

**Park and Recreation Open Space Advisory Commission Meeting
February 7, 2017**

Chair: Welcome to the February Park and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee. Thank you all for being here. We'll begin with roll.

Richard Rothman: First Vice Chair, District 1.

Maya Rodgers: Maya Rodgers, Second Vice Chair, District 10.

Jordyn Aquino: District 4.

Robert Brust: District 8.

Patricia Delgado: District 9.

Winnie Chu: District 7.

Jane Weil: District 6.

Tom Valtin: District 9.

Ana Gee: District 6.

Linda D'Avirro: District 11.

Kim Hirschfield: District 3.

Kenneth Maley: District 3.

Mark Scheuer: District 8.

Katherine Jones: District 5.

Nick Belloni: District 2.

Chair: Steffen Franz, District 2. Okay, I guess before we get started I wanted to share with you our member Kenneth Maley has given us a New Year's gift to enjoy so I would like to pass around some chocolates.

I'd like to move on to the review of minutes and ask has everybody had a chance to review the minutes? Are there any comments on the minutes?

Kenneth Maley: I have a question in general about the minutes. I have a concern that committee members comments at a meeting may be recorded but not get into the minutes and when asked about that well sorry but they are on the recording. It seems to me that if the committee is asked to review and approve minutes then everything should be in the minutes.

Chair: So actually there is the transcript and the transcript is not the minutes. There was a determination made by the Secretary for the Recreation and Park Commission because we model after the way they do it and they have two pieces—action minutes and a transcript. The transcript is the literal transcript of everything said which is available to any member anytime.

Kenneth Maley: And when did Margaret put that in place.

Chair: Tiffany, how long have we been doing both transcript and action?

Tiffany: Probably about three years.

Chair: To address your question—Tiffany, do you send out both the action minutes and the transcript?

Tiffany: I do. And both the transcript and the minutes are available online for public viewing as well.

Kenneth Maley: That answers my question, thank you.

Chair: Moving on, any other comments on the January minutes?

Patricia Delgado: Move to approve.

Tom Valtin: Second.

Chair: Moved and seconded, all in favor?

All: Aye.

Chair: That item is closed. I'll keep my Chair's report short and sweet today. First of all I want to remind you that last Thursday and tomorrow night Katie is doing the budget meeting which is an open public meeting. The Department is required to have these public meetings to discuss the budget so we will see it tonight but again it will be played tomorrow night I believe at Joe Lee. So if any of you would like to attend that I will be there, we can have a coffee. Again, it's good for us to show up at these types of meetings. Certainly it's within our purview to be at these meetings.

I wanted to let you know I took in an interesting meeting with the San Francisco Parks Alliance under its new leadership. I had some questions and wanted to see where they were at. They offered through Rachel Norton to come and present to us in April. So we will be putting the

Parks Alliance on the April agenda to get a little overview of where things have kind of developed to at this point.

That concludes the Chair's report for the February meeting. Richard does have two or three comments.

Richard Rothman: First is my photo show at the lodge through the end of the month. Second is I read in the newspaper that some people are appealing the Recreation and Park's decision about the Nature Area. So if you want to let your Supervisors know your opinion on it it's at the end of the month.

Lastly, for those of us who are awaiting reappointment to PROSAC I talked to the clerk, because I'm waiting too. One is they've changed the meeting dates for the Rules Committee, now they meet on a Wednesday so they meeting the second—well, they're meeting on the 22nd, I think it's the 2nd and 4th Wednesday and you said he's trying to get all the—I guess there's some other pending ones besides myself. So if you're in that group you might check with your Supervisor and Derek and the Rules Committee Supervisor's Office. He usually knows the Friday before for sure.

Chair: I think that speaks to anybody who was up for reappointment. Again, if you have a new Supervisor or if your old Supervisor if you termed out and you need to be reappointed you do need to go to the Rules so I would ask you to make sure so that you're not coming to this meeting next month and you actually have somebody sitting in your chair.

To that end, we have some new members. It actually appears to me that our newest member who we welcomed last month, Natalie, said she would be here but hasn't arrived. But we do have Katherine who is a new member and I will give you just two minutes to give the committee a little bit of who you are.

Katherine Jones: My name is Katherine Jones. I live in Cole Valley. I was born and raised and Sausalito. I have two daughters, ages one and three, and we spend our free time in Golden Gate Park and Sutro Forest. I grew up running the vales of The GGNRA and Mt. Tam so I developed an interest in parks and open space early and after graduating from UC Hastings law school. I worked for the County of Marin, ending up with the Parks and Open Space District there for a few years and I am now a public events and policy manager for the Trust for Public Land based in San Francisco. So I have worked on some projects in partnership with Recreation and Park but I'm here as a citizen and interested citizen of District 5.

Chair: Welcome. I have one other quick note for everybody and I would ask you to please pay attention to this. Our secretary Tiffany said that last month quite a few people's comments got drowned out by background conversation that goes on in front of these mics. So again, please be conscious as you are talking amongst yourselves that these mics are live and it does hinder Tiffany's ability and the people who do the transcript's ability to really hear what's going on. So please identify yourself and keep the background conversation down.

Are there any comments or public comments? Being none, the Chair's report is closed.

Let's move on to Item #4, Stacy Bradley.

Stacy Bradley: I'm the Deputy Director of our Planning unit. My overview today will be quick. We are making a lot of progress on many fronts so I want to give you some of our quick updates.

South Park should be opening later this month. Mansell just opened last weekend in the rain was the big event and a great amount of people still came even though it was raining. The same day was the second community meeting of the McLaren visioning process. Linda, thank you very much for your comments. I think as part of that we are working going to other groups so that workshop in the rain won't be the only opportunity to voice your opinion. We'll have everything posted online, sending information digitally as well as making the team available to go to other events.

For ground-breakings which are coming up: Geneva Avenue Community Garden which has been discussed here for awhile is breaking ground this month. McLaren bike skills also should be breaking ground in the next month or so. The Civic Center Playground is also breaking ground on Valentine's Day.

The acquisitions that Janice is going to bring to you later on today is on the equity zone. They're both in the equity zone so there's some emphasis on that. And I didn't think about it before this meeting but I will start letting you know some of what we're doing in the equity zones as I continue to provide updates.

As Richard mentioned the Natural Resources Management Plan is appealed to the Board and it will be heard on February 28th. So please do contact your Supervisors and let me know if you have any questions. I'm more than happy to provide any information for you.

Katie is going to talk about the budget so I won't go into detail on any of that but we are before the Capital Planning Committee on the 13th for going over a presentation of the Department's ten-year capital plan. It's very similar to what Dawn went over earlier with the Department's now capital plan. And our bond is now going to be in 2019. It was originally slated for 2018 but it is official that it is now 2019. 2018 there's going to be a seawall bond for the Port.

If you have any questions I'm happy to answer them.

Patricia Delgado: Tell us more about the 2019 bond.

Stacy Bradley: I don't have much to tell you about the bond in 2019. Because it is in 2019 the public process should start in say July of 2018 because the measure needs to be completed by the summer of 2019 so we'll have a year-long public process. To be prepared for that process we will be starting that this year but we haven't actually started yet.

Patricia Delgado: Do you have a set amount that you're looking for?

Stacy Bradley: Right now it's likely to be the same amount that's happened in the past and the Port has indicated in being a part of it as well. But that is still evolving.

Kenneth Maley: I was going to ask about an update on the 11th and Howard.

Stacy Bradley: Yeah, 11th and Natoma we finished the phase two and are now in negotiations with the seller. We're hoping to bring that forward in the next couple of months.

Linda D'Avirro: District 11. Going back to the workshop number two for the park will you post what was out there in the rain because it got all wrinkled and wet.

Stacy Bradley: Absolutely, that will definitely be posted online. I think part of that was there were surveys included in that which will all be online too to get people to provide feedback.

Chair: Just before I open it up to public comment because I do have public comment on this item I want to remind everybody if you have specific projects that you would like information about today was a good example Stacy is more than willing to field this discussion before she comes here so I just want to reiterate to you that if there is something in your District that you want an answer to at the meeting that's to send Stacy the email prior to the day of the meeting and say hey what's going on with Geneva or what's going on with whatever. So I think that's a good way to get the answer that you're looking for without Stacy having to go back and get the information.

So no other committee conversation on this topic? Hearing none, I will open it up to public comment. Patrick you are my only blue card right now so you have two minutes, please address the body not the staff.

Patrick Skain: I'm a member of the Pine Lake Park Neighborhood Association. I'm very interested in improvement at Pine Lake Park. Over the last few years looking at bond measures and actions of this committee we haven't seen many proposal for improvements in Pine Lake Park. Two of the issues that come forward first are capital improvements and also trees which may be on a future discussion point. Last year we had over a dozen trees come down in Pine Lake Park. This year we've had more than a dozen. As a result of that we've lost capital infrastructure. Last year large trees came down and took out the trellis work in the dog play area. If you've been to Pine Lake Park recently your might realize that a large hundred-foot tree came down and hit the Trocadero last week putting a 30-foot hole in the roof and as far as we're concerned contributing significant structural damage. So when I got to the West of Twin Peaks meeting I say hey Mt. Davidson may not want trees trimmed or trees removed but if they don't want the money we're gladly take it. We've been waiting twenty years for tree trimming and tree removal in Pine Lake Park. In terms of capital improvement projects. At some point we'd like to see a master plan for the west end of Pine Lake Park. Significant damage there done by PG&E and other capital improvement projects like the Pine Lake Park home station improvement project. Farther down this year we've got the seismic upgrade, the 54-inch service line being put in between Merced Manor and Sunset Reservoir. It split the park. It contributed to significant disturbance in the park so we'd like to see a follow-up on that by Recreation and Park to see that restoration is made. Also on other capital improvements the overlook at the lake has significantly

deteriorated. Also, we need some work on the closed section of Wawona street with erosion control and erosion control around the lake. In the future I hope that this committee and perhaps Recreation and Park might be entertaining some of these proposals on future bond measures and improvements. I don't know how many of you have been out to Pink Lake in the last year or never been out? So I encourage you to go out. It is one of the natural lakes in the city along with Mountain Lake, Lake Merced which is going to have significant improvements in the next year Pine Lake Park is natural water source in the city and park of the significant natural resource area. So we treasure the area but it needs improvements and so we look perhaps some support from the committee and also Recreation and Park. Thank you.

Kenneth Maley: I'd like to address Patrick if I may. I'm very concerned about the twenty years of no tree work in your park. I'm from North Beach in District 3 and I've encountered the same situation at Washington Square Park and I'd like to remind this committee that for some time that's been on the proposed agenda to invite Recreation and Park to address tree maintenance in our parks and I'm hopeful that your comment mind help the committee move that up on the agenda.

Chair: I believe that Recreation and Park is gearing up for a tree presentation next month in that March meeting. Is there any other public comment on this item? Being none, public comment is closed.

We are now ready for our good friend Katie Petrucione.

Katie Petruccione: I am the director of administration and finance for the Recreation and Park Department. I'm here this evening on my annual pilgrimage to talk to you all about the budget. Tonight I'll talk a little bit about the Mayor's budget outlook for the general fund, talk about the impacts of Prop B, give you an overview of our budget in the current fiscal year, talk a little bit about some of the changes that we're contemplating for the next two fiscal years and then answer questions and listen to comments.

The Mayor's office is projecting a somewhat mixed outlook for the general fund over the next two fiscal years. They are projecting that revenue growth is going to remain strong with an additional \$144 million next year and then on top of that an additional \$184 million the year after but they are also anticipating the grown and expenditure is going to continue to exceed growth and revenue. Over the next five years the Mayor's budget office is projecting that revenue growth will be about 11 percent but that expenditure growth is going to be in the neighborhood of 29 percent.

So this of course presents the Mayor's office with something of a challenge as they contemplate balancing the budget in the next several months. All told the Mayor is currently anticipating a \$119 million general fund shortfall next year with a cumulative shortfall the year after of \$283 million. And just a reminder that both of those deficits will have to be erased by the time the Mayor submits his budget to the Board on June the 1st.

So to achieve that goal the Mayor has issued budget instructions to general funded Departments asking them to cut 3 percent from general fund subsidy in each of the next two fiscal years. The

Mayor's office has also asked all Departments to contain the growth of budgeted FTE budgeted positions. They've asked for no growth in fact in the budgeted number of positions in Department budgets in the next two years.

The good news is that the passage of Prop B this past June and the creation of a general fund baseline for the Recreation and Park Department means that the Department is now exempt from making these reductions to our general fund support. In addition, the charter language gives us more control and flexibility over our capital budget going forward and it allows us to use any new revenue or year over year revenue increases to cover costs and enhance our budget.

However, with this very great benefit comes a great responsibility. The Recreation and Park Department is now required to absorb all cost increases and any revenue changes within our baseline. So for next year that would include a 3 percent wage increase for city employees, an additional 3 percent increase the year after, health care costs which are assumed to increase by 7 percent in each of the next two years as well as increases to contributions to the retirement system, 2.5 percent increase next year and a little less than two-tenths of a percent the year after. We also will have to absorb any increases to our work orders. So the services that we buy from other Departments and right now that looks like that's going to be in the neighborhood of about 4 percent.

So what does that mean for our budget outlook for the next two fiscal years? Well, so we have guaranteed general fund of \$70.9 million next year and \$73.7 million the year after that. Currently in the budget system there's about \$72 million in general fund support budgeted and the number is high because it includes all of the cost of living adjustments that the Controller's Office has loaded and \$60 million the year after so just from the get-go that leaves us with a small deficit next year and a surplus the year after that.

But then we have to talk about all of the things that we have to adjust for. So we are anticipating about \$2 million in revenue corrections in the next two fiscal years. Next year that's primarily related to our parking garages. We've got some really bad next particularly on Union Square in the current fiscal year. Our budget for Union Square this year is \$3.2 million. Last year Union Square ended the year having made only \$2.5 million so right off the bat our budget has to be adjusted. And then MTA is actually projecting that Union Square is only to generate about \$1.9 million this year and then in the budget year. That's primarily related to traffic downtown from the Central Subway project but they also believe that their business not just in Union Square but at garages across the city are facing reduced revenue because of the real growth in ride sharing. So Uber and Lyft are cutting into our parking garage revenue.

The MTA garages are also seeing reductions. Sutter-Stockton is down 7 percent, so not quite as much as Union Square but definitely an impact.

And then in the second year of the budget I'm projecting that garage revenue comes back a little bit but then that's offset by the fact that we are proposing to turf the greens at Harding Park, so put down entirely new grass at Harding Park in 2019 in preparation for the 2020 PGA Championship and while the golf course will remain open we will have temporary putting greens

which means that we anticipate less play and we also will have to discount fees. So that will have about a \$900,000 impact on golf revenue in the second fiscal year that we have to account for.

So we also in year two are going to budget for a capital budget between general fund and golf of at least \$15.3 million. We need to budget for equipment in year two at \$1.1 million. We have a little bit of non-salary inflation that we have to account for and then about \$2 million in work order increases.

So that's offset a little bit by some reserves. We put a reserve in the budget for next year anticipating the cost of living adjustment and then we also have a reserve in some recoveries that will help balance the second fiscal year as well. So right now I'm looking to solve a \$2 million problem in year one and a \$3.2 million problem in year two.

Some context. Our current year budget is almost \$209 million. The lion's share of that, \$154 million, is our operating budget. About \$54 million is the capital budget in the current fiscal year and we have 955 budgeted and funded positions.

As you know, the Department has three primary sources of revenue. Earned income which is 28 percent. 31 percent of our budget comes from the open space fund. And about 40 percent, 41 percent, comes from the general fund.

So the open space fund as you all well know is a property tax set-aside. We've seen some really significant growth in open space which I'll talk a little bit about in a minute. General fund support this year is nearly \$70 million and then we do have under the charter we get to keep prior year savings and year over year revenue growth.

Earned income we generate income from our assets from concessions and leases, from recreation programming, almost a little over \$79 million in the current fiscal year. You'll note almost \$20 million in neighborhood development funds in the current fiscal year, \$19.4 million. This is revenue that comes from the various neighborhood plans, so Eastern Neighborhoods, Market-Octavia where there's a great deal of development, the Planning Department exacts a fee on the developers and then that fee revenue is spread across different city needs in an effort to increase resources in order to address the increased density in neighborhoods. And that \$19.4 million actually goes straight into capital projects.

So the red line on this charter is earned revenue. You'll note that we peaked in 13-14, plateaued and have come down a little bit in the last couple of years. The decreases primarily related to the fact that the stadium has gone away, so that was about \$7 million a year in income to the Department that no longer exists. But you'll also note that our general fund subsidy really has taken up the slack so to speak and that general fund subsidy number is going to increase now for the next 30 years because of the general fund baseline.

So how do we spend our money? Nearly 50 percent of our budget goes to taking care of our parks, so gardeners, custodians, urban foresters. About a third for recreation programming and aquatics. 11 percent supports our structural maintenance yards, so carpenters, plumbers, roofers. 7 percent is administration, primarily the folks who work for me—human resources, payroll, IT,

purchasing and contract, accounting and all of those folks. 5 percent of our budget is now allocated to park safety. That's actually an increase over the last few years. That used to be about 2 percent, it's now up to 5. And then the Marina and the Zoo at 2 percent and planning and volunteer services at 2 percent.

The single largest chunk of our budget goes for salary and benefits—almost two-thirds of our budget pays for staff. 14 percent of the budget is allocated to work orders. So this is telephone and fuel and light, heat and power, workers compensation, City Attorney services. 8 percent of the budget is contractual services and that includes everything from the cost to run the Harding Park clubhouse to software licensing to copier rental. 3 percent of the budget goes to our agreement with the Zoological Society for running the zoo on our behalf and pay them \$4.1 million a year. 5 percent of the budget is allocated to materials and supplies and equipment procurement. 4 percent on debt service which is two big pieces. We are repaying the State of California \$25 million that they loaned us to renovate the West Harbor of the Marina. And then pay about \$5 million a year on debt service for the lease revenue bonds that the Department issued against the open space fund in 2006-2007 to do capital projects. And then a tiny little sliver, about 1 percent, is citywide overhead.

So as I mentioned we've seen some really significant growth in property tax in the open space fund. So over the last five years we've seen actually growth of 36 percent, a little over 7 percent a year. The Controller's Office projecting about an 8 percent increase year over year between 16-17 and 17-18 and then nearly a 5 percent increase the year after that and then going forward a little over 3 percent annually.

I do want to note that in the same period that revenue increased by 7.2 percent, costs increased by 15 percent. So the Open Space Fund is not immune from the general trend in the city where we do see strong revenue growth but costs continue to grow at a faster pace than revenue. But open space we are lucky to have it. Really the Open Space Fund is primarily going to be the tool that we use to balance the budget in the next two fiscal years.

Just some detail on the Open Space Fund. The largest blue wedge is of course salary and fringe benefits, it's about 54 percent. The red wedge is overhead and that is about 20 percent. The green wedge is debt service so as I just said the lease revenue bonds in open space. The purpose wedge is capital projects at 3 percent. The light blue turquoise wedge is the contingency reserve which we're required to set aside 3 percent of the budget annually for contingency. And then the orange wedge is materials and supplies and equipment. Acquisitions is 5 percent and then the burgundy wedge is again citywide overhead.

So we're looking at some changes to the budget. One of the really strong aspects of the charter language that the voters approved this past June is the new emphasis on planning for the Department, really asking the Department to plan and look ahead. So as you all know per the charter the Recreation and Park Commission just approved an updated five-year strategic plan for the Department. The charter language says that plan will guide the Department's work over every five-year period. The Commission has also recently approved an operational plan which says that the objectives and initiatives within the strategic plan that the Department intends to undertake during the next budgetary period are included within the operational plan. We are

anticipating that we are actually going to launch 58 initiatives over the next two fiscal years so that really in large part is what's going to drive our budget changes.

And then the other new tool that the charter gives us that really will have an impact on how we allocate resources is the equity lens that we developed and that I know Taylor has been here several times to talk to you all about.

So just some highlights. I think you guys have seen these but just a reminder of some of the initiatives that we are going to be undertaking. We are going to implement a community based Park Patrol staffing model. We are going to prioritize deferred maintenance renewals in parks in equity zones that have family park scores. We're going to pilot a Spanish language permit assistance program at Mission Playground. We going to expand youth program emphasizing movement and wellness. We are going to do some homework to actually develop a list of operational and capital projects that we can share with our philanthropic partners. We are going to work to increase volunteer support in parks in equity zones, add another class of the Greenagers program, this one is the northern side of the city. We are developing an equity focused learning initiative for our own staff and then we're also looking at identifying technology to enhance service.

So how are we going to balance? Well, as I said definitely the Open Space Fund is going to be the primary tool but we also will have some additional general fund revenue that we can budget. All of the growth that we're seeing in general fund revenue is just from increased used. We're not looking at any kind of fee increases. The Mayor has been pretty clear that he does not want Departments to entertain increased fees. And so the single biggest chunk that I can see is \$200,000 from increased ticket sales at Outside Lands. A little bit of additional revenue from leases and concessions and really, honestly, this is like \$15,000 here and \$25,000 there. Ultimately it adds up to real money which in my mind is not real money if it's not over \$100,000. Some additional revenue from rec programming, this comes from learn to swing programming. I think a little additional revenue from the Sharon Arts Studio. A little bit of additional revenue from Mather. And then some additional revenue from facility rentals primarily athletic field permits, so adults pay for athletic field permits, kids do not. And e continue to see growth there.

So my budget is due two weeks from today. I'm still very much in the throes of working on how we're going to close the deficit and I feel like I have to do that before we can really talk about any kind of enhancement.

As always we're doing community outreach. So as Steffen noted we had a public budget meeting last week, another one tomorrow night at Joe Lee Rec in the Bayview from 6:30 until 8:00. It's actually really nice having PROSAC members there. You are all super knowledgeable about the Department and it's nice to have that element and experience in the audience. There is an all staff meeting about budget. I'm going to do a brown bag lunch for our staff this coming Friday to give them an update on where we are. Recreation and Park Commission meetings. The next meeting that I'll be at the Commission will actually have the budget in front of them for approval and then I'm here tonight doing park advocate meetings.

So this is the timeline. The budget is due to the Mayor's office on the 21st of February and then the Mayor will submit the budget to the Board on June 1st. It's a slightly different dynamic with the Mayor's office now that we are a baseline Department. Certainly the Mayor is the ultimate authority on what is or is not in our budget but we are not going to be negotiating with the Mayor's office about cuts or can we generate additional revenue so that we can offset general fund support. So that's nice.

The baseline Prop B is absolutely not a panacea but it does create stability and we should all be pleased about that.

That is my presentation and I welcome questions.

Chair: Thank you Katie. Certainly for most of us this is the first time we've seen you do this. I think in years past and I'll just say from my own experience there have been a lot more doom and gloom type meetings where we all left like wow, did she just say she has to make up this much? It makes the numbers that you're showing us now seem much more sustainable.

Katie Petrucione: I agree. I remember the year very clearly where we cut \$12.5 million out of our general fund support. This is so much better.

Chair: I'll take some questions starting with Richard, Ken, Nick.

Richard Rothman: I have a couple questions. The first one is about the Outside Land, when you say increase does that increase the price or does that increase the number of people?

Katie Petrucione: I believe it's believe they're increasing their ticket prices.

Richard Rothman: But the same number of people.

Katie Petrucione: Yes.

Richard Rothman: I've been on PROSAC I think three years for District 1 and I think we're supposed to be budgeted six gardeners and I don't think we've ever had six. Now we're down to three and I don't know if it's the curse of the rich man but one of my neighbors told me maybe you have an answer. I hear one person said workers comp or whatever. But can't they develop a pool where people will be floaters so we don't have this shortage? Is there a shortage in other Districts?

Katie Petrucione: Yes.

Richard Rothman: Is it spread around or is it just the Richmond?

Katie Petrucione: The Richmond is not being singled out. We have a number of gardener vacancies right now. I think we have about thirty vacancies. We're in the process of completing an exam. This isn't necessarily a dollars issue, it's more of a process issue. We are trying among other things to increase the number of apprentices that we hire and push into the gardener

pipeline because we're committed to hiring as many apprentices as we can. People come through the apprentice program, they get trained and so we're at a moment where we're trying to increase the number of apprentices and reduce the number of people that we just hire off the street and so we're kind of trying to strike that balance right now as well.

Richard Rothman: So when do you think we'll get some more gardeners?

Katie Petrucione: So we just finished doing the hiring process. We created the list. I think that the hiring managers have selected and that there will be actual new 3417 gardeners out in the field soon and soon like in the next month or so I think.

Chair: Just to chime in Richard because I think it's important—you know Richard raises a point for District 1 but I think many of us who engage with our parks on the ground hear the same story. It all comes back to you even though you're kind of saying it's not really the budget, there are a lot of backfill positions that we need to get to. And so I think again as a general rule his question was really well received because I saw a lot of people go hey you know we're supposed to have three we only have one. It would be nice if the Department—if there could be some statement at least to us that says this isn't really a budget issue this is more of a process.

Katie Petrucione: It's a pipeline issue. It's both, it is. Hiring takes too long. We've committed to hire two classes of 3417s a year which is a gardener classification.

Richard Rothman: I know I work for the city I know how long it takes but one of the gardeners told me that—I don't know, is Recreation and Park having a hard time finding gardeners?

Katie Petrucione: We are, yes.

Richard Rothman: He said because of the cost of living in the city there was a shortage which I was surprised.

Katie Petrucione: Honestly, it may have to do with—I think frankly so many city staff don't live in the city anymore including gardeners we are having a hard time finding qualified gardeners. In the last five or seven years the Department made a concerted effort to really raise the minimum qualifications to become a gardener and it's been challenging finding people who meet the minimum qualifications and so you know we might have thirty vacancies and we have seven apprentices we might not actually get 23 qualified people to fill all the slots. This is the Superintendent of Parks and Open Space Eric Anderson feels this one very keenly and it's something that he and I spend a lot of time talking about.

Richard Rothman: Maybe we could work with City College?

Katie Petrucione: In fact the apprentices do attend Horticultural classes at City College.

Nick Belloni: Quickly on this, just with the hiring freeze you said in the next couple of years will this be affected?

Katie Petrucione: It's not a hiring freeze. So let me just clarify. It is absolutely not a hiring freeze, it's just please don't add more bodies to your budget. If Recreation and Park is 955 budgeted positions don't give us 975 next year. But the 955 you can hire.

Nick Belloni: So these are in that 955?

Katie Petrucione: Yes.

Kenneth Maley: I'd like to echo Richard's comment also for District 3 because we have a very similar long term problem with Washington Square and Pioneer Park. But if you're saying that the process is part of the problem what's the Department doing about addressing the process bottleneck? That's a comment but I do have a couple of other questions. When you say balancing the budget through the Open Space Fund I served on a civil grand jury in 2006, 2007, and 2008 and while I can't really discuss what happened within the jury but I know that there were comments at that time about the Department issuing revenue bonds and you mentioned those specific years. Are revenue bonds still being issued to make budget shortfalls?

Katie Petrucione: No. Revenue bonds were issued to pay for capital projects not so support operating expenditures.

Kenneth Maley: My understanding is they were being used for administration costs.

Katie Petrucione: Absolutely not. We issued about \$40 million in revenue bonds for specific capital projects.

Kenneth Maley: And then finally is there are other city Departments that are of comparable budgets does the percentage of staff demand on Recreation and Park budget equal or comparable to other Departments of this same size? It seems like an enormous amount of money for staff, 70-something percent out of the whole budget just for staffing.

Katie Petrucione: No, actually our staff budget is about two-thirds, it's about 64 percent of our total budget.

Kenneth Maley: Would that be comparable to DPW?

Katie Petrucione: Yes, we're not out of line with other city Departments.

Nick Belloni: I think you didn't go over the [unintelligible], where are we on that?

Katie Petrucione: We're in the neighborhood of \$1 million and I think we've sort of plateaued there. \$1 million, 1.1, 1.2.

Nick Belloni: Every year it's kind of gone up.

Katie Petrucione: And we had a pretty steady increase and it sort of seemed to have leveled off. I don't know if that's because fees haven't really increased. I don't know.

Nick Belloni: I was just curious because when I started it was at five and you know it's gone over \$1 million. I'm curious what the jump was this year.

Katie Petrucione: It's not insignificant but I don't think the year over year is going to be that big.

Robert Brust: How well are these community meetings—the one yesterday and one tomorrow—attended?

Katie Petrucione: I think we had eight members of the public at my meeting at Hamilton last week. I except Joe Lee actually is probably going to be better. The last time I had a meeting at Joe Lee we had a full room. I will say that in my experience if we don't have a lot of bad news attendance tends to be a little lower.

Kim Hirschfield: District 3. So saw in your budget that you're getting \$200,000 for Outside Lands and \$400,000 for facility rentals. What is the strategic plan to increase partnerships and increase facility rentals and market facility rentals to increase revenue?

Katie Petrucione: Just a note that the numbers that were on that slide were incremental, not the total amount. So Outside Lands is budgeted this year at \$2.8 million and it's increasing to \$3 million, just to clarify.

I will say that the Department does not have a strategic plan in place for revenue generation.

Kim Hirschfield: Why is that?

Katie Petrucione: I think that would be an interesting question for your colleagues to be honest with you. I will say that when Phil Ginsburg became General Manager in 2009 we were in the midst of the depths of the Great Recession and we spent a lot of time focusing on increasing earned revenue and we were pretty successful as this slide demonstrates. There is not opinion regarding the Recreation and Park Department generating earned revenue is not annexed. We get a lot of pushback from charging fees for service and I think there's always a balance. There's certainly, absolutely things—and this is my opinion—but there are things that the Department does that should be heavily subsidized. Recreation programming should be heavily subsidized. And then there are things that the Department does that I think should generate revenue. Facility rentals being one. Somebody is using something for their own private use, I believe that they should pay for that.

So the Department certainly strives to strike a balance between making our property and facilities and programming available to San Franciscans at low cost but we also know that revenue is a three-legged stool and earned revenue one leg of it. So we have focused very much on earned revenue in the past but that is not where we are today.

Also, the Mayor has been very concerned about affordability in San Francisco and has been very clear with Departments in the last several years that he does not want to entertain any kind of additional fee proposals. So I would say that's a factor as well.

Chair: Kim I'll speak to that as well. In the beginning of this process when I came on PROSAC the Department was almost aggressive in trying to generate revenue and I don't mean that in a negative way. A lot of the discussion was what if we could charge this, what if we could charge that. I think the Department as the recession ended and as people started to embrace their open space and loving these things what they didn't want was their parks to get little name tags on them or to be completely subsidized by corporations and so there was a push-back and Katie has to sit directly in the middle of we want more for less. We want that for free. We need more stuff but we're not willing to look for revenue.

So I think part of what this committee should be doing is thinking about maybe not just today but ten years from today or twenty years what is it going to look like. If there was a General Manager who was in place who was aggressively looking for revenue he or she would be in direct conflict with the gist or the vibe of what San Francisco is right now. Ten years ago it was totally different but right now it seems like people want for free without selling their soul. It's a discussion and I think unfortunately that discussion falls somewhere between Phil's overall thoughts and Katie's pocket. That's where it falls because she's the one that has to make up those shortfalls and I'm sure it would be very easy to say hey we'd really love to get X amount to make up our difference and we'll name this rock for you. But that's not in line with general San Franciscans. It's easy to say hey why don't we raise some revenue but there is pushback to that.

Kim Hirschfield: It seems that when we can't take care of trees like in District 3 or the gentleman over here, we can't take care of trees and then we have trees falling on citizens we need to take care of that. I'm not talking about a big marketing Google partnership, I think we need to take care of our trees so that they don't fall in disrepair. I would think that the city would be working on that just for liability reasons.

Chair: We heard from Denny last meeting that his big picture over the next fifteen years is to turn the tree lifecycle—he said in the first presentation years ago when we talked about trees he said ninety years. At the last meeting he said he would like to in the next few years get it down to fifteen. So if that's not seeing your concern and other members concerns I had it too. In my park in Lafayette I have a limb that is waiting to kill us. It's sitting up there waiting for the next chance it gets to fall on us and I saw the Urban Forestry cats come in and they cut about 27 other branches but they didn't cut the kill us branch. I don't have an answer why. Again, I think your point is well taken that there are basic necessities that the Department has to undertake. How they fund it or how they plan it—a funding questions is for Katie, if it's a planning questions it's for Denny. I think Denny will be back next month and is excited to talk to us about trees.

Katherine Jones: District 5. There's been some overtures from Washington about taking funding away from the city if it maintains its sanctuary city status. Is there any preparations being undertaken for planning in worst case scenario?

Katie Petrucione: The Mayor's budget office is very much on top of this. The place they have started is just to catalog all of the dollars that come in to the various city Departments from the Federal government and for which purposes.

For Recreation and Park specifically it's not very much money and it's all for capital projects. For the city as a whole it's still very unclear what the Trump Administration is going to mean for the city budget and it's hard to respond without really having the specifics. But I suspect that the city is actually going to have to make some very clear trade-off decisions and to the extent and certainly the policymakers have been very clear that sanctuary city status is who we are as a city so if we do see millions of dollars in cuts from the Federal Government then the general fund is going to have to absorb—we will then have to make tradeoff decisions about what services get cut, basically. If the Federal Government is no longer funding things then you'll have to pull money from other places to support those programs and that will force cuts in other places.

So they're thinking about it. They're very worried about it but we don't know yet exactly what it all means.

Chair: I would echo that is saying that I had a meeting with Phil and that was one of our topics of discussion. PROSAC will undertake a conversation at some point when this become clearer for the Department whether it's Katie or Phil Ginsburg to talk to us about what this might mean in terms of funding. But Phil had made it very clear that it's only a very small amount of money we're talking about. It would affect city services that would eventually affect Recreation and Park but that's not today. There are many other Departments that would be impacted much worse.

Katie Petrucione: Human Services and DPH are the two biggest.

Kenneth Maley: Is it fair to ask you more about the gardener deficit situation? I'm curious about the volunteer program. Do we still have a robust volunteer program with gardeners and are there a potential pipeline for coming on board?

Katie Petrucione: Yes, there is absolutely a robust volunteer program. For many years there was a lot of tension between especially the Gardener's Union and the concept of volunteers and that has largely dissipated in the last five or seven years.

Kenneth Maley: I'm curious about that because when Phil was the attorney at HR he negotiated the contract and allowed in it a provision that if any volunteer got hired on the Department the volunteer program would be scrapped. Is that still an issue in the Department or is that the issue you were talking about at the time?

Katie Petruccione: No. Not in any meaningful way that I am aware of, that is not an issue.

Kenneth Maley: Because often gardeners really were not added value, they were given assignments that really did not add value or help in the Department because the gardeners have to deal with volunteers, I know that to be a fact.

Katie Petrucione: I think that much of that feeling is gone. There's a lot more cooperation now between the gardeners and the volunteer program. I think last year there were something like 180,000 volunteer hours at Recreation and Park, most of them on the park maintenance side of the world but some recreation.

Kenneth Maley: It just seems like there's such public interest that it should be a resource.

Katie Petrucione: Absolutely. We have a robust and thriving staff of volunteer coordinators who spend their days recruiting volunteers, both individuals and corporations and coordinating volunteer events and then on top of that of course you have your neighborhood parks groups that have regularly scheduled events. I've worked at Recreation and Park for thirteen years now and I feel like we do so much better on volunteers today that we did thirteen years ago.

Chair: I think another thing to add to that is the apprentice program. I've never seen gardeners so happy to see a bunch of people in vests to show up. Because the apprentice has really allowed them to go out and do these large scale projects that they can't do and I think we would encourage certainly—Ken's point—that if volunteerism is something that the Department is okay with and the gardeners are okay with, great, that the more bodies in the park the better whether that be apprentices, whether more cleaning and greetings. Each one of us with all our friends of groups and all we have to do with work. By any means necessary is the reality.

Katie Petrucione: I will say that I think Phil wholeheartedly embraces that philosophy.

Chair: Jordan.

Jordyn Aquino: District 4. I've very pleased to see the equity lens incorporated with your budget presentation and so I wanted to know from a financial perspective if you have an idea of how funds will potentially be allocated.

Katie Petrucione: I think the most immediate place that we're going to see allocation of resources through the equity lens is really through deferred maintenance funds. In the current fiscal year alone court resurfacing just for example. We have \$750,000 budgeted for court resurfacing and pretty much all of those funds are being allocated to tennis courts, basketball courts in equity zones. And then field rehabilitation we're allocating a good amount of money over the next couple of years to redoing the baseball fields at Crocker-Amazon, also a park in a equity zone.

So that's the initial place that you're going to see it and I think it's going to take the Department a while to grow into the idea of applying and equity lens to how we budget and allocate resources and I suspect it's going to evolve over time.

Ana Gee: District 6. Going back to the volunteer program, I know that for at least the parks in the Tenderloin gardeners when they come in they come really fast and there's not a lot of trees so there's not a lot of trimming or—

Katie Petrucione: Urban forestry?

Ana Gee: Yeah, but there is a lot of cleaning that has to be done in the park so how do we inspire all these volunteers in making sure that the gardeners work more than half an hour?
[laughs]

Katie Petrucione: I feel like those are two different questions. I think for trying to create a robust volunteer program that is not my world but Kimberly Kiefer is the manager of our volunteer program and she probably would be a good resource.

Robert Brust: I want to get back to the equity lens just for a minute. I'm glad you included those two slides, that was great. And you did mention it would evolve over time. This is why I'm requesting that it would be in the interest of this evolution that more specific goals be established now and more specific tracking rather than just you using your memory to pull these out, that they're actually being tracked as we go along and at the end of the year when we ask for these numbers they're all right there and they're there for the Department too so they can see if they're actually going in the right direction.

Katie Petrucione: You are absolutely right Robert. It would behoove us to track this for sure.

Chair: It would more than behoove you, it actually is something we've looked for next year when you come back, how did that work out.

Katie Petrucione: Right.

Chair: Like we'd like to see the percentage of investment.

Katie Petrucione: Absolutely. And that's not something we're going to recreating after the fact. We need to be tracking it in real time.

Chair: Absolutely. Robert, the one thing that I do want to speak to that I heard today that I think is in line with the strategic plan and I think it is something that I would lobby for is the deferred maintenance in the equity zones, their focus of money going to the most needy places first to me that's a shift, that's something that's a directive of the strategic plan and in essence I feel good about that. When I heard that and saw Katie making that point that's one that she can come back to us and say hey we actually spent \$15 million last year on fixing these things all in equity zones. So that's the most we've heard in terms of really action around those items. It is clear to this committee that's a really important point, that is something that keeps coming up over and over again, how will this lens give us feedback that will allow you to make that decision.

Any other questions for Katie?

Katie Petrucione: Thank you all, I appreciate it.

Chair: Thank you Katie. Is there any public comment on this item? Being none, public comment is closed.

We're going to move on to two very quick items. Item numbers 6 and 7, these are two acquisition items. Janice, you're going to present.

Janice Perez: Good evening, my name is Janice Perez and I'm a planner for the Capital Division of Recreation and Park. Today I'm going to be talking a little bit about Shoreview and Adam Rogers. I just wanted to give you a little background on these two acquisitions and how they came to our attention.

So after the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency dissolved back in 2012, OCII or the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure was formed as their successor and I'm actually joined today by Maureen Munson, senior development specialist from OCII.

OCII adopted a long-term property management plan back in December of 2015 and it includes the disposition of several mini parks that were formerly in the Hunters Point redevelopment project area. These mini parks were developed to serve the adjacent affordable housing back in the 1970s when they were developed. This management plan identifies two mini parks that will be transferred over to Recreation and Park Department and these are the two that we are talking about today.

First I'm going to talk about Shoreview Park. Shoreview Park is about half an acre and its currently owned by OCII and located at 1 Lillian Court between Rose E. Lee Lane and Beatrice Lane in the Hunters Point/Bayview neighborhood. The nearby parks are Hilltop, Adam Rogers and Ridgetop Plaza. You can see the two acquisitions in context to each other here—Shoreview and the Adam Rogers addition right here.

So a little bit about Shoreview. Almost two decades ago, early 2000s, Shoreview has not been a fully functioning public park since then. Back in 2000 the children's play area the sand was deemed as unsafe because of the presence of buried needles and also it's not ADA accessible and therefore it was fenced off and it remains so today. In addition the irrigation system failed. They couldn't find the leak and therefore it hasn't been irrigated since 2009.

A little bit about the current park. As you can see there's a children's play area, there are some picnic areas in the back. There's a lawn and some other picnic tables out in the open with some barbeques.

You can see little close-up of what's existing there today.

So this last summer in 2016 in preparation for this property transfer OCII and Recreation and Park had a site visit and we determined that there was some very hazardous trees onsite and because of that OCII took the initiative to take care of the hazardous trees and hired a contractor to remove these trees and to prune back some of the vegetation. This aerial shot actually shows after the tree removal as compared to the previous slide where you can see there's still some trees here.

So in line with the Recreation and Park acquisition policy Shoreview Park is located within a short distance of an area that's identified at high needs in the recreation and open space element of the general plan. The neighborhood is within the lowest median income bracket in San Francisco and abuts an area of high youth and overall population density. Shoreview Park is also within the Department identified equity zone. Also in line with our acquisition policy Shoreview has identified funding for the development of the park with the property transfer OCII will transfer approximately \$2.1 million to Recreation and Park from the Community Development Block Grant program to fund future capital improvements at the park. And the money will be transferred pending Recreation and Park Commission approval of the acquisition.

Next steps. OCII is currently in the process of finalizing a transfer agreement and obtaining an appraisal and property survey of the park and staff will bring this forward to Recreation and Park Commission.

We are also exploring funding options to support future capital improvements. In the coming months staff will be applying for the State's housing related park program funds and Shoreview will be one of three Recreation and Park projects that will be applying for this grant funding.

So I'm moving on to Adam Rogers. The existing Recreation and Park property is seen here in the tinted green on the non-hatched outline. There's a full basketball court, children's play area, picnic area, a community garden and some really nice scenic views. And the area that we're going to be talking about acquiring is actually near the park entrance on Oakdale. It's roughly 8000 square feet and staff speculates that there was an error made in the 1970s when the park was transferred to Recreation and Park and this area was left off the original grant deed and we're still in the process of researching what happened. With this acquisition we can correct that error.

So this is a park that was developed back in the 70s with Public Works, with the Recreation and Park Commission overseeing that and run by the Redevelopment Agency. The park was developed as a whole with this parcel. So currently Recreation and Park operates and maintains the parcel. This is a correction.

Here's some photos of that parcel. It's quite small. It's a little steep hillside with a grove of mature trees. And that actually concludes my presentation. Maureen Munson is here to share a little bit about the support that we're going to be getting from the community for this.

Maureen Munson: I'm a Senior Development Specialist with the former Redevelopment Agency which is now the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure. As Janice said as under dissolution law we have to get rid of all our properties and we can transfer some to the city for governmental use and we have Shoreview and that sliver of Adam Rogers and it's very frustrating as Janice said, the tenants have been working very hard, especially the Tenants Association, particularly the president Janice Powell, on trying to get this park fixed. The former Redevelopment Agency worked with the community on a renovation plan that was developed in 2010 and then the lawsuit came and the dissolution of Redevelopment happened. So we have this plan and we've been working together about having it just under your jurisdiction. The community is very interested in it. I just wanted to acknowledge Janice and Robert Watkins who

have been helping me. As I said we actually had a tree limb fall this summer. We went out on a tour and we found all these dead trees and limbs and we expedited getting Bartlett Trees out to take care of the problem and the heads of the Tenants Association were out there, they were thrilled. We took pictures with the Bartlett Tree repair people and set up chairs to watch them.

There's just some excitement that something may be happening that we're going to be transferring this over to the city and hopefully you'll take it under your jurisdiction. We do have money that's coming in from a lease on a grocery store that we have out in Hunters Point and we funded the acquisition of that property where the grocery store was developed with CDBG funds. So any income generated from that grocery store is being set aside for the improvements at Shore View Park. And I just want to tell you that Janice Powell the president of the Tenants Association was so excited about the tree work, she had calls from residents saying oh my God you took care of those trees and now we even have a better view of the bay. She called me I think in December, we keep in pretty close contact, and she said call me back. Guess what? The park is green.

So there's a lot of excitement there. And Janice also I sent you an email I didn't know if you wanted me to read that for the record.

Chair: I can read it into the record during public comment.

Maureen Munson: Great. I'm available for questions too.

Chair: Tom Valtin.

Tom Valtin: I was just curious if anything was going to be done with this Adam Rogers addition or it's simply being transferred?

Janice Perez: Nothing is going to be done. We already currently operate it and maintain it so it's just business as usual.

Maureen Munson: And that's going to be a little slower process because we're having some trouble as Janice. This is a parcel number. We are not able—we are working with the title company for both of these parks. We have get legal descriptions, grant deeds, surveys and appraisals. We're having trouble finding a grant deed or instrument for this or even if this parcel exists and we're trying to track down documents for the larger park.

Janice Perez: So this parcel will probably take a little longer than Shoreview. Shoreview has to go through by the end of this fiscal year because the money is already budgeted.

Chair: Nick?

Nick Belloni: I'm just looking at the picture on my phone but when looking at this you have part of—is that part of someone's backyard?

Janice Perez: Yes, it's adjacent to private property.

Nick Belloni: Well no, in the thing there's a building and then it looks like you go into the park diagram side that gray building, the end gray building there it looks like it cuts into their backyard because the other two properties have backyards and then that one doesn't.

Janice Perez: Back in the 70s—this was the old wartime house and there were these huge parcels of land that were given from the School District and from the Housing Authority over to the Redevelopment Agency. And then this is from like the 1867 map and so the Redevelopment Agency acquired some private property and some of these parcels were closed off to redevelopment. So there was a parcel that we acquired here called Lot 2 and then it was Lot 18. And what we did was transfer some of the property back to the owners. So there is a backyard here. These are three homes and there are backyards on each of them. This is I think has already been developed into the street, into Oakdale here. So really the parcel that's remaining which we think is a parcel is this kind of a notch, this upside down L. So they do have backyards.

Nick Belloni: We just wanted to make sure, we don't want to get in a fight with the property owner or something because you're going to be taking part of their backyard.

Maya Rodgers: I am excited about Shoreview because I've been hearing for years about it. It's been in bad shape for many years even before 2010 and just to see that it could be something better. Because as soon as the children's area got fenced off it became kind of a hangout and obviously needles. If you can look at the diagram 1 and 2 where those trees are it's like a little path but you couldn't see it from the street and it was right by the children's area.

So the neighbors up there are really excited. They've been working for years to get their property developer to purchase it, to just buy it for a dollar or whatever it was then and they wouldn't do it because they didn't want to take on the responsibility. And so now I'm glad to hear it's being taken care of.

Janice Perez: And Shoreview apartments surround this park on three sides and the area that they have within the apartments it's like this broken down basketball court and then a cement slide.

Linda D'Avirro: District 11. The \$2 million when it gets transferred—and you might be the one to answer this—is this going to the Open Space Acquisition Fund?

Janice Perez: No.

Linda D'Avirro: It goes directly into Capital's budget? I mean Adam Rogers.

Janice Perez: Well Shoreview. It's \$2.1 million. [simultaneous comments] It's already budgeted. We knew this was coming last year so we put it into this fiscal year's budget to allow for whenever we're able to do the acquisition. So we'll be able to use it for capital but only for Shoreview.

Linda D'Avirro: The reason I ask is the Open Space Acquisition Fund earns interest.

Janice Perez: It's not in that fund.

Linda D'Avirro: Too bad. Even if it's earmarked, I mean \$2 million interest is not bad.

Janice Perez: It's not going to there. We had to go to HUD to get the approval of the expenditure of these funds because it is restricted and it's specific to Shoreview.

Jane Weil: District 6. Just to clarify—so no acquisition funds will be used, no funds at all will be used to buy these, it's just a transfer for a \$1.

Janice Perez: No dollar, zero. [simultaneous comments]

Jane Weil: But in terms of the acquisition it's just a transfer, okay. Just as an aside could we have an update on the acquisition fund status, what's in there.

Janice Perez: Sure.

Chair: That's certainly a whole other conversation.

Jane Weil: But just requesting an update.

Chair: Any other questions for these folks? Is there any public comment on these items? I don't hear any in the room but I do have a letter that I would like to read into the record. This is from the aforementioned Janice Powell. It says my name is Janice Powell, I'm the president of Shoreview Apartment and Tenants Association. Shoreview apartments surround Shoreview Park on three sides. We understand that when the Redevelopment Agency was eliminated Shoreview Park will be transferred to the city. We ask that the Recreation and Park Commissioners acquire, rehabilitate and maintain Shoreview Park. We've been working with the former Redevelopment Agency, now OCII, to bring the park back its full use. OCII is setting aside funds for the park's renovation for several years. In 2010 there was a redevelopment plan for the park's renovation, however because Redevelopment was eliminated the renovation did not happen. This summer OCII with the help of Recreation and Park staff had dangerous trees and limbs removed from the park. Residents are excited to see this because the park is safer and the removal created more views of the bay. They look forward to being able to use the whole park soon. We hope you'll consider acquiring the park and using funding to make needed improvements. Please contact me if you have more questions, Janice Powell, President, Shoreview Tenants Association.

Okay, so I hear no other public comment in the room. We have two resolutions in front of us and I ask you to please take a look at those. I would like to start with Adam Rogers since it was the first.

Nick Belloni: This is the resolution that was written by PROSAC. PROSAC's resolution is for the acquisition of the 0.118 acre adjacent to Adam Rogers Park block 4700 lot 555 recommends the Commission to move forward with this acquisition.

Female Speaker: Second.

Chair: All in favor of supporting this resolution to acquire Adam Rogers Park?

All: Aye.

Chair: It's unanimous. That item is approved, thank you. Let's move on to the second item which is the acquisition of Shoreview Park.

Nick Belloni: PROSAC resolution to support the acquisition of the half-acre Shoreview Park. PROSAC supports the acquisition of the half-acre Shoreview Park block 4713, lot 8, and recommends that the Commission move forward with the acquisition.

Female Speaker: Moved.

Female Speaker: Second.

Chair: So all in favor of the acquisition of Shoreview Park?

All: Aye.

Chair: It's unanimous, thank you. That item is closed. Thank you for the presentation.

I'm not going to spend much time on new agenda items now. I did spend quite a bit of time at the last meeting and both Stacy and I have talked about a couple of presentations for March and in April the Park Alliance is going to come. But I think we would like to find out the status of Lennar which I know you would too and we're going to look into that and see if we can with OCII here we are really interested in hearing about that particular space.

The Recreation and Park Department is sending young Denny back to us to talk about trees which I think will be important for us to understand what the Department's theories are, how they're going to implement the ninety years to fifteen years tree cycle.

Kenneth Maley: I'm asking a protocol question. Would it be appropriate for the committee to ask Denny Kern to bring a fellow staff person to that presentation, Kelly Cornell?

Chair: I think that's who he's bringing. I can't confirm that. Stacy, do you know?

Stacy Bradley: I don't know the answer. I would hope that he brings him, I don't see why he wouldn't.

Kenneth Maley: He's the most knowledgeable on the issue.

Chair: And we are all with that.

Stacy Bradley: Just like he brought Mike Celeste and Marcos Santiago to talk about park safety. He brings his key people.

Chair: So we'd like to make a request if possible. Is there anything else that any of you see? I did get an update in the gardens there will be a presentation at some point, we don't know when.

Stacy Bradley: Possibly April.

Chair: It's a moving target but we're getting closer. What I'm very interested in is this contracting practices. Unfortunately, I've heard that the best person to present that would be Tokes Sugeekay and unfortunately now Tokes is covering some people who are out of his office. He may not have time to prepare for that particular presentation but that's one that I definitely would like to see move up on the agenda.

Again, you see possible funding cuts. We added that as an item that I think within the next couple of months we're going to want to hear what the Department's perspective is. Certainly Lake Merced, McCauley Park, these are all viable conversation items that we'll move up into the agenda.

Kenneth Maley: Agenda question please. When might we entertain additional items for the agenda?

Chair: So last meeting I actually moved this up in expectation. I would say that I would like to do every two months where I move that item up so that it gives a chance for new items.

Kenneth Maley: That would be next month?

Chair: I would like to do it next month. I will say that I really want to thin out this list and I've been begging members of the Department and trying to get as many of these onto the agenda because I feel like if we just keep adding them we're never really getting through to the ones that have been sitting on this list for a long time. So next month I would be open to moving up new business to item number 3 or 4 so that we can give it a shot again in adding some items.

Richard Rothman: We should get through this list here.

Chair: The point is Richard if we don't bring it up earlier and we don't get more things on there—I agree, I would like to see preservation of CEQA which has now been on this for two chairs, for Les and Linda prior to me. So believe me, my frustration with the Recreation and Park website I know that's been on here for seventeen months. I would love to see some of this stuff moved off.

Is there any other committee comment on this item? Is there any public comment? Being none, this item is closed.

I will open it up to the committee. Any announcements for items not listed on the agenda?

Jane Weil: This isn't really an announcement but I talked to Toby Levy today about South Park. As everybody knows and has read the project hasn't gone exactly smoothly. It's taken a lot longer, there have been some issues with equipment not being managed well. The large equipment that's gone in, the big bulldozers and things. Trees and shrubs that were brought over sort of prematurely and then left in their canvas sacks and some of them have actually died. What's most concerning is the impact on the businesses around there, several of which are really on the edge in terms of having lost business over all these months. So it does look like it might hopefully it's on the schedule to open at the end of this month, they're trying to schedule the opening and they'll let us all know as soon as they pin down a date. They're afraid to pin it down because it might keep going longer. But I think the real point of my conversation with Toby was how can we learn from the problems that they've had and the mistakes or problems that happened when renovating a small park in a very dense part of the city. It's not like when you're out at a large open development area, this is right in the heart of the city and so there are sort of special problems that come when you bring in big bulldozers. One of the biggest issues they felt was there was a lot of community input into the planning of the park but there was very little community input into the actual management of the construction. So we all know it's impossible to have a fulltime Recreation and Park person there all day supervising the staff but the neighbors are all watching and they saw the days that nobody showed up or one person showed up for an hour and left. They would have liked to have more of a conduit to staff to then help shepherd this along because it ended up taking much longer than predicted.

So at some point I think it would be really useful to have somebody from that group report to us and share some of those lessons because we know we've got several more similar projects coming. McCauley will be a very similar project right in the heart of the city renovating an existing park. So how do we manage that so we don't wreck the rest of the neighborhood.

I just wanted to share that. That's sort of an announcement.

Chair: It's something that we've heard about at a previous meeting and I appreciate the update.

Stacy Bradley: We were hoping to talk about that in the contracting discussion to have that provide South Park as a lesson for opportunity.

Jane Weil: Maybe you and Toby or something could present jointly how we learn going forward.

Chair: Stacy I'll just say now that the cat is out of the bag these sound like the same problems that any one of us has felt and so I think it's worth again to hear this and take it back as feedback that this particular exact issue comes up time and time again. Lack of communication with stakeholders, lack of communication when the fences go up, lack of communication when the project is in some phase of completion.

Stacy Bradley: I agree and I don't want to get into defense mode of anything but I think we have been improving, especially with our blog posts and trying to make sure that we're providing updates along the way at least electronically. I think that there is definitely improvement so it

will be available to us. I think it will be great to talk about this one in particular. I do think that with some things our process has been improving and that we also with this one and a few others we've had some transition of staff members and I think that likely contributed. The problem was in construction when one project manager left and the other one took it on. Some of these things we need to have better transitions and I think we're getting to a point where we're staffed at a better level so also that should help being able to have enough time to communicate effectively.

Ancel Martinez: At large. So Toby has requested as I understand it that PROSAC advocate for more transparent or clearer communication from staff in the local residents or advocates of the park and so my question is should we do it and how would we do it in an effective way if this is a pattern because the communities around these parks they've come to PROSAC and asked hey we need your help for like very reasonable matters that we want some type of engagement and communication from the staff. So do we pass a resolution or do we ask staff to set up a meeting and report back a meeting? But I think some action needs to take place for discussion by PROSAC and potential action rather than kind of a one-off saying okay try to do the best that you can because what I'm advocating is some type of accountability in response.

Chair: I would speak to that. Thank you for raising that. I think my simple answer to that is there needs to be some checks and balances because the community obviously feels one way and the Department feels like hey we're smooth sailing.

Stacy Bradley: I wouldn't say that.

Chair: I take that back. I think to serve your purpose and the betterment of the committee this item that we're talking about for contracting reforms really speaks to the idea of the communication between the contractor and the Recreation and Park Department. You're speaking about the stakeholders in the Recreation and Park Department and so that kind of leads another level of discussion and maybe through our discussion and understanding of how the Department is dealing with the contractor issues maybe we can start to formulate a resolution that would be put in line some sort of check and balance because I think it is necessary.

Linda D'Avirro: We did have that flow chart that was presented both by Capital and Operations and that was also a key point is the stakeholder part comes too late and that probably is where we want to come back and maybe that does address a little bit of what you're saying Ancel is that perhaps that flow chart needs to have a different end to it or different steps.

Stacy Bradley: I think there's many areas where there's challenges. You were saying about how we have no capital improvements planned for Pine Lake and so sometimes it's not always just a construction project it's also how we're dealing with parks day to day. So I think it's possibly a broader conversation than just focusing on capital projects, maybe it's something that we want to bring Sarah Madlin in to have her talk about how she encourages communication.

Patricia Delgado: My experience was not that. It was a wonderful experience but I was a stakeholder from the get-go with all the planning meetings. I was as a nonprofit attended all of the city meetings during the architectural planning so I was at the lodge for a year and a half and then once the contract was awarded I was in the trailer every Monday morning for a year until

the park was done. So if Recreation and Park can go back to that. But I also had a great project manager. It Rick can sort of tailor that to its various projects I think then you have somebody, a stakeholder that's got concerns and can voice them at the time as opposed to trying to find somebody at the lodge to register a complaint.

Chair: Just for clarity, are you proposing that PROSAC members themselves avail themselves of these types of projects?

Patricia Delgado: No. I'm saying that the Department should have—

Chair: You just said you had a great experience because you were willing to go and sit in that trailer.

Patricia Delgado: It was right across the street from my house.

Chair: I'm just asking.

Patricia Delgado: If somebody in the neighborhood wants to do that, be that involved, I say go for it because then you've got the neighborhood involved and I reported back to all my neighbors so I was the voice for the project ongoing. So it worked well for us. Part of the lessons learned and the sort of new model going forward is also positive experiences. So if at some point we could sit and outline what you did that made yours go well and use that as model and not just look at the ones that went badly. It's back to the flow chart. The last thing we want is for the park lovers to be the advisories of Recreation and Park. There is constituency out there that is dying to make these parks happen well and so it is a pity to not use them and the people at South Park felt like they just didn't—after they finally got their park going and things weren't going well with construction they didn't know what to do.

Stacy Bradley: That's unfortunate, it shouldn't happen like that.

Kenneth Maley: My announcement I suppose seems to be rather timely to this discussion. For the last several years Friends of Washington Square has been lobbying the PUC and Recreation and Park for new infrastructure and water conservation at our park which we have not had a major infrastructure improvements since the first master plan of 1957. And so this last year finally Friends of Washington Square lobbied—I'm sorry, two years ago—lobbies the bond process to include water conservation and irrigation for the last bond. The Department determined that they could not afford to manage all the infrastructure problems relating to that so they decided that they would spread the money to ten parks. Washington Square came in at the top of the top ten water wasters of all parks in the city. It's in the hundreds of thousands of gallons of water. So now this week or so ago I got work from Tokes that the PUC and RPD have agreed on funding for a major infrastructure and water conservation project in Washington Square which will put Friends of Washington Square in this very position, a capital project that will close our park for more than a year and that process is only about to begin. I understand—I don't know if this is accurate—that the Department has hired a project manager for this particular project and that process is going to begin. But I can say at least at the outset the Department has engaged Friends of Washington Square to be a conduit of information of North

Beach and the community about the impact on our park. So I'm hopeful as Patricia has mentioned that I and the Friends of Washington Square can play a similar role in interfacing with the Department and the contractors because this is going to be a major project.

The second brief thing is that as most of you probably know thirty percent of the bond issues revenue go to the Port for open space and while the Port's open space is not necessarily under our purview those open space areas are mostly maintained by Recreation and Park. So in June the Port will be opening Crane Cove Park which will be the newest addition of open space which is down by The Ramp. I'd like to keep the committee aware of that but I'd also like to invite the committee to the ceremonial opening of that new open space on the waterfront.

Richard Rothman: So how would this hearing be different? Maybe six months ago we had somebody here from [unintelligible] talking about contracts.

Chair: [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments]

Richard Rothman: Did that pass?

Chair: Did what pass?

Richard Rothman: It went to the Board of Supervisors, didn't it?

Chair: That passed, yes. What Stacy is proposing is to look at certain projects and look specifically because this dialog has come up around South Park that there needs to be more engagement with the process and I think what our goal would be at PROSAC is to have this dialog.

Richard Rothman: I just want to make sure it's not duplicated what we had last time.

Chair: Stacy, would you say these are two different situations?

Stacy Bradley: Yes. I think they're connected for sure because some of the problems that we have with contractors are from how we contract but I think we want to provide an update on that work that Nick talked about early from Public Works. I think it's lessons learned that would be really helpful. You all have such a wealth of experience and being able to have a good discussion on that I think would help us be better project managers.

Chair: Again, I think Jane your point is well taken that this can't be a let's make a list of thirty bad projects and bash the hell out of the Department. I think it does have to be an ongoing dialog. That's why I like what Ken brought up because he's about to go set sail on this ship and I would love to hear his process and even to that end I had a meeting—it might not be the most popular project in town—with the Francisco Park Conservancy yesterday and they are in the planning phase. They've already done three community meetings and they have their own challenges to this. This is a very odd site, it's got a lot of work, there's a lot of talk, a lot of want from the neighborhood in terms of this multiuse park. So again I think it's our purview to be in line with what's going on here. These are the areas that we've all experienced whenever we've

experienced capital projects. Patricia you had a good experience. Some of us have had good experiences, some of them not. But again Stacy's point is let's bring some of that to the table and talk about what we learned.

Stacy Bradley: And what went well too. Like Alamo Square I think the communication around that is going quite well.

Chair: One think that I'll certainly say from my perspective I always bring up Lafayette Park and our renovation was I felt like the initial contractor failed miserably but the pickup which was a different contractor they ended up spending attention and fixed what he original contractor did was phenomenal. So I mean in one project we had both a bad and a good. So I do think that's really the line of conversation.

Okay, any other comments, any other items not listed on the agenda? Great, hearing none this item is closed and the meeting is adjourned.

End of Document