

**PROSAC Meeting**  
**May 3, 2016**

**Chair:** Welcome to the May 2016, Park and Rec Open Space Advisory Committee meeting. This being my first meeting as Chair we're running promptly seven minutes late. I'm glad we're here. I appreciate all of you making the journey through whatever delays could have been.

Today we're going to try to run a fairly quick meeting. There are a handful of agenda items that we'll cover. I will start by asking for a roll call.

**Linda D'Avirro:** Linda D'Avirro, District 11.

**Robert Brust:** Robert Brust, District 8.

**Winnie Chu:** Winnie Chu, District 7.

**Tom Valtin:** Tom Valtin, District 9.

**Jane Weil:** Jane Weil, District 6.

**Linda Shaffer:** Linda Shaffer, District 10.

**Kim Hirschfield:** Kim Hirschfield, District 3.

**Maya Rodgers:** Maya Rodgers, District 10.

**Ancel Martinez:** Ancel Martinez, at large.

**Jordyn Aquino:** Jordyn Aquino, District 4.

**Heather Fuchs:** Heather Fuchs, District 4.

**Richard Rothman:** Richard Rothman, District 1.

**Mark Scheuer:** Mark Scheuer, District 8.

**Richard Ivanhoe:** Richard Ivanhoe, District 5.

**Nick Belloni:** Nick Belloni, District 2.

**Chair:** Steffen Franz, District 2. Excellent. On to the next item. Any thoughts on the minutes?

**Male Speaker:** [unintelligible]

**Chair:** What does that mean?

**Nick Belloni:** Motion to approve.

**Chair:** Nick Belloni, District 2.

**Nick Belloni:** Motion to approve.

**Female Speaker:** Second.

**Chair:** Can I get a vote? Everybody okay with approving the minutes from April?

**All:** Aye.

**Chair:** That's unanimous, so moved. The Chair's report. I don't have much to discuss as I am a new Chair. I'm sure that as time goes on I will have plenty to bring to you. The only thing I do want to raise is Mark Scheuer sent me a couple of emails or a couple of links. I know as a body that we generally support Prop B. There are some mentions in the press now about not supporting Prop B and I would ask you that if you do support this item to please make that public, feel free to support it with your Supervisor, with the people in your districts and don't hesitate to maybe write a letter to the editor or voice your feelings in other ways. So I just wanted to bring that to your attention that there is some no on V. Again, as a body we support B and as individuals I think most of you support it, so do what you need to.

**Linda Shaffer:** Is it permissible to add some information to your announcement?

**Chair:** Sure.

**Linda Shaffer:** Linda Shaffer, District 10. In case no one has seen it Isabelle Wade and someone else wrote an excellent op-ed in the Chronicle taking a different point of view.

**Chair:** Thank you for that and I would have mentioned that certainly that Isabelle Wade did a wonderful op-ed piece. I myself submitted a letter to the editor, it has not been published. There are 35 other people in similar positions who have submitted and not been published. But I'm just asking if you want your voice heard you know how to do it, you know what the email address is, send a letter of support. Any other comments on this item? Any public comment on this item? Hearing none, this item is close.

Capital planning and monthly update with Stacy.

**Stacy:** We have an action packed month as always. With Rossi we are now in the concept design phase and we had our first community meeting last month. Balboa Pool, the bids are due this month so we're looking forward to it going better than last time.

For the failing playgrounds which have been now been named “Let’s Play SF” to be more exciting and energetic. We have Washington Square playground, our first community meeting for the first playground to go out is this coming Thursday. And Merced Heights, that’s the next playground on the list. That meeting should happen sometime next month.

Noe Valley Town Square we have construction starting this month. 17<sup>th</sup> and Folsom construction has started. The [unintelligible] playground restroom we’re bringing the concept plan to the Commission this month. Franklin and Garfield field renovations those are both going to contract award onto the Commission this month, so construction will start soon and should be done by the end of the year. Willie Woo Woo Wong, we are going to request an additional \$4 million to improve the clubhouse from the Downtown Park Fund. So we’ll be at a joint Commission hearing this Thursday for that. We have a very successful community meeting at Willie Woo Woo Wong.

Margaret Hayward, our next community meeting is May 18<sup>th</sup>, that’s also going fairly well and the negotiations with the [unintelligible] have been great and we’re able to move some of the spots so that’s looking good. West Sunset we’re also negotiating our contract and hope to start construction in the summer. Gilman is the second 2013 bond project is to open in June, that’s also very exciting.

We have our acquisitions. So we have a couple that are going to either I or Jordan will be talking to you about in the next couple of months. There is a small space next to the Housing Authority at Alemany Farm that looks like it’s Alemany Farm but it’s actually Housing Authority so we’re going to go through and clean that up with them as to how they’re running their land. We likely will have a number of these Housing Authority properties that will come through either as acquisitions or maybe as DPW rights of way. We’ll update you if we’re doing any acquisitions.

Then Shoreview which is one sort of near the Bayview. I bought it up at one of our updates. It’s a property that is planned in India Basin and it’s right by Hilltop.

**Female Speaker:** It’s adjacent to Hilltop in the housing development.

**Stacy:** And Adam Rodgers. So that’s OCII property and they’re giving it to the city.

**Female Speaker:** What’s OCII?

**Stacy:** That’s the redevelopment successor agency. So it’s the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure. We’re working on a lot of things with them but Shoreview is moving forward quickly. They have a phase I assessment as a next step and they have funding from a previous grant that’s going to go towards renovating the area. They’re hopeful that if we have it we’ll take better care.

**Linda D'Avirro:** Linda D'Avirro, District 11. What Boat Playground restoration, what’s the source of those funds.

**Stacy:** Supervisor Tang. She has been accumulating funding over the past few years now to get enough to put in a good bathroom there.

**Mark Scheuer:** Mark Scheuer, District 8. There was recently a really great article about the Buchanan Mall and I have a question about it. I couldn't tell whether they received another \$75,000 grant on top of the first one or whether they were talking about the one, can you clarify?

**Stacy:** Yes, [unintelligible] is actually working on that. It's a great project. We got \$75,000 funding from Supervisor Breed's office and we put it out as an RFP, TPL and their team who did the activation project ended up winning the proposal and they kicked in another I think \$67,000 as a grant in kind for their services so it's going to be \$75,000 plus \$67,000.

**Richard Rothman:** Richard Rothman, District 1. Two other questions. One is if you can remind Deanne we're still waiting for the meeting about light pollution at Beach Chalet and the other is about Rossi. When they had the first meeting they had it at night and all the lap swimmers so maybe if you can tell Leth and Tokes if they can have the next meeting during the daytime in the Richmond District either at the Richmond Police Station or the Library so maybe the parents can get the kids there. Because apparently there is some conflict between the two over the use of the pool. Apparently they're supposed to have another meeting at the end of this month.

**Stacy:** I think so, I didn't get the date.

**Maya Rodgers:** Maya Rodgers, District 10. I'm interesting in knowing, I never hear about the Hilltop project and so I'm just curious.

**Stacy:** It's because it's in construction. So typically when things go into construction it's kind of dead zone. There is not much going on because we give over the land to the contractor and they take care of it. I mean we're in communication with them all the time, a weekly meeting. So I don't have much to update. We typically give updates on construction award and so once it goes into construction a month before it's going to open.

**Maya Rodgers:** Well I just said because I don't think I've ever heard about it here.

**Stacy:** Well, we'll change that because that is a very exciting contract and we all love it. There's a skate park.

**Chair:** Maybe at the next meeting you could give a rundown.

**Stacy:** It's a really great contract.

**Chair:** Any other questions for Stacy?

**Stacy:** I have just one more thing. We're also working on a D6 acquisition so we're really pushing for the property that we showed you before on 11<sup>th</sup> and Natoma. It's about 20,000 square feet and we will likely have more information.

**Chair:** Any other questions for Stacy regarding Capital updates? Hearing none, any public comment? May Wong.

**May Wong:** I'm from the Excelsior. Is there on the website a listing of the projects that are in progress?

**Stacy:** Yes.

**May Wong:** So Hilltop I could go to your website and find out about Hilltop Park.

**Stacy:** Yes. On our website we have I think it's under Park Improvements, there's active projects and Hilltop is definitely listed there.

**Chair:** Any other public comment on this item? Hearing none, this item is close. Moving on to Item #5, we would like to welcome Nicolas King. Is Annie here? Hi, how are you doing? Which of you is presenting or both of you?

**Nicolas King:** I'll be really brief and answer questions. I'm not sure exactly what you want to talk about so I'll just say what we're working on in nutshell and you can take it from there.

I work at Public Works, I'm working with all of the Chapter 6 Departments, those are the Department authorized to do construction [unintelligible]. We're working on a couple of things and it relates to legislation that's been introduced by Supervisor Weiner, it's been sponsored by Supervisor Tang and Supervisor Breed. The legislation is pretty short, it's only two pages long and it just says two things. Number one, that we shall evaluate construction jobs. And number two, it adds a best value contracting option to the code.

So one of the main origins of The Controller Report from a couple years ago that says that the city [unintelligible] and does not do a good job taking past performance into account. That's just one of the sources of the recommendation that we're trying to implement and the legislation is relevant because it basically tells us to keep going and the Departments have already been working on this some time together, that they should move a little bit faster and that they have to implement it, it's going to be a legal requirement.

So that's it in a nutshell. I'll go as far in the weeds as you like.

**Chair:** I think part of the reason that we wanted you to come to this and why we wanted to hear more about this is because most of us are in fact District stakeholders in our own parks and any of us who had experience with certain contractors understand issues that relate to those contractors. I don't think that there is one sweeping piece of legislation that's going to be introduced that's going to change past practices. Maybe the committee would like to hear why this sudden want to change from what was the existing legislation which was by the way a low bid legislation, to a more substantial look at past practices because I think any of us who have experienced this know there are certain things at the end of a project that create questions. Who is responsible? Is Recreation and Park responsible? Is the contractor responsible? What happens

if the contractor decides not to do the items that are on the punch list and they eat the proverbial retention? And for those of you who don't know what the retention is, every time they issue a project there is a certain amount of money that is held, that money is basically held in reserve until the project is completed. Contractors in this day and age know that and they say we don't need the retention, we'll just walk.

Where does that leave us as stakeholders? So the question is why now? Why is this a big thing to focus on and why as a body should we support that?

**Nicolas King:** The question should be why not sooner.

**Chair:** I'm fine with that.

**Nicolas King:** So just a couple of clarifications. Low bid contracting isn't going to go anywhere. There will always be a need for doing a contract like that. It's a lot more work to do a best value contract with the city so overnight we're not going to change.

The idea is that in the last year or two we've added a lot of different contracting mechanisms to the code, design build and hopefully best value in the next couple of weeks, CNBC, the idea is to give these other people here at the Parks Department more flexibility in how they do things and that's a separate issue really that [unintelligible] that you're talking about whether a contractor finishes a job with all the energy that they started with. So that's part of where the evaluations come in, so we're trying to add a little bit more transparency and accountability to the process by saying [unintelligible] reporting what's happening at the job.

It's not supposed to be—if we do this correctly, at least in a way it doesn't start more trouble than it's worth, it won't be about branding a contractor bad or good. Hopefully it's just a tool that allows us to improve on the city side. Contractors have a lot to say about the city and they do about our inconsistencies and shortcomings. So we're moving in the direction of a more 360 evaluation on the top that has some punitive aspects to it on the [unintelligible].

**Annie Fryman:** One way that this will affect future parks projects is that when/if implemented in Recreation and Park if a contractor with a previous bad record or bad performance on their record were to put in a bid for a parks project that would be factored in. Often a bad contractor could get the lowest bid and then actually add a lot of cost to the project later on. So it's both giving us more accountability for the contractors and also more confidence that the city can have because they are considering performance and past performance for future projects which now they're unable to do.

**Richard Rothman:** Richard Rothman, District 1. I'd like a little difference perspective, I work for the city of San Francisco for 26 years and three-quarters of that time I've dealt with contracts and one thing that bothered me in doing the work, is the city getting the best contractors? I don't know if it's changed but the city had a very bad reputation of not paying bills on time. So I don't know if that's changed.

The other is I'm not making a judgment, I'm just saying that the work I have to do is I don't know if anybody ever read a city contract and all the requirements. It's up to the voters, if they want to put those requirements in fine but are we getting the McBride rule for lumber and the different requirements for hiring people. I spent a lot of my time just getting people certified and maybe some vendors it's up to—but I always just thought about. I did what I had to do to get the service done for the Department but I don't know, do you think we are getting the best value for our money with not paying out bills on time or having these social requirements that we require.

**Nicolas King:** In terms of payment it's a bit of a change of subject because—and I've done this a lot with lots of contractors where they said why don't you not work on this and there's like fifteen other things that we'd like to fix it up and do that first and everything would be. One contractor said that 99 percent of the problems on any job were caused by the city and if it weren't for us everything would be fine. So that's not to say that we're not working on paying more promptly but it's a bit of a separate thing. We're not afraid to—any Department head would be happy to take steps to pay people faster especially because of the city's commitment to working with smaller businesses who have less cash flow. So that's the first thing. If they're doing that, that's a separate avenue than this and in terms of—I understand what you're saying about the different hoops that we have to jump through for city jobs instead of private contractors but that is what it is and all we're talking about really is evaluating the job as it goes down.

I didn't make this clear before, right now some Departments do evaluate jobs and it's all one-way evaluation where it's just a city evaluated [unintelligible] and the direction we're going is the contractor also comment on the city for the first time. So we are creating forums for contractors to say what they're concerned about.

**Richard Rothman:** I remember I used to have to bring the paperwork over to the Controller's office and then go pick up the checks.

**Nicolas King:** The city is updating its financial system for the first time in forever and that's a project that's moving fast and it's going to change a lot and it's going to mean a lot less paper in the system and a lot more things that are happening online and direct deposit of all different sorts. So there's a regular meeting of contractors and city Departments which was a couple weeks ago and there was a presentation on the new financial system that's coming onboard.

**Richard Rothman:** Well I'm glad they're working on it, thank you.

**Chair:** Just to comment on Richard's comment, the only thing that I don't like about what I'm here in this is basically there's already a tail chase between the contractor and the city and by that I mean a contractor comes to the table and they say okay what would you like to do? DPW designs the park and they say yeah we're going to have this great area that has a slope and that slope is going to run off over to here and everybody goes okay that looks good. Then that slope starts to flood out an area over here that somebody didn't really take account of. It sounds slightly like you're grading who's issue it is as opposed to clarifying who's issue it is because—and I'll just give you my understanding—you can't really sue the city for a design mistake. In other words the contractor is really the only person who can actually fix the problem. The city can't fix the problem after the fact, it's come, it's gone, yeah we told the contractor to build it

like that. What's the fix? You're talking about potential putative on let's say oh they didn't finish the work or they did a bad job. What if it was poorly designed by the city, the contractor is doing what you sign, okay yes we signed this. When does the tail chase end? No, no, it's not us it's DPW. Oh it's not DPW, it's the contractor. Oh, it's not the contractor, it's DPW. I don't hear anything in this legislation that actually addresses that particular issue.

**Nicolas King:** I'm not clear on your question.

**Chair:** My question is you just said there is going to be an open forum for contractor to tell the city hey you know we weren't treated fairly or it wasn't our fault but where do the stakeholders benefit in this? That's the question and that's why we were so excited about this legislation because it sounded like it benefited the stakeholders but kind of what you're saying is we're opening up this 360 where they can give us feedback about how we handled it. I guess my question would be where does the SHOE drop? Who take responsibility if there was a design flaw or if the contractor didn't fulfill what their obligation was? What happens from that moment on?

**Nicolas King:** I would phrase it in a different way. I would say what instances do we have now and are they working and I think the short answer is that you get what you pay for. If you send out a list of specifications for a contractor and it's a minimum you're going to get the minimum. There's no incentive to come to the table and overachieve or try to go an extra mile or to pull staff from another project you might have and put it on to this park that you're working on. So this is a multi-year effort to try to bend the curve on culture and that's where the stakeholder—

**Chair:** That's a better answer to me.

**Nicolas King:** I want to clarify, when people hear evaluation especially the contractors that first go to this, their minds went all over the place. They thought of grades from school and it's not fair for me to be graded. What if I get a D and the teacher doesn't like? [unintelligible] by contractors and have relationships with these people and some of them don't like me. It was all of this fear and we've been working slowly and deliberately on this exactly because we want to create a tool that's useful. It's not just going to be a piece of paper that the contractor says here comment on what the city did wrong. That would be a recipe for finger-pointing and gray areas and a lack of accountability. We're trying to change incentives so that when people are working on a project all of them have an incentive to solve problems and part of that has to do with the culture. There's an incentive now to shave costs wherever you can and if you can get a used product past the city when the city asks for a new one, that happens. If you can staff a job with three people instead of six, that happens.

So we're trying to do a better job of keeping track in what's likely to be a publically accessible database.

**Chair:** I like that.

**Nicolas King:** So you have to as a contractor be willing to weather a lot of criticism. Like one time that somebody says you're a jerk or you're incompetent or you do this it might just be that one guy but over time there should be a pattern and that goes for us too. If there's one guy who keeps missing some part of the design drawing over and over again we would like to know about it. The contractor would be very much less than excited about when it started but they were very excited about the possibility of evaluating the city. Once we were able to sit down together and have a few angry meetings and then change our focus to what this constructively looks like, we're doing fine now. They're all for it.

**Linda Shaffer:** First a comment and then my question. Thank you for coming. I now realize I understand nothing about the contracting process of the city. I didn't know there were all these options that you've been throwing out here. And secondly it's a shame, I have not taken the time to find the legislation so we haven't actually read it.

But with that as a preface I understand the issue. I'm glad that someone is trying to address it. My concern is does this possibly have any impact? What about contractors who have no past and are bidding on a project and I'm particularly thinking of minority contractors or small firms that are maybe just beginning to get into the process. Is there any possible effect one way or the other of this legislation?

**Annie Fryman:** This is a bonus given to MBEs and LBEs [unintelligible]. So there is a bump for that that was called for by the community and we agreed to it. Also I guess it's worth clarifying that this would only enable each Department head to work this into their criteria and the methodology would be developed by each Department. So I mean the words exactly that I can just read off, each Department head will be authorized to create a methodology to evaluate these contractors based on a defined set of criteria including things like safety record, past performance, labor compliance, demonstrated management experience, financial conditions, so ability to acquire bonds and insurance as needed, and relevant project experience. So those are some things that would be built in by each Department head kind of at the suggestion of this along the genre of best value, things that we believed that fell into that.

But in terms of first time contractors that is a good quick. I don't know. I think it would be just up to each Department on how they build their methodology on that.

**Linda Shaffer:** I just want to be sure that we aren't inadvertently approving something if we're supporting something that is going to down the road—because I'm thinking actually of a case of a past contractor whose past performance is good and I'm not saying—I don't have the result of this but you can see the issue.

**Nicolas King:** I think that it's right now so much of what drives the thinking on the city side and on the contractors is not of angels and personal experiences and rumors and water cooler talk. We're trying to add some actual facts to the process and there are small contractors who have done small jobs and done well on them. So we're talking about one evaluation form for a runway at the airport of S.F. General or Dolores Park, right. So it's if you can do well on your small thing the incentive for the contractor is that they have a document that can help them get other jobs from the city.

**Linda Shaffer:** I understand that and thank you. I was more concerned about the new contractors trying to break into this and with the past performance being given weight I don't understand.

**Nicolas King:** I don't want to separate the evaluation part from a best value. If you have past performance it doesn't matter where you did it. Do you mean like a brand new?

**Linda Shaffer:** I though you meant only past performance working—[simultaneous comments] Thank you, that answers my question.

**Chair:** Can I ask one quick? So you said each Department head will have a criteria, in other words somebody in the airport might be different than let's say for our purposes Dawn who would probably be the person who composes it for Recreation and Park. So one thing that might be helpful for us as this moves along is to really understand Dawn's—how she sees this because I know this is a stress for her, it's a stress for the Department. It would be good for us to know that she's getting the support she needs because really at the end of the day we're not making these deals she is and we're the ones kind of representing the stakeholders at the end of the process but it would be nice to see what her criteria is to say what a good contactor or—I shouldn't say that, what her criteria is to rate. So I don't think that has anything to you. Dawn presents to us every month. Richard Ivanhoe?

**Richard Ivanhoe:** District 5. Can you tell us where this in the legislative process? When was it introduced at the Board? Has it been sent out to committee?

**Annie Fryman:** So it was introduced late February and will actually be hitting the budget finance committee next Wednesday, May 11<sup>th</sup>. So one thing that I wanted to bring up tonight if you all agree to support it was we already collected named for people who would be willing to give public comment in support at that hearing, [unintelligible]. But committee will be May 11<sup>th</sup> and then off to the Board after that.

**Chair:** Any other questions from the body for Annie or Nick? Thank you very much. Public comment? David.

**David Pilpel:** I submitted some—

**Chair:** We got it. We haven't even got to the resolution yet. We're waiting.

**David Pilpel:** Are you going to take public comment at that or is now my opportunity?

**Chair:** I'll take further public comment on the resolution.

**David Pilpel:** So on the proposal, the legislation, I appreciate the staff presentation. There are a lot of issues involved with city contracting, in part design, project management, construction management on the city side, relationships with the contractor, finance, OCA, CMD, Controller, City Attorney. There are a lot of hands involved in it. I think this is attempting to give the city

another option as to part of it. It doesn't fix everything. I don't think it attempts to fix everything but it I think makes part of it better and gives those Chapter 6 Departments another option and I think that's good. With Dawn and her folks at Recreation and Park, with Nick and Stacy and various folks at DPW—you know, there are a lot of people who have spent a lot of time trying to make the city contracting process better and there are bodies over this, there are people who hit their head against the wall. There's a lot of work. The financial system replacement, the coordination with [unintelligible], all of that will help. There are lots of moving pieces here and in conclusion I think PROSAC should support the effort, ask Dawn to report back on her criteria, I think that's important as to how projects roll out here, and some of the horror stories that you know and have heard of about in particular a Recreation and Park project where there are handoff issues at the end or punch listings that don't get done or issues. Again, this isn't going to fix everything but it's an improvement and so I would support it.

**Chair:** Thank you. So basically you have in your packet a resolution. I take it from Linda Shaffer that not everybody has read the actual legislation so before—I'm not asking the body how many of you have read this legislation? How many of you feel like you would act on this today?

So that puts us in a position because if you haven't read the legislation that it may call into question whether you would support a resolution. Richard?

**Richard:** It's only two pages long, why don't we just read it?

**Chair:** That's fine, I'd be fine if the body want to read the legislation there are copies of it floating. I don't know.

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Are you okay with that? I want you to be informed before we [simultaneous comments].

**Annie Fryman:** So the existing law to clarify and give background, Chapter 6 of the administrative code governs the procurement of public work or improvements. Public work not performed by city employees must be contracted out where a contractor is selected on the basis of only low bid. Certain limited exemptions to low bid apply for emergencies, sole-source procurement, design build, and construction [unintelligible] general contractor contracts.

The amendments to the current law that we're proposing. This ordinance would allow city Departments authorized to perform public work to select construction contractors on the basis of best value to the city. The ordinance would not replace traditional low bid contracting but rather provide Departments with another tool to procure public work contracts. The ordinance would establish procedures and criteria for the selection of the best value contractor and allows selection based on a combination of price and qualifications. The ordinance would further require that any local business enterprise bid discount available under the Chapter 14B of the administrative code be applied to the price or cost portion of the bid only.

This ordinance would also require each Department authorized to perform public work to document, evaluate and report the performance of all contractors awards construction contracts under Chapter 6. The contracts or performance evaluation requirement would become [unintelligible] to all contracts first advertised on or after September 1<sup>st</sup>, 2016.

**Chair:** Nick?

**Nick Belloni:** Two questions. Who does that evaluation? Does that contractor have the right to appeal that evaluation?

**Nicolas King:** We're working on the process so it's nowhere near finished yet. The evaluation we're moving towards a vision of having it be the project team, whatever that means. So the fear from the contractor's side is that it would just be one person from the city and the fear from the city side is there are some people who are eager to be that one persona and there's some people who even if there's something negative to say don't want to have their name attached.

So the procedure that we have in mind to address that is that it would be an evaluation would reflect the opinion of a team and there would be more than one. The idea is not to surprise anybody, that it would be something that happens at the halfway point of a job or after an important stage of a job and also at the end.

So the goal here is not to surprise anybody or to grade them. It's not like Yelp where you eat your food for two hours and then you leave and say mean things. It's to say look we're halfway through, this is going great, this is not going so great work on that.

In terms of appeal not it's not, it wouldn't be an appeal because that's too strong of a word. It would be more like the evaluation itself is passed along to the contractor for comment. So if they want to add or something or they think that there's some clarification they would add that and if it's not—that can't be resolved then it would just be in a database thing.

**Annie Fryman:** I would also add that of a lot of these categories only one of them is past performance and the rest are financial capacity to get [unintelligible] relevant past project experience in one's portfolio, safety record of onsite for workers, labor compliance ability to comply with wage laws, etc. So past performance is definitely a very important piece but it's not the full picture.

**Nick Belloni:** Then you're telling the contractor that we're going to give you a rating and you really have no say after that of maybe why something happen or appeal that maybe this person in this Department didn't see it the same way we did and that can get into weird, shaky ground too.

**Nicolas King:** It is if you think of it as giving a rating. If you think of it as much as possible reporting the facts.

**Nick Belloni:** I've done this for corporations where I've dealt with employees that I've had to give constructive criticism to and you know as well as I know if somebody sees an issue totally different than you as a manager sees an issue. So where does that go?

**Nicolas King:** So the good news is that San Francisco is behind in this. There's a lot of other jurisdictions that do this including the Federal Government, so we have a head start. The Federal Government has been evaluating construction jobs for more than twenty years and in fact the form we're using is in part based on the questions that the contractors thought were sufficiently objective. We started off with pages and pages of questions and then crossed out eighty percent of them, saying this is too subjective. Even when it was objective they said we don't like this question. So as much as possible this should just be about placing the city staff in a position of just reporting the facts. So again it's not a rating. There's not going to be a—

**Nick Belloni:** I get that. That's understandable. But you understand where I'm coming from on that. We've all done it.

**Nicolas King:** Importantly, it's when you first talk about it with somebody, with a contractor or with anybody there's an assumption that just because you're evaluating you're blaming and we're trying to move away from that to say that for example on our draft form one of the things we're going to try to keep track of is change orders and the reasons for the change orders. The way the conversation goes every single time is the contractor says but sometimes you ask for change orders. We know. We're just going to track the amount and the reason for it. Will there be disagreements sometimes on what the reason is? Yes, but we have to—it's better than the system we have now and it often just comes back to public accountability if you're going to change a job for \$15,000 here and \$100,000 there you should have a good reason that you can write down in once sentence.

So as much as possible we're trying to make this an automated foolproof system where the city is just in the position of reporting the facts.

**Chair:** So Robert, you had a question?

**Robert Brust:** I was just interested in how this would play out in the second stage where you've got these contractors that now have a track record that you're looking at when you're trying to award the bid, then what happens if you don't give it to the lowest bid because when you give the reasons? What's gone on in the Federal government and other jurisdictions that have been using this?

**Nicolas King:** It depends on the type of contract that you use for a particular project. But no one so far is envisioning a system where somebody has got let's just say for the sake of simplicity B plusses on their past park project and another person had like one C and three A's no one is going to try to parse those comparisons. We're more concerned about excluding people below D, above F. Like if you do something really bad it would have an impact on our future award but we're not trying to draw the lines—so low bid would still just look to serious issues of the contractor's responsibility.

**Annie Fryman:** I'd also like to add that there are some really good contractors and this layer of complexity helps highlight who those are and ensure that those contractors are a set of eyes to keep their good record good or make it better and kind of align the incentives a little more so that

good business also means good work because right now more business means lowest bid regardless of the quality of the work I guess is more than we have an issue.

**Chair:** I think to follow on this you've said the term grading or don't think of it as grading. It sounds more like feedback. It sounds like you want feedback from them on this city and you want your feedback whoever the head of the Department is to give feedback on the contractor's work and that will somehow play into future bids. Mark?

**Mark Scheuer:** District 8. When you were reading that legislative digest it just sounded like you said that it's not going to replace the low bid system, it almost sounds like it's going to still be the low bid unless you can find a good reason not to give it to the low bid.

**Annie Fryman:** So a little bit about the mechanics of how this play in and interface with the low bid is that once the Department has a score for each bidder based on the value based criteria essentially the bid will be divided by that score and so with a higher denominator there's a higher chance for the end score to be the lowest cost. Does that make sense? So if you don't score very well in financial condition because your capital is a little more constrained but you have a lot of management experience in labor compliance and past performance those would all be weighted by the Department in the methodology that they've created and be divided by the low bid.

**Mark Scheuer:** Would each of those criteria be given equal weight or are some more important than others?

**Annie Fryman:** That would be up to each Department to decide. So this, all this does is empower the Department to integrate this kind of value contracting into their methodology but it's up to the Department, so Dawn at Recreation and Park if she's the one in charge, to actually figure out what the math problem is going to look like and so if this committee for example has strong feelings about what's more important or what we've learned from past projects and where they're gone wrong that's a conversation that can happen on we think that you should rate this one higher or this one is actually irrelevant to a lot of park projects given the budget.

**Chair:** But in reality it sounds like it's criteria as opposed to actually here's what we think you should grade it as.

**Annie Fryman:** But the mandate for the Department is not at all in this legislation. This just allows them to integrate it which now they're not able to do.

**Chair:** I'm basically taking two more questions now. Richard Rothman and Richard Ivanhoe with Nick closing.

**Richard Rothman:** I don't know if I can support this. I think there either needs to be in this legislation or another piece of legislation saying that the Supervisors are asking the Controller to evaluate the payment process and the Human Rights Commission to how those two Departments can make the process speedier so we're getting the best contractors who will do this process because if we're not getting the best contractors then we're getting second rate contractors in this process. We want to get the best contractors right off the bat and to get the best contractors we

need a smooth process to get them to start the process. So if they know they're going to get paid on time and they know they have to—because it was to me it was very frustrating dealing with the Human Rights Commission and that was my job and I did it but many contractors don't want to do it so I don't know if the Supervisor wants to put it in this legislation or wants to put it in a separate bill but I think that's important if we want to get the best bang for our buck.

**Richard Ivanhoe:** District 5. Of other jurisdictions that have implemented best value generally done the evaluations by Department or generally used centralized evaluations?

**Nicolas King:** The evaluations and the best value are two totally separate things. The evaluations would apply to all jobs whether it's \$800,000 or \$1 billion. So that's totally separate. Seattle is most like us on the path that they're on as far as I can tell. I'm sure there's other cities out there but I've talked to them directly, in fact they were just here yesterday and we were talking about all of this and we were kind of heartened that we're both on the same track and have a lot of the same problems. There are lots of other jurisdictions that have best value so that's a separate question.

**Richard Ivanhoe:** Well, the question was are the evaluations in other jurisdictions generally done by Department or by centralized evaluators?

**Nicolas King:** Seattle's system is very centralized. So yes, they are not as side-loaded as we are and Los Angeles for example they have abandoned the idea of evaluating let's say like C minus and above, they don't care because as long as it's above they don't care. They have a more putative system where they only care about people who break the rules and I should say that a lot of contractors are excited about this because they think they're good. So good contractors—one of the things good contractors are good at is estimating the cost of the project and if you're good at estimating the cost of the project you might lose a lot of bids because they're higher. So the idea here is to improve the pool and by improve it I mean enlarge it. So we're hoping to lower the barriers because we know it's not always easy to work with us especially when the economy is really good, so that's one of the intentions here is to expand the pool and not shrink it.

**Nick Belloni:** Just a quick one. When we're talking about the contractors giving the evaluation to the city it just kind of came to me on this especially with Recreation and Park how many times is the public going to end up being the scapegoat? You know, the contractor going well the public wanted this or the public stopped me from doing this? I can see that happening too and I don't want to see a situation where we become the problem versus the solution.

**Nicolas King:** Well, so a couple of answers. Sometimes we are the problem.

**Nick Belloni:** It's a given. It's more in parks than any of the other Department especially.

**Nicolas King:** I would phrase it a different way. We're trying to be better, we have all these conditions and rules and laws on different days we enforce different ones and it's frustrating for the contractor. So to give a really clear example we were attempting to enforce the hours requirement on a job, like please stop working after this hour because [unintelligible] cut it out. And the contractor was happy to oblige and a police officer rode by and said that this job needs

to finish today because this is part of the route for a Presidential visit tomorrow. So I'm ordering you as the Police Department to keep working. That shouldn't happen. It shouldn't happen that a Supervisor's office can call and change a job. Like we're trying to take some of the politics out of it. So we're trying to take that stuff out of the job and that's what having a standardized tool will do in theory, it gives people a forum to say the reason that I wrote that rule is because SFPD told me to.

**Nick Belloni:** I'm more concerned on like say we're talking about a park project and in the middle one of the stakeholders gets mad because something is not being done right and then they jump in and you've had this happy on projects before and then boom, there's a problem between the contractor and stakeholders in the parks.

**Chair:** Sorry Nick, my answer to that is the stakeholders never get a voice during the process. That's the truth. The truth is once it's contracted with the contractor it's going to happen exactly how it says in that contract or they're breaching and if they're breaching then maybe there could be some impact but if it was said you can have five community meetings, everybody is in agreement and then somehow, somewhere in the middle of the project somebody goes crazy. No, no, I didn't mean to that da-da-da! That's not going to change the project no matter what.

**Nick Belloni:** You're right, it causes delays.

**Chair:** It may cause delays.

**Nick Belloni:** And that—

**Chair:** Wait, wait, wait! I don't think they have an answer and that is not what's on the table today. We could have a whole item about causing delays in contracts.

**Nick Belloni:** What I'm saying is that gets the public thrown under the bus within an evaluation.

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Right and they don't get their park back because it's two more months or six more months to have the job fixed and it's a really good point but I don't think it's a point for this particular—

**Annie Fryman:** That would be a point worth bring up with Dawn and working out the methodology and creating protocols in this type of [simultaneous comments]. These are the things that we use to stay in check or have extra investigation or whatever.

**Chair:** All right. So any other questions? Ancel.

**Ancel Martinez:** I have a question, the legislation is sponsored by Supervisor Weiner?

**Annie Fryman:** Weiner, Breed and Tang.

**Ancel Martinez:** Thank you.

**Chair:** Okay. So thank you for your presentation. I would love to have you back again as this proceeds to understand more about the process.

To PROSAC, there is no public comment on this item, right? PROSAC you've seen a resolution that supports Supervisor Weiner's legislation. Linda do you want to introduce this legislation or introduce this resolution that we've discussed or do we choose now to allow everybody to go back and read the legislation as is?

**Linda D'Avirro:** Well, taking into account that you were seeking perhaps some of us to go to comment publically or via email I would think that question would be should we not take a resolution and see if we can pass it tonight. Can I ask for a show of hands of those who would like to defer it because that's going to be another month out and it will be long since past any interest on our part to go forward?

**Chair:** There's one, I knew there'd be one! Anybody else who would think to defer this item?

**Linda D'Avirro:** I'd like to read the resolution. I had a few minor changes but I'm going to read it as written. PROSAC resolution support public contracting reform legislation requiring best value public works procurement contracting.

Whereas San Francisco Recreation and Park Department contracts for construction projects within the city's public parks and open spaces and whereas under the current award system only the bid price is considered with the lowest bidder automatically receiving the contract award and whereas member of PROSAC have heard from the community of park users that using the lowest bid price to choose contractors may not deliver the best value to taxpayers and whereas members of Park and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee have brought the issue of contractor selection, safety record and past performance to both the Operations and Capitals Planning Departments, and whereas Supervisor Scott Wiener introduced legislation reforming San Francisco's public contracting process by allowing city Departments to evaluate contractor's past performance when awarding public project contracts and whereas the legislation requires completion of public works contractor performance evaluations and to require the creation maintenance of a database to collect the contractor performance evaluations. Therefore be it resolved that the members of the Park and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee support legislation supporting best value public works contracting to consider a contractor's overall ability to delivery contracts that best uses taxpayer funds.

The above resolution was proposed by Linda D'Avirro and Steffen.

So having heard all that is that a fair way of supporting what we just heard?

**Chair:** Do we have a second?

**Nick Belloni:** I'll second.

**Chair:** Okay, let's call the question.

**Female Speaker:** Are we allowed to suggest changes in wording?

**Linda D'Avirro:** Yeah, there's a lot of wording suggestions.

**Female Speaker:** Well, there's a couple that I think are substantive.

**Chair:** If they're substantive absolutely.

**Female Speaker:** For example in the very first line does this legislation require best values or does it authorize it?

**Linda D'Avirro:** That's a very good point. Now, having heard it it sounds like it's authorized.

**Chair:** So let's change that to authorized. [simultaneous comments]

**Female Speaker:** In the fifth whereas by allowed city Departments to evaluate contractors past performance isn't it to take into consideration the past performance when awarding public projects? Take into consideration?

**Male Speaker:** But to consider, I think Nick said to consider.

**Chair:** To consider.

**Female Speaker:** Okay fine.

**Chair:** Here, you're writing the changes. To consider under the third whereas. [simultaneous comments] The fifth whereas. [simultaneous comments]

**Female Speaker:** Allowing city Departments to consider.

**Chair:** Anything else?

**Female Speaker:** And I have problems with the very last therefore but I haven't been able to figure out how to straighten it out.

**Linda D'Avirro:** I have a suggestion from the public. Therefore be it resolved PROSAC supports legislation to implement best value public works contracting by considering contractor's overall ability to deliver construction projects that best uses taxpayer's funds. Okay. [simultaneous comments]

**Heather Fuchs:** Quick question, Heather Fuchs, District 4. Is it worth it to say public database? Was that something that was decided upon for sure or is that sort of in the future?

**Male Speaker:** It's a public record.

**Female Speaker:** Will it be public?

**Male Speaker:** Database is probably fine.

**Chair:** Okay, anybody else have any other thoughts on this resolution? Does the public have any thoughts on the resolution?

**Male Speaker:** I gave you some suggestions.

**Chair:** She read them.

**Linda D'Avirro:** Yeah and some of them are grammatical.

**Chair:** The grammatical ones we'll take under advisement.

**Male Speaker:** And I just wanted to point, although this is we talked about at great length is a change to the process and would allow Departments da-da-da—Departments have also done other interesting things in the last few years for design build like at S.F. General, CMGC which is a different procurement style and negotiated procurement for things like MUNI buses. So there are different approaches that one can use and this is just allowing that.

**Chair:** Thank you.

**Linda D'Avirro:** So we did incorporate your last paragraph for sure and your other grammatical changes just so you know he has some commas and things like that so nothing substantive. I'd like to call the question.

**Chair:** Yeah, let's call the question.

**Male Speaker:** Second.

**Chair:** All in favor of supporting the resolution to—God that was quick, I didn't even get it off.

**Linda D'Avirro:** We have a couple without hands.

**Chair:** Let's see everybody's hands. That's fourteen out of sixteen.

**Male Speaker:** [unintelligible]

**Chair:** Right is has to be the whole one.

**Male Speaker:** It's still majority.

**Linda D'Avirro:** Then we have two no's?

**Male Speaker:** Can we abstain?

**Chair:** No.

**Male Speaker:** Why not?

[simultaneous comments]

**Female Speaker:** It's our rules.

**Male Speaker:** I'll vote yes.

**Chair:** So now it's fifteen to one. So the measure passes. Thank you. [simultaneous comments] So thank you to Nick and thank you to Annie for your time and please report back to the Supervisor that we carried this.

**Annie Fryman:** [unintelligible]

**Chair:** I think through either to me or to Tiffany our secretary and she can pass it out to the entire committee.

**Annie Fryman:** Okay wonderful. I can send also some links to other press releases and legislation drafts.

**Chair:** That would be great. Thank you for your time. Moving on. Bob Palacio, we are ready for you. Bob has two presentation. I assume you are going to do recreation centers and clubhouses first.

**Bob Palacio:** So I just want to say hello to everyone. I'm Bob Palacio, Superintendent, Recreation and Community Services for the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department. I want to thank you for your service and giving your time and advice to the Department and the city in general because things like what you guys were just talking about are super important and they actually have such a lasting effect on the city when we build things and they last fifty years. So you can get them right on the front end.

So I have the fun part, I don't have to talk about contracts or any of that stuff, I get to talk about recreation and all the cool things that we get to do. So we have about 5400 formal recreation programs that we currently offer. That does not include things that are done by partner agencies on our properties or permits and reservations. These are actually our staff offering these programs throughout the city. We try to offer them at all 220 locations across the city. Some get multiples, some only get one or two or three things here depending on what type of amenities they have at their property.

We have 26 full service rec centers and 40 clubhouses. I'll get into how we kind of broke this out. Six years ago when the Department was going through a really tough time and you guys were all aware of that, the whole city was, and we decided to reorg the recreation side of the Department. We were kind of left with these resources that weren't really appropriate for programming at all the facilities that we had and so we had to come up with a decision to say well either we're going to do away with public recreation or we're going to figure out a better way to do recreation.

And so what we came up with is that we would concentrate on the major rec centers. Now, since that's happened we've been able to get some add-backs and we've been able to kind of move some things around so we are doing some programming in clubhouses but by and large we have clubhouses that we have licenses with other agencies or other nonprofits that offer programs in many of the clubhouses. So some of them will have an afterschool program put on by us but they may have a nursery at another clubhouse and we'll talk about that.

We have over 75,000 yearly registrations that come in, that's a formal registration, that is not somebody who is coming in dropping a basketball and playing on our property or using our property, it's actual you sign up, you show up to the courts, you have a curriculum, you follow it out until the end and that's how that kind of works.

So it's been really successful. I think far and away more successful than I ever thought it would be. I've been with the Department for 24 years and I kind of remember the old way of doing things where you'd have a Recreation Director somewhere and they would just kind of come up with an idea and say this is what I'm going to offer. And I think now we're much more community driven in what we actually try to offer each center meaning we listen to the community and then we try to provide people that actually have an extra tease in that area to provide programs and it's resulted in a lot of people wanting to sign up for us. I think before we were kind of looked at low cost and low quality and I don't feel that we're looked at in that way any longer. I think that people see us as a good value and a high quality recreation program offer.

We have our core programs and those are the ones that you see up here. We have early childhood and those are like the pre-kindergarten Tiny Tot classes and things like that that we have throughout the city. We have arts and science classes. We have our waterfront programs that we're doing at India Basin as well as at Lake Merced and even some in the Marina Yacht Harbor. We have our Aquatics Division which we have our nine pools around the city and we offer a lot of learn to swim courses and lap swim and all of the things that you guys are aware of. We have our sports so you have the traditional sports of baseball, basketball, volleyball, things like that. You have alternative sports, so a lot of the stuff that we grew up playing that people want to play either as adults or we want to reintroduce to kids like dodge ball and things that you didn't really look at as a sport but yeah they really are a sport.

We have outdoor recreation. So those are our eco camps and things like that. We have teen programs. We have some really cool teen camps and programs that we do. We've come up with some camps like how to survive on \$5 a day in San Francisco as a teenager. What you'll do is you'll with five bucks, we'll take you in that camp and you'll go do all kinds of things in San Francisco for that day.

We have camps where we target the tweens who are about to go to high school and we help them to navigate MUNI and public transportation around the city so that they feel comfortable getting to different places in the city as opposed to just kind of guessing or someone telling them about it because it's going to be a new bus route. It's been really successful.

We have our senior programs so we have obviously the senior center out on Fulton but then we also have our citywide programs. We have a lot of dance, a lot more dance than we've had in the past, especially citywide and that's run by our Cultural Arts Division. So our recreation now is broken up into four competencies—cultural arts which does things like dance, photography, theater, things like that—sports and athletics, community services which is like the early childhood and after school programs, and then leisure services which does like the outdoor rec and skateboarding and things like that. And then we have our adaptive rec.

So one of the things that we are working really hard on and we're focused on this year is making sure that our inclusion services are up to snuff with any agency in the United States. It's a goal we have. In the past what we did was we had adaptive rec programs so if a person was blind or deaf we would have programs specifically for them but it was difficult for them to actually take part in all of these other programs with people without disabilities and so what we've done is we've made a concerted effort to make sure that we have that one-on-one attention if needed for someone to be able to take all the general courses and have that one-on-one interaction so that they're able to do that and it's been great.

We've actually been flooded a little bit with the amount of people that have come to us over the last two years and one of the tough things that we've had to do is decide where a disability where we're not suited to deal with a disability. It's a very tough place to be because some kids, some people, have disabilities that maybe we aren't the best provider of services for that person and you have to work with them to get them into the right place but you have to know your limitations as well and I think sometimes we've taken on a little bit more than we can chew and at other times we've been maybe a little bit more reluctant that we needed to be to take on a challenge so we've kind of found a little bit better happy medium there.

Connecting through special programs. So we have programs like healthy people, healthy parks. We're working with the state, you're see East Bay Regional Parks has it as well. We're working on different walking programs and things like that which is terrific. We have our four major festivals. Who's been to any of our festivals? Scaregrove, the tree lighting, and Playday. And Playday usually is the one that kind of gets high jacked a little bit because it happens in the summer and so we'll end up having some sort of event that will tag along. The Olympics is out here in front of City Hall or something and we kind of tag on to that.

We have our ASL immersion programs which is really cool. We're doing most of those right now out of Mission playground and that's sort of kids that are learning sign language for the first time and other kids that's actually how they communicate and they're joined together and it works great.

The mobile rec program. So this is a program that I actually have gone down and spoke around California about and there is a lot of interest nationwide about this program that we have created. There's been versions of it since the 60s. It used to be where they would pull up in a big van or truck and they would bring out the board games and Frisbees and things like that and that was mobile rec then. So it wasn't like we just invented it. But what we did do is we got current and so our mobile rec program now has 32-foot tall rock wall, we've got BMX bikes, we've got skateboards and ramps and things like that for kids to do and so rather than try to get kids to come to where those amenities are we actually bring them to them and so I think we had 58 different locations we hit last year which was cool. It's one of the most successful programs we have. One of the only challenges is we get a lot of request for it and we get them last minute and it makes it difficult because it's not that easy just to drag around a 32-foot rock wall and all that stuff so it takes a little bit of planning and people they see how great it is, they attended it somewhere or see it somewhere and then they want it for their event and we try to do the best we can to actually show up but what we don't want to do is be like a free party rental place. That's not what we're trying to do. What we're actually trying to do is enhance different parts of the city where kids aren't being exposed to certain things and we want to expose them and give them an opportunity.

We have the Greenagers programs which is out in District 11 and it's a great program where teenagers get to work. Basically they've been kind of in that greenway down there near India Basin and that area. We've done a lot of food and nutrition courses. Those really took off. People are into health and wellness and looking at what they eat and they like to figure out new ways to actually prepare food, how to buy food and all those type things. So those have done well.

And then the Let's Move initiative was a program that we're not sure whether this is going to continue or not but in essence it's a program where we partner with the San Francisco Unified School District, they know that they have a truancy problem and there's a lot of reasons for that, right, that kids either don't get out of bed in the morning for whatever reason they're not interested in school, there's nobody pushing them to get there. Whatever the reason might be. We show up in the morning, we provide program in their schoolyard so they're able to do yoga, dance, whatever it is so that it encourages kids to actually get there. It also encourages kids to get active because we've got a lot of kinesthetic learners. I was a kid who could not sit still, I couldn't learn that way. I think the Let's Move initiative was formulated because of that. We can work with teachers and help them to come up with curriculums that would actually help those kids that learn through movement, that you don't have to sit at a desk to learn math you can actually have other ways of teaching kids because kids get labeled early on and they get disinterested and so that's what that has been targeted at. It's been difficult to pull off. It's labor intensive but it has been successful when we're targeted five schools in Hunters Point and we had some real good success with it. It's expensive. It was not funded. It was something that we wanted to see if we could have an impact on kids in that area and an impact on truancy and I think we did and it's something that we're going to ask for funding probably moving forward to see if the School District can help out but I do think that was one of the coolest programs that we actually had.

What do you think is more healthy the kid who walks to school or the kid who's driven to school? You're wrong. In San Francisco what happens is kids because there's so many liquor

stores and corner stores they walk to school and they walk into those schools and buy soda or candy or chips and they're already behind the curve and so in San Francisco it's more healthy actually for the kids who are being driven.

So everyone deserves to get out and play. So one of the things that we said when we were going to redo the recreation model is that no one would be excluded for ability or inability to pay and so what we've done is this summer alone there's going to \$800,000 in scholarships awarded and it's about \$1.2 million annually. That number is climbing at a very rapid rate and that's fine, that's okay. We want to scholarship as many people as we can. What we did was we put a price on things. Before, everything was free and what we've done is now we've put a price on things and those with the means and the ability to pay, pay. And the folks that don't have the ability to pay or the children that want to participate in programs we subsidize. And it works out great. Our revenues are rising as far as the money that we're taking in from recreation as well as our scholarships so it's been a cool thing.

We also violence prevention programs and strategies. One of those is the Camp Math Teen Outdoor Experience. We call it TOE. TOE came about around five years ago. Mayor Lee was walking around down in the Mission after a shooting and he was walking with a couple kids and said man we've got to do something, there's got to be more done, right. And you always kind of hear that but he thought what about just getting kids out of here and that was kind of the initial thought, just get them out of here and expose them to something different. And so we were able to take that first group of about 60 kids who were on probation—so these kids are in this, they are not at risk, they are in some sort of contact with Juvenile Probation, either on probation or currently incarcerated. And we took them up to Camp Mather for four days and we learned a lot from that. We learned that we needed to not just be a four-day trip for these kids, that wasn't going to do much for their lives and so what we kind of redid the program and now it's a much more comprehensive program. There are lead-up orientations that they have to go to. So there's about 100 kids that start and we finish with about 60. In these orientations we do things like gender respect and health and hygiene. It's really cool because they actually get to bond with staff and the staff is not only Recreation and Park it's Juvenile Probation counselors, it's SFPD, it's a lot of different folks. So it is a terrific program. We're going up for our sixth year. I would encourage anybody in this room if you're interested in coming up for a couple days, it's Mather and we do have cabins. The cost of it is not really going to cost us anything else, we're already up there. You're not going to get all the amenities but you're welcome to see kind of what's going on up there. It is a cool experience.

Then one of the best things about the program is each one of those kids is actually—because they're on a job interview so once they go up there if they're ready for a job we have a job at Recreation and Park for them, we hold the slots for those kids because we figure these are the kids who are most in need of that type of support and so we do that. Now, some of them are not ready at all. So what we do is we don't just dismiss them actually do give them training and stick with them. I get probably—just today I was with two of the kids from TOE that have been with us for three years that wanted some paperwork from me for a reference. They just kind of latch onto this program and there is a special bonding that I don't think happens with any of our other programs.

Late night hoops is a Mayor's program that Recreation and Park runs so they give us a little bit of funding and we run at Joe Lee or Palega, Hamilton and we'll probably do one in the Mission this year. It targets the [unintelligible] population and teens so we do like 15-17 Division, two Divisions and then we do adult, 18-25 year-old Divisions of basketball. They have to go to the classes prior to the games and those classes are actually very helpful. There's things like how to get your license back. So we'll bring in the DMV and they'll help them get their license back. We'll bring in folks that will help them with child support because what happens is a lot of the guys are incarcerated and they think that there's no way out and they have no hope and that their child support has ballooned to a place where why pay? Why do anything at this point and they just don't feel hope and what we do is we try to give them things that actually have impact on their lives and gives them some of that hope and reason to move forward as opposed to giving up. So that's been a cool one.

Leaders in Training is targeted at our 14, 15, 16 year-old kids. We work on park activation as you guys all know, spaces that don't have anything going on in them usually will end up having bad actors in them. So for the most part if we can activate these spaces it's great.

We work with Operation Dream with SFPD and this is property activation with is a little bit different than parks.

So for youth and young adults ages 15-17 even 18 if you're still in high school, we have our Workreation program that we do. This summer we'll hire I think 235 kids to work this summer. We'll also hire probably 70-80 during the school year and it's a really cool way to give kids experience. In the old days we just used to kind of grab a bunch of kids and stick ten of them in a rec center and there wasn't any real leadership or training. We've really tried to be conscious now to limit the numbers of kids that we put in places and we actually do trainings for the people who are going to be working with Workreation kids so that they can help them and give them support so you're not stuck trying to figure out what you're going to do with that kid that day. We give them a little bit better curriculum but it's a very cool program and I think it's one of the oldest in the Unites States. I think it started in Oakland and morphed its way over here.

So how do we get out stuff out? So we do collateral material which is fliers, posters, things like that, we have our banners, we use our e-news. I know all of you get e-news. Recreation and Park website, social media, our partner websites and newsletters, so anybody that we can throw our stuff to we throw it to them, city agency collaboration, elected officials, newsletters, direct outreach to SFUSD schools, direct outreach to recreation centers and facilities, direct outreach to Housing Authority which we're trying to do a much better job of because we are seeing that kids in housing are for the first time starting to come back to our programs. For some reason it became uncool to play sports and do things. It was a weird sort of four or five year period and I don't know what that was really about but we're making a concerted effort to reach out to folks. Online calendar for special events or media. We get our bus ads, you'll see one probably for our summer camp registration, radio PSAs and newspaper ads. And that's it. [applause]

I'll tell you what, if you have a deep question or one that's really specific I'd be glad to meet with you if you want to do that. If you have general questions for the group we'll take those now.

**Chair:** Kim was first and Richard next.

**Kim Hirschfield:** Kim Hirschfield, District 3. I wanted to your Greenagers program if you're going to expand that to other Districts?

**Bob Palacio:** I think we want to do that. I think it's one of our most successful programs that we do for that age group. I don't run it myself, it's actually one of the only programs that's not really run by Recreation, it's actually in the Volunteer Services Division but I know that they've talked about expanding the program throughout the city so we probably should be strategic about how we pick the next spot and so yes, that's something we'd love to do.

**Richard:** About the clubhouses, so the ones that are run by no Recreation and Park are those programs open to everybody?

**Bob Palacio:** They should be. Obviously if you have a nursery or whatever they take registration and when it fills it's—

**Richard:** But I mean like a general. Something like Recreation and Park would run and if a private group then it should be open to the same number of—to the same group of people as if Recreation and Park.

**Bob Palacio:** Exactly. So there's a criteria that they have to have in order to even get those leases that they are open to the general public. I don't know how the pricing works on their programs and how much we can control that but I think there's some metric in there that says whether or not they can do it. One of the things we were concerned about is that whoever comes to our clubhouses has to be aligned with what our mission is. We don't want people selling tires and stuff out of these clubhouses. That was something that was really important for people to be able to say well is this ground to be open to the public. So like at Vis Valley clubhouse you've got 90 kids that show up there for an afterschool program and it's run by the Boys and Girls Club. So it's open but they're stuck for space. It's the community and the general public is able to sign up there but it's not open all the time unless somebody else leaves. That's common with us too.

**Richard:** So like Cabrillo I think is only open three hours a day. So are you in the next budget—I guess it depends if Prop B passes or not but I mean do you envision opening the clubhouse for more? Now on the weekends do you have staff there all day long?

**Bob Palacio:** Right now that one is only open during the after school time and I think from me and Phil's viewpoint we would like all of the clubhouses to be back open for public use. We think that's super important and I know Prop B money will help us to get to that. What we've done is strategically asked Supervisors hey can you give us an add-back here. Will you do this? We've been able to kind of get them ones that were sitting vacant open. The only tough thing has been you open—you build a brand new clubhouse and lots of people want to lease it but what about the ones who they're not quite real but they're not as sexy as the ones that are brand new. We've had a harder time finding people to come in and provide services at those. Those are the ones we'd like to go back into. So that's kind of a long answer.

**Richard:** I know at Cabrillo on the weekends people have parties.

**Bob Palacio:** They do.

**Richard:** I don't know, are you or the Department getting away from as-needed workers?

**Bob Palacio:** We just created the new class of 3278 which is an assistant facility manager or coordinator and that was always done by a rec leader so we were having people who were at the front desk and they were doing registration, they were greeting people, they were taking attendance, things like that and we've just switched that over or in the process of switching that over, for 3278 assistant facility coordinators and those people are PCS. So they have benefits and stuff like that. That was through an agreement with SCIU. There was a whole long process and by having those PCS people now taking those hours you're going to have less as-needed folks just as a result. So that's kind of that answer.

**Linda D'Avirro:** Linda D'Avirro, District 11. Recently I was at a meeting where the YMCA is leasing the clubhouse and I'm interested and glad to hear that you want to go into the clubhouses that are right now closed. This one is leased out and the lease will be coming up in a couple years and the request of the public was that that be returned to the public rather than continue the lease and what was interesting during that meeting was the person that was at the YMCA was planning programs that were identical to what you would offer at Recreation and Park and it really was very concerning to the people that were attending because they said why can't we have a rec person there where we can come in because this is a YMCA program and we can't come in right now first of all because you're only offering an after school program and the rest of the time it's not open to the public. So what are your thoughts on these sorts of situations where we can return those?

**Bob Palacio:** I think we've been strategic about giving one-year leases when we can at these sites sort of as a test. You know like is this going to be successful, is the community going to like this? And where is it? That's where I think we should go back in. The Excelsior is near and dear to my heart. That's where I spent my entire life. I was born and raised—my grandmother lives across the street from the park on Madrid. My whole family is still there and I would love nothing more than for Recreation and Park to go back in there. We're going to be doing the basketball courts there and the tennis courts. What would be helpful for me is if you could even send me an email just kind of telling me what the community's feeling is on the services at Excelsior because a lot of times we get the feedback from the YMCA side saying oh everything is going great, we've got X number of kids. Everything is going terrific but we don't hear the other side that yeah but the building is not really open and we don't feel like it's serving all of the community, just a very small portion. And the Excelsior is unique in that it doesn't have a major rec center in it and so for us to say yeah you know what, Crocker and Excelsior need to have more hours, more staffing, more programs similar to what you would see at a major rec center it's probably appropriate. That's the way I see it.

**Tom Valtin:** Tom Valtin, District 9. Where does a kid like my sixteen year-old apply for a job?

**Bob Palacio:** So you can apply in January, December-January but if you have a burning one right now and you were to send me an email I could probably get you to Youth Works and we could hire you through Youth Works and then get you working in our Department somewhere. We did it for someone else in this room very recently. My email is bob.palacio@sfgov.org. What we do is we always try to hold a few slots opens so we've exhausted those but we know that there are going to be kids that are special cases or an organization is going to call and say man I've got these five kids they really need a job or we try to work with some kids that have gotten in trouble and we had one where Amos Brown brought in five kids that we decided you know we're going to try to change these kid's lives. No matter how much you disappoint us, no matter how much they let us down, we're still going to be there no matter what. And that's a difficult thing to do because they're going to let you down and some of it starts with giving them a job, giving them a little bit of hope. So we hold a few back. Right now we've exhausted them so now we're using Youth Works to where they'll pay but we supervise. So you'll be on our properties, there's really no difference it's just a funding mechanism.

**Chair:** Linda Shaffer.

**Linda Shaffer:** Linda Shaffer, District 10. This is a general question. Some of these wonderful programs that you've describe working with at risk teens and some of the others they sound as much educational or related to the Police Department or Department of Corrections. I hope you're getting funding?

**Bob Palacio:** We do. The Mayor's Office pays for the Teen Outdoor Experience. With the exception of the sump costs. I'm there, Phil is there. They're not paying for us but as far as all of the stuff, the busses, the food, all of the things for the orientation. The people that are in this program Juvenile Probation and SFPD they are fully invested in this. This is like something that everyone feels is having a real impact. In my 24 years I've seen all kinds of crazy programs that don't work, that are fluff, that don't have a real impact. They tried but didn't real do it. This is one that is working. We are seeing kids that are changing their lives and the ones that don't—I've gone and visited kids who were handcuffed to a pole after our program, that are going into court and stood in front of a judge and testify for them and tell them this is what the kid's facing. This is what we're going to do and this kid is going to accountable and he's going to call me every day. Me and Chief Nance have done that for a lot of these kids and a lot of them are incarcerated and we'll hold the job until they actually get out because if even three days go by that they don't have a job or have direction they'll get in trouble again. So we make sure that it's seamless, that the day that they get out they're seeing their PO and they're getting a job.

**Chair:** Any other questions? Any public comment?

**David Pilpel:** *Four* things very briefly. You told a very good story. Not just what's currently happening but things that worked and didn't work. If there's some way that you can convey a bit of this history. I just worry that a lot of the rec programming history of the Department sort of gets lost and never gets captured and it's more like well I remember 20 years ago blah, blah, blah. You've been around and you know and it would be good to sort of memorialize that and I trust you on it.

**Bob Palacio:** I agree.

**David Pilpel:** Two, the Housing Authority we still have a friend Rose Dennis over there.

**Bob Palacio:** She's great.

**David Pilpel:** Three. The comment about scholarships, I don't know if the Department goes out to the Zuckerbergs and other people but I think that would be a great opportunity to get more funds not for facilities, not for capital stuff, but for things like that affect people and make programs successful to everyone. If there's a way you can get whoever to do that I think there's a story there.

**Bob Palacio:** Yeah, and it's an easy sell.

**David Pilpel:** I would hope so but people like names on buildings. The last thing, I don't know that there's a current debate about Sharon Arts or programs but I recall years ago there was discussion about the programs and offerings that you had compared to the Jewish Community Center or other kinds of places that had classes and things and what you would do that either are competitive or aren't. I just hope that you're focusing on the things that you do and do well and do for the public as opposed to private offerings. If someone else is better at doing it, let them. But if you're got resources that are available, whatever, you should do the things that you're good at.

**Bob Palacio:** I agree. I think one of the areas we've worked hard at is not having [unintelligible] services whether it's by us or another agency and being aware of what other people are doing.

**David Pilpel:** If it's something everybody wants a lot of and there's not enough there then you should—

**Bob Palacio:** Sharon's had a lot of turnover on the foundation side but I think we're in a good place right now.

**Chair:** Any other public comment on this item? Being none, public comment is closed. So Bob?

**Bob Palacio:** You should have in front of you about community Youth Parks. This will be brief because I'm actually not the expert on this but I have been attending the meetings so I'll do the best I can.

So a Youth Park is in Hunter's Point. It's just below Malcolm X Elementary School and it is a property that is much larger than I originally thought. It is a big piece of property. I think the park description says it is 1.3 acres, 56,000 square feet. It seems bigger than that to me. It's very large, it's got lots of different levels which is a challenge for when they're going to redo this. It's got three very old buildings on it that used to be like after school programming and stuff. It has a

long history in the community. It has this giant steel slide, it's huge. The school district who owns the property is actually pulling that slide out and Recreation and Park has agreed to store it until they redo the park and we can kind of figure out how we're going to do this.

Our role as a Department could be something like we offer some programs on the property when it eventually gets redone. It just went under construction so on April 23<sup>rd</sup> they actually had a going away party almost for the old park that we participated in. We did the little kids tennis stuff where we brought out the mini nets and we did some basketball and we brought a DJ and stuff like that and they served food and they brought out a lot of the old furniture and a lot of the old stuff that was in those buildings, pictures and everything else, the community came out and they were able to take those things. It was a cool event.

It's going to cost a lot of money to get that place back to where it needs to be. What they are doing right now is they're demo'ing everything and they're going to do an EIR and all that stuff and figure out what is it actually going to take in the end. But I'm thinking this is probably like a \$25-30 million project in the end and I think the School District has probably put in somewhere in the neighborhood of about \$400,000 to knock down the buildings and make the place safe. In the short term they're going to be working with hopefully the Golden State Warriors are going to come in and redo the basketball courts that are there and make those nice because the space is a really good space for that to go on.

Again, if you look at this and are interested in reading it will tell you kind of the basics about the property. But it is a School District property. They don't have a lot of funding for it. They got the initial funding just to take the thing down, the buildings down, make it safe, because it's not safe. It's an eyesore! It's not safe. It's not great but it's getting better and there's so much development that going on around the park that it can be a community hub, it can be sort of the heartbeat of that area and I think some of the developers are kind of seeing that and I know there was a lot of conversations about what they'll put into it as far as money. So hopefully they can keep plugging along. There is a lot of momentum behind that park and a lot of will to get something done there nice and a lot of people who care.

It's interesting, Hydra Mendoza and Shamon and Ron, there's a number of folks who have been able to call in everybody that they know from around the city and keep them at the meetings and keep them energized and ask them for their favors and their contacts and everything around this park and it's been pretty interesting to see how much they've been able to get done with pretty much no money. You can do some things. You know, they had the little Super Bowl event up there, they got the Super Bowl committee to actually throw in a little money to beautify a picnic area up there and we did the work and they added a few things.

So it can be great but it is a long way down the road. It's tough.

**Tom Valtin:** Tom Valtin, District 9. I don't see exactly where it's located? Am I missing it?

**Maya Rodgers:** Maya Rogers, District 10. If you are at the end Ingalls right where it curves, so it's like Ingalls and Harbor Road.

**Bob Palacio:** If you take Hudson up the hill, it turns into Harbor, take Harbor to Ingalls, you're going to go left in Ingalls.

**Maya Rodgers:** It's Hudson to Ingalls then you make a left.

**Bob Palacio:** It's just below Malcolm X School.

**Maya Rodgers:** And right behind West Point on that corner.

**Bob Palacio:** If you took a ball and throw it over the buildings you can almost hit India Basin, it's pretty close. If you drive a car like it's right around the corner, it's close. But it's a School District property. They don't know what they're going to do with it yet. There's lots of talk and possibilities. The community has some ideas but nothing in stone other than it can't be what it is.

**Maya Rodgers:** It took since 2010 to have this conversation because the initial conversation was the School District was not interested in doing anything with that property and so it's been ongoing. I feel like Recreation and Park was always okay, what do you want us to do?

**Bob Palacio:** We're not talking about some pocket park, this thing is big. When you go out there and you look at the enormity of the property and the different grades—is a big job.

**Robert Brust:** Would you have to buy it from the School Board?

**Bob Palacio:** I don't know, I think they want that property. I think they didn't at one point but I think that they see now there's some opportunity there and I think what they would want to do is develop it, use it for certain things, maybe in conjunction with Malcolm X and the community and have Recreation and Park do some programming on top.

**Chair:** Any other questions from the members? Maya, I brought this item for your benefit and I hope that you feel Bob covered everything. We'd appreciate an update. It think it sounds like the kind of property as PROSAC that we would rally around. Certainly we want all our Supervisors, all the stakeholders to know how important this is.

**Bob Palacio:** I agree. It is a cool property and can add value to a lot of people. When people talk about Youth Park the people that live there or grew up there or whatever it's like it was the greatest thing ever as a kid. People were crying that the slide was leaving.

**Chair:** Maya I'll just tell you that as we started to research this item I started talking to people who were native San Franciscans and they were like oh you're talking about Youth Park up on the hill, like they knew exactly where we were talking about. Bob, thank you very much. Is there any public comment on this item?

**Female Speaker:** Since Recreation and Park is going to be storing this slide can we store it at McLaren Park?

**Bob Palacio:** I don't know that it's entirely safe. It's got a lot of dents and things that are probably not real safe. We think we're going to keep it at the yard. We're not entirely sure where we're going to put it yet. [simultaneous comments] And the reason we're storing it is hopefully it's going to be part of—I mean it's huge, the slide is as wide and as big as this room.

**Chair:** Thanks Bob? Is there any public comment? Being none, public comment is closed. So we're moving on to announcements. Do anybody have any announcements? Tom Valtin.

**Tom Valtin:** This is not an event but did everybody see the article by where Richard was quoted? I just wanted to make sure everybody read that article about the Mother's Building.

**Chair:** We saw that.

**Tom Valtin:** I wanted to acknowledge Richard's work on that. I read it to my wife, she was excited. How do I see this place? Well done.

**Linda D'Avirro:** I saw my water bill and they have something that came to us about two or three years ago, it was a Pacific Rod and Gun Club and it said the site cleanup is nearing completion and the remediation is necessary to remove soils that are contaminated and arsenic and all this stuff left behind by skeet and trap shooting. Anyway, it says there's a public process underway to determine a new tenant who can provide a variety of recreational opportunities at this lovely lakeshore location. Since we had speakers about that that was the disposition is that they basically eliminated the Pacific Rod and Gun Club and if you want to attend the meetings you can go to the [sfwater.org](http://sfwater.org) Lake Merced and find out about future meetings.

**Chair:** Thank you Linda. Anything else? Hearing none, that item is closed. The only thing I'll add in terms of new business agenda setting is you all as a body see how quickly we can move. Is there any general public comment?

**David Pilpel:** David Pilpel.

**Chair:** Of course.

**David Pilpel:** I just wanted to say what a wonderful job Linda did as a Chair and I expect the best out of you.

**Chair:** So noted, thank you so much. Just on agenda setting, the more you get at me during the month the more I can speak to Recreation and Park and we can get items on the agenda. So please, if there's something that's strong in your heart that isn't on our list get it on the list so that we can address those items in the future. What the hell is that?

**Female Speaker:** That's the park report. That's the only District that hasn't done it.

**Chair:** Oh, District 3. Where's Kim? So Kim you're the only District that hasn't done a park report. Like give us your District report so I won't compel you to do it in the next one but maybe you can think about July or August.

**Kim Hirschfield:** Okay.

**Chair:** Thank you. Linda, take your little things away. Yes, David Pilpel.

**David Pilpel:** Just two items. I think it would be nice if all these items that were initiated by members can indicate who is doing them.

**Chair:** Sure, yes.

**David Pilpel:** Also, if you can give some indication of which things are sooner rather than later. Some things have been hanging on here for a while and it would be nice to get a sense of what's the next few months and what's sometime next year and what's never.

**Chair:** Absolutely, thank you.

**David Pilpel:** You might also want to think about combining Item 8 and 10 so that you've got agenda setting announcements and sort of catch-all everything.

**Chair:** I think the announcements are really for the members to voice intimate details of their own District as opposed to adding items for the agenda. Okay. Any other comments? Yes Richard.

**Richard:** How is the full Commission going to get the resolutions that we pass.

**Chair:** The woman sitting right behind you has the responsibility to deliver that resolution to the Commission.

**Linda D'Avirro:** Any member can go to the Commission and if the Chair wants to appoint someone at least quarterly they can go on our behalf.

**Chair:** It's on the agenda every single time as part of the General Manager's report. I would like to tell you, friends, I would like to get our own agenda item on the Commission and I will lobby to do that because I don't think we should be a part of Phil's report. I think that makes us part of his report. So I would suggest that's something we can bring up at a future time but I will try to attend Commission meetings on our behalf but I do feel like it should not be a part of Phil's report.

Anything else? Everybody happy? This meeting is adjourned.

**End of Document**