behalf to have a much higher dollar amount and I went forward with that and was met with the fact that I would not have not only the Mayor's support nor six Supervisor's support which I need to get through and that is a fact and so I was faced with either you go raise a

signature drive to do something like this or you do it where you can bring parties together. I wish it was more. Margaux and I sat through countless banging fist negotiation sessions around it and I will tell you this is the maximum I could squeeze out of this charter amendment that would allow [unintelligible].

**Denis Mosgofian:** What was the resistance to your earlier proposal?

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** There was too much money out of the general fund.

**Denis Mosgofian:** With a \$9 billion gross budget?

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** You're arguing what I was arguing. You're not telling me anything I don't know. I was in your shoes and I argued that. I wasn't successful and I was not going to get six colleagues to sign on to that as well so I absolutely fought to get the maximum dollars that I did, came to blows with many people in these hallways and the Mayor's office around it and we are where we are and that was the last penny I could get to get the support to put it legislatively on the ballot.

In terms of language I need to see what's deleted or not. If you're talking about there was some maintenance language and a lot of times a lot of things when we went through it with the City Attorney and so forth go deleted and put in another section or things that we realized is here we realized it already existed over here. So just blanket saying things were deleted and I don't like it it's very tough for me to respond. But I will say one of the things you talk about maintenance and capital, one of the things that was added in here was that previously the Open Space Fund was actually the additional tax revenue that was put in, 5 percent of that was dedicated towards acquisition of space. What was important from the Recreation and Park Department's perspective was being able to say it's not just pure acquisition but it could be used for acquisition and some development as well of those new spaces because what the Recreation and Park Department was saying was we might have money although it's limited to acquire new land but we have no money to develop it so who cares if we buy an empty lot if we don't have a situation like Francisco reservoir where the neighbors have pledged to build it with their own funds to great a city asset.

**Denis Mosgofian:** I saw the additional amendment to use for planning and some construction.

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** Right, so you mentioned language around that. That might be one of those. I know that is a specific thing that was put in there on purpose and we're making sure that was a consensus thing that people wanted to be able to use these funds for some of these purposes.

**Denis Mosgofian** If you have ] there was three conditions that specified how money was supposed to be spent and in the current version.

[simultaneous comments]



**Steffen Franz:** [unintelligible] have been doing a lot of legwork around the language. Would it be conceivable between now and whatever the next step is for them to come as a working group and meet with you rather than all of us sit here and kind of go through line by line.

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** Of course.

**Steffen Franz:** Because I think all of us feel the same way. You know we wouldn't be here if we didn't want the best possible outside but I think the points that are made represent what the [unintelligible].

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** Hold on. These sections right here were actually replaced, these three sections, these three measures here were replaced. The only one that was kept was the third one was kept.

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** Yeah, but they were all combined [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments]

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** I'm happy to sit down with you and walk you through it. This has been combed over so much and there's a reason for everything that I don't have at the tip of my tongue right here.

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** I do think that would be helpful because one of the things I want to mention is we saw what is pretty much a final product at last month's meeting presented by Parks Alliance and we did have an opportunity and I know that when you had come in July you had asked for input. Now we're drilled down and looked at and we'll probably talk about it after you leave but nonetheless I think we might want to know your reasoning for doing certain things or entertaining maybe some of our thoughts on it.

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** More than happy to do so, always, that's why I came early and want to make sure you're included in that discussion.

**Chair:** Linda and then—

**Linda Shaffer:** District 10. We already talked about this but I would like to go back to the property tax and start with the extension of the Open Space Fund. Without revealing—I don't want to ask you to reveal things that you shouldn't but what's the problem with extending the Open Space Fund—extending the length of time?

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** Again, my original proposal was higher dollar amounts extended for a much longer time. Getting six Supervisors and the Mayor on board is not an easy proposition at times and all I'm saying is I was not going to be able to do that without agreeing to have it coincide with the open space fund the parks community comes together with a comprehensive package. It's not my reasoning, it's tough for me to argue against but I will tell you that it was not going to happen without that.

**Linda Shaffer:** Let me see if I understand, so the issue is that there were people involved in the negotiations who want the current Open Space Fund termination date to be solid and then start all over again at some point?

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** Correct.

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** There has been some sentiment from some people that they don't know—and why a lot of people kind of want to reduce the dollar amounts—they don't know if Recreation and Park has [unintelligible] there is a sentiment around that and obviously I have full faith that it will and I think no matter how they spend it it's going to be put to good use for the residents of our city but some people don't and so this was kind of hey after X number of years we want to see how the package is working totally and comprehensibly and then there is no doubt that it will be renewed at some point in time in a more realistic level. My original proposal was not only to have this new set aside extend for I think thirty more years but extend the Open Space Fund. They just want throttle it back to where the Open Space Fund is currently getting sunset. Again, it was not--

**Linda Shaffer:** Can I follow that up? Do these people understand that part of the Open Space Fund is the acquisition money that we use and that's like crucial and they still—is there any way we could separate out the acquisition fund and keep it going?

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** Believe me I tried.

**Richard Rothman:** Richard Rothman, District 1. Who were the six cosponsors?

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** We have Eric Mar, myself, Julie Christenson, Katy Tang, London Breed just signed on today, Norman Yee, Scott Weiner. I'm working with my colleagues, I want it to be supported by everyone and cosponsored by everyone. I think this is a wildly popular thing topically and I want it to work for everyone but that's getting everyone's specific concerns onboard and trying to hold that together first you get to six and be able to get it on the ballot and then hopefully you can address everyone's specific concerns.

**Richard Rothman:** Maybe get everybody's concern before at the Board.

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** Well that's what we're doing right now, that's the legislative process.

**Chair:** Other questions? Anthony.

**Anthony Cuadro:** District 7. When will it be on the ballot?

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** June of 2016.

**Chair:** I have a question, you are going to the Rules committee November 12 so in order to meet with you how soon can we do that?.

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** We should do it before [unintelligible] because there will be one meeting for sure where we know there are going to be some amendments that we want to the original piece and that committee will then sit until the next one but afterwards in order to introduce amendments it will have to sit for another number of weeks and the more we delay that the greater likelihood we risk not getting on the ballot.

**Denis Mosgofian:** I thought March was the deadline of the ballot?

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** I don't have the specific dates in front of me. But aside from what deadlines are we have a parks community from Parks Alliance and another of other groups that feel very much—parks have never been put on the back burner and they want to be the first on the ballot for June so they can start their campaign and start raising money and start raising awareness on this and I want to be supportive of that process so we want to get it done as quickly as possible.

**Margaux Kelly:** I'm happy to [unintelligible]

**Chair:** We'll come up with a date and let you know first thing tomorrow morning for sure and also you mentioned that there will be amendments, is there anything you could share tonight?

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** They're really technical ones at this point.

**Chair:** Richard? Denis?

**Denis Mosgofian:** District 5. In the Parks Alliance write-up of this in support of this charter amendment I notice that they at least it looked like [unintelligible] it talked about being able to push the Park Patrol up to eighty officer at a cost of \$7.5 million [unintelligible] but I remember that was something specific that Phil said he wanted when he rolled out the strategic plan when he worked [unintelligible] he had eighty Park Patrol by fiscal year 2020 and then when we raised questions about putting that kind of cost, chasing down half a million or a million dollars worth of graffiti is pretty extraordinary, he took it out of there but I notice it's in Parks Alliance. Is that really part of the intent here is that this money will eventually go to that purpose?

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** It's a great question. I think ultimately that will be subject to the Mayoral budget process every single year and appropriation process through the Board of Supervisors. To be honest with you there is a real split right now between some people that believe the answer is more Park Patrol officers and there some people that believe Park Patrol officers are not the solution, it should be SFPD and that is a real debate raging so what I will tell is I don't know the answer there. Without a doubt there will be more funding for enforcement. My gut is it will be a vast majority maintenance and some enforcement but whether that's Park Patrol or SFPD working on parks to be quite frank with you I would be surprised if that's a decent debate going forward in the next year or two.

**Chair:** I also want to raise something that you brought up last month and that was you have shall and the PROSAC committee in this charter, my request and I think I reflect the members is we need to have more authority that is not currently available to us. We are an advisory committee and we are—no aspersions cast on Park Alliance, but we do represent the actual residents and users of the park and we are their last stop. Can that be a consideration to raise our role and our responsibilities so that they actually do have to listen to our words coming out, our resolutions?

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** PROSAC isn't addressed in there right now.

**Margaux Kelly:** We did have some reporting requirements for the Department to come to PROSAC before they [simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** They don't and then what we offer they may not take under advisement and I think that's what we're looking for. [simultaneous comments]

**Margaux Kelly:** It's a reporting requirement now, every year before they submit their operational plan and then specifically for their capital plan and for their strategic plan and we go over all of that too.

**Steffen Franz:** I think what the concern is that we know in the charter it says they have to present a capital plan but they have yet to other than this strategic plan that Phil presented once in ten years and we didn't really have a lot of feedback and really put in our claws. I think what Linda is asking for and this committee would ask for is we put in a lot of time and effort for this exact same thing, it would be nice to see a little be of [unintelligible] to be able to say this is a citizen's oversight committee of this situation, your job is to monitor how this money is being spent, whether it's correct or not. At least they have to listen. At this point they don't really have to listen. She can go to the meeting but they can just say great, PROSAC, nice next. That's no teeth. We're your ally but we don't have enough teeth to actually make a difference once this happens. And again what we're doing is we're saying hey we're giving you more money but we're not really controlling, nobody other than maybe an audit four years down the right might control where they send the money or how they send the money so I think that's what Linda was asking, is there a way to put something in there that focuses more on what PROSAC's role is since you are amending the charter and since we are a part of that.

**Chair:** And also what we see is fait accompli, it's like we did it, here you like it or not. What we envisioned our role and I think the way the role was originally designed is they're supposed to come here in process and work with us before it get finalized. What happens now is they say oh by the way is there a report out there somewhere? Yeah, here it is and so I think we need to be involved earlier also in the process.

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** That's why I came to you earlier and with all respect I haven't heard from anybody about it until today and so I'm happy to be and that's why I came months ago to talk with you about it but also from my perspective without having any interaction with anyone here since then I'm more than happy to meet right before a committee but I want to call fair is fair.

**Chair:** I hear you and I can address that off-line. There were different reasons for that but not for lack of trying, believe me. This is our third meeting on the subject? So we've met here to try to hash it out but we had nothing at hand either until last meeting so I think it's not for lack of trying. Denis.

**Denis Mosgofian:** I think that actually we should draft whatever language we think would fit what Stephanie was talking about and what you're talking about to make a proposal so the Supervisor can look at what we're actually thinking about and see if it fact works and how we would fit it into the charter. It's not hard to find the charter language and just take a look and see what we can add. It's easier than in my opinion than asking the Supervisor to [unintelligible]. But I have another question—

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** Believe me, I would appreciate that and whenever we do get together I hope I can be there again if not Margaret has been as if not more intimately involved in the language than I have, it would be great to come forward with language and I'm happy to look at it and talk with people about it.

**Chair:** We've really been trying to get in on the process.

**Denis Mosgofian:** There were some things in here that didn't make a lot of sense. There was a requirement in the draft—I mean in the current language that says that the Commission's plans have to be run by planning to see if they conform to the city's plan and that was deleted and didn't make any sense to me because that's standard constitutional language and it's that kind of thing and the environmental planning section.

**Margaux Kelly:** I think specifically the planning section that was a request from the Department because they believe that all of the items that they'd have to go to Planning for them separately so they just didn't go with that language, it was no longer necessary so that's what they recommended.

**Denis Mosgofian:** Because Recreation and Park would have to go to Planning or the Commission would have to go to Planning to see if their plan was in conformity with the city's plan?

**Margaux Kelly:** It's my understanding from Katie at the Department that they thought for all the other items that they would have to go to Planning anyway so it was no longer needed in the charter language.

**Denis Mosgofian:** Can you understand at least from my point of view I see something like that eliminated I say that's an accountability [unintelligible].

**Margaux Kelly:** Sure and that's certainly something that I can follow up with.

**Denis Mosgofian:** The same with the environmental, there's another section about the environmental and our planning and that section was deleted too and I didn't understand that would be. Environmental and design guidelines, whole paragraph was deleted.

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** So as talked about [simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Thank you, we've taken a lot of your time. I hope you don't think we don't support you, we're ecstatic about the fact that as we said at the last meeting that you were act finally someone has heard what our whole charter has been about so we want to see funding for maintenance and so we may be [unintelligible] but the objective is our desire to have something there.

**Supervisor Mark Farrell:** Likewise.

**Chair:** So I do have to open this up to public comment. Do we have any other comment from members? Seeing none, I'm going to open it up for public comment. I see a blue card from Dee Seligman [simultaneous comments] followed by Nancy Wuerfel and there's a third one. Since there's three of you let's keep it at two minutes and no more than that. So if we could start with Dee Seligman. Please address your comments to the members.

**Dee Seligman:** I am the interim president of the San Francisco Forest Alliance, we're a 501c4 group formed to advocate for appropriate maintenance and preservation of the forest on our public lands. I would like to respectfully request that a vote of endorsement of Supervisor Farrell's charter amendment be delayed until PROSAC has held an announced hearing on the significant legislation that amends the Open Space Fund ordinance approved by voters in 2000. Today's agenda number 4 refers to a "maintenance initiative discussion" without even mentioned the Open Space Fund. So tonight's topic working does not inform the public about the subject actually being discussed. On behalf of the Forest Alliance our members along with many other community members who care about parks and the Open Space Fund want to weigh in. I'm comfortable speaking to you because PROSAC represents everybody in the city. Much more outreach is needed including the opportunity to review the text of the actual legislation. I went to Supervisor Farrell's presentation in Noe Valley on July 27<sup>th</sup>, I retained the handouts he provided, but there has been no follow-up with the proposed legislation itself even though I signed in. It has been difficult to find the legislation. Please delay your vote until the proposed legislation can be reviewed and digested by you and by the public through a hearing at PROSAC and you are better informed of the concerned by a wider group of people about this proposed initiative before you make any resolution. I'd also request that we be considered as a stakeholder in any working group that is formed to review the actual text of the legislation. Thank you.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** Good evening, I am a former PROSAC member representing District 4 for nine years. I've come out of retirement to address you to tonight about one of the most important decisions that PROSAC will ever be asked to make. Tonight you are discussing and possibly acting on a resolution about the proposed ballot initiative that changes the charter amendment approved in 2000 that governs what PROSAC does, how the Open Space Fund is used and introduces the new general fund baseline for funding of the Recreation and Park Department. This amendment is a very big deal involving some complex financial formulas about the city's

discretionary revenue and budget deficits that are not fully defined or explained. It includes feel-good audits that lock the barn door after the horses have left that authorizes no audits on actual expenditures paid by the Open Space Fund. There is now accounting of the fund at all in this initiative. It even removes protections requiring unspent funds to benefit enhancement of programs and maintenance improvements. The most egregious change is on page 6 of the draft legislation that allows unlimited use of the one sacred acquisitions funds to be spent on planning and construction purposes. Of the \$48 million in this year's fund only 5 percent or \$2.4 million will be allocated to buy new land. That \$2.4 million could be accessed for non acquisition purposes because of the way the current legislation is written. How will the fund even gather enough money to buy land in District 6 if planning and construction costs could be legally charged to the small pot intended to acquire land? There is over \$45 million left in the fund to take care of these kinds of expenses. Since we are amending the former charter language how about increasing the minimum allocation for buying land to ten, fifteen, or even twenty percent of the set-aside? PROSAC, what are your priorities for the Open Space Fund? I ask you that tonight. In fairness there are many updates and procedural improvements to the original charter language that I do agree with. I suggest that before you vote on a resolution this initiative deserves more in-depth discussion to clarify what it should accomplish and how that will happen. PROSAC can lead the way to correct the failings in the draft legislation so we can support this initiative without the current reservations. However, if you decide that PROSAC must pass a resolution tonight then I offer for your consider a revised version that I happen to have with me for incorporating your needs for the draft resolution but also removing the offensive language that impacts the preservation of the acquisitions money. Please at a bare minimum protect these funds to buy land. Thank you for considering my remarks. And by the way the name of this committee is also changed in this—you will no longer PROSAC, you will be PROSCAC so I just mention that.

**Anastasia Glicksten:** I live in District 7. I live next to one of the natural areas in San Francisco I am totally unfamiliar with the legislation but I'm afraid that if Recreation and Park get more funds they also will use more funds for this Natural Areas Program and this should be eliminated, it should be killed. It plans to chop down 8,500 trees and use herbicides all the time and it's totally unacceptable. I really would like this program to go or at least to have very serious restrictions. There is no reason to cut trees, there's global warming right now and it's totally inexcusable. [simultaneous comments] Sorry. And also the use of herbicides, they use more than anybody else. You see those notices all the time, you probably have seen the article in the Chronicle about the petition which by now has 11,000 signatures, it's only about herbicides they are as bad and the city is supposed when they were talking about the history of IPM, the city was supposed to be totally pesticide free by 2000. Now it's 2015 and category 1 and 2 toxicity herbicides are used all the time because it was amended. So you have a list of least dangerous pesticides or whatever it's called and as long as this is on the list you use it as much as you want, no limits and it's totally unacceptable and trees should be preserved. It's not something which Llightly [unintelligible] which would take care of sick trees so that they don't become dangerous and [unintelligible]. I'm sorry it's not to legislation proposal but I think it's a very important topic for me and that's why I'm talking about it.

**Chair:** Public comments are closed on this item.

**Les Hilger:** Can I make a request? Nancy, could you supply you said you had some recommendations—we are meeting so I know I would like to at least have them myself or make them available to everyone else. So if you could either send them to Linda or myself I know that we would like to have this be part of the conversation and at least be informed by the work you've done.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** I would be happy to do that. What is your timeframe?

**Chair:** Immediately.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** I was not prepared to give a list immediately.

**Steffen Franz:** How about by the end of the week Nancy?

**Nancy Wuerfel:** Thank you.

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** So we are back on the minutes, Item 1. Item 1.

**Denis Mosgofian:** I actually have a point of information.

**Chair:** On the item that we just closed?

**Denis Mosgofian:** Yeah. Is the October 6<sup>th</sup> resolution is that an existing resolution that is binding? [simultaneous comments]

**Steffen Franz:** It's a moved resolution. You can bring it back as a new agenda item.

**Denis Mosgofian:** But then that would be for next month.

**Steffen Franz:** By suggestion would be bring it up as an item not listed on the agenda and potentially if you could get the votes you could present it that way. She closed this item. This item is done and we're [simultaneous comments].

**Denis Mosgofian:** Excuse me, I thought you were going to raise this issue because in fact— [simultaneous comments]

**Les Hilger:** Just a point of clarification. We passed support of this resolution as we saw it. It's changed so doesn't our support also become negated. Do you need to explicitly rescind your support of a resolution on a language that no longer exists?

**Robert Brust:** It hasn't been changed since October officially. [simultaneous comments]



**Robert Brust:** Denis is looking at a version that they did the proposal prior to the committee. What we saw in October was the one that [simultaneous comments]. I see no presentation, where's the language?

**Chair:** I was going with just as it was proposed here.

**Les:** Has something shifted from what we supported?

**Denis Mosgofian:** I wasn't here in October.

[simultaneous comments]

**Robert Brust:** Is that on the table over there?

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** The motion we passed, the resolution we passed was based on this document which is the same document.

[simultaneous comments]

**Robert Brust:** So is he in order right now with this suggestion?

**Chair:** I'm sorry.

**Robert Brust:** Is there suggestion in order?

[simultaneous comments]

**Robert Brust:** I'm asking for a ruling.

[simultaneous comments]

**Richard Rothman:** I just want to say I mean if we're going to have some kind of impact I think if the Rules committee hearing is this month you know. I think this we let Linda and Denis go talk to the staff and they can tweak the language fine but we're not. Well we can't rescind it. Oh Yes we Can

**Steffen Franz:** I am actually in line with what Richard is saying. Clearly the Supervisor and his staff are will to meet with you under [unintelligible]. We don't know what the outcome of that final language is anyway so why don't we put them on the agenda for the next meeting, the December meeting which we won't have because we won't show up, we won't have a quorum like every December. [laughter] Let's say that it comes closer, let's say we get closer on the language and we want to support it or continue to support it. I think it doesn't serve our purpose to vote to rescind this and you go make a deal or you're happy with the language and then we vote to support it again?

**Denis Mosgofian:** You suspend, you support ending the outcome of the legislation.

**Steffen Franz:** I don't know how that works. [simultaneous comments]

**Nick Belloni:** Point of order, can I ask what we're trying to do so I can look it up online right now and get an actual ruling.

**Chair:** Rescinding a motion.

**Linda Shaffer:** We just need a motion to rescind. That's how you get it started.

[simultaneous comments]

**Robert Brust:** I would like to yell at you all again. I'm disappointed that he has made a motion which no one wants to seem to want to second. That we want to rescind approval of the PROSAC amendment before we have—I've not seen amended language, I've not seen a change since last month.

**Les Hilger:** Well don't second his motion to rescind either. [simultaneous comments]

**Robert Brust:** I'm still appalled.

**Chair:** Nick go ahead. [simultaneous comments]

**Nick Belloni:** Using the motion to rescind or amend something previously [unintelligible] if you can undo or change any decision your group has made in the past. The motion to rescind of appeal or annul is used to cancel a motion altogether. The motion to appear or amend a motion The vote required is determined whether there has been a previous notice of the motion. Whether any proposed amendment within the scope of [unintelligible] motion or rescind or amend something cannot interrupt the speakers on the floor, must be seconded. It is debatable, can be amended, requires two-thirds vote, a majority vote with notice. So we need two-thirds or a majority vote of the entire membership with no notice.

**Denis Mosgofian:** What was that last one?

**Nick Belloni:** It can be reconsidered if failed. Vote requirement I can go through but I think we've followed all that out.

**Chair:** We can go ahead with the motion to rescind. It will need a second, we'll have to have a vote. So we have Richard Rothman.

**Richard Rothman:** You know, I think we should wait until the December meeting. The other thing besides Linda and Denis going to speak with the Supervisor and or his staff is the other thing the rules committee I think it going to meet what he said the 15<sup>th</sup>? 12<sup>th</sup>. And who knows,

you know, there might be amendments there we might like or might not like and then we can do this at the December meeting and you know he's sort of hinted there's going to be—

**Denis Mosgofian:** I think he said technical amendments.

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Okay, so there's a motion waiting for a second on the floor.

**Linda Shaffer:** I didn't hear a motion.

**Denis Mosgofian:** Okay, I'll make the motion and I'll read the reason, a simple reason. PROSAC members move that PROSAC members go on record rescinding their October resolution supporting the proposed charter amendment to the Open Space Fund because it has been changed from the proposed amendment as present to PROSAC several months ago. That's the context I have. The current amendment eliminate the doubling and set-aside, reduces the annual monies to the RPD from approximately \$40 million a year to an iffy \$3, deletes important language directing the expenditure of those monies, marginalizes long-term maintenance of our parks and recreation facilities to a footnote and directs these monies [unintelligible] without any meaningful monitoring and accountability. So I move that we rescind it until such time as there's a change in the language that we could support. If nobody seconds it—

**Robert Brust:** That's not what I was going to say [unintelligible]

[simultaneous comments]

**Steffen Franz:** Does anybody second Denis' motion? So the motion fails.

[simultaneous comments]

**Linda Shaffer:** I almost seconded Denis' motion and the reason I didn't is because I would like to have the resolution that we passed rescinded also but for different reasons and the other reason I didn't second it is I'm kind of persuaded that we should wait until after we've sat down with the supervisor but I just am going on record again, I'm extremely unhappy about the Open Space Fund issue, particularly the implications acquisition. That really is a big stumbling block for me.

**Denis:** And I would have incorporated that easily.

**Linda Shaffer:** I know.

**Chair:** Les.

**Les Hilger:** I just want to say that the Commission gets the resolution we passed but you each are able to inform the Commissioners of your concerns over any changes that have been made and list them. So I certainly don't feel like we're being muzzled at any level because of our past

support of a resolution. We can still move forward and have a constructive conversation about the current motion, the current charter amendment that's evolving and you can express all your concerns to the Commissioners at any time.

**Denis:** I guess the issue Les is that he can then politick and campaign based on the support.

**Nick Belloni:** To tailgate off Les I do know that the Commissioners do like to hear from us personally and individually. I've talked to them and they always say it's nice to hear from the members of PROSAC, it's something that I've heard many times so you guys should know they're more than open to hear from you and they listen.

**Chair:** I think also weighing in on that is that I think after we meet that we'll have a stronger position in which to rescind if we choose.

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Let's make sure of that before we leave tonight that we have at least people identified [unintelligible]. Okay, I want to go back to Item 1 so we can [unintelligible]. Item 1 we have three months of meetings and I would like to take a motion to approve all three months. We have August 4, September 1, and October 6. If I could—

**Female Speaker:** So moved.

**Pat Delgado:** Second.

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** What do we have back there?

**Nancy Wuerfel:** Public comment on every item. Some of the last discussion is pertinent to the fact that the minutes were not online. I would dearly have loved to have read the October minutes. I think also the attachment of what you voted on would have been helpful to me tonight and so I know you're not going to talk about Denis' resolution but I think it's [unintelligible] for me to the fact that you are communicating with the public whether these minutes come out after the fact and now we have this big discussion about the fact there's another resolution which I can't find, I don't know what the hell.

**Chair:** August was stamped forward. I don't know what the situation is with the web person, Sean Stasio but what I heard from you about that that was the first I was made aware of it.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** I'm making a general comment on the fact that I don't see how the minutes are serving the public. Also, I would like for you to tell me right now what is the resolution that you had that you voted on so that I can understand what we were supporting because there's nothing that I've been able to find especially since there's something different now. It's all connected in terms of the documentation of the work of this committee.

[simultaneous comments]

**Nancy Wuerfel:** So if you could ask Recreation and Park to post in a timely manner all of the documents that you're going to vote on tonight then I could have done my homework and contributed but right now—

[simultaneous comments]

**Nancy Wuerfel:** Not the resolution. I want to see what it was that you said was okay.  
[simultaneous comments] It seems to be missing. Does anybody have it?

**Chair:** I have the document on my hard drive.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** Can that be posted online so everybody in the world can see it?

**Chair:** [unintelligible] why it wasn't posted. It's not from lack of paperwork. We had a meeting with Sarah Ballard our new secretary and we had dates clearly spelled out, those dates [unintelligible] so I do not know at this point why.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** Linda has very kindly given me this and I don't want to belabor it but I want to understand, this looks exactly like what I've got now. I want to know is this the document that you looked at and said that you took verbatim, that was your—you appreciated everything in there. This looks like what is the only document online at the Board of Supervisors, was there a separate piece of paper?

**Linda Shaffer:** No, there was not.

**Chair:** It was a separate, single-paged document.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** A single-paged document?

**Chair:** A single-paged document. What normally happens is it's reflected in the minutes as to the verbiage, a separate document is sent forward to our secretary.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** And may I ask who prepares that, just for my edification.

**Chair:** I do.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** Thank you. And that's what you voted on in order to have your resolution?

**Chair:** Yes.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** Thank you. And that should be posted hopefully.

**Chair:** Unfortunately I can't answer why—

**Nancy Wuerfel:** I'm not trying to attack you but you can see my frustration of looking at a resolution, no know what it was based up, hearing Denis' concerns and I could even read the October minutes before I walked in the door.

**Steffen Franz:** Nancy, if you have Sarah Ballard's email address I would urge you to take this up with Sarah.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** Why is this my job to talk to Sarah?

**Steffen Franz:** Well, it's your job to Commission to this committee to tell us that—

[simultaneous comments]

**Nancy Wuerfel:** I would like you to talk to Sarah on behalf of what you learned tonight.

[simultaneous comments]

**Steffen Franz:** It does come from us Denis, it's come from us every single month we've said something about it and every single month we basically get cold shouldered.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** Well then you will be very impressed with the memo I'm going to send her which sites what happened tonight.

**Steffen Franz:** That would be awesome.

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Unfortunately this is turning into a recurring issue.

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** This was the first I knew when I got here, I knew because I saw this note here and it said press the button to start the recording, that's how I was notified.

**Richard Rothman:** She hasn't been here any—

**Chair:** No, we have an issue and we're going to have to—

**Steffen Franz:** [unintelligible] the whole time is how do we end up with this not being online and people not being able to see it, it violates Sunshine.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** Is it acceptable to everybody if I just send something to Linda just to cut to the chase? [simultaneous comments] and then I'll let Linda then pass it on to the full committee. You'll know that I did write Sarah and what I said.

**Chair:** Is there any other public comment? Being none, public comment is closed.  
[simultaneous comments] We can restate the motion to accept only the minutes of August 4, September 1 which were published online.

**Female Speaker:** So moved.

**Male Speaker:** Second.

**Steffen Franz:** All in favor?

**All:** Aye.

[simultaneous comments]

**Denis Mosgofian:** You said you handed this to me today and you said you read my comments into the record?

**Chair:** Yes.

**Male Speaker:** Would that have been October's records?

**Chair:** Yes.

**Denis Mosgofian:** It's not in there. I just wondered what you read them into. Unless I can't read.

**Steffen Franz:** No, it was though, she read it into minutes. Actually Richard [unintelligible]

**Chair:** [unintelligible] a separate document as well. I sent that as an attachment so even if it hadn't been in the minutes it would have been attached.

**Steffen Franz:** And it is not a part of the October minutes.

**Chair:** Item 3. [simultaneous comments]

**Stacy Bradley:** I'm stepping in for Dawn today. I'm Stacy Bradley, I'm the deputy director of Capital Planning. So I have I think a very good, positive update today. So our second bond sale was passed to the Board of Supervisors yesterday so the next step is to start we should get the money in December so we'll have some projects starting, the money will be available. January and December is very exciting for Balboa pool in particular and then a lot of the other projects will be able to be kicked off.

Today the McLaren quick start projects for \$2.5 million approved at Capital committee. Linda I'm sure can talk more about it but it is a number of things including things needing immediate fixing connectivity, some paving, some signage, improved signage, some things that improve the entrances.

The first Garfield Pool public meeting is going to be held this month, November 17<sup>th</sup>. The South Park project we're having a groundbreaking next week. I also have a number of openings. So this Saturday the Buchanan Street Mall activation project that's funded by TPL that's going to have its grand opening on Saturday, we're having the activation project that TPL funded with the Exploratorium and Green Streets as partners, it's opening on Saturday, it's very exciting.

**Denis Mosgofian:** Is that Turk to Fulton?

**Stacy Bradley:** Yeah, they did a small elements. Grove to Turk. The whole thing, the whole thing. It has—there's elements on every block that are designed to match all of the different blocks and tell the story of the people who live in the community. It's a really great project and it has gotten a lot of community input for this project. It's really cool and they the Exploratorium all of the pieces in house. It's a really great project.

Then also, the next one is Joe D. so that is opening on the 14<sup>th</sup>. And then the last one is the Larson playground. That's opening on November 21<sup>st</sup>.

**Chair:** Is the plane there?

**Stacy Bradley:** The plane landed yesterday. We went by, we saw it. We missed the move in of the plane but they were doing a lot of work and the structure was there.

**Robert Brust:** What is it, we had to buy a new plane?

**Stacy Bradley:** Yes, it's not a real plane. We couldn't have a real plane because it's too dangerous.

**Robert Brust:** But there used to be a plane there.

**Stacy Bradley:** There used to be a plane, there were two planes. One would be removed, another would be added. But this looks like a plane and it is—the playground has a little pack out and a little SFO. It's so cute, it has luggage stacked on top of each other for climbing. It's very clever.

And then we are interviewing candidates this month and we hope to get some more onboard by January.

**Female Speaker:** And how many do you have right now?

**Stacy Bradley:** I'm not positive. We have about ten to twelve but I'd rather check.

**Robert Brust:** I would just like to make sure that new members know that PM is Project Manager.

[simultaneous comments]



**Richard Rothman:** I'd like to say something that Recreation and Park and the Art Commission should be very proud of, they were recipients of the State Office Preservation annually gives out the Governor's Award for the top preservation projects in the State and one of the winners was Coit Tower and I don't know why the Mayor is keeping that secret but I just want to—I think Recreation and Park and the Art Commission should be really very proud of the work and the mural are staying in great condition. I'm up there almost every month and the leaks are manageable and so the city Recreation and Park and the Art Commission. Actually they won two preservation awards, congratulations. [applause]

**Richard Ivanhoe:** So last month Dawn mentioned that Margaret Hayward our Recreation and Park needed to meet with the Office of Emergency Services to figure out what their needs were. Has that meeting happened or is it planned?

**Stacy Bradley:** I don't know if the meeting has happened. I know they've been working really hard on Margaret Hayward so I don't know if it has happened already or if it's just moving ahead, but it is moving forward. The project is definitely moving forward.

**Denis Mosgofian:** District 5. Do you know if—that's where the emergency center is that going to have to stay there, I guess it is.

**Stacy Bradley:** I think for the time being yeah.

**Denis Mosgofian:** Probably for the next fifty years.

**Stacy Bradley:** Yes, it's going to have to stay there but I think the facility itself will change so that it's better served.

**Chair:** Are there any other questions? Public comment? Seeing none, public comment is closed. Agenda setting. Last night on the 11:00 o'clock news I saw something about the—and this relates to Richard Ivanhoe, we were talking about January, talking about the GGNRA off-lease dog policy. On the news they said it's going to be February that they're going to release their revised versions. So I'm not sure do we still want to schedule them for January's meeting?

**Richard Ivanhoe:** We're talking about GGNRA dog policy how it's going to impact Recreation and Park. So far I've only gotten two names from somebody I know at the National Park Service and I don't have their contact information. People here might know them—Howard Levitt and [simultaneous comments] If you want to just give me his contact information or ask him if it makes more sense doing it in January.

**Chair:** And then the other one we had talked about Richard Rothman was art in parks.

**Richard Rothman:** I will email.

**Chair:** Please do. Have them on by the end of the year. That way we can finalize our agenda. The other item—

**Richard Rothman:** You know maybe the dog, I don't know, the GGNRA they control the beaches, it's confusing now, but they control the old breaker and I guess the walkway and from the Cliff House down to I don't know where bunker do you know where stairway 14—I don't know, it must be down by Balboa Street or further down, they decided to removed the garbage cans and want people to take the garbage out. I had a long talk with Richard actually he called me today so maybe we should have them come and talk about garbage. I mean the reason he wants to do it is because he thinks people should pack their garbage out and it will be less work for his people and I told him well we're not Yosemite so I was concerned whether they're going to dump garbage across the street, you know, it affects DPW land, Recreation and Park so he told me it was an experiment, if it didn't work he'd put the garbage cans back. So I have his information.

**Chair:** Okay, so that's the agenda. Public comment? Nancy Wuerfel.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** I am very interested in the last bullet point called the RPD website. If you think you have fun with the agendas and the minutes you ought to be somebody in the public trying to find out if this meeting existed. I'm going to honest, I had to call Margaret MacArthur to walk me through because I could see that you existed and that you had a schedule of meetings every month of the year. I could not find the agenda for this online unless you go through some magic over about us and around the corner and through the alley. It was unbelievable and then it took me a while to figure out that there was some documents online. The point is there's no reason why you are buried in the bowels of the RPD website. You are a legitimate honest to God committee, you are in the charter and I want you front and center and I want you even on the banner right next to the word Commission. The citizens advisory committee has to have some dignity, it is not just some extra thing that happened, it was passed by the voters and I want this committee to take the respect that you deserve and demand it. Do I have to add that to my list to Sarah? [laughter] I'm getting quite a long email going but I'm serious, you've got to follow up. If I start the ball rolling you've got to hit on her because this website thing is a big deal and—

**Tom Valtin:** And as a member it's not expressing this in self-interest, it's you expressing outrage as a member of the public.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** But seriously, this has been a bug for a couple of years but I've casually wanted to look you us and I've spent so much time I thought it's just not worth it. So sorry about that but I mean you need to follow up when I follow up. Thank you.

**Steffen Franz:** Nancy in response to this I just want to say that all of these points that you've made both with the minutes and the website have been discussed with RPD numerous times.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** And the response is they're going to put it on the list?

**Steffen Franz:** The response is that it was being handled and we see what that means.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** It's called the round file.

**Steffen Franz:** Unfortunately what we also know is that poor Stacy, who's here checking her email because one thing I can tell you for sure, Steffen Franz District 2, I served with Nancy Wuerfel, I know that she's going to tear at this thread until it reaches right up into Sarah's situation. These are conversations that shouldn't be brought up by the public at an open meeting where in reality we're expecting certain things from the Department. So again we're not going to shell you or Dawn because it's not really her purpose. Chair, I believe that we have to have a conversation with Sarah Ballard again announcing that this is getting out of hand. That these areas now are being brought to us by members of the public, ex-members of this committee and things haven't progressed and if they don't progress then we'll have to go to the Commission and we'll have to say that our Nancy, I think your words were well-expressed, we are as positioned as anyone else in this to have a voice and here we are with a Supervisor fighting for our clause but yet in reality the Department that we're supposed to be working with isn't really respecting our position. So I think your point is well-taken I just wanted to say that from the committee we all feel the same.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** I wouldn't if I may be so bold is wait more than I would say a couple weeks after you see what I have written and then pass another resolution to the Commission that identifies the same complaints that you have probably even more, to simply say the support staff is not serving us which means they're not serving the Commission, that's a direct insult to the Commission that you are not taking care of.

**Steffen Franz:** Again, I think our feeling is not to speak for Linda, does not seem to resonate to Sarah and maybe Commissioner Buell should here about this.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** That's who you advise is the Commission, you do not advise Mr. Ginsburg, you advise the Commission, I have read the law.

**Steffen Franz:** We have a working rapport with Mr. Ginsburg but clearly if we need to take this to somebody else we will act on it and if the Chair sees fit to act on it that's fine, if she doesn't then somebody else will.

**Chair:** We actually have a scheduled meeting both Ginsburg and Sarah and it's time to have another.

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Closed. Okay, public comment did you have another comment Richard? No? OK Now we have General public comment.

**Dee Seligman:** I have a point of information, how does one who has offered to serve on a working committee with PROSAC how do I know if I will be on that committee or not or a representative.

**Chair:** You're talking about what you mentioned earlier?

**Dee Seligman:** I asked in my previous comment if our group, me or someone else or it may not be me, be part of that working group.

**Chair:** Well our group is going to be PROSAC members meeting with Mark Farrell. Are you asking for a separate meeting?

**Dee Seligman:** No, I'm asking a member of the public representing an organization that has a particular interest in this topic whether our organization can be represented on the working committee? It seems as if—that's my question, how can that happen because it seems as if Supervisor Farrell was open to exploring issues with portions of the amendment as it is currently drafted.

**Chair:** With PROSAC members. You would have to set up your own meeting with Farrell or you could go to public comment. There will be public comment at the rules committees.

**Dee Seligman:** I'm aware of that but really the question was a point of information about the working group that you're setting up.

**Les Hilger:** Or you can bend one of our ears and get us to advocate. But your group cannot participate as a PROSAC group member.

**Dee Seligman:** It does not include the public is what you're saying. Okay, thank you.

**Chair:** Dee, regarding your concerns, we can talk offline. Any other public comment? Yes.

**Tom Borden:** I'm with the Anti-Intolerance League. (laughter) I'd like to comment that there was a hard-fought battle that resulted in this Board of Supervisors resolutions 653-02, the resolution was adopted unanimously by the Board of Supervisors, signed by the Mayor and ~~not~~ it's being subverted by Recreation and Park and I'm trying to draw some attention to that. This is the one that says that the Natural Area Program shouldn't do naughty things until after the Board of Supervisors approves the Natural Areas Management Plan and I'd like to see PROSAC take a position and actually try to do something about it because it's wrong. Sorry, I'm upset..It's wrong.The people fought hard to get this resolution and it's being ignored by Recreation and Park.

**Chair:** Denis, did you want to reply?

**Denis Mosgofian:** No, I'm just going to ask a question Tell me what specifically you're referring to nasty things?

**Chair:** Here's a copy.

**Tom Borden:** This is a copy for you. So basically the Board of Supervisors instructed the Natural Area Program not to close any trails, restrict recreation, restrict access, cut healthy trees or kill any feral cats, etc, until such time as the Board of Supervisors approved the Natural Areas Management Plan and further there's an EIR in process for the Natural Areas Management Plan

which has not been approved by certified and approved so how is it that they can go and do the elements of the Management Plan when these two other steps have not been crossed by the program.

**Denis Mosgofian:** Is this a document you gave me that says its date 9-23-02?

**Tom Borden:** Correct.

**Denis Mosgofian:** Is this is the original?

**Tom Borden:** That's the resolution I'm referring to. [unintelligible] On the next to the last page I've highlighted in red the language.

**Chair:** Have you gone to public comment taken his to the Commission?

**Tom Borden:** I've been to a Capital meeting and mentioned the issue. I've sent a letter to the Board of Supervisors and Commission, the Bicycle Advisory committee has issued a resolution and directed some attention to this to the Land Use and Transportation committee of the Board of Supervisors and they're sending another—today they sent another letter to the—I can't remember the name of the other committee but it's one that supposedly interfaces and has responsibility for Recreation and Park.

**Chair:** Land Use?

**Tom Borden:** No, not Land Use, it's another one. So

**Chair:** This might be timely when we discuss SNRAMP. I'll leave it up to the members to tell me when to bring this to members

**Robert Brust:** We could do that now, I so move it. I've been—it's just been brought to my attention, I've been on the PROSAC board for two years and I've heard lots of people come in and address issues around the Natural Areas Management program with Recreation and Park but I have never—I don't think we've really had anybody come in. We had that one big presentation. [simultaneous comments]

**Nick Belloni:** We have had it a couple times in the past before you were here.

**Robert Brust:** That's what I'm saying. [simultaneous comments] That's my point thank you. [simultaneous comments]

**Linda Shaffer:** District 10. My understanding is that it really may happen soon that the final EIR for the SNRAMP is going to be released by late this year, is that what I heard or is that now not—

**Stacy Bradley:** I think it will be unlikely that it's late this year. Early next year.

**Linda Shaffer:** Early next year, probably when I'm in Central America.

**Stacy Bradley:** We'll plan around that. [laughs]

**Linda Shaffer:** That was off the record. But yes, that would be the time to bring this issue back to the committee.

**Steffen Franz:** I think it is fair to say that many of the members were not on PROSAC when we were presented with whether it be NAP or SNRAMP at a time when we first took it up when I first started on this committee it was very contentious, there were certain people, there was division amongst PROSAC who supported SNRAMP I think that it's clear that the body has changed so I think it would be good for us to revisit this. I know somebody like Les who was the Chair before, has this look on them like do we really want to open up this can of worms but we do because I think there's interested amongst all these parties, we want to know, we want to know what this looks like, we want to know if they have funding, whether it's the maintenance alternative or whether it's the actual plan that they put forward. But I think the reality for us is we need somebody to come in and present to us clearly within the scope of whatever the EIR before it passes before it actually comes.

**Chair:** I know we've mentioned this item a couple times with Phil and when we had met Sarah last time and it was all about the timing of the release of the EIR. It seems like that's always the obstacle to scheduling this.

**Linda Shaffer:** Point of information, I know we all know this but every once in a while somebody has to say it, the SNRAMP and the Natural Areas Program are two different things and we don't want to have both of them being discussed. They overlap but—

**Chair:** Would you suggest that we just have the Natural Areas Program as presented by RPD?

**Linda Shaffer:** As separate, yes.

**Robert Brust:** What is SNRAMP?

**Linda Shaffer:** The Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan. The RPD wrote it ten years ago and it's taken ten years for the environmental impact report to be released.

**Chair:** Any other public comment?

**Robert Brust:** Does anybody want another copy of the Board of Supervisors resolution?

**Chair:** Announcements? Yes, Richard Rothman has an announcement.

**Richard Rothman:** Two. One is the Mother's Building assessment report is almost ready and Stacy and I are going to work on a presentation which we would be happy to do here and if any

other community groups would like me to come and talk about the Mother's Building I'd be more than happy to.

The other thing is you might have read—this is good news for Recreation and Park tonight, two good things I have to say about Recreation and Park is that in September there was a newspaper article in the Chronicle about how the city manages its artifacts and I was almost going to come here and say not nice things about Recreation and Park but I found out that the Commission secretary Margaret is actually working on this to get these records out of unsafe conditions and hopefully they'll be opened up to the public and we'll be able to see the history of Recreation and Park and maybe I'll find some photos of the Mother's Building there.

**Chair:** Any other announcements? Yes Steffen.

**Steffen Franz:** I just wanted to qualify that in the minutes the transcript of October's meeting that Denis' comments—Richard's comments on behalf of Denis is actually on page 22 and 23 in its entirety.

**Richard Rothman:** Mostly, with a few unintelligibles. Like introducing that it was Denis' comment.

**Steffen Franz:** We have a transcript.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** Why don't I have it?

**Steffen Franz:** The transcript is distilled into the minutes.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** That's not the point! I want the raw data, you have 23 pages of good stuff and I can't see it.

**Chair:** That transcript is online.

**Nancy Wuerfel:** You show me where? I'm going to have fun tonight. [simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Adjourned.

**End of Document**