

PROSAC Meeting
October 4, 2016

Chair: Welcome to the October Park Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee Meeting. I hope you all are doing well. Thank you for coming tonight. We have a fairly packed agenda so we're going to try to get to items we have here. I would like to start with roll call and I'll start to my left.

Richard Rothman: Richard Rothman, District 1.

Mark Scheuer: Mark Scheuer, District 8.

Robert Brust: Robert Brust, District 8.

Patricia Delgado: Pat Delgado, District 9.

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

Jane Weil: Jane Weil, District 6.

Denis Mosgofian: Denis Mosgofian, District 5.

Jordyn Aquino: Jordyn Aquino, District 4.

Ana Gee: Ana Gee, District 6.

Sharon Eberhardt: Sharon Eberhardt, District 11.

Tom Valtin: Tom Valtin, District 9.

Richard Ivanhoe: Richard Ivanhoe, District 5.

Nick Belloni: Nick Belloni, District 2.

Chair: Steffan Franz, District 2. We'll move on to Item #2. Has everybody had a chance to review the minutes from the September meeting? Does anybody have any comments on the minutes from the September meeting?

Sharon Eberhardt: I move that we accept them.

Patricia Delgado: Second.

Chair: Hearing no objections to that the minutes for September are adopted. Moving on to the Chair's report because we have such a packed meeting I will try to keep this as short and sweet as possible. If you a member of the public who is not presenting who would like to speak on any item please fill out a blue card. Those of you presenting thank you for coming.

Quickly, I want to touch on the schedule for two agenda items that have come in front of us a couple times. These items are the strategic plan and the equity metrics. As you see on tonight's agenda we are discussing the subcommittee's let's call it information that they would like to present for the equity metrics. I did want to touch in with you on some pending dates and I also have what's called the expanded equity metrics which is fact Linda who is the head of that subcommittee had asked for. So please feel free to pass these out.

Dates to remember with regards to this—today is the 4th of October so District 11 council. SPUR, October 17th. Youth Commission, October 17th. Recreation and Park Commission, October 20th and then back to PROSAC for our November 1st meeting on the strategic plan.

I don't have much else in terms of Chair's report. I do feel like people are starting to be a little more receptive and responsive with the RSVP. On the other hand, if you are involved in an agenda item and that relates to a resolution that you are proposing there is a deadline of the Wednesday before the meeting that the text of that resolution needs to be submitted. This time we waited right until the last minute and we did get it but I would ask you if you are interested in having something heard by the committee that it please gets to Tiffany no later than the Wednesday before the meeting.

With that said I also want to address documents. There was a change about a year and a half ago from all members getting every single document related to our meeting physically at meetings. So that means for all these years most of you who have been on this committee for a long time know you have this many documents at home, many of which are now worthless. The decision was made to primarily give out those documents digitally and then if you wanted to print them you could yourself. I am putting it out to the committee that if you want a physical packet or a specific agenda item presentation that you request that from Tiffany on the Wednesday before the meeting. So, again, sometimes she will make copies if the presentation doesn't reach us in time to review. For example if we get a presentation that comes in on Friday and we don't have time to review it she's print out copies but if you specifically want a presentation or the packet then you should ask Tiffany for that on the Wednesday before the meeting. Any questions? Any public comment? Being none, that item is closed.

Our next item is Capital Planning with Stacy.

Stacy: We had a really great event at McLaren this past weekend, 176 people showed up and we had a lot of different feedback which we're compiling and see where it's going to take us. I didn't go but I heard it was really great.

The Natural Resource Management Plan has been scheduled for a joint hearing on December 15th. So Lisa and I will likely be back probably in December to go over that with you.

We also have two more project managers starting in November so it's very exciting. There is one more opening we are looking to fill.

The Urban Ag coordinator Emily Gogol—I think I talked about this last month but she has started and she is excellent and is already making inroads throughout the community. She needs a little bit of time to get immersed in what she's doing but she also instead of being part of the Capital team she's now part of the Policy and Public Affairs team so she is still working very closely with Capital but it's a different position.

[simultaneous comments]

And then we along with the strategic plan we are doing an annual capital report so we hope to bring that to you in December. This will be the first time that we're doing this annual report for the new charter amendment.

There are a couple of openings. We have the Noe Valley Town Square's opening at the end of this month.

Male Speaker: It doesn't look ready. [simultaneous comments]

Stacy: There will be some things of course not quite done as always but generally it should be done. And then the 11th Street properties we hope to have it at the Board in November we're getting the phase II done right now and we've had—it takes so long to do things—to do the phase II we need a driller to go out there and test some surface conditions and they were booked for six weeks. So I believe that is happening this month and then we'll have the report shortly thereafter and will then go to the board.

That concludes my update.

Chair: Hang on Linda. Jane, did you want to?

Jane Weil: Whenever Stacy is finished.

Chair: She's finished.

Jane Weil: Yeah. So District 6 is where the 11th Street acquisition is and basically what I've heard from Dawn is—so the Commissioners heard it. It was disappointing I think to both staff and people from District 6 their lack of enthusiasm even though we are the number one priority, yadda yadda yadda. If we were a different neighborhood perhaps they would have had big celebrations and people there. So there's a lot of push-back and one of the push-backs that Stacy is alluding to is they wanted stage two to look into the remediation of the land before they would actually pass the formal resolution, right, for the acquisition?

Stacy: They did pass it unanimously. They passed the resolution. They requested that we get it done before it goes to the Board.

Jane Weil: So the bottom line is I think it would be very helpful to have letters I would say either individually from members of this committee to the Commissioners supporting the acquisition. Again, on the strategic plan it's one of the key initiatives so letters would be very helpful and then letters to every Supervisor from each of the members because there are just lots of reasons why this should pass so I can give everybody a sample letter but it would be helpful.

Chair: I would propose that if you want to send a sample letter through Tiffany.

Jane Weil: Then there is as we know we passed last December there was a second choice park that was turned down because there wasn't enough money and it was too small and all of that and everyone in the District is still pushing for that as well. It's the same size as Noe Valley Town Square so it is little. It would be the most expensive park per square in the city's history but we're in SOMA and that's what land costs and that's the long and short of it.

So Stacy has done all the work already on both of these parks in terms of fitting it into all the metrics. So I would like to say I'll send a letter out through Tiffany and especially to each Supervisor, that would be helpful.

Chair: Hang on Denis. Linda.

Linda D'Avirro: I have a question. Do you know whether the October date that was planned for the Mansell corridor is going to be met? While you're looking at that I have a question for the Chair. Since we are going to hear the Capital Plan are we also going to schedule someone to speak on behalf of the Operations Plan?

Chair: I would assume we'll have young Denny Kern come back. We haven't heard from Katie Petruccione much this year and Capital is obviously what they have teed up but I do think that we should hear from Operations as well.

Linda D'Avirro: So Stacy you think 11th Street will be sometimes in November before the Board of Supervisors?

Stacy: Yes. I think it's very likely. It hasn't been scheduled yet because we're waiting to get the results of phase II which should come in at some point this month so then we'll be able to schedule it.

Linda D'Avirro: So you'll let us know, thank you.

Denis Mosgofian: I have a question for Jane through the Chair—what are the reason people are opposing this acquisition? I thought it was a done deal.

Jane Weil: We all thought it was a done deal. The three reasons were too small, it's only a quarter of an acre. But again, that's what Noe Valley Town Square is. No money left in the acquisition fund and we have pretty strong feelings that money was given elsewhere when it should have been kept for District 6. And the third reason was it was too expensive, it was too small—and, what was the third reason?

Stacy: It was more expensive than every other park [simultaneous comments]. There just wasn't enough money to purchase both of them.

Denis Mosgofian: I didn't know there was organized opposition that would require or should get us to communicate so strongly to so many people which I'm in favor of but I didn't know.

Stacy: I wouldn't say there was opposition. There was lack of enthusiasm. There definitely was no opposition to be honest. Like people they were—there was just lack of enthusiasm and a lack of outward support as well.

Linda D'Avirro: So too expensive per square foot, there's not enough money left on the acquisition fund, and it was too small were the three reasons for the second one. The first one, the 11th Street, they did pass the resolution.

Male Speaker: But you're asking us to write in favor of 11th Street?

Linda D'Avirro: To let them know that we would like them to be a little more enthusiastic. [simultaneous comments]

Chair: Robert.

Richard Rothman: What meeting was this again, the Commissioners?

Linda D'Avirro: The park Commissioners passed one of the parks. They passed the 11th Street but they asked for the report on the remediation. They did not even consider the smaller one.

Richard Ivanhoe: And the speakers were unenthusiastic?

Linda D'Avirro: The park Commissioners.

Richard Rothman: Well they ask a lot of questions, they just do that. Send us the letter.

Chair: Richard Rothman.

Richard Rothman: Richard Rothman, District 1. Can you talk about the field trip?

Stacy: We went to the Mother's Building and I'm pleased to report that the zoo has done all the work they said they did. They did a lot of work to preserve the Mother's Building—removed some vegetation, cleaned it up, got rid of some mold, they put in dehumidifiers, they fixed the roof. Actually the west side of the building is what's getting hit most by the ocean and the storms and that's where the murals are deteriorating most rapidly and there has been a plywood board up there that's I don't know how effective it is, it probably does something, but it was falling apart when we were out there last year. This year it is very nice, it's well-done, it's put together and they even roofed it so I think it's going to provide some good protection until we're able to

get in there and actually complete the renovation of the building. Katie Tang's office has given us \$200,000 this year and \$200,000 next year to wrap up all the rest of the short-term and immediate needs for the building. It's very exciting.

Richard Rothman: I just want to add that the zoo is actively working to open that area of the building. They want to open up the Sloat Street entrance again. They might have to close the Ocean Beach entrance so they are working on a plan to incorporate it. They just have to find about \$5 million.

Stacy: Linda, Mansell should be open in November.

Linda D'Avirro: Mid, late?

Stacy: It said early to mid November but I'll get more details.

Chair: Any other questions for Stacy? Any public comment on this item. Being none, that item is closed. We'll proceed with the next item.

Eric Andersen: I'm the Superintendent of Golden Gate Park here to present the proposal that we're partnering with SFMTA on the installation of speed bumps in the western portion of JFK Drive in Golden Gate Park. This is a stretch of road where data shows there's a high degree of severe and fatal traffic injuries so this initial proposal really focused on what was considered a fairly treacherous stretch of road.

In the broader context of all this in April of this year the Recreation and Park Commission approved a resolution to support the Vision Zero initiative which seeks to end traffic deaths and serious injuries by the years 2024 in San Francisco. Also, in relation to this in August the Mayor issued an Executive Directive to city agencies to do a few things but specifically for Golden Gate Park to within six months, implement traffic calming measures on JFK and then also within three months to initiate a longer-term traffic calming study for the park which we are excited about and I'm sure you'll be hearing more about in the future.

This speed bump project is a small piece of what we think will be a much broader initiative for Golden Gate Park. Miriam, take it away.

Miriam Sorell: I'm a project manager and team leader with the Livable Streets Group at the SFMTA which is the group that works on bicycle, pedestrian, and traffic calming projects. So as Eric mentioned JFK Drive in Golden Gate Park is one of the locations we're looking at making traffic calming improvements. It's on our bicycle high injury network, particularly the western half of the park and we've observed that there are real speeding issues there. We've gone out and measured the speeds at a few locations, in particular at 30th Avenue we found speeds between seven and nine miles per hour above the speed limit. We know that the speed that a car is travelling when it hits a pedestrian or bicyclist really impacts whether that person walks away from the collision. So if you're hit at 20 miles an hour you're probably going to survive but if you're hit at 40 miles an hour you're less likely to. The speeds we were seeing were about the 32 to 35 range.

What we are able to implement in the very near term to address that problem is speed humps and raised crosswalks and these are the locations that we're proposing. Speed humps are a little different from speed bumps which are what you might see in like a parking lot. So a speed hump is a little bit more gentle, you can still park on it, it isn't disruptive. People don't love it if they're riding a bike but it isn't disruptive or unsafe. But it does have an effective result of reducing vehicle speeds. Our plan is to implement these starting in the end of October and into November after the Parks Commission hearing on October 20th and we also had an MTA public hearing to hear input on these. We're really excited to be able to do this is a really quick turnaround. 30th Avenue is where a bicycle rider was killed in June riding her bike on JFK Drive so it's really time to make some improvements.

We're actually looking forward to opening it to a broader study and I didn't have a detailed slide to show for this because we don't actually have a lot of details yet. What we're interested in is learning from you guys and from the community about what people are interested in seeing in terms of priorities for vehicle circulation in Golden Gate Park. We're collecting a lot of data about what speeds are on other locations besides just JFK Drive and also where people are turning, where people are going throughout the park with the idea that we can take a broader view of it. There are some roads here that we should make sure are prioritized for people trying to access the park only rather than for through-trips or are there other things we can do at specific intersection locations to make it safer for people biking along the length of these roads or crossing from the trails on either side.

So in the very near term hopefully in November we'll have a first meeting where people can come and share their hopes and dreams for Golden Gate Park and we'll be working with the Recreation and Park Department.

I have a couple more comments related to some specific questions from Richard but I thought I'd first see if anybody has any questions about the speed humps?

Tom Valtin: District 9. I'm a really slow driver. I'm 59 years old and I've never got a speeding ticket. Speed humps don't slow me down very much.

Miriam Sorell: Well, you're a slow driver.

Tom Valtin: Speed bumps slow me down big time. Speed humps don't do much.

Chair: What's your point of the comment?

Tom Valtin: They should have speed bumps, not speed humps.

Chair: Okay. Denis, do you have a comment?

Denis Mosgofian: District 5. I live very close to Golden Gate Park and we just recently had two speed humps put on our block directly off Lincoln Way a block from the park. It has slowed down the traffic a great deal and it's been a real relief for us but I have a question specific to you

about the park because I'm not opposed to speed humps. What's the accident ratio on JFK in this section or the injury ratio compared to say South Drive or in the main section near the conservatory, the east end of the park?

Miriam Sorell: That's part of the set of things that we're going to be looking at in the study so we started to pull that collision data but haven't done a full analysis of it because our direction was to start with what we could do immediately on JFK. We'll be looking closely at that and seeing where the collisions are happening and focusing our efforts there.

Denis Mosgofian: I heard about somebody in June getting killed, that's terrible, but was this particular section chosen for other reasons than what happened in June?

Miriam Sorell: It was highlighted because of what happened in June and we were able to go out there and verify that not only in that instance which was in addition to speeding there was a number of other things we wanted to see like is that—are speeds a recurring problem there. So we collected speeds. We would be open to doing the same treatments on other streets but it took more time than we had up to this point to do that.

Nick Belloni: District 1. I live right up the street from there and I have a couple questions on this. I like the speed humps are great, I hope we're not going to go into a situation where we have on the east side of 19th because I get more complaints being part of the Planning Association for the Richmond I get more complaints over that stretch from both bicyclists and drivers on how that's not the best idea. I get it from seniors, from people with kids. There are more complaints over there. I hope we're not thinking of that over on the west side.

Male Speaker: What is this raised crossing you're talking about?

Miriam Sorell: There's a raised crossing behind [unintelligible] drive. But it's basically a speed hump except instead of having this marking it's a bit longer in this direction and then has our crosswalk marking on top of it. There's also one that just went in at Herman and Steiner near Duboce Park. Basically it's a speed hump but at a location where people are supposed to be crossing the street. So it's a combined crosswalk and speed hump.

Richard Rothman: District 1. I live half a block from Golden Gate Park and I'm not a bicyclist myself but I've heard when I brought this up to our District 1 community meeting and other bicyclists that apparently the humps are going to go curb to curb and bicyclists were concerned about that. And then one of the park employees raised the questions about the races in the park but my concern is—

Chair: Are you talking about races like the Nike Women's Race?

Richard Rothman: The footraces in the park. Somebody just mentioned it. My main concern is that whatever you do is going to cause more traffic to go on Fulton Street and Fulton Street is a dangerous intersection and I can speak for Lincoln too because I've been working with District 4 on this issue too. I guess one of the questions I asked you was about you know I think before you come back to us is I don't know if takes an Act of God of whatever to lower the speed limit to 20

miles an hour. Like you said, speed is the biggest factor so I think that should be the next step in lowering the speed limit on JFK and then also tracking the cars. You know, if you could track it now on Fulton, JFK and Lincoln before you put the humps in then track it six months later, see on the three streets what the effect is and then come back and see how the traffic is. I wish you could count where the cars are coming from but apparently there's a privacy rule or whatever because I think a lot of the cars come up from San Mateo and come that way. So it will be addressed in my resolution.

Miriam Sorell: As far as the races that take place in the park we did do outreach to the race organizers so we have one of our colleagues Dana Ketcham at Recreation and Park who is the events coordinator for Golden Gate Park so through her we reached out and spoke to a handful of race organizers. They did want to learn a little bit more about it. We explained about the type of hump that's going in. We actually went out and visited a few with one of the organizers to see what it felt like in person to ride a bike and jog over it and we also spoke to some race organizers who have organized races in other locations around the country where they do have these speed humps and so we did have that conversation and what we learned is that they're generally not a problem for both footraces or bike races. We would be marking them more aggressively during those races because the markings that we use are at these specific points that apply for one car in each direction but during a race if there's higher concentrations of people we'll be marking along the whole bottom during the races. So we're working with them on how this will play out but that seems like it should be fine.

In terms of the curb to curb speed hump that is our design. We don't want to encourage people to go around them into the gutter. We want people to ride through the center, that's the safest location and any swerving behavior is not encouraged. Folks are allowed to park right up along the speed hump but of course in Golden Gate Park there isn't anybody parked there so we still hope that people will go over the center rather than veer to the side.

In terms of impact on Fulton that is something that we'll be measuring. We're doing four counts at a lot of locations along JFK and we'll be doing after as well as some intersection counts to see which direction people are going. We don't anticipate seeing an appreciable difference on Fulton, there's so much more traffic than JFK to begin with but we are definitely interested in studying that and particularly as we move into this project, the next the phase of the project that's a higher level where we might consider other alternatives we definitely want to have an eye towards are we changing where traffic is going and do we want to be doing that or not. So it's definitely part of the conversation that we're going to be having and what we're going to be looking into.

On Fulton itself you had asked me in email about the crosswalks there so for those of you who don't know we have a number of traffic signals going in on both Fulton and Lincoln in the next couple years and that will create new crossing locations for pedestrians and bicycle riders coming from the Richmond and Sunset Districts. Richard has asked why we don't have crosswalks at every locations. We do have a safety challenge where if you put a crosswalk where there isn't other kind of control like a signal then it can be less safe for somebody to cross the street than encouraging them to use a location with a crosswalk and that's something where there are State standards for what pedestrian volumes are required to encourage a crosswalk. So we

prioritize locations where we get the signals or where there's MUNI stops and other things like that and I can definitely put you in touch with the project managers for that piece. I'm not actually working on that myself.

And then you ask does it take an Act of God to change the speed limit. It might be an Act of State Senate to do it. There are also State rules about what speed limits can be at different locations so that's something that we'll continue to look at but I can't give you a timeframe for that.

Richard Rothman: I mean it's not a State route so why not? Is it too complicated to answer?

Miriam Sorell: There are State established regulations on how we set speed limits and what minimum speed limits can be at different locations. It's complicated. However, what I'll also say is that just changing the speed limit doesn't have a very big impact on how fast people are driving just like on JFK right now the speed limit is 25. Recreation and Park has recently added more signs reminding people that it's 25 but that doesn't stop people from going well above the speed limit so it's actually these other measures like speed humps or changes that we can do to the roadway itself that will encourage people to go more slowly, as well as enforcement. But I think that considering we're already above the speed limit at 25 our goal will be to first get it down.

Patricia Delgado: District 9. I just need some clarification. My understanding is that speed bumps take over the entire roadway. Speed humps are just a little bump in the middle of the roadway.

Miriam Sorell: That's not quite right. A speed bump is usually what you'd see in parking lots. So instead of being this is I think ten or twelve feet it's usually like two feet or so. So a speed bump is very sharp. It's literally this long and you would have to be going like five miles an hour to do it. It's very bad on a bicycle, you can actually fall on your bike. We don't do that on city streets because it expects a speed that's lower than we would ever expect people to go on city streets. So that's something you would see in a parking lot.

What you might be talking about is we have a different thing called a speed cushion which is divided in a way where there are two slots on either side which are to allow a wider based vehicle. So if it's a MUNI route or a route used frequently by the Fire Department then we build a speed cushion where the wider based vehicles can track their wheels through those slots on either side. They're not as effective as speed humps at slowing down traffic.

Patricia Delgado: On Clipper that's what you see and they're calling them speed humps. They're saying—there's a sign that says speed humps ahead.

Miriam Sorell: I think the sign is just because a speed cushion is like a subset of a speed hump.

Ancel Martinez: At large. Thanks staff for showing up and offering your pitch. Just a point of clarification, this resolution was drafted by?

Chair: Richard Rothman and we'll read it into the record.

Ancel Martinez: My question is that in terms of your outreach to different groups did you present and did you receive endorsement or support from the Pedestrian Safety Committee of the city?

Miriam Sorell: We did not go before the Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee. We mapped the timeline of this project and our general understanding of their interests, that's a group that we go before frequently and I think that that's something not typically on their agenda but we may do so when we get to recommendations for the broader project.

Ancel Martinez: I ask because the obvious logic that their constituency at this point that's interested in Zero Vision. Thank you for that answer and the only comment I would add is that do good and logical and I would move to support the resolution.

[simultaneous comments]

Eric Andersen: We did get support from the Bicycle Coalition and they were actually at the hearing with the MTA.

Denis Mosgoffian: District 5. I have a concern that I'll direct at the body but it's actually for you too and that is that as far as I can tell what it appears to be is this is based on input from bicycle riders and as somebody who goes to Golden Gate Park all the time—I live across the street—I find a lot of bicycle riders drive very fast down JFK even, well not quite during Hardly Strictly but very close to that and I've driven in the park most of my life. I've never really experienced a lot of speeding on JFK or in the South Drive because it's not exactly a place where you want to speed other than when we had the Le Mans race back in the 50s here. So I have a concern that if this is based—and I'm not opposed to doing something for Zero Vision, that's not the issue but for me it sounds like one, the only evidence you have is of the unfortunate death of the woman bicyclist in June and you haven't talked to the Pedestrian Safety Folks and it seems that it's rather a response by the MTA for a rather concern and you don't have comparable statistics in terms of the number of injuries or other kinds of accidents that would explain why this is being proposed and yet you've already talked about the idea of looking at it throughout the park. So it seems like there's a solution being proposed but I don't hear that there was grounds for it and I'm not opposed to doing anything for pedestrian safety or bicycle safety but it's really unidirectional only, it's not sufficient grounds. You should do more work and know more about both the rate of injuries as well as what other folks think about it before you launch this thing which then becomes a precedent for a parkwide proposal and then will go to other places. It needs to be more grounded and I know the Bike Coalition has a very powerful influence on MTA but I think maybe you need more evidence.

Miriam Sorell: Just to add clarification—although there was that fatality that sort of spread us to action we did measure actual speeds. So we did go out there and do an actual measurement of speeds and this is this is something that we do throughout the city when we get requests for speed humps and it exceeded our threshold for where we would consider a speed hump an

appropriate measure. While the Bike Coalition is certainly interested in improving safety in Golden Gate Park they certainly did not suggest speed humps, that recommendation did not come from them. And we did look at collisions on JFK Drive and found that speeding was a factor in a number of the collisions that we saw. So in terms of the broader project that is something where we're not saying speed humps is going to be our go-to tool. We're saying for the broader project we're going to look at all the different collision data and speed data and circulation data that we have and then find out what the most appropriate tools are.

[simultaneous comments]

Miriam Sorell: Then also what I showed before. We already knew that this was a high injury location for bicycle riders.

Denis Mosgofian: What about pedestrians?

Miriam Sorell: It's not on the high injury network for—yeah, it's not a high injury network for pedestrians but it certainly benefits pedestrians immensely by slowing down the speed because pedestrians in Golden Gate Park cross frequently at locations all along the length because there's not the density of cars and there's the destinations all up and down.

Nick Belloni: Just a quick question. Since we're talking about all this speed humps and stuff like that and you're saying that people speed there and everything, have we looked at maybe having enforcement?

Miriam Sorell: We do have enforcement after the fatality the Police Department set up a temporary speed radar sign and was conducting enforcement out there but that's not our agency.

Nick Belloni: I drive it almost every day I haven't seen one, I literally haven't seen one cop, one Park Patrol, anything out there. So if you're saying that I'm just saying I haven't seen it. So I'm curious about.

Eric Andersen: Maybe they're there midday.

Nick Belloni: I go at commute time and I see nothing. So that might be something to think about too because enforcement actually is probably a better way to deal with speeders than humps and this and that.

Chair: That sounds like a good end to that comment. Are there any other members with questions? Is there any public comment? Julia Raskin. You have two minutes to speak.

Julia Raskin: I'm a community organizer with the San Francisco Bicycle Coalition. The tragedy of June 22nd when two people were killed riding their bicycles in San Francisco is still fresh in the minds of many people who live in the city. When Mayor Ed Lee issued the Executive Directive in August bolstering his commitment to making our streets safe for everything he committed to reducing the speeds on JFK Drive where one of the fatal collisions

occurred at 30th Avenue. The proposal from the SFMTA and Recreation and Park to add these nine speed humps and one raised crosswalk is an inexpensive and short-term measure for reducing speeds through the park. The bicycle coalition appreciates the responsiveness especially in light of the Executive Directive. As an addition to this proposal we are encouraging the SFMTA to do a speed survey before and after implementation to measure the effectiveness of speed humps and common speeds along the corridor. The San Francisco Bicycle Coalition has historically advocated for opening access to park for people biking and walking and strongly believes that parks are for people. That is why we support speed humps as a preliminary measure and we are advocating for a circulation study to consider long-term solutions like traffic diversion to reduce the inflow through traffic, another task that's outlined in the Executive Directive. This would make the park more welcoming to people of all ages and abilities to either walk or bike safely in the park. Thank you. We look forward to continued improvements to ensure Golden Gate Park is a destination location and not a thoroughfare for fast-moving vehicles commuting through treasured urban space.

Michelle Jacques-Menegaz: I am a San Francisco resident. I live in the Richmond District, in the mid-Richmond, and I work in Cole Valley. I commute by walking, biking, bussing, I have to drive more than I'd like. So I often am witness to the commute time around the big intersection of Fell and Oak and Stanyan and it's been a wonderful thing of the years that I've lived in the city, about thirty years, to see the increase in bicycle use especially as a commute tool. I used to do that a long time ago before there was a legal right to ride, we'd get honked at and traffic and it was get out of the street, crazy stuff. So anyway what I would like to say is also my fiancée lives on the other side of the park from me and I often cut through at around 41st. I do see people speed. I do drive my car through the park sometimes as a way to relax instead of driving in the craziness on Fulton but when I do I do the speed limit and I get tailgated frequently. So I do see a lot of speeding. I have kids. I work at a school so we try to do a lot of our families bike and walk so I'm very much in support of these measures. I have had speed humps put in on my street at 18th Avenue and while it hasn't been a cure-all it has slowed down some of the traffic speed so I will speak to that. I just have one other thing to add and this isn't necessarily something that's part of this but I think it's part of a larger picture is that I come upon bicyclists all the time in the dusk hours and at night and they're invisible because there's no or insufficient lighting and I'm sure there's lots of ways for that to be fixed but it's just something I think to be said in the mix of everything is a bit of personal responsibility to make sure you can be seen. Thank you.

Chair: Is there any other public comment on this item? May.

May Wong: I just wanted to tag on to what Nick said. You mentioned enforcement and I thought that the roads in parks belong to Recreation and Park, not the city. If that is the case then we need to get our Park Patrol out there or have some arrangement with Park Police Station to actually use motorcycle cops in the park during certain peak hours when you know people are going to go speeding through.

Chair: Thank you. So I'm going to turn the floor over to Richard Rothman who has spent time composing a resolution which you all should have. Richard, if you'd like to read it into the record, let the members speak about it.

Richard Rothman: First I want to thank May and Jordyn for this input resolution, Golden Gate Park Vision Zero plan. Whereas Mayor Edwin Lee asked SFMTA and the Recreation and Park Department to develop a Vision Zero plan to reduce traffic speed and to reduce the number of pedestrian injuries and deaths in Golden Gate Park. Whereas studies have shown significant increase in the likely hood of death upon impact of a person walking or riding a bike in various areas due to the higher than normal vehicle speed. Whereas the Department has identified JFK as one of the city's Vision Zero networks that require the roads to be improved to ensure pedestrian, biking, and driving safety throughout the parks. Whereas SFMTA has developed a short-term plan to install nine speed humps and one raised speed crosswalk on JFK Drive between Transverse Drive and the Great Highway. Whereas both District 1, 5 and 4 are the northern and southern borders of Golden Gate Park, whereas the second phase of Golden Gate Park Vision Zero needs to include plans to make it safe for the resident of District 1, 4 and 5 to walk to Golden Gate Park, whereas SFMTA needs to do an assessment of the effects of the speed humps on the number of vehicles on JFK, Lincoln Way, and Fulton Street before and after the nine speed humps are installed. Be I resolved that the Recreation and Park Open Space Advisory Committee supports the first phase of the Golden Gate Park Vision plan and asks the SFMTA to return in six months to report on the effects of the speed humps on the traffic on JFK, Lincoln Way, and Fulton Street.

Mark Scheuer: I have a question. In the third paragraph it says injury networks that required road be improved. What did you mean by road be improved?

Richard Rothman: Well, like putting in the speed humps.

Mark Scheuer: It's probably a moot point but improved could mean retarred or made smoother or something and I think it's different than improvements what we're proposing.

Richard Rothman: Right.

Denis Mosgofian: District 5. A question on the resolved, where it says to return in six months following the implementation. I mean, we don't want six months following this. Just a technical point.

Richard Rothman: That's a good point, okay. [simultaneous comments] Actually, it's going to be implemented next month. [simultaneous comments]

Denis Mosgofian: So after the word months following implementation is what I would propose to inset.

Jordyn Aquino: I just wanted to respond to Mark's question about—the third paragraph about JFK Drive as one of the city's Vision Zero high injury networks. So that was described in the Vision Zero two year strategic plan that is available online. So even before implementing the new nine speed humps it was already indicated as a high injury route.

Chair: I think Mark's question is about specific wording. Is it improved—is that how it reads in the statement?

Jordyn Aquino: In the statement it was to be improved.

Richard Rothman: Any other questions?

Linda D'Avirro: I have a question for my own edification. So six months goes by following implementation and it turns out it didn't work out. Do these get scraped up or what? You mentioned there's a phase II. This sounds like this is pretty much a fait accompli going in at nine rather than maybe something less and then after that we come back and we talk about it in six months and you say well you know it's still fast or something. Then what happens? If it doesn't work out are these permanent now?

Marian Surell: Technically it's about as much work to take them out as put them in.

Linda D'Avirro: Is that anticipated or is that unlikely?

Marian Surell: Unlikely but it is true that the process we will undergo for broader improvements include things that cost as much or more as removing humps to it's not out of the question if it turns out that there's no data showing effectiveness combined with recommendations for other improvements.

Linda D'Avirro: So then where do you go from here? I'm curious how much additional infrastructure building will go into this particular part of the park. We're not there yet, okay.

Chair: That's why we'll hear about it six months after implementation. Mark?

Mark Scheuer: I was going to offer alternate language. This is the third paragraph. It would say blah, blah, blah Vision Zero high [unintelligible] networks that require that safety improvements be made to ensure that pedestrians blah, blah, blah.

Male Speaker: I second that, that's good.

Richard Rothman: Say that again.

Mark Scheuer: Basically after the work require—require that safety improvements be made to ensure that—finish it any way you want.

Richard Rothman: Yeah that's okay, yeah.

Chair: So jot it down. Any other input on this resolution. Richard is accepting both Denis and Mark's change. Robert?

Robert Brust: I'd like to move that we accept this.

Denis Mosgofian: Second.

Chair: So this was moved by Robert Brust and seconded by Denis Mosgofian. All in favor of adopting this resolution? Is that unanimous? Sharon's wasn't up. So by my count that's fifteen to one. The resolution moves, it's accepted.

Richard Rothman: Thank you.

Chair: I'm going to turn the floor over now to Linda D'Avirro and Jordyn Aquino who are going to present on equity metrics the subcommittee perspective. This item is now on the agenda simply because I feel as did the subcommittee that the Recreation and Park Department pretty much came in and gave us their perspective on equity metrics and I think there was some back and forth discussion but at the behest of many members they felt like we had this subcommittee, they spent a lot of time researching, they spent a lot of time talking amongst themselves about what this looks like and in fact they never really got a chance to be heard. Part of this committee is the idea that if we create a subcommittee they go to work and they have the right to come back here and speak to the items they are a subcommittee around.

So this item has now been added to the agenda with the intention of Linda making this presentation and for your feedback. Taylor is here from the Department in case there are questions although this really does pertain to the subcommittee on equity metrics. Denis, yes?

Denis Mosgofian: One quick thought for everybody. So this is intended as a recommendation to the Commission as advise rather than a resolution up or down. It's not a pro or con to the equity metrics because we were all okay with the idea of the introduction of equity metrics. They just need to be, we thought, more precise.

Chair: I guess then that really leads to what is the outcome if we support what you're saying as opposed to supporting what the Department says?

Denis Mosgofian: The answer would be that this becomes a communication to the Commission from the body, unless the body doesn't agree with the observations we've made and the assessments and recommendations, that's all.

Chair: But we're not offering a resolution to support this particular perspective.

Linda D'Avirro: What we're offering is what we think is additional considerations that we would like ultimately Recreation and Park to introduce going forward in their equity metrics. Perhaps it's already in there, perhaps not and perhaps you'll take note of some of the things we've brought up and I know in our conversation back and forth through email there were some changes and clarifications in both directions. So as was mentioned earlier this is a work in progress. We expect it to remain a work in progress which would hopefully include our observations and our requests for things. We are not in opposition to equity metrics. What we're offering you is some of our viewpoints that we would like to present as our body reports to the Commission. We don't report to Recreation and Park, we report to the Commission so this would be a report to the Commission that we have observed the presentations of the equity

metrics. We have some additional items that we would like to take a look at and incorporated perhaps.

Chair: Robert.

Robert Brust: We would have to ask the body's endorsement to send this as a letter to the Commission's meeting at the end of this month? I didn't plan to do that.

Chair: That would be the outcome as far as the action. The action would be to sent a recommendation, this recommendation as our perspective as a body. [simultaneous comments]

Linda D'Avirro: So Jordyn is going to tell us—we all met by the way.

Jordyn Aquino: Before we begin the presentation I just want to applaud everybody of the working ground—Linda, Denis, Ana and Robert. It took us a lot of research and detail to come together for this presentation.

The first screen we like to begin is that the equity metrics have been described by the Department as a lens through which everything will be viewed. Since the lens is a way for everything to be viewed we now indicate that the lens is the system of metrics and the metrics are the lens. We found that equity metrics should be described almost like the Hubble telescope. We do want to make sure that the lens is put on right before it is adopted and so it does describe a positive set for change for a more equitable distribution of properties.

And with that being said with the Hubble telescope we do want to see the Department tweak some needs prior to the equity metrics launch and I believe this will be a lens that will be challenging to adjust.

Female Speaker: [unintelligible]

Jordyn Aquino: Before the subcommittee these are the steps of our recommendation. We would want to see the Department first [unintelligible] whether it's decisive and difference-making and equitable resource distribution. The second step would be to prioritize the Department's strategic and operations work plans in the equity metrics so everything from improving and maintaining the lower quality parks and playgrounds in every disadvantaged or equity zone.

A second way would be to acquire and develop parks and playgrounds in disadvantaged areas of equity zone where there are too few parks and playgrounds that currently exist. And then secondly would be to implement equity metrics based on two themes that we came up. So catching up [unintelligible] and the theme of no community left behind in San Francisco.

Within the research that we did as a subcommittee we did look into the Minneapolis Recreation and Parks Board and just to paraphrase their outcome they did use clear equity guidelines for how the projects are selected and prioritized over other projects. The investment of large amounts of funding for capital and major rehabilitation projects and to public amenities and

infrastructure is something that should be done with clear equity guidelines for how projects are selected and prioritized over other projects.

Linda D'Avirro: I think that's where we mentioned as well that what—even though you have a process in place what's really important to all of us it to know what those priorities are in a capital work plan, in the operations work plan, because again having all of this in place means it has to be implemented and how it's implemented is where the crux of the whole process either begins or delays further improvements in parks than the equity zones.

Jordyn Aquino: So from our evaluation PROSAC fully supports and promotes equity metrics first and foremost that are based on the [unintelligible] equity metrics, so everything from unemployment, poverty, [unintelligible] isolation, children, youth and seniors, low education, asthma and low birth weight as described by the Department, the absence of parks and playgrounds in specified equity zones and inquiring and developing parks and playgrounds in disadvantaged areas or equity zones where too few parks and playground exist.

Linda D'Avirro: And this is our add because we want to emphasize that the absence of playgrounds is very important as well. In some cases—we'll talk about that later.

Denis Mosgofian: One point we noted that the metrics don't measure lack of existing parks, existing playgrounds and measure the quality but it's something that's missing. In District 6 it doesn't measure it specifically and so in the Controller's report—and I think is it coming up? There's a slide on the Controller's report where when the Controller was measuring maintenance scores interestingly enough District 6 scored higher than District 8 but everybody in town knows that District 8 has some really lovely parks and lots of them and District 6 is suffering from a lack of. It was an example of how the absence of information is not reflected in metrics.

Chair: So you're saying that attributed to the fact that they don't keep score on things that don't exist. [simultaneous comments] Do you want to respond to that?

Linda D'Avirro: We're going to also have that on a separate slide.

Jordyn Aquino: So what else we've come up with as the working group is we would hope to see a listing of each park and playground in terms of the lowest performing ranked at the top in order to know where we would start. We would also want to see the Department to prioritize any strategic plan for investment that disadvantaged communities or equity zones with the least parks should get the first investment. Lastly, we would want to see the Department prioritize in their operations plan that the lowest ranked parks in equity zones received badly needed maintenance and increased staffing from the Department.

As we were doing our research we noticed that there were some missing metrics from the original presentation that were given to us by the Department. The first one is that there is no equity metric that correlates the need for staffing and resources with the programming at certain facilities or parks and playgrounds that would ultimately represent the advanced Department community planning to ensure sustainable improvements in the equity zones.

Another issue that we address is the actual accessibility of park in equity zones. So, the current equity metrics measure accessibility isn't really based on the on-grounds means of accessing one entrance of the park and that's the buffer areas equity zones misrepresent of many five-minute walks to parks. So that could be the hills that it takes for someone just to walk to a park or having [unintelligible].

Linda D'Avirro: Or no entrance at all so they have to go somewhere else.

Jordyn Aquino: Another issue that we found was that some equity zones ignore census tracts so that mean we found those metric currently omit thousands of non-equity zone residents who reside within [unintelligible] and presumably as a routine use of these equity parks and facilities are the nearby dwellers of the equity zone. Instead, these metrics suggest that 100 percent of the resources provided to equity parks are solely devoted to equity zone dwellers and people within a five-minute walk of such and will mislead the Department in distributing Department resources.

One thing we also found was that the current equity zones metrics double-count some parks and playgrounds in San Francisco. So this shows some examples that equity zones are double-counting parks within the same park and located in the same place. [unintelligible] and Herbst Playground and [unintelligible].

In addition to double-counting equity zones the equity focus parks which was provided to us in last month's presentation such as Garfield Square, James [unintelligible] Playground, Little Hollywood, Potrero Del Sol, Potrero Recreation Center are listed in both equity zones and non-equity zones and so we're not sure if they will ever be included in the final document for the October 20th Commission meeting.

Linda D'Avirro: As a result they're still double-counted and that was based on an email that we exchanged with Taylor when we pointed that out and when I asked what this equity focus park category was it was defined as other parks that are not caught within the definition of disadvantaged communities but that nonetheless serve communities in need. So they're like equity zone and then some other ones that we really wish equity zones. I'm sure Taylor will fix an update on that.

Jordyn Aquino: Another issue that we found was totally based on Lincoln Park. So in the current equity metrics the Department lists Lincoln Park as an equity zone marine park but we find that inaccurate because on the Recreation and Park website it does indicate that this 100 acre park in the city's northwestern corner offers superb views of downtown, the Golden Gate Park, and the Marin Headlands. It's main features are an eighteen hold public golf course and the Legion of Honor Museum. So we also noted that the only roadway entrance of the corner of 33rd and Clement is within a five-minute walk from 33rd Avenue and Geary. The most northern tip apparently based on largely language isolation.

Linda D'Avirro: I don't know if you want to add to that [unintelligible].

Denis Mosgofian: It's a wonderful park and it goes all the Golden Gate Straights. It has nothing really whatsoever to do with an equity zone. The equity zone identified on the map originally from 29th Avenue along Fulton to 35th Avenue extends up to 33rd and Geary but that's the only point at which that would have any relationship to Lincoln Park and Lincoln Park is a really gorgeous park in a very well-off area including Sea Cliff and the outer Richmond.

Richard Rothman: I didn't realize Lincoln Park was not on the list until Dana sent me an email but I have no objections to taking it out. There actually is a playground on Clement and 32nd and it was just fixed up in 2012. I think it looks modern to me and the only thing it really needs is a—

Linda D'Avirro: When we're done we can talk about where we want to go from here.

Nick Belloni: How are you taking 33rd and Geary to 33rd and Clement a five-minute walk, that's a two-minute walk if that.

Denis Mosgofian: The issue is in equity zones there's a buffer zone. Remember the map?

Nick Belloni: No, no, I know. I'm asking how is that a five-minute walk? Basically my question comes down to [simultaneous comments].

Denis Mosgofian: Let me explain the point. The point is the metrics are the lens as Phil explain to us on several occasions. He told us twice. Everything that the park is going to do through operations and strategy is going to be viewed through the lens. If the lens is including places like this beautiful 100 acre park in a well-off area of San Francisco in an equity zones or disadvantaged zone it doesn't make any sense and excuse the number, that's the point.

Linda D'Avirro: That's the point!

Nick Belloni: I'm still not getting my question answered.

Denis Mosgofian: If you want to dispute the five minutes, that's fine.

Chair: I think the bigger picture is if it's being claimed by an equity zone and we know based on the Department's own verbiage on their website that this is a wonderful park in a luxurious neighborhood and it is only the language isolation that in fact defines it as an equity zone that's a concern.

Linda D'Avirro: I'm going to move on. The next one is [unintelligible] in equity zones. That was the other thing that came up that was a question in our minds. There's five—Maritime, Union Square, Justin Herman, Japantown Peace Plaza, and they're all shown as equity zone serving parks. These are all well-known tourist sites and in their locations many of them are going to have historic significance and there's no doubt about it. But as such they're a separate class of parks and so our interpretation when we were working on getting the charter amendment in place was the parks that reside in neighborhoods where those of us who lives here recreate and so it was of concern to us that these are in there to begin with whether or not they touch an equity

zone. So it results in an aberrant result and three of the four plazas are in the heart of the Financial District and mostly used by shoppers, work people—nothing against them but it's not quite the concept that the rest of those parks are residing in the neighborhoods. The fourth is within a commercial mall, the Peace Plaza, and they're all tourist areas. Union Square also has [unintelligible] and then Maritime Plaza surrounds the Alcoa Building. Justin Herman is right at the Ferry Plaza Building. So we just found that was kind of odd or at least questioned when you talk about resources so those be given the same weight as some of the other things.

Jordyn Aquino: One thing that was highlighted in the Department's presentation about equity metrics was the San Francisco Police Department results and we found that those incidents currently include a lot of traffic problems, illegal left turns and other infractions. However, we do believe that the SFPD incidents should not include everyday type of events but should only include incidents that directly affect the safety and security of those in the parks or accessing the parks.

Linda D'Avirro: The RPD metrics scores don't identify the lack of parks and playgrounds or [unintelligible] in specific zones. That's a problem when you rely on just statistics and we found this particularly in McLaren Park where we have five ghost parks and so going back to the days when there was the failing playgrounds with the Neighborhood Parks Council was still around we never had a chance to say hey we'd like these parks back that were removed because things were dismantled because of malfunction. And it was too bad. It never existed. So that's what we're seeing here, again. There's areas particularly we're talking about in this case McLaren Park I'm sure there's other parks throughout the city that I don't even know about but then we're going back to District 6 where there's a high need but there isn't anything in there about that.

So it needs to be something and we don't have necessarily the answer for you Taylor but we want you to be cognizant of the fact that somewhere that has to be acknowledged and as Denis mentioned earlier if you go strictly on a statistics basis District 6 you're in good shape. [unintelligible] high standards on maintenance but you don't have any open space so the one or two that you do have it's in great shape. Where District 8 is a lower graded park.

Again, another parks, mini parks, and community gardens are rated the same. The whole list is a combination because, again, it's the equity zone and within that zone are mini parks, community gardens, playgrounds, tennis courts, plazas and the issue again comes back to a distinction. We have to make a distinction. The list can't be a be-all, end-all where everything is applied equally because so many parks are just pathways and I know we have one in our neighborhood [unintelligible] and all it is just a walkway from a higher to a lower street. Does it need money? Probably not. Some parks are just open space. Do you need money on an open space? Maybe some, you know, repair of maybe a walkway once in a while but not the same as maybe a full park.

Community gardens are for a few limited number of people and they're usually gated and if you're going to spend on those it's usually capital dollars not maintenance.

So our point is that not all equity zone parks on the list can be equally weighted and with the limited amount of capital and operations budget we feel a distinction has to be made on the highest need with the broadest [unintelligible] in delivering the equity.

Jordyn Aquino: Another issue we found was scores versus observations. This is the [unintelligible] some of the statistics that were given to us originally. So in the current equity metrics park maintenance evaluation scores in both equity and non-equity zones are within 1.5 points and maintenance and repair costs are within a 0.5 point. So this also suggests that the Department has little to do to even the scores and so we believe that observing the quality of parks is much more a subjective metric than the quantity of the actual park maintenance score.

So eyes on the ground and resources applied accordingly are the only means of changing the reality of the overall quality of parks.

Linda D'Avirro: As far as a pathway forward we encourage RPD to create and promote an innovation generation program. We think that if it's open to the public and to staff and to have creative ideas and an action for improving the quality and functionality of a park I think it goes a long way because a lot of the ideas that come out of Recreation and Park are insular they're often based on the way things have always been done and it's kind of hard to break out of that silo as we call it. We encourage you to add innovation program where people might come up from the public and say hey why don't you do blah, blah, blah and it makes all the world of difference. I don't know you if you've thought of that but we certainly did. I know there was a slight reference but not a very strong one in the strategic plan. I think we're about something more broadly embraced and implemented and also we encourage in our strategic plan to increase community outreach and promotion of local business owner, community leaders and neighborhood groups and included in that is using more translated materials because that's probably one of the biggest complaints that certainly I hear and many of us who work in parks is there's just not enough communication of outreach to people and what we use a lot of times isn't working for whatever reason that is. We're got different cultures who maybe are again monolingual or there's reasons, maybe they have to take care of their kids so they can't come to a night meeting or a weekday meeting, they can't come to the Commission is you work. We think there's a hecka lot than can be done.

Jordyn Aquino: In addition to our Pathway to Miracles we found out there can be no substitute for the direct input and feedback in those areas which are being addressed. So we really need to hear community feedback from people living or near equity zones. We would suggest that the Department use surveys and other outreach tools to develop the assessment in order to gauge resident demand and programming gaps in order for the Department to significantly improve outreach involvement with every residence directly affected by the poor quality parks and playgrounds in their communities and the way that we found that in the Department strategic plan was by inspiring play and recreation and that the Department be encouraged to increase person to person outreach.

Ultimately the community is a vital part of the equity conversation so within the strategic plan as we mentioned before a significant increase in community outreach with leaders, business owners and neighborhood groups.

Linda D'Avirro: More importantly we want to emphasize we should let the community set the priorities too. A lot of times the way it works today is in spite of what the three meetings that everybody else has it's usually top down and a perception whether it's reality there's a perception that the conclusion has already been made. I think that where we see real equity occurring is when you let the community set priorities because perhaps in some communities the most important part for them is a community garden, maybe for another one it's an open natural area, not a fences one but an open one that they can enjoy. But in another community it might be a playground structure and a clubhouse and a soccer field. So I think that's where that has been probably the shortcoming of many of the past plans is that it's a top down and the community says why do we get this. So that's where we see you can do it.

Jordyn Aquino: So we do fine with the top priority is that the equity metrics must address a lack of parks and playgrounds in designated high needs areas. This goes back to areas where there's a lot of parks and playgrounds especially in certain districts. We want the Department to develop more open space, to address population growth in high needs areas and also within the strategic plan forecast and illustrate how much open space can be potentially acquired within the next three, five or ten years for each District.

Linda D'Avirro: Taylor, you may not have been at the meetings where Dawn and Stacy have been but Dawn has said over and over and over again that rather than being reactive we have to active and now that we have the passing of the charter and there is thirty years' horizon there are different ways that in case we want to generate revenue perhaps we can do it rather than bonds. It may not be to everybody's liking but something has to be done and there has to be a plan ahead where neighborhoods that has growth do have some sort of a plan in place where perhaps when this building is next up for sale we buy it, something where there's a plan because at the rate we're going by the time we wait until we have enough money on a daily basis of every year property taxes are collected the open space is going to be gone and we're talking about District 6 and District 10 [unintelligible] might come up in Chinatown.

Jordyn Aquino: We would also want to propose that the Department make sure that they serve community needs particularly in equity zone with the proper staff and numbers. So most of the times maintenance operations we would want them to higher and get a new team of permanent fulltime gardeners and maintenance workers assigned to only the lowest rated parks and facilities in the equity zones.

So another recommendation that our working group did have is that a clear equity lens would ensure that all people have access to the benefits of local parks and recreation so we ultimately urge the Department to create individual service and maintenance plans for every park and facility with a particular focus and priority on the low performing parks. So the goal ultimately is to bring these parks and facilities up to what the community grades is a well-kept and adequately funded park

Our conclusion is to focus on these themes of catching up, no excuses San Francisco, and no community left behind San Francisco.

Linda D'Avirro: Our recommendation is that we hope—PROSAC urges the Recreation and Park Commission and RPD to adopt its assessment of discrepancies and recommend charges to the September 1st, RPD metric implementation charter section 16.17. There you go [unintelligible] from about 150 years ago. That's Golden Gate Park through a stereograph and that's the Conservatory of Flowers. Here we are, a group, there's the five of us that put all of this together. Thank you.

Are there any questions?

Chair: I'll take questions. There are certain pieces here that maybe the Department wants to respond to and I was hoping to leave that to you if there's anything in particular you feel you'd like to address within their presentation. I want to say thank you to the working group. This is how PROSAC gets stuff done, resolutions versus having really fleshed-out understandings of presentations. Thank you. Again, I would encourage any one of you that feels strongly in the future to please join the working group and become part of the voice. Are there any questions? You have a question about your own presentation Richard?

Robert Brust: Yes. I want to make a statement and support Jordyn and Linda in this. If we as a committee identified anything it was the difficulty of the task of coming up with a lens. It's definitely going to be a work in progress. It's something I think PROSAC is going to have to keep its eye on as the years go on. Each committee member is going to have to look at their own District and the parks in their District and see if they are getting their fair share. What I think is the important thing in the presentation was the Pathways to Equity! Where we are asking sometimes for out and out miracles. We know there's not going to be funds available right away for some of these things but I think it's up to the city and Department to identify how much it would cost to bring the parks up to standards.

I know that a lot of this was going on. I was at the fundraiser last week for the Strategic Alliance for Parks and they're working at the Recreation and Park Department to raise money for the underfunded playgrounds. They're set a goal at a \$1 million or something. I think that's the general direction we need to go.

Chair: Does anybody else have a comment?

Denis Mosgofian: I just want to tell you there was a point where we were going over the material and all of the notes and it got to the point where I thought there's no way I'm going to sort my way through this, this is too complex. At some point all of a sudden it started to turn into something we could understand and get a hold of. Everybody else worked harder than I did but it was pretty impressive to actually turn this around and be able to see more clearly from where we were at one point. I was feeling like I had way too much material and couldn't get through it. But we did. I want to thank everybody. This was an extremely impressive piece of work that finally Linda put together after everybody else put the material in.

Chair: I will root back to the subcommittee that dealt with Prop B. Your willingness to spend volunteer hours as you serve on this committee whilst other people are paid salaries to work through these problems speaks to your commitment to wanting to have a great outcome. Again,

we worked hard, we all testified, we supported B in nature but maybe not word for word but we still came out and supported. So I think it's important to go on record as saying as a body generally we support the Department's want for these numbers. What we don't see or maybe where this is triggered from and certainly this will get back to the powers that be is to include us as a partner as opposed to coming to us and telling us what they're going to do because in essence that immediately creates friction between the committee and Department. I would by proxy suggest to certain people that they engage with this committee as opposed to dictating what the plan is and then vetting it through multiple meetings and I think what we see clearly here is a lot of brains doing a lot of work to keep everybody in the same room. But again without this presentation some of us might choose to support this without knowing what's going to happen. I think our big selling point right out of the gate to me is if the Hubble is wrong in orbit we'll never had the right [unintelligible] and this is to the Department that happens more often than you know and you guys know it not just with Recreation and Park but in general I think if we cast the ship out of the harbor and wave bye fixing it after the fact is not going to happen or only at great cost.

So I think this is a very important time for us to be active in this particular topic. Again, I ask any other members for your input on this because this may be the last time we touch on this. I know we're going to hear about the strategic plan, I know you touched on the strategic plan to some extent, but this item is really equity metrics, two separates things even though they're woven. And so again I ask any other members do you have any other comments related to this presentation as it pertains to equity metrics? Richard.

Richard Ivanhoe: District 5. Well, we've heard that equity metrics is new territory. We're all stumbling through trying to discover the best way to develop metrics and just hope the Department is willing to incorporate some of this.

Chair: Any other members of the committee?

Female Speaker: I just feel like I beat a dead horse. On the record as the person who represents the park that is the most deprived per square foot per person clearly breaking it out is important. Even in the districts there are subdistricts within neighborhood. So obviously the Tenderloin and central SOMA even though they're part of District 6 are clearly deprived and need to be prioritize.

Chair: Denis, something else?

Denis Mosgofian: One short remark. As a native San Franciscan I've known even since I was a kid which areas of the city have been deprived and it's some of the same areas, all my life. So maybe this is a real step forward.

Chair: I'll add—as the Chair I don't like to put in my two cents but I would like to say because I wasn't really a part of this committee there's one term that keeps coming back and it's boots on the ground and I think it's important to note that during the 2007-2008 years when I was a member of this committee all we heard about was cuts, all we heard about was less gardeners, all we heard about was less people on the ground. So I would just like to iterate that in

this equation putting some people back to work or putting people back to areas where they say yeah we did it with one gardener for the past six years so why do we need to have that same person? Well the truth is your workforce is getting stressed and your workforce is not performing up to its optimum because they're still somewhat understaffed and I say that only from the standpoint of somebody who listens to gardeners and again I think this talks a lot about higher vision for areas that are deprived. Are those areas—those are the questions—are those areas deprived because during those budget shortfalls staff was cut and have you restored that staff? Is there a level back to where they need to be to be positive and create a good space? So that would be an area that I personally champion is more boots on the ground, less management jobs and more gardeners, that's what I would change.

Patricia Delgado: District 9. I think we also need to remember that the eastern neighborhoods were basically the industrial zone portion of the city, those are the new neighborhoods and those are the neighborhoods that are crying for open space now where prior to this time they were where the factories were, they were where the warehouses were. They were where the waterfront was and as the city changes our needs change so we can't be too hard on the Department for saying District 9 or District 6 doesn't have enough because District 6 is changing. So we need to remember that as we grow we need to put our resources where we can.

Richard Rothman: I just wanted to add to what Steffen say. While I wasn't on PROSAC when they had the big budget cuts I was active in my union and the Recreation and Park playground directors they took a massive hit and other classes too but this was one of the classes that really got cut and for District 1 the one area in our area I mean the only thing I would want in the two playgrounds at Cabrillo and Fulton is just to have Recreation and Park staff there. I don't know if they're there even in the afternoon but nobody is there on the weekend except when they rent it out and they pay somebody but I would like to see Recreation and Park besides maintenance bring back—see what the levels were before 2008 and bring that out and hire the city workers and not privatize it out and let's try to bring it back to the pre-08 level where it was. I mean it's a shame, they fixed up Cabrillo Playground, I live across from it, but I never see it open. The only time I see it open is when they rent it out and there's a party there but I think it should be open more. That's would I would like to see.

Linda D'Avirro: One of the things we input in there was my original presentation which we gave it at the lodge involved some data points and I don't know again Taylor what those data points if they're all incorporated so some day we need to go back to that original list which I have and I can resend it to you because I matched them up the strategic plan items. But one of the things we focused on was the NERPA standards for staffing and that's a really key point. McLaren Park for example the NERPA level for gardeners for the size of the park is ten. We have one and a half. We've had one and a half for many years. Those are the kinds of things that speak to what you're talking about in addition to programming which is also part of the NERPA is they have levels of programming requirements that supports communities.

Richard Rothman: Yeah, even our gardeners I know that the section Supervisor I haven't talked to him recently but you know he's having a hard time keeping—we're supposed to have I think six gardeners in the Richmond District and he has a hard time and he's even saying now he can't hire people because they can't afford to live in the city. I know gardeners make a pretty

good wage and I haven't checked lately but every time I've checked we've never had a full complement of gardeners.

Chair: So Taylor obviously there was a lot of discussion. [simultaneous comments]

Taylor: This is seeing it. I look forward to going back to work tomorrow and trying to figure out and categorize some of these recommendations and see [unintelligible]. I want to remind the committee that acquisitions has its own policy, Karen Monty-Brodeck worked through PROSAC to craft acquisition policy and so those have been adopted.

Money spent towards acquisitions is counted in the capital line of the proposed metrics because the charter specifies capital renovation and acquisitions which is one reason it is so high in the equity zone because there's so much money going towards acquisitions. So I just wanted to clarify those two different—

Linda D'Avirro: No. We know that.

Taylor: On the second to last leg it had what your goal was, before the historic slide. It seemed like exactly what our goal was, to have all the staff we need to make every park fantastic which of course is our shared goal. [simultaneous comments]

Male Speaker: But is specific on the low performing parks, that was the point.

Taylor: Of course. We want to bring all the parks up, have the floor be 85 percent. I'm happy to great all this great feedback and some fantastic ideas. Some of the ideas actually reflect the next steps. Just to remind everyone we're going to Commission—

Linda D'Avirro: We really need to hear that.

Taylor: We're going to Commission with the equity analysis and metrics because it's part of the charter in October. Then we get to do the fun part which is take all that great information and put it into the strategic plan, the capital plan, and the operation plan. So all the fun stuff is actually ahead. We've started to apply the equity lens to our strategic plan and we're going to be talking about that a little bit at SPUR on the 11th and then after that we're definitely bringing the strategic plan back here and I think that you'll see some of these ideas played out there because really the equity analysis and metrics is just the data. Now it's like the policy part of it is applying that data into the allocation of our Recreation and Park resources and services.

Linda D'Avirro: I think too that we want to emphasize some of the things we pointed out like Lincoln Park. I really urge you to look at some of these.

Taylor: Let me talk about Lincoln Park. You know we've been very—

Linda D'Avirro: But not just Lincoln Park but the plazas! Some of these really ended up in equity zones but we hope that when you go forward on the policy part you're not going to be putting equal amounts of emphasis on those [simultaneous comments].

Taylor: [unintelligible] I'm with you on that.

Linda D'Avirro: It's in the data. [simultaneous comments]

Taylor: This is the challenging part of all this. We wanted to have a real analysis and intellectual consistency and not have it be equity by anecdote because when we mapped the scholarship data for example which there's no subject [unintelligible] if you're poor enough you get a scholarship. When we mapped the scholarship across the city there are scholarships everywhere. There are disadvantaged people in Seacliff and Pacific Heights and Noe Valley. So this is a very challenging.

Richard Rothman: There's no disadvantaged people in Seacliff.

Taylor: They're cash poor I guess.

Linda D'Avirro: Again, this is consideration of things that jumped out at us. One of the things I do want to mention is that again we didn't talk about details but you and I exchange a lot of TMAs and I didn't want to belabor that here because I'm looking forward to your next iteration. TMAs which are the work orders—it's the total managed assets program and that could be something as simple as painting over graffiti versus a structural deficiency such as the slide at Crocker Amazon right now with the big hold in it. How long do those stay in queue because as I mentioned to you on the email when we had Denny Kern here he mentioned the 4500 and he said, and rightfully so and understandably so, that the first thing that happens is emergencies. So all the other TMAs so sit over there and wait. And then after that is health and safety. Those TMAs that are already in there sit and wait.

Chair: What?

Linda D'Avirro: They sit and they sit and they sit and yet you have statistics that show how much is closed but what we don't have is how many of those have sat there for years, perhaps months, I'd like to be generous and say weeks but anyway a lot of them are lengthy and I think that's where the equity and the view of the park really hits hard is when people see it over and over again unfixed. But it's not just your Department.

Taylor: Just to get to back to Lincoln Park, when we applied the data set to the city it drew a line.

Linda D'Avirro: Sure.

Taylor: The only place we jerrymandered that line was because Golden Gate Park fell inside so we excluded Golden Gate Park from the concept of an equity zone but in all other places we just let the data be what it was, just expose it using the methodology. This data set is changing and I don't know—I welcome any ideas about alternative data sets. The state is already poised to issue 3.0 and the character of San Francisco is changing so quickly I can tell you for sure the

parks are going to change. It is really an evolution. I do believe I'll be working on this for the rest of my career.

Linda D'Avirro: Yes you will.

Denis Mosgofian: I'll direct this to you Taylor. I know the parks pretty well, at least a lot of them and I certainly know Lincoln Park, I've walked it end to end many times. That's a very nice area of San Francisco and the closest thing one might say is that the northern tip of that equity zone that you described as from 29th Avenue along Fulton up to 35th is about 150-yard to one point of that thing to Lincoln Park and that's only the entrance otherwise that 100-acre park skews all the numbers. There is another bold point I want to make. I just want to leave that with you.

Taylor: I think that's a good point and I did not particularly notice Lincoln. It was certainly among the group of oddities that resulted but it's just a lot of acreage.

Denis Mosgofian: And one more thing, we struggled with the math on it. It took me a long time to get it but I think I got it. It was that in the buffer zone particularly around the southeast section and southern section of San Francisco where there's that pinkish area around the equity zone it was pointed out and I think I got it, that actually a lot of folks who live in nearby areas that are not in equity areas they also use McLaren Park and all those same things. Different census tracts and in fact there was an analysis of 24 census tracts around McLaren and only 19 of the census tracts related to the equity zone. But here's the bottom line of it, of all those people who used it the assessment was that about 56 percent of the people who were using those equity parks were actually living in non-equity census tracts and 44 or 45 percent were living in equity zones so if the Department's resources are distributed according to equity and nonequity then instead of applying 100 percent of the resources or assuming a consumption of 100 percent of the resources by the equity population it would actually—they actually weren't consuming a 100 percent, they were consuming 44 or 45 percent.

Taylor: Definitely.

Denis Mosgofian: So then the allocation of resources has to be taken into consideration and the reason I raise that is because this sheet I thought reflected that other value system and the sheet that was handed out earlier tonight, the one that you handed out. I thought the statistics on this are skewed as a result of the mistaken allocation of how much is consumed by the equity population.

Taylor: I completely understand what you're saying. For example my son takes basketball and Minnie Lovey because he likes the coach there so we drive, it's not too far, but we drive over there. So those recreational hours that he consumes are counted. So we're counted in the recreation resources in the equity zone because we don't limit who gets to go to Minnie Lovey to people in a certain neighborhood, right. And just like there are people like me using park facilities in equity zones so do people in equity zones are using facilities outside. For example I know many kids across the city drive across town to go to Hamilton Pool. I mean everyone goes there. It's the best pool in the city so kids from all over go there and all those hours counted.

There really is no—I agree with you completely. I wish we could just measure just the Recreation and Parks those people consume but I don't have the data to do that. None of us will ever know if it washes out. Of course we understand that argument.

Linda D'Avirro: But again, what we're trying to get to is the eyes have the parks so even though your metrics may say that what we also said in one of our slides is you have to get out there and say oh I know this was here but boy this one really needs the money even though your statistics say something we can't rely totally on statistics.

Taylor: Yes, exactly. We have to do this equity analysis and develop these projects and track the data but it doesn't have to limit us as to where we spend our money or allocate our resources which is one of the things that proposal—and I'm not sure where this is going to go, if our General Manager is going to stick to it—of those four or five extra equity focused parks.

Linda D'Avirro: That belies your whole [simultaneous comments]. It washes out your whole concept of equity zones. [simultaneous comments]

Chair: Let's wrap it up. Robert, this is the last question from the committee.

Robert Brust: I think our report clearly states that we would like to balance this totally statistical approach with a more sociological story, going out and actually looking and that's one of the reasons I'm urging people—can we move ahead with this? PROSAC urges the Recreation and Park Commission and Recreation and Park Department to adopt PROSAC's assessment of discrepancies and recommendation changes to the September 1st, 2016, Recreation and Park Department equity metrics implication of charter section 16.107.

Chair: Is that a motion?

Robert Brust: We need a second. We've heard the motion—

Male Speaker: Can I ask a question? Does it need to adopt our assessment? Why don't we ask them to include our assessment into their—

Chair: It becomes a much harder resolution to pass.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: Sorry, let me just interpret it from my perspective. What you're asking for is us to basically push to the Commission these idea, these assessments and discrepancies and ask basically that they adopt these changes. We're not creating a resolution that's a negative resolution by saying we don't support this in general, what we're saying is we'd like them to at least consider [simultaneous comments] our assessment and discrepancies.

Male Speaker: Then why don't we say consider instead of adopt because adopt kind of means include.

Chair: That's what the idea is, to include.

Linda D'Avirro: We do want them to adopt and include.

Robert Brust: Yeah. I mean if they find that there's a mistake that's different, you don't include a mistake. But so far everybody on the committee has worked very hard to figure out [simultaneous comments].

Chair: Sorry, let me just take a time out. I also don't want to demean the fact that the Department has worked really hard too. Again, I'm not trying to force something that stops the Commission from supporting overall equity.

Linda D'Avirro: No. This isn't meant for that.

Chair: Okay. But again just like you said to Taylor you have to say that, that this isn't meant to be a roadblock it's meant to say we as a committee put our minds to this, we've come up with some suggestions, we found some discrepancies in your planning and then we would like for you to [simultaneous comments].

Male Speaker: Do we want to take it as a friendly amendment and change adopt to consider?

Female Speaker: That's watered down! [simultaneous comments]

Chair: Ancel.

Ancel Martinez: When I hear the word adopt in terms of administrative procedures what I infer—we can look it up—adopt is more codify, incorporate, and execute certain changes of assessments. And so that's what I think of as adopt. Consider meaning the best intentions is that you evaluate the facts presented, the analysis and our interpretation. And so where I'm going with those distinctions I think consider is a better verb for this resolution than adopt because adopt is more okay, these are—these are our perspectives and we want them to be changed or incorporated in the charter section.

Chair: So is that a friendly amendment? Are we accepting a friendly amendment to change adopt?

Ancel Martinez: Let me develop my point further. So that's why I see a different between consider and adopt. Adopt is an absolute action and then consider is more a consider my plea is that you have a responsible evaluation of your argument. So that's where I'm going with it. I understand That we would want to be direct in saying we have this body of thought and we want you to act upon it but you see where I'm going with this? I'm trying to draw that distinction is all.

Chair: So there's a million hands up. Let's go Tom then Mark.

Tom Valtin: District 9. To me if something is considered it can be evaluated but then rejected. If it is adopted we are saying we want you to accept this and not reject it.

Mark Scheuer: District 8. I would change the word adopt to consider incorporate so that's adding a word to consider. So RPD to consider incorporating it's assessment blah, blah, blah.

Female Speaker: But it goes back to what he just said.

[simultaneous comments]

Female Speaker: I like keeping adopts. We are urging, we're not dictating. We have no power to dictate. We're simply urging strongly that they adopt these recommendations. We can't force them and they know that and we can't block the progress on this. We don't have that power. They can ignore us if they want.

Denis Mosgofian: I think you guys all should consider that what we intended here was to offer this as advice. We're an advisory committee and since we were not opposed to—in fact we were supportive of equity metrics—the question was what could we do with the discrepancies we found. So we offer this as advice and we want them to adopt it. That was the only reason.

Male Speaker: The other change is urges to revise the Recreation and Park Commission to adopt it.

Chair: I like Richard's.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: I would like to maybe qualify although PROSAC supports the Department's efforts to achieve equity metrics or something in that vein, PROSAC urges the Recreation and Park Commission and RPD to adopt the assessment and discrepancies and recommended changes to the September 1st, 2016, RPD equity metrics blah, blah, blah.

Male Speaker: So the big word addition is although.

Chair: I'm just saying we are in fact supporting the equity metrics, the work that the Department has done and if we are going to use a term like adopt then we should at least say that we support what they're doing to begin with.

Male Speaker: I agree.

[simultaneous comments]

Richard Ivanhoe: District 5. Maybe it's the same thing but I go kind of further down whereas recommended changes.

[simultaneous comments]

Male Speaker: Linda, before you insert everything that Steffan proposed Richard has something.

Richard Rothman: My thought is where you have recommended changes on the third and fourth line make that recommended changes and admissions which acknowledges some of the work that's already been done by the Department.

Linda D'Avirro: I like that. Does everybody agree?

Male Speaker: I didn't understand it.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: Although PROSAC supports the work of RPD on equity metrics—we need to say it better. Although pro supports the work of RPD's—

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: The work of RPD on equity metrics PROSAC urges the Recreation and Park Commission.

[simultaneous comments]

Female Speaker: We have another presenter.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: I see the look on his face, he's enjoying every minute of it.

Female Speaker: I'm sure he is.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: So everybody let's read this and see if we support this.

[simultaneous comments]

Linda D'Avirro: Are we good?

Chair: Everybody read it, make sure everybody is happy with it.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: Is this on the table?

Male Speaker: So moved.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: I'll call the question. So all in favor of this current recommendation based on the committee's work. Everybody in favor of this? Anybody opposed to this?

Male Speaker: No, but I think we watered it down.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: Great, thanks for flying United. Is there any public comment? Being none, that item is closed. Okay, so I'd like to call the last presentation item. Mr. Press, thank you so much for waiting through what appears to be a lot of talk. At the behest of Jane Weil, District 6, we have a presenter for the group Build Public and basically Jared Press is going to give us a fifteen minute presentation on Build Public and what they do.

Jared Press: Thank you all. My name is Jared Press, I'm the program manager—actually no, I'm currently the interim executive director while our full time ED is out on maternity leave, Brooke Ray, for Build Public. Build Public is a local nonprofit here in San Francisco focused on innovating the development and stewardship of public open spaces by leveraging public-private partnerships and creative financial pools.

As Steffen said we were invited here tonight by Jane. I'm going to give an informational presentation and hope to spark an ongoing discussion with you all about ways that our organization can support your goals and those of Recreation and Park.

So our mission and vision at Build Public is simple and one that I think aligns with yours. We believe our cities and neighborhoods deserve great public space. When properly cared for urban plazas, parks, and streets unite communities, provide safe, shared places to relax, play, connect and celebrate.

When neglected they divide communities and undermine shared values. At Build Public we apply the spirit of innovation to empower neighborhoods to finance, build, and maintain great public spaces.

So our organization was founded on the premise that public-private partnerships offer great opportunities to innovate in the way in which we create and maintain public open spaces in San Francisco and beyond. But our focus is in San Francisco. We were founded by partners of a for-profit residential development firm who were interested in improving the neighborhoods in which they were building beyond their own property lines. Two of those partners independently helped created two very well-known and beloved unique spaces in San Francisco—Mint Plaza and Linden Alley in Hayes Valley. Both of those spaces leveraged private investment to generate funds for capital and maintenance. And Build Public as an organization we think that public-private partnerships is a term that gets thrown around a lot and what does it mean? What is the

nature of the partnership? What is the outcome? It's not always clear but we really do believe our huge staff of three we're all coming from a background in urban planning as well as our board chair and president and we do genuinely believe that our approach to public-private partnerships can result in a win-win situation, really a scenario where one plus one equals three.

We have three programs areas. Build Public place, that's where we focus on building new spaces. Build Public stewardship--how do you maintain a space over time, how do you program it, how do you clean it, how do you manage it. And then policy. So right now San Francisco has some great tools that we're utilizing. Other cities don't necessarily and so we have worked with a couple of other municipalities in the Bay Area to this end. I won't go into that now.

Really what it all comes down to is that our main goal is bestow upon neighborhoods new permanent public spaces, the physical infrastructure and new neighborhood governance entities, the invisible infrastructure and we think you always need both of these. You can design a beautiful park but if you don't have the means to take care of it, whether the funding, the knowhow or the social investment from the community you're not going to have a great space, it's not going to be worth investing a ton of money into wonderful design.

We like to think of ourselves as a toolbox. We have a variety of tools that we draw on depending on the scope of the project, depending on the neighborhood. One of our capital funding tools is an in-kind agreement whereby a developer can propose to the city a public improvement project that's a priority in that neighborhood and build that for the city as opposed to simply writing a check to the city for those impact fees and this is a mechanism that we're utilizing on a couple of projects right now and there are three distinct advantages that come with this tool that save the city and community time and money. One is that the project sponsor, the developer, has to complete the proposed public infrastructure improvement such as a public open space prior to being able to occupy their own building. So that means before anybody can move in, before the developer can start making money on their investment they have to complete the project. So there's a stick in this equation.

The second advantage is cost overruns are on the developer not on the city. So anytime a project runs over due to time, due to delays that's born by the developer.

And third in order to do these deals the developer, the long-time property owner of the project is responsible for the maintenance of the space long-term as opposed to building a space and it being maintained by the city only.

Build Public where we come in we come in and we manage the process, the in-kind improvement process from start to finish but our role is—a big part of our role is in the collaborative public-private design process where we bring in members of the community to ask them what type of space they want to see and it's in this process that end up meeting a lot of invested community stakeholders, people, residents, property owners, business owners, and these people are valuable and I'm sure you can understand. When it comes to open space the people that live in the neighborhood, that use it the most care the most. They're vital to the success of a space.

That leads us to our third tool or goal is instilling and building long-term stewardship systems and we look to these people that we identify during the design process at the very beginning during concept design to serve as a local stewardship entity. So ultimately we're creating a project in Dogpatch for example and in working with people a couple years ago we identified these movers and shakers in the neighborhood. They're ultimately going to be this Friends of Dogpatch Arts Plaza. This neighborhood group that's small scale it will be responsible for programming and maintaining these spaces. Now it's all well and good to identify these people but we believe they also need the tools to manage these spaces so that means developing a management plan, coming up with an estimate, a maintenance budget and then of course most importantly figuring out how to fund that maintenance.

So we have a couple tools that we utilize, one is a benefit district, the other is a community facilities district. Both of those are essentially special tax districts, they operate in different areas. A GBD is similar to a community benefit district, the difference is that it's designed primarily for residential areas and with the explicit purpose of maintaining the public realm and for green infrastructure projects. We created the first green benefit district in the state last year in Dogpatch and Potrero Hill.

A facilities district is similar except it's just more targeted. You can create it with a lot more flexibility whereas a GBD takes multiple years and election and petition, it's a much more expensive process. But there are great applications for both these tools.

We have a number of projects across the city both projects where we're converting underutilized streets into public open spaces, either dedicated spaces or shared public ways. We have a couple of living alley projects here in Hayes Valley that we're working on and we just recently started working on our second green benefit district in the Inner Sunset. If any of you have questions about that or any of these projects that overlap with your Districts let me know and I can go into more detail but for now just sharing with you some of our active projects.

Dogpatch Arts Plaza is going to be our first project that goes in the ground. We actually are breaking ground this week and we hope to be done by January of 2017. What it is—it's in Dogpatch on Indiana Street where 19th Street dead ends into the Cal Trans embankment. So if you know where Cresco is or Café Kokomo was this is right in between those two parcels. It's a dead end street that was used for parking. We're converting it into an 8000 square foot pedestrian plaza, maintaining vehicle access for Cresco. They have a warehouse access point right here, during business hours but we've designed it flexibly such that when they're not operation on the weekends or evenings the space can be opened up for pedestrians. The theme of this plaza is an open outdoor art gallery. So we'll be programming it with art installations on a rotating basis.

Eagle Plaza, this is a project in Western SOMA on 12th Street between Harrison and Bernice adjacent to the Eagle. Here we're converting that section of 12th Street which is about a third of the block between Harrison and Folsom into a shared public way where cars will be able to travel in a one-way southeast-bound direction in a slow manner. The plaza will be building face to one unified surface.

Lastly right around the corner from here we're working on a project on Oak Street, this is Van Ness. This is where the doughnut shop is. This is the conservatory. This is 25 Van Ness and we're proposing to convert this project into a shared public way as well.

Female Speaker: I have a question. In all these pictures it shows different buildings. Are those new buildings going in or are they just there to make it look prettier?

Jared Press: They are new buildings that are going in. Those are the residential projects that are generating the impact fees and with the in kind agreement are with those developers.

Male Speaker: [unintelligible]

Jared Press: Right now we're working with a group of community members to propose a green benefit district. There are a lot of members of the Inner Sunset Park Neighbors, Merchants Associations, Cal Academy. We should talk afterwards. We're proposing a green benefit district there which to jump again began—this is a special assessment district. It's like a CBD, again, property owners pay into this District, those funds are dedicated for the maintenance of the public realm. So new parks, maintaining existing parks whether it's tree trimming, graffiti removal, trash removal, the entire public realm of the District so not just parks but also streetscapes, sidewalks.

Linda D'Avirro: District 11. Is that including existing RPD managed parks?

Jared Press: Good question. In the case of Dogpatch and Potrero Hill there's one RPD property, Esprit Park. In that case services are—funds can go towards maintaining that park. I'm glad you raised that question because there's a really important distinction. Funds from a GBD are used to maintain—to contribute to maintenance of the public realm above and beyond what the city already does. The city can't remove services from that district. So it's enhancing what is already there.

[simultaneous comments]

Male Speaker: So you're taking over those streets like in Dogpatch, I mean are you taking it away from the city?

Jared Press: Not at all. It remains city property.

Male Speaker: Can the owners close it off? Say like they don't like certain people on the block, can they close it?

Jared Press: By no means could they close it off. A plaza of this nature, Dogpatch Arts Plaza and most like our other plaza projects will enter into the plaza program which allows for a public open space to be closed for special event like a festival but there are limits on how many of those events can happen a year. Right now the limit is eight events per year. So that's the only event in which there would be any sort of restriction. Otherwise it's the same as any street.

Male Speaker: So why couldn't Recreation and Park do it? Why do we need private owners, you know? Why can't city employees take care of these instead you know people who are probably going to get less pay. Are these workers going to get health and retirement benefits like city workers?

Jared Press: Which workers are you referring to?

Male Speaker: Well I don't know. Who's going to maintain that plaza, it's not going to be the city right?

Jared Press: No, it's not going to be the city.

Male Speaker: It's going to be the benefit district right?

Jared Press: Correct.

Male Speaker: Are they going to pay the same benefits as city works get and the same pay?

Jared Press: Community benefit districts are not necessarily required to pay employees at the same rates that the city does.

Male Speaker: Then you're just contracting out city work then. So you're demeaning—you know, I don't know, it's just—

Jared Press: I would say the thing about this neighborhood and many other neighborhoods is that in the Dogpatch in general a lot of people—and I know there are representatives from this neighborhood in the room—in my work with people in this neighborhood they feel as though the city is not able to provide the services that their neighborhood needs especially as that neighborhood is being upzoned and increasing in the number of residents who live there and use those spaces. So I hear your point, it's a valid one, but I don't think it's necessarily a matter of replacing city employees.

Male Speaker: Let's go back to the Inner Sunset—the area that you've circled there—

Jared Press: It's not at all—

Male Speaker: Wait, wait, wait, wait! Let me say something. It's directly next to the main entrance on the south side of Golden Gate Park. You guys can't be going in there and going the gardeners work or the custodians work. The second thing is the streets around there have a lot of trees and stuff. Those are maintained by Friends of Urban Forest and by community and we have a measure on the ballot this year that's going to actually turn over street trees back to DPW. I've lived there for 43 years so I don't exactly understand. I know I've heard talk before about a community benefit district. What would you actually do there? And I know the people you're working with they're primarily interested in capitalizing on the anniversary of Golden Gate Park and getting funding from the Academy of Sciences. What are you proposing?

Jared Press: We're in an early phase right now with this group, the formation committee. And right now the range of potential uses for funds, the things that a GBD could fund in this area are really wide. It goes from capital improvements to improve pedestrian safety at those intersections.

Male Speaker: Do you realize the MTA has just—they've been working on it—they're doing all 48 blocks of Irving Street. [unintelligible] they're changed the street shape, they're putting all sorts of plantings and benches.

Jared Press: We were connected originally this project through Public Works who are doing those projects because they're interested in coming up with a way to enhance the maintenance of these spaces. The idea of a district—

Male Speaker: [unintelligible]

Jared Press: So really this might help kind of explain what I think you're getting at. The idea is not for a district to replace city services. The Dogpatch GBD for example they have an annual budget, a total of about half a million dollars. Of that let's say about a quarter is for capital improvements a year. Now there are some projects in that area like 22nd Street where that amount of money on its own might not be—is definitely not enough to do a full streetscape improvement.

They city on their side they may not be able to fund the improvements to the same degree on their own as residents might like but what a RBD does is it allows the neighborhood to leverage their funds to couple with city funds, go out and get outside funding from grants and foundations. So it's really enhancing what's already there.

Male Speaker: If you can get it passed.

Jared Press: If you can get it passed, sure.

Male Speaker: Because there's one person in the neighborhood who specifically wants to control that money just to let you know and you're working with him.

Jared Press: Let's talk after.

Chair: Let Jared finish his presentation. Then we'll ask questions.

Jared Press: Let me say quickly to conclude. We're really excited to explore opportunities to partner with you guys, with this committee, with Recreation and Park. I would say that I think we're overdue for actually meeting with your guys and that's our bad. We absolutely want to work with you guys in such a way that we can help and serve as a delivery tool, a mechanism to help you guys deliver priority projects and no in competition with other priority projects. By no means do we want to pull funds away from projects that are in the pipeline but we do think that they are great ways to support your efforts whether it's building new space of figuring out a way to maintain it. I think there are a lot of creative approaches to this. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you. If there are questions just give me a paw, let me see who's asking. So there's Linda, there's Nick, I have a couple, anybody else? Let's start with Nick.

Nick Belloni: Are you guys a 501c3?

Jared Press: Yes.

Nick Belloni: That's something that I was curious about to find out how this money was getting to you from the impact fees. You talk about innovation on this but I didn't hear you really say much about it. You have a whole slide that says public-private and then you talk about how it connects with innovation but I'm not getting this.

Jared Press: It's a fair point. I think conventionally we rely on the city to provide open spaces and our mission is to come up with alternative means of delivering those and especially after redevelopment went away the city and state's ability to continue to provide the type of infrastructure that they require, that we all require to live in a city like this it was really hamstrung and so we think that there are great ways to supplement what the city is already doing. And so that in and of itself we think is innovative.

Creating the first green benefit district, it's a spin on an existing too but it's also a really great form of neighborhood organization to see what's going on in Dogpatch right now is really inspiring. It's a new model for organization because it's not just a neighborhood association, it's a neighborhood association with a real budget and that's a guaranteed source of revenue. It's not just annual contributions or dues to a Neighborhood Association.

So we're trying to empower neighbors to be able to implement the types of changes that they want to see but the city can't in some cases—and I don't mean to say this to badmouth the city—but in some cases there are so many, especially a city like San Francisco, there are so many needs the city doesn't need to be the only mechanism.

Nick Belloni: If you're talking public policy is the green district the public policy you're talking about?

Jared Press: We actually worked with Menlo Park with their economic development plan last year. We've been talking with a couple of other cities about potentially helping them create similar types of tools, an in-kind mechanism, an in-kind of agreement that's a San Francisco took from the Planning Department. Other cities don't have those tools necessarily. A city like Oakland probably IKs wouldn't work because hey don't have the impact fees over there so ultimately right now we're really focused on San Francisco like I said but we do—we are thinking long-term about public benefit tools and strategies for helping cities come up with new ways to fund these spaces.

Nick Belloni: So you're not just focusing on San Francisco?

Male Speaker: Right now they are.

Jared Press: Yes, right now we're stretched thin.

Nick Belloni: That's what I was going to say. Three people and then you start getting too big—your idea is too big for what you really want to do.

Jared Press: Our ideas if you know our board chair his ideas are way too big for what we can do but we're not really focusing on the policy piece right now because of that reason.

Nick Belloni: Then the last question is, Oak and Van Ness your picture shows like the conservatory area there, are you going to ask to take parking that's already there?

Jared Press: That proposal would result in some loss of parking.

Nick Belloni: So you do know that the MTA is right there and that's like the only public parking for the MTA. We're talking about taking away public parking from a public building.

Jared Press: Yes.

Nick Belloni: That's a problem. That's a huge problem.

Jared Press: We well aware of that. I don't mean to downplay that at all.

Nick Belloni: No, no, no, I mean you're talking about a public building not making is accessible to the people by doing that.

Female Speaker: But the new building that are going to be built there at the hub are going to be huge.

Nick Belloni: [unintelligible] If they take away the parking for the public space we're talking about losing parking.

Female Speaker: But the new buildings that are being built there have underground garages with hundreds of parking spaces.

Male Speaker: For the public?

Female Speaker: I assume they're have to be paid. I don't know.

Jared Press: The underground parking for the new tower that's going up that's just private parking for the tenants. To your point that parking is incredibly important to the Conservatory of Music. And the developer is working very closely with the Conservatory of Music to come up with a long-term permanent parking solution for them. There's an adjacent parking lot.

Nick Belloni: I've heard some discussions they're going to make the parking there like six bucks during midday when people actually need to go to the MTA and you're talking about holding it back for people who actually go to a public build and that becomes a problem.

Jared Press: It's a trade-off. You're right. Parking in the city is really tough, I think that—

Nick Belloni: But near a public building where you're supposed to be able to get to, to have access.

Jared Press: Point taken.

Linda D'Avirro: My question is if you're not in an area where there's development and impact fees are you also helping the outlying neighborhoods? Are there programs that are assisting those neighborhoods?

Jared Press: It's a really good question. For one the in kind agreement tool is applicable only where there's an active area plan so those projects are restricted to those areas. Our living alley projects those utilize a grant problem in the city for living alleys. But we're well aware that the IKA tool is restrictive. It restricts us from working in other areas. We are exploring ways—new tools, new avenues for funding projects because let's be honest the current trajectory of development in San Francisco is going in one direction but it can't last, we've all seen that. The cycle will turn and then there aren't going to be the impact fees to generate these types of projects and so yeah, this is a big question mark for us. It's something that we're trying to figure out how to get creative around.

With regard to green benefit districts the first GBD took place in an area that was experiencing a lot of development and that was fortunate, that helped it because a lot of the formation costs were funded from developers that understood the value of this. The Inner Sunset doesn't have any development.

Male Speaker: You're not going to have any impact fees, it's not an area plan.

Jared Press: Exactly, so there it's a different ballgame but ultimately what a neighborhood can pay will vary and so a GPD could exist in a really wealthy area, it could exist in a lower-income area. The assessments that people would pay would rise and fall.

Linda D'Avirro: That issue came up when we were revising the ROSE, which is the recreational element of the General Plan and the discussion at that point was about PID, park improvement districts, and what happens in those cases is those that can afford it get extra benefits and really nice stuff and the rest of the people don't because they can't afford it and that's why I'm raising that question.

Jared Press: I think it's a really good point.

Richard Rothman: So if you set up a benefit district and there's a hundred property owners in the district and 95 vote for it and I vote against it I still have to pay for it, right?

Female Speaker: Yes.

Richard Rothman: That's not fair. [simultaneous comments]

Chair: I've got some questions. My first question is I see a lot of talk about new open space and I see a lot of DG. Do you guys actually have any parks, like actual grass and trees, not like decomposed granite?

Jared Press: We do have a lot of trees.

Chair: In San Francisco?

Jared Press: Yeah.

Chair: You do not.

Jared Press: Well that's not quite accurate.

Chair: Tell me.

Jared Press: First of all, so yes—are we building parks, no. We aren't claiming to build parks.

Chair: But we're the Park Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee and we like parks, green space.

Jared Press: That's true. I'm not sitting here telling you, not trying to sell you on plazas over parks. I'm saying what we're offering is converting underutilized—mainly what are projects are converting underutilized street space into plazas and the value there is you're taking land that is free. The city already owns it and you're able to at a much lower cost—and to Jane's point District 6 is absolutely in the most need of open space. The cost to acquire land is astronomical.

So this is an alternative means of creating small pockets of open space in areas where there aren't as many opportunities. Is this a replacement for a park? No. To you point about greenery, we want to provide as much as possible that we can—that can be supported in these areas. To your point about grass and I would say I would thank Stacy here, she gave us some really great feedback in the design process of this plaza. Initially it was far too much hardscape. Now, we came back to the community and we said here are some proposals where we would have more grass and their response to us was absolutely not. Grass will not survive in this condition. So we're trying to figure out a balance of providing landscaping that's durable and will survive in this area. This is not a place where you're going to go and play catch. It's not a place where you're necessarily going to go and lie down like you would in Delores of Golden Gate Park. But if you know this area you know that even a small enclave, a small little pocket of open space is more than there is right now.

Chair: I'm quite familiar with that neighborhood. I'm also really familiar with plazas like Mint Plaza that have failed, that are basically homeless encampments now. So I have grave concerns when we talk about creating plazas between two buildings and that you guys are going to build these but then what happens when like you said the Market turns?

Jared Press: That's a good point about Mint Plaza. Mint Plaza we look to for a lot of lessons learned both positive and negative.

Chair: Us too. That's why when you're showing us these plazas the first thing we say is maybe that's not the greatest way.

Jared Press: That's fair. One of the problem with Mint Plaza is there wasn't a dedicated source of maintenance funding. It was up to the developer and any property owners around the plaza to provide that funding and over time the property owners have basically tightened the budget to bare minimum and that's one of the major reason that space is struggling.

Our proposal for this project as well as 1 Oak—and this is something that the developer has voluntarily opted to do—is to create a CFDO . It's like a GBD except it's much more flexible. So we could created a CFD that has one property in it and the district boundary could be encircled just around Eagle Plaza.

Male Speaker: What's a CFD?

Jared Press: Communities Facilities District. So in that case the property owner—in this case this is a building, a rental property, the property owner would opt to self-tax themselves annually to pay for the maintenance of this space. The difference between that and what happened at Mint is it's not just an agreement, it's not just written into the deed, it's actually a legal mechanism that goes on your property tax bill. So whereas a developer could get creative about getting out of an agreement or reducing the level of service a CFD provide much more assurance to the city and to the community that the space it going to be maintained over time.

So that doesn't answer the question necessarily of how do you keep this from becoming a homeless encampment. That's another challenge that you really have to look at programming activation. That's one of the things that we look to our friends of stewardship entities to really champion. As I was saying, we provide them with management plans. We partner with MJM Management, a public space but they're been working with us, providing us with management plans, activation plans. So these are the types of tools that we give to these friends of groups to prepare them for managing these spaces once they're up.

We're not naïve by any means about the challenge that's going to come with making a plaza work on 12th Street a block up from Division. That's probably the thing I struggle with most.

Chair: And again one thing I want to go on record as saying is I'm very supportive of public-private combos, I think that it's the only way really forward aside from dedicated open space and finding maintenance funding for that. The one thing that brings—I'll end my questions on this. You keep referring to your executive director or your board chair and he's a developer.

Jared Press: Yeah.

Chair: And so I'd like to understand how a developer just to best frame it he's a developer and his focus is about developing properties. Like are these his properties that border? Are any of these his properties that border?

Jared Press: They are, yes.

Chair: Ah, so that concerns me just a bit because he's basically putting money in his own pocket.

Female Speaker: Yes, he is.

Chair: I'm not asking you to answer that questions. I'm only trying to voice it because I like what you guys are doing but I don't want to look through the drapes and see the guy pulling the strings owns the property.

Jared Press: No. And Bill doesn't hide from that. They are one of the developers that we work with. We also work with other developers. Ultimately we do believe that the fact that a developer—if a developer is doing a project that benefits them that doesn't necessarily mean that it might not also benefit the community.

Chair: That's fine but what we've seen in the past, again if we use the Mint as an example what we're seen in the past is that developers come in and they say anything they need to do to get the building but and occupied and then there's a space that has no sunlight and no facilities that actually benefit the community. So we're super supportive of this if you can show us a way that doesn't become the case, that it doesn't become an easy paper shuffle to say oh yeah we're going to build this nice green space but it doesn't end up being a green space. It doesn't end up being accessible to anybody who doesn't live in the building.

Jared Press: Well, the proves of building one of these plazas as we're going through right now with Dogpatch Arts Plaza it requires a level of input from the city and community that is rigorous to say the least and what I mean by that is the checks and balances that are put in place through an encroachment permit—I believe your name is Richard you asked the earlier question is this public open space. This is public open space. It remains a street under the jurisdiction of Public Works. In order to build this you have to take out a major encroachment permit and that is a permit that is revocable. So at any point if the city feels that the developer is not living up to their end of the deal they can revoke the permit and the developer would be required to pay at cost to return the street to its original state at their own cost.

Now, for example Linden Alley, the space outside of Blue Bottle, it's a very small space, that required a major encroachment permit, same mechanism. This is just on a much larger scale. So I don't—I'm not sitting here trying to pretend like I'm not aware of the suspicions that come with our group. We're Build Public, we were founded by a group called Build. Unfortunately you know there's a lot of suspicion that comes with that and I understand that. It is what it is. But I

do genuinely believe that this ultimately is a approach to building public open spaces that the community will benefit from.

Chair: Again, I'm not trying to come off as nonsupportive, I'm trying to come out like vetting it for the long-term to steward the future of the city.

Jared Press: As you all should.

Denis Mosgofian: I have a few questions about the Inner Sunset.

Chair: Dennis, if there are specific questions can you—because we're not a half-hour over where we wanted to be. You and Jared could have an awesome talk I believe over coffee.

Male Speaker: Just for the record I would like to thank Jared for appearing before us.

Chair: It's not a crucifixion it's just a conversation.

Jared Press: You guys are asking the right questions and you should because ultimately these are spaces that were proposing to build for communities. As PROSAC more than anybody else you should be applying a magnifying glass.

Linda D'Avirro: I think we should ask Jared to come back after some conversation perhaps takes place with Recreation and Park particularly as it relates to the quest I had around the parks in Dogpatch that are Recreation and Park facilities. I think you just touched on it that that's a conversation that is taking place and will take place.

Chair: Personally I would like to have Build Public come back in a few months with what your progress is and how we can identify ways to improve.

Jared Press: If I may I think in the new year we'll have something physical in the ground to look at that I think would make a great presentation.

Chair: You can invite us and we'll come.

Jared Press: You're all invited.

Jane Weil: District 6. I think the other thing that would be good to hear from you is perhaps what you are thinking about—we all admit that Mint Plaza is a failure. There's nothing green there. It is sort of a homeless camp. It's occasionally at noon you know there's a little concert. But what do you—okay, live and learn, but what are you going to do to fix it? I think it would be very helpful to have you come back in a few months and say what you should have done there. Then there's Totoobe Plaza which I don't think nobody even knows [unintelligible]. It's the poster child for a failed street plaza.

Jared Press: I could come back and give an entire presentation on best practices around stewardship and program.

Jane Weil: That would be excellent.

Jared Press: I think that's a huge part of the equation that we didn't even touch on.

Chair: I think it was great for you to come and make us aware. Moving forward we'll certainly look to include you in future agendas and I think it would be great to have more of an active dialog with you and I would also encourage you to have more of an active dialog with RPD.

Jared Press: I talked to Stacy earlier today. We've got a meeting.

Chair: [unintelligible] It's nice to hear that you guys are communicating. Any other questions for Jared? Any public comment on this item? Being none, that item is closed. Thank you.

So on to Item 8, there is no new business or agenda setting. We are working with [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments]. We will be moving some items up in November and December. Member [unintelligible] who did not appear tonight. [simultaneous comments]

Female Speaker: Offline please.

Chair: Mr. Maley had suggested that we move up earthquake prep and trees so Tiffany how about that for the November, December meetings, both earthquake prep and trees.

I'm not going to add anything else. I do think that the open space at Delano and Geneva was addressed by the General Manager.

Sharon Eberhardt: He addressed it but the problem is still—

Linda D'Avirro: Yeah, it hasn't moved but he addressed it.

Chair: So do you want a presentation on that?

Linda D'Avirro: No. We want action.

Chair: Excellent. Are there any other agenda setting items or new items that need to be addressed that aren't on the agenda right now? Being none, that item is closed. Public comment?

Announcements not listed on the agenda, Richard.

Richard Rothman: Two announcements. Apparently October is San Francisco Open Studios and if you go to artspan.org and the last Sunday in October is the Arts Commission has a passport program. Linda and Pat and myself have gone in the past. This is a great program. This year it's going to be in Chinatown. If you go to the Arts Commission webpage and you get this little booklet and you get for \$25 you walk around and you get your passbook stamped with all

these beautiful stamps. They're masterpieces of artwork. The money goes to the Arts Commission and I've gone on two of them and they're really enjoyable.

Chair: I've got a couple. First one is Friday night Lafayette Park Fall Social. You are all invited. For those of you who have attended in the past we welcome RPD, PROSAC members, this is a little community party for our peoples but one of our greatest ones and I really would encourage you guys—we had a wonderful movie night.

Secondly, McLaren. Saturdays in the park, McLaren, next three shows starting this weekend a rock show, then our bluegrass show next weekend, our finale the blues show which celebrates the 45th anniversary of the Jerry Garcia Amphitheater so we would love for you guys to come and attend that. Free cake. Free music.

Linda D'Avirro: I noticed on tomorrow's Commission agenda for the Operations Committee for those of you who remember we had a presentation by the PUC about the Gun and Rod Club. They've cleared out. The agenda tomorrow which was presented I guess by Dana's people they're going to be entertaining an RFP to develop the whole western end of it.

Chair: Is this actually the RFP is going before the Commission?

Linda D'Avirro: Yes. And again it raises the issue that many times things that affect public space that are through the Permits Department probably should come to PROSAC first so at least we would know about it and not be surprised. This is major, this is a really big transformation.

Chair: If anybody has strong feelings about that they should appear at the Operations Committee for Recreation and Park. Any other items not listed on the agenda? Being none, that item is closed. Thank you, the meeting is adjourned.

End of Document