

**PROSAC Meeting
September 6, 2016**

Chair: Welcome to the September meeting of the Park and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee. Thank you for attending. Thank you as well for RSVP'ing. Those of you who did, I think everybody in this room did RSVP. Obviously last month we had an issue with that both with the RSPV'ing and the attending. It's nice to see a full committee today. I expect to see at least a couple more people.

I will start with roll call and then we'll jump right into an action packed PROSAC meeting. I'll start to my left.

Richard Rothman: Richard Rothman, District 1.

Mark Scheuer: District 8.

Robert Brust: District 8.

Jordyn Aquino: District 4.

Winnie Chu: District 7.

Linda D'Avirro: District 11.

Denis Mosgofian: District 5.

Anthony Cuardo: District 7.

Ana Gee: District 6.

Kim Hirschfield: District 3.

Kenneth Maley: District 3.

Richard Ivanhoe: District 5.

Nick Belloni: District 2.

Chair: Steffan Franz, District 2. We're going to jump right in here. I have a couple quick items. We'll do a review of the minutes. Has anybody reviewed—I think we're actually owing both the July 6th and the August 2nd minutes. Has everybody had a chance to review those minutes?

Linda D'Avirro: I'd like to put forth a motion to approve both the July and August minutes.

Jordyn Aquino: Second.

Chair: All in favor of passing July and August minutes as is?

All: Aye.

Chair: That's unanimous. Moving on to this month's meeting I would like to direct your attention to our calendar. Our calendar now shows that our November meeting will fall on November 9th and we did that basically trying to leave room for election day and what we realized is we actually could do the meeting on November 1st and I think many of the members would rather do the first than the 9th so I have heard from some members that they would like to proposed us changing that day. I guess I will ask the membership is there anybody who objects to moving our November 9th meeting to November 1st?

Nick Belloni: Let me say one thing.

Richard Rothman: Don't the bylaws say that we're first to meet the first Tuesday?

Chair: It does. So that leaves Richard Ivanhoe out in the cold proverbially. Tiffany?

Tiffany Lin-Wilson: Let me actually double-check with City Hall first because I know that they have meetings that have already been scheduled so I have to make sure this room is actually available.

Chair: Please do find out and email us your findings. I would say that barring anyone else's concern that we do move the meeting to the first.

I don't have much else to report other than my email that went out to all of you and everybody who is here I thank you again for attending. I would like to continue to urge you to RSVP. I think it's very important for us to know before a meeting whether we have quorum. I got some nice personal responses and some not so nice personal responses. But I think it's an important topic for us. I don't feel like any one member's time is more important than the entire body and by keeping up with RSVP and in fact attending each month you're respecting each other and the committee's time.

I'll move on to our next agenda item, Item #4.

Stacy Bradley: We have a lot of good news. We are strengthening our workforce. We are hiring and interviewing hopefully a couple more PMs and our urban agriculture coordinator just started today. She was at our office all day and we've excited about that.

We're moving forward with bond project. A few are in construction. We have the McLaren Vision Exercise scheduled for October 1st.

Chair: Stacy, for those people who are unaware could you just give them a little background on that? I think the members of Districts 9, 10, 11 are very aware of that, just make sure that the whole body is.

Stacy Bradley: Sure, so McLaren we're looking for—there's some funding for the bond and this exercise is to do a visioning exercise for what is really needed in McLaren. We kicked off the process with a treasure hunt just over a month ago and it was very successful so this visioning exercise is the next time to really talk about McLaren, what you want to see there, what works and doesn't. We're really excited about this.

Then we have Balboa is starting up this month. And West Sunset is also going to be in construction. And then we're strengthening our historical resources. We've got the glazing underway at the Conservatory of Flowers. This has been a project that's taken a while to get underway.

Also the 11th and Natoma acquisition in District 6 was approved at the Recreation and Park Commission so we are moving forward on that. We are going to do a phase II before bringing it back to the Board for their final approval so that should get to the Board likely in November.

Lastly, we have the natural resources management plan. We decided that's moved to later in the year. We don't have a date for the joint hearing, we're looking at calendaring it, it was scheduled for the 29th.

Hilltop is still in construction, underway, it's moving forward and 17th and Folsom also is in construction.

Denis Mosgofian: District 5. I have a question about McLaren. Having sat here for quite a number of meetings where there was a lot of discussion by everyone. How is this visioning process—does it proceed on top of what they've already come up with and what they've already proposed or is it a new invention?

Stacy Bradley: I don't think it's a new invention. It's definitely taking into account the conversations that have already happened and I think creating the framework and finding ways to move it forward.

Denis Mosgofian: Have they established the framework? Because we heard it a lot here for a long time and we pushed for the \$12 million and so on. My impression is having worked with Linda and others that there was a lot on input from the community over maybe several years demanding certain thing to be basically done. So I'm just wondering is this visioning process really going to build on top of that or is it going to—because I have some suspicion of bureaucratic proposals for how to get things done that ignore the community. So that's my skepticism.

Stacy Bradley: I think the point of it is to move forward from the conversations that have started in making such it's inclusive as we can with trying to get some more people to come from

the treasure hunt, making sure that everybody is providing their input and moving forward I think we're looking at starting with some Quick Start projects which I believe are working out of the McLaren Collaborative discussions. And then looking at the park as far as a whole and moving forward with the process. I think the McLaren Collaborative definitely does that as well, looks at it as a whole and the visioning process is building on top of the collaborative's work.

Denis Mosgofian: Do you want to talk about the treasure hunt? How many people did we have?

Stacy Bradley: We have a few hundred people at the treasure hunt and people came who lived nearby and never come to the park. We're just hoping to really fine ways of engaging the people who are nearby and to use the park as much as possible.

Richard Rothman: District 1. I just realized this in getting involved in Rossi Playground that I think as far as the artwork that it might be too late for Rossi although I'm trying to get funding for a mural on the outside, that maybe consider having the artwork on the outside of the building because there's going to be more people seeing the artwork on the outside of the building than in the pool or maybe diving up the money so some of it can go inside and outside. When I got involved in this and started learning about it I thought that maybe your staff will consider that. Like Cabrillo Playground, they put the artwork on the fence there so that when people drive by they see it. So maybe that's a suggestion for your staff.

Tom Valtin: District 9. Just back to McLaren. Many moons ago when I ran for Supervisor and was soundly trounced I met Chuck [unintelligible] still in extent?

Stacy Bradley: Yes, they're part of the Collaborative.

Tom Valtin: I would just urge you to include them in the visioning process.

Phil Ginsburg: They're extremely included. We're also trying to include—I'm going to talk a little bit about McLaren but there's really good stuff there. There's the Mansell roadway project which is happening. We have a playground renovation, a couple of court resurfacing projects. And that doesn't even get into the Quick Start projects.

Tom Valtin: Thank you.

Chair: Any other questions for Stacy?

Kenneth Maley: District 3. On the 11th and Natoma if you're projection of November to the Board of Supervisors comes to fruition. I believe our group is authorized or able to express and interest [unintelligible] to the Board of Supervisors and I'm wondering if that purchase would be a topic that would be important for this group to weigh in on before [unintelligible].

Stacy Bradley: Well, you have unanimously approved it already in July.

Chair: Any other questions for Stacy? Hearing none, before we move on to the next item I want to ask if the members are okay with switching Items 6 and 7, so we would hear Equity Metrics first and the Strategic Plan second? Any objections to switching those items? Hearing none we will switch the items.

Our next item is Item 5, new business agenda setting. Linda, did you want to make a comment on this item. But first, is there any public comment on Item 4?

May Wong: May from the Excelsior. Any news on our little plot of land at Delano and Geneva? [unintelligible] and there have been emails back and forth about getting another vendor in there.

Chair: Are you asking the committee?

May Wong: Yes.

Chair: Perhaps someone on the staff can answer that. I don't think we're really able to answer that? Sharon?

Sharon Eberhardt: District 11. I made a request a couple months ago that somebody from Recreation and Park come and fill us in on that project because the community is getting the runaround. First we're told it's going to be completed, then we're told [unintelligible] it's not going to be completed. So we want to know what's going on.

Male Speaker: I remember you saying was is this Community Opportunity Fund money again. What is it?

[simultaneous comments]

Female Speaker: It's round one or round two.

Chair: Please, instead of cross-talking, indentify yourself if you want to speak I'll gladly give you the floor.

Linda D'Avirro: Linda from District 11. That was a Community Opportunity Fund for Round one or two of the 2008 Bond, not the 12, and it has languished a very long time and there's been a lot of emails back and forth with Melinda Stockman and that's where the community has asked if at this point nothing can be done. It's turned into a weed patch, can we at least get some beautification of the area.

Chair: Just for clarity and the record, the original intention was that it would be a community garden?

Linda D'Avirro: Yes.

Chair: And Melinda Stockman—

Linda D'Avirro: Is the planner.

Chair: I know who she is and I've been asking for her to come and present to this committee for quite a while now.

Phil Ginsburg: Steffen, since she normally has that role why don't we just expedite things, why don't I as the General Manager get an update on the project [unintelligible].

Chair: That would be wonderful. Linda, does that satisfy you?

Linda D'Avirro: Between Sharon and I also the public comment from May it's not just a report, it's action. This is the only remaining 2008 Community Opportunity Fund project.

Chair: All right, I'm going to make a suggestion. I will accept Phil's response but also say if you would like as we now move to Item #5 to add that as an agenda item. I would be glad to add that to our roster of potential presentations. Is there any other public comment?

Denis Mosgofian: District 5. Are you proposing?

Chair: No, we're not on agenda Item #5. I'm asking if there is any further public comment on Item #4? Being none, that item is closed. Agenda Item #5. One of our members has asked because our agenda setting seems to fall at the end of every meeting if we could move that item up which I gladly support. So I would like to draw your attention to the current list of items for this let's say next year or so. I believe that are now some items that have come off this list, specifically SNRMP which is now NRMP, Natural Resources Management Plan which will have to obviously go back on this list. I believe that there are a couple of other items that there are members still very interested in. We talked about community gardens. Certainly Maya I would like to know move or Lennar I'd like to know more about Candlestick. I think Ken brought up a good item which should be addressed again which is Park Patrol, park safety, certainly in light of certain occurrence that are going on it would be great to hear more about Park Patrol's increased ranks, a little more information about that as its own item.

Is there anything on this list that you see that you feel is irrelevant or not accessible anymore? In other words is there anything you see on here that I can take off this list?

[simultaneous comments]

Male Speaker: What is that?

Chair: That's a good question. I don't know how that got on. Linda, maybe as—no? That's a no, you don't know? Textile waste and its local and global impact. Why does that sound like some member put that on a long time ago? Yes Linda?

Linda D'Avirro: District 11. My recollection was it was put on there because there was a request to the committee to go forth and discuss this group. It has something to do with Goodwill Industries and that probably could be found in the minutes.

Chair: I will gladly take a look.

Linda D'Avirro: I think about five months ago if I'm not mistaken. It was very early in the year.

Chair: So this is T3 Goodwill, right?

Linda D'Avirro: Yeah.

Chair: I'll try to hunt that down and see who suggested it. Are there any other items on here that we feel could come off of this list?

Richard Ivanhoe: District 5. [unintelligible]

Chair: Would you like to be off of there? Here let's do that. You're off. Hearing that there's not too much that has to come off of this I would like to open the floor to members who would like to propose new items for future agenda setting. Ken?

Kenneth Maley: District 3. I do have a couple of suggestions but I do have a question on procedure with determining the topics and their sort of prioritizing for the committee. Perhaps a more regular review of the items that you have just gone through, eliminating some items or at least putting in the question there is continued interest. And I bring this up because I think there are issues that come to the surface that have some urgency or some immediacy.

I'm going to use as an example the recent unfortunate accident at Washington Square Park where a 100-pound limb fell fifty feet on the back of a woman who will never walk again. I'm not suggesting anything in terms of how that event occurred but I do think it brings to the surface the issue of the Department's difficulty in managing the city streets. In some of the reports I've read recently and I'm paraphrasing numbers, they're not particularly accurate but normally the trees should be inspected and accessed in let's say a period of fifteen or twenty years but given the limited resources that the Department has not it's projected to be 150 years.

Chair: I heard about 115.

Kenneth Maley: I'm just repeating reports. I think that's an issue that has some immediacy that's sort of come to the surface with the unfortunate events. The second one is looking at the second item on the agenda here is the update on Lenore. I believe there's been a Chronicle report recently on the stalling of that project due to cleaning up the toxic land.

Another issue I'd like to suggest—and I won't continue to go on—maybe two, one is that it's very well known that following the 1906 and the 1989 earthquakes that many people retreat to public open spaces and I believe the Department has a staff person that sort of oversees this

concern within the Department. I think with the upcoming October anniversary of the Loma Prieta earthquake it would be interesting to have a review of how the Department is planning their response to the inevitable. We know it's going to happen but when?

Then my final suggestion is I've just been down to look at the redevelopment of South Park which is one of the most historic parks in the city and I'm a little disturbed at the design and the major alteration of the character of that park. I'd like us to either do a site visit or invite the landscape architect that's been involved in that project to make a presentation to us on how the redevelopment of that park has occurred. But I think the primary issue is regularly addressing our interest in new business and a new way to prioritize issues as they come up with some immediacy.

Chair: I thank you for that. I will just respond to the areas that I feel can be responded to, specifically trees. This committee has had numerous presentations over the course of six years. Hort Science has come and presented to us. The Department has presented to us. Clearly that was a terrible occurrence. I think we're all understanding the plight of the 115 year tree touch. I would be glad to entertain an agenda item that has Hort Science come back if we feel that would give us a good perspective on what the future is, how this will actually work itself out.

As far as Lenore goes I have left that to the District. I have asked numerous times as the District will say. I would like to hear about that project. I would like to make it a priority. I think it's important. I think Candlestick and Lenore are both important.

Your earthquake prep I think is a very reasonable request. I'm very aware of NERT as most of us are but I think it would be nice to know what the Department's plan is given open space will be at a premium if something happens and it would be good to understand what their policy is.

Kenneth Maley: There is within the Mayor's Office called the Neighborhood and [unintelligible] network that's been working on neighborhood groups involving open space and emergency planning and that's run by a fellow named Daniel Holmsey and it's down in the office where the Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services was. I think he would make a very interesting presentation on this.

Chair: I'll be glad to look into that for future meetings. And then the South Park one is certainly one we can take up. I think I would like to hear from the District 6 as far as their concerns.

Denis Mosgofian: District 5. I want to follow up on the tree suggestion that you made. I think perhaps what would be relevant for us would be the Department's plans for how they intend to increase the workforce that's needed to deal with the trees to reduce the span from 105 or 50 ultimately to 15 and I know that we've heard some of this from Denny in Operations but it would be good at this point to actually hear specifically how they intend to beef up the workforce in order to reduce that length of time and then we could get more specific about where some trees should be addressed even more frequently because there's more people around.

Chair: I think it is an absolutely timely item. It is absolutely something that I'm sure the Department is trying to figure out and I would ask that we do a presentation whether from Denny or Hort Science to understanding what the next step is. Like you said, is it workforce? Is it just money? What is actually missing from the equation. The General Manager is sitting right here and I don't think he's going to comment on it but—I mean, you hear what the concern of the committee is.

Phil Ginsburg: We would welcome [unintelligible] that stat, that 100-year stat is out there as is the 50-year but [unintelligible]. We have the resources to maintain all of our 177,000 trees a year [unintelligible]. But Hort Science will tell you that's not realistic and really what we focus on with our assessments and our tree maintenance needs to be trees that are close to pathways, structures, playgrounds. And there is an arborist system for rating [unintelligible].

And with the passage of Prop B we have upped our tree maintenance [unintelligible] before the tragedy in Washington Square, we upped our tree maintenance funding considerably both on the workforce side and the expertise contract side. We've added a tree crew, we've taken back the arborist employees that were doing contract work for [unintelligible] and our tree maintenance budget [unintelligible] every year thereafter and our goal is to figure out how to do enough—we've done fourteen assessments including Friends of Washington Square Park which was [unintelligible]. Tree assessments get done for different reasons. They get done for safety reasons and then for design and landscape reasons as well, looking at what kind of trees should [unintelligible].

Our goal is what Denny and his staff are working on right now, the right number of assessments we can do every year that will allow us to maintain and respond to those assessments the following year [unintelligible]. What I don't want to see happen is us do an assessment and then create a backlog of tree assessments.

So using the resources that we have whether it's five assessments a year or six assessments a year we are going to be chasing our tail. 177,000 trees, 220 parks. But we want to get in a loop of doing some regular tree assessments every year and then doing maintenance based on those assessments the following year.

Nick Belloni: How many of those assessments turn into maintenance?

Phil Ginsburg: Some do, some don't. It really depends on where the assessment is happening. [unintelligible] We've done some significant work in Stern Grove, some in [unintelligible]. Again, we identify areas that are close to people, structures and all that stuff. So if it's a tree in the middle of the woods. It's also interesting is it's based on the little bit of a network with each other where if they're in a forest and a branch falls it's less of a risk that other places that are kind of isolated [unintelligible]. So it depends. Our urban forest is old. This is significant. Trees die and limbs fail. It's a real issue and historically a lot of urban canopy was in Golden Gate Park and [unintelligible]. It speaks to the importance of the [unintelligible].

So that's a little bit of an update but I'm happy to bring in a team [unintelligible].

Kenneth Maley: Thank you Phil. I want to just make a couple of comments about that. I would suggest if it would be okay with the General Manager that we include in our invitation a gentleman named Kelly Parnell. This is a person who's I would say feet on the ground but more likely feet in the trees. This is a fellow who is very [unintelligible], who is very informed and I think very knowledgeable and dedicated to the work that he tries to do at the Department.

Friends of Washington Square did commission Hort Science to do a tree assessment of Washington Square in 2008 and that was prompted by the discovery that the trees in our park had all been planted in 1957 with the first sort of master plan for that park, the very first bond issue that was passed. And we had discovered that the trees in the park had not been assessed for more than twenty years. So that management plan was then adopted by the Commission as the official management plan and it has created an opportunity for Friends of Washington Square to work cooperatively with the Department and Kelly and his crew have done some outstanding work.

We also donated \$10,000 to the Department for pruning of the park and so I think we've been prompted by this recent incident that we're revisiting a new assessment [unintelligible] and are working with the Department [unintelligible] to create that new assessment.

Chair: Again, I think it's a very valuable item, not just for Washington Square but for all the parks. Phil, can I ask you one question that I think relates to this. I was here, I was really into Jim Clark's presentation, he's really smart and what goes on in trying to figure out what an issue is. And I understand his targets, that that's how the assessment works, is it going to—

Phil Ginsburg: The risk assessment.

Chair: The risk assessment. Is it going to potentially hit somebody. Is it going to hit a parked car. What was the rating of the tree that fell, do you know?

Phil Ginsburg: The trees that [unintelligible] those trees were all in very good condition.

Chair: They were in very good condition. And I would also speak to a tree that fell in Lafayette recently that was in excellent condition and it fell. And so again I think it's important to have somebody tell us because we represent open space what can we expect in the next 25 years at status quo? What can we expect in the next 50 years at status quo versus your proactively towards trying to address this? I think it's a never-ended chase. So I think within the next few months we'd like to hear an item. Ken, thank you for bringing that one up.

Any other members? Let's start with Anthony, then Denis then Sharon.

Anthony Cuardo: I'd like to have an agenda item that talk about just Community Opportunity Fund projects in general. Like I am unaware that a 2008 project hadn't been completed so I'd like to hear about other projects from other bonds that have yet to be completed because I think that would be important for us to know.

Chair: So you're saying basically an assessment of the Community Opportunity Fund winners. It's certainly something we can have. Sharon?

Sharon Eberhardt: District 1. I just want to make sure language is there that says someone from Recreation and Park will come and explain to us what that community garden has not progressed. It's been eight years and either shut it down and put something else in there or complete the project but keeping us hanging is not good.

Chair: So what I'd like to ask of you or Linda is to give me some wording, send it to me by email please and I will address this on our call.

Sharon Eberhardt: And I would like an answer by the next meeting please.

Chair: I won't promise that to you Sharon but at least I'll ask.

Sharon Eberhardt: The community will take some action.

Chair: All right. Denis.

Denis Mosgofian: You can go ahead Maya.

Maya Rodgers: District 10. So thinking about the space and Delano and Geneva, wondering even if the Community Opportunity Fund isn't happening is there like another community agency or resource that does beautification in the meantime? Would the community be open to that in the meantime? Someone is saying no, someone is saying yes.

Sharon Eberhardt: Well, the problem is we keep getting the runaround as far as what the condition of the soil is because there was an assessment done saying that there was toxic material and the soil had to be remediated and that's been going on and on,. Then the next thing we heard was they had to change the design because they ran out of money, they didn't have enough money to put in all the bids they wanted to put in. I mean it's just one thing after the other. We have somebody in the community that [unintelligible] that's willing to come out and work to put in I guess beds. It just seems like it's just sitting there and nobody is doing anything. And it used to be a beautiful little park many years ago. Somebody from Recreation and Park used to tend that little garden and it was gorgeous and when that person left Recreation and Park it went into disrepair and turned into nothing but a weed patch. In fact, one of the neighbors that lives behind the garden had a chicken coop in there and was raising chickens.

Chair: Linda.

Linda D'Avirro: Just to answer your question Maya, the community would like it beautified pending the completion or the abandonment—the question that was brought up was if this was not feasible let's move the dollars and bank them or move them or whatever needs to be done, go back to the Commission, withdraw it from the 2008 and either reassign it to something else or whatever has to happen and then come back when there is money and finish the project in the

future. But in the meantime they've asked for turf. They've asked for weeding, any number of things to beautify it in the meantime.

Maya Rodgers: Maybe we can talk offline about it.

Chair: Denis.

Denis Mosgofian: On Item #s 6 and 7 it says discussion only but I believe the charter directs us discussion and action. So I would propose that for the next meeting since this is an urgent matter that the same items be placed on the agenda for further discussion and action since the discussion will be ongoing and it probably started some time ago.

Chair: You raise a good point. Obviously this is not the item I would raise it up.

Denis Mosgofian: I don't understand.

Chair: My plan was because this is an item that most of the committee didn't hear last time we obviously wanted to hear it again. There have been questions, there's a working group, everybody has put feedback in. My intention is to add it to the agenda for the next meeting at least for the strategic plan because it's our responsibility under our charter to do that.

Denis Mosgofian: And the equity metrics?

Chair: I'd be open to discussion on the equity metrics as well. I don't think we're compelled to do that. I would be willing hear from the body if they want to vote on that after we hear today's presentation. I think it's a little—for me to commit that do you now without us hearing this presentation I can't say that I can. I can say that it's our responsibility in Prop B to look at the strategic plan.

Denis Mosgofian: And to comment.

Chair: And to comment. Again Denis, if we had this and it was the only agenda item in August and there wasn't quorum we wouldn't have gotten this opportunity to hear it again. So I'm just saying I'm motivated us hearing this again so that other members who are not in attendance, yourself included, could comment on these items. So let's get through the presentations. Obviously we're not going to vote today but I certainly do support the idea for the strategic plan that we take a vote and either support or not support.

Are there any other member additions to this item list that we have now discussed at length? Hearing none, is there any public comment with regards to this item? Being none, that item is closed.

Let's move on to Item 6, Phil Ginsburg. Welcome to PROSAC.

Phil Ginsburg: Thanks for having us back. I know that we're going to do the Strategic Plan next but in introducing the equity metrics the Strategic Plan is important to reference to set some

context which is we worked on our Strategic Plan and got a lot of help from all of you which we appreciate and this was now about a year and a half ago almost.

Last year was our first fiscal year under the plan and it is really amazing how effective it is to work a plan and you'll see in the next section just how much of the initiatives under the various strategies that we've been able to tackle. There is no initiative that I'm more proud and grateful to all of you for working with us and most of you supporting than Prop B and that came from a strategy in the Strategic Plan which was to inspire more investment. Not just private investment but public investment and public commitment to funding because I've now been in this job for seven or eight years and frankly this tenure that we've had since I've been the General Manager has really been fraught with economic security for parks.

Parks are underfunded. They've been underfunded. There were some pretty dramatic budget cuts and we've been on a six or seven-year path of fighting through that financial insecurity. And you know what? We all did it! We didn't always agree on everything but unlike the State of California we didn't shut down parks. We have more programs today that we've ever had, certainly before any of the bad budget crisis. We fought through it.

What Prop B really did was offered some long-term stability. Because of Prop B which essentially creates a baseline of General Fund support we are no longer threatened with the 10 to 20 percent General Fund cuts we had to navigate. It provides some incremental growth but we all know it's not a growth measure. There no new big ball of treasure trove of cash. But it baselines a pretty healthy budget and allows us to plan. I think your input really pushed us on reporting and accountability and on equity.

As I sit here today we really embrace that and I think you for that because it has given us an opportunity to kind of pivot and reset our financial insecurity. We're going to have resource challenges but we now have an opportunity to engage in more long-term park planning and to really think about our true core values and that gets to this equity presentation.

It does start with what the charter says which is the Department shall develop a set of equity metrics to be used to establish a baseline of existing Recreation and Park services and resources in low income neighborhoods and disadvantaged communities compared to services and resources available to the city as a whole. That's what the language says.

There's other language in the charter that talks about incorporating our metrics into our Strategic Plan and our Operations Plan and our Capital Plan but this is step one of a long journey. This ballot I think is at least 28 more years when I will be very old. I don't know if PROSAC has term limits but maybe some of you will still be here.

This is a new way of doing things for this Department and what I'm here to present today and I hope you'll understand is this is just the beginning. This is the first small step along a long path and what we are doing in this first step is building a new lens. Up until now and the passage of Prop B the only real way to look at comparisons with respect to program delivery in different neighborhoods is to do the old fashioned District 2 gets versus District 11 gets. Guess what? There is no District in this city where the demographics are perfectly homogenous. There is a lot

of socioeconomic and racial diversity in all Districts and we have not really had the tools to really take a good look at how we're delivering services to the neighborhoods and communities around the city that need it most.

We've done some good project by project work. I think Let's Play S.F. where we focused on the presence of arsenic regardless of what neighborhood you live in. It's time for those things to go and we focused on low income and youth density, the task force did, in figuring out what playgrounds get remodeled.

There's been instances of us coming up with different ways but there's never been frankly this tool and so what I'm going to present today is this tool. There are not policy consequences with flow from the tool. It's just the tool. The tool will be incorporated into our Strategic Plan which you'll also hear an update today which we will come back in October and the Strategic Plan will be updated to incorporate this new lens tool.

And then we work our way through our specific operations and capital plans which will influence our budget and to be clear we're now in 16-17. We built our budget assuming that Prop B would pass but this will be our full Prop B budget cycle. So again, today the lens and rinse and repeat for 29 years.

I'm going to turn it over to Taylor to explain how we'll do this. What I'll say to your proudly is that we started working on this the day after Prop B passed, immediately we got to work on this and to our knowledge this is not another big urban park system in the country that has this. A lot of cities are talking about the importance of equity but defining it and analyzing it is more loosey-goosey.

Taylor will now show you how the lens was built.

Taylor Emerson: It's an honor to be a staff member in the City and County of San Francisco where we're working on this kind of important question. So the first was to define what is a disadvantaged community so we could then measure parks and recreation, resources and services in that area compared to the city as a whole.

So what is a disadvantaged community? If you remember the language says low income and disadvantaged. So it's more than just poverty from that language. So we went about benchmarking and looking at other governments and other park agencies and looked at academia and all kinds of stuff and happened upon this tool designed by the California Environmental Protection Agency called Caloviroscreen. They were directed to develop a tool—they were directed to define disadvantage in response to Governor Brown's Greenhouse Gas Emissions Cap and Trade program and it said that 25 percent of the proceeds from that program had to benefit disadvantaged communities. So for them again step one was to define disadvantaged communities.

And they did. It took them four years and millions of dollars and they've actually come out—we're working on the second version. They're getting in another six months or so they're going to release version three which has more enriched and updated data.

What this tool does is provide a standard that the State is using to define disadvantaged and if face they made it all open data and other jurisdictions are starting to use it. This was a slide I made weeks ago. Over a thousand people participated for jurisdictions of all kinds looking at the data and how it's updated.

So it's exciting to have this tool, this third-party data set. Having someone else figure this kind of stuff out has been fantastic for us.

So what their tool does is it looks at what they call population characteristics which is a set of seven different characteristics that in combination create disadvantage. Age—so youth and seniors are considered a more vulnerable populations, as rates of asthma, low birth weight, low education, linguistic isolation—actually this is very interesting and relevant in San Francisco, it means no one in the household over age twelve speaks English well so that would most definitely be a disadvantage in accessing public services. Poverty, standard definition that we use in San Francisco, 200 percent of [unintelligible] and unemployment.

So what the data does is look at the rates of each of these characteristics and weights them equally in a calculation. So poverty counts as much as asthma. And overlays the incidence of the rate of frequency of them by census tract and then compares every census tract in California to every other census tract in California so you can see where you are in relation to everyone else.

Because they made it open data we have this awesome GIS analyst in our Planning Division she was able to extract the data and look at just San Francisco and compare the census tract data to every other census tract just in San Francisco. That's what this is a picture of—population characteristics, the percentile rank. So in the darkest purple has the highest combined incidence of these characteristics. So it's places that you would expect, the southeast in the city, pockets in SOMA, an interesting pocket over in the Inner Richmond.

Male Speaker: I have one quick question, does youth include children?

Taylor Emerson: Yes, everyone under eighteen. Then we took the data and overlaid it on a map of San Francisco and our parks. To repeat, this is census tracts with the highest 20 percent of Cal EPA's population characteristics compared to the city as a whole and inside of calling them disadvantages communities we call them equity zones.

The darkest purple represents the census tracts where that meet that threshold. The lighter lavender represents a five-minute buffer. This is a standard methodology used by the Trust for Public Land in evaluating access. For example, if you live right on the corner right there the closest park to you is outside of this imaginary lines, it's across the street. And so we wanted to reflect the reality that for some people walking just outside this imaginary boundary is in fact closer and more convenient or might have the amenity they're looking for.

Phil Ginsburg: Can I interject. There are two standards that are used. There's a five-minute walk to the park standard and a ten-minute walk and you'll find them cross-referenced in the Rose, the Trust for Public Land which really does a lot of this. We didn't choose ten minutes but

the characteristic that makes San Francisco considered to be one of the top five park systems in the country is that over 99 percent of us live within a ten-minute walk of a park so we would have captured everything. But we wanted to make it clear that if you live right outside of Excelsior Playground by way of example it's technically right outside of the equity zone but we know that park serves people that are living in the equity zone so we did this five-minute walk standard. We don't count the people, we include the parks. The data is focused on the people that are in the equity zones but we include as we're looking at our parks and service delivery we're including parks that a five-minute walk from an equity zone.

Taylor Emerson: Here's a list by name of the parks. It's all the parks that you would expect that we saw on the map. Margaret Hayward, Vis Valley Playground, Silver Terrace, SOMA rec. These are places we know—Chinese Rec Center is right in the middle of that. It does create some odd bedfellows. Huntington Park is on here. Telegraph Hill Pioneer Park is on here. There's only one place that we sort of gerrymandered with the data. Those oddballs are on there because we kept the data integrity for what it showed but we did gerrymander right here. Technically using the same methodology Golden Gate Park would be included in an equity zone. That stretches the imagination a little too much and Golden Gate Park is just such a different special park.

Phil Ginsburg: It captures a small piece of Golden Gate Park and we could have reliably segregated the service data in this section. So Golden Gate Park being what it is is not included in here.

Taylor Emerson: Now we have defined a disadvantaged area, the equity zones. What are ways that we can measure equity? What are data sources and what are data sources that have integrity and that can serve as proxies for equity?

So we have all our great mapping info, park scores, park evaluation scores, work orders, the maintenance and repair requests that go into 311 into our structural maintenance yard, our budget, we have lots of great data on programs and permits because it's all in a great database, other Department records and we tried to think about what we could pull from these that spoke to our mission. Access certainly, recreation for everyone. Clean, safe, well-maintained parks. Investment.

So using what we had and what our mission is we went back and measured what we could from the parks that are inside the service area and compared that to all of our offerings citywide.

20 percent is the highest incident of those population characteristics so this particular spread is based on 2010 data. So it was 800-5000, 20 percent was that number. They're inside these census tracts. And then we looked at these metrics, access, acres of park per 1000 people. Pretty good parity there I would say. There was a criticism of the methodology because it counted all the large natural area acreage of McLaren. So in response to that I did another one—number of parks. Because McLaren counted as one in this situation and in number of parks it's amazing.

Phil Ginsburg: I would also note that the citywide data [unintelligible].

Taylor Emerson: Mini parks, community gardens are included in this.

Denis Mosgofian: District 5. I had a question about those two number. When I read it over I said it doesn't make a lot of sense for 4.42 acres of park per thousand people in the equity zone which is the area that is generally disadvantaged and then 4 citywide. So I wondered why you used citywide even though I know the charter language. Instead of the 80 percent and had a comparison of that. The second point I wanted to make is that I found that the number of parks in the equity zone which is the most disadvantaged have twice the number of parks as citywide which doesn't make a lot of sense to me and I suggest that a more realistic statistic would be to look at the other 80 percent because if you look at District 8, District 2, they have a tremendous number of open space and parks compared to other areas. I just find those statistics not believable. They contradict everything this says and also tells me that what would the Commission do as the body that oversees the Department what does it tell them to do if the number are so close of skewed that way how would it give direction to the staff if they're basing it on this?

Taylor Emerson: Well, that was a lot of question and comment together. As far as why we did it this way I did just take a very literal read of the charter. There have been two other Departments that have some an equity analysis type of thing and they did it a little bit differently but they also just took a literal interpretation of what their mandate was. So looking at it differently you can see in another slide I do look at it 20 percent versus 80 percent but in this presentation—

Phil Ginsburg: We could cut the data that way too.

Taylor Emerson: We can. Now that it's been parsed out it's easy to cut. Another thing we added in response to public comment was this feeling of crime or safety in parks. It turned out to be a real data challenge and the closest we could get to this was SFPD incidents within 500 feet of parks which is about a block per 1000 people. So this is absolutely everything from an illegal left turn to an interview of a missing person to something that would affect park safety. It could be inside of the park or within 500 feet. So there's a real difference here and I think that synchs with everyone's expectations.

On maintenance, park evaluation scores, I think the last time you saw this it was FY 15 scores but this has been updated now to reflect the FY 16 average for all parks across the city. Good news, both categories went up. Maintenance and repair requests, this is TMAs, this is work orders. We had no idea how this was going to come out. It surprised me. Capital investment per 100 people. Now, this is easier to understand because this includes all the impact fees and development fees that are going into the neighborhood plan. This is the fruition of the last two years of development in the city. So this is going into acquisition and development of new parks. It's more than that but that's one reason this is—

Phil Ginsburg: It's three years of capital budgets that are [unintelligible] and the sources of that come from bonds, they come from gifts, they come from General Fund capital dollars and open space and they come from impact fees it's everything we able legally allowed to spend. Even if it's a gift we have to accept it and that goes in to our budget and we choose a three-year

average unlike capital budgets are lumpy. Some of you have heard me say that before. It's because projects some take too long according to Sharon. But projects take a long time and bonds are issued in one year and spent over a period of time. So we will take a three-year rolling average. Every year we'll just look at the average of the last three years.

Taylor Emerson: Hours of volunteer service. This is dollars investment, this is sweat investment. I'm sorry I have not been able to do this yet. I do think before we get to next week I'll be able to get that data done.

Hours of recreational resources. This is all the structured recreation offered at a recreational park site. This includes free Zumba, Mobile Rec, and also recreation provided by our partners so Self Help for the Elderly, Vis Valley YMCA, and it really show our years-long effort. When I looked at one thing that's included here is hours that clubhouses are open and staffed so kids can come in and play and 86 percent of clubhouse hours that are open across the city are in equity zones.

Scholarships granted per 1000. This is exactly what you would think. Phil really wanted to make sure that we were getting the word out to the people most in need of that information that we do offer scholarships for kids and adults.

This is what we've been able to put together so far.

Phil Ginsburg: Let me say a word about this because it may not fit some people's narrative which is that we're not doing anything in parks in certain communities and this is data and it's just data. Everybody's experiences are going to be different. We had to start someplace and through this lens over time we can look at different types of methods and we can also continue to drill down and get more granular. These are if you look at the Department's mission statement these metrics were designed to match the language, the precise language that's in the mission statement. These are the highest level metrics of what we do. We're not holding onto these. Like what's significant about this is the lens itself, it allows us to compare different elements of service delivery in equity zones and outside of equity zones and I think we can cut it to look at the inside equity zones outside versus citywide.

This is information and it's going to help all of us to work together to shape the policy choices that we make going forward. My only ask is that if there are other things that we want to measure that we have real data. Doing this by anecdote doesn't work as well. That we have real data and that we have the resources to capture it.

But I go back to that first point, this is a start. It's a start. And it tells some interesting things. I don't know necessarily where we should be but obviously this remains and issue and as we look at how we deploy Park Rangers or how we work with SFPD this is an issue. This says we have a backfill of about 17 percent by the way system wide in our maintenance and repair requests. This doesn't mean that our work is done, it means we're just beginning and that we are committed to doing more and looking at our service delivery within the overall context of these equity zones.

Male Speaker: Phil, that's just the emergency maintenance?

Phil Ginsburg: No. These are all of our TMAs and a 311—311s are a much broader category and they don't often involved maintenance. It might be like I saw somebody naked on a street corner. So these are the ones that translate to something that's broken get entered into our total managed asset maintenance database and this database and I think Denny came and gave you a little bit of a briefing on that, we code that database and we code it—we have a prioritization and it's coded as follows: emergencies, health and safety that's not an emergency but is a health and safety issue, water. Those are our top three and then it's everything else.

And so our stats unless a project is really complex and I'll give you one which is we have a leak someplace underneath Alta Plaza that we cannot get to the bottom of. There is a waste of water and it's causing some hazards around the sidewalks so there's a health and safety issue there so it's bumped up but we haven't solved it yet. Emergencies, health and safety, and water. Like now you're motivated because now I can go back and ask my staff what's our response rates for emergencies, health and safeties and water and it should be significantly higher than 83 percent and I can even do that comparing equity zones to non-equity zones because I have this new lens.

Ana Gee: District 6. So just to understand access—so the number of parks in the equity zones is larger than citywide but does it mean that [unintelligible]?

Phil Ginsburg: Right.

Ana Gee: [unintelligible] is not because of the number of parks but it's because of that [unintelligible].

Phil Ginsburg: Yes. And there are some that frankly need to be renovated, right? I mean we've had the benefit—we do have and it's important to keep in mind we have I think the numbers have fluctuated a little bit and we've got a little bit of bond help but we still have over a \$1 billion conservatively of deferred maintenance in our parks system of things that need to be fixed and we're able to chip away at them. For example a brand new park in Gillman playground, they have a brand new park at Hilltop. That means your park scores, maintenance scores—this stuff is a mix of how well we clean it and deferred maintenance. Some of it is like is there trash on the grass. That is a staff function but then there's also is there a crack in the retaining wall. It's a mix of these two things and when we do a park renovation you're seeing higher scores actually in some of our parks that have been renovated.

But we have a long way to go in that respect. We have as a staff going through an exercise of we are visiting all of the lowest performing parks that are in our equity zones and I went to Alice Chalmers today. We must do better than that.

[simultaneous comments]

Phil Ginsburg: Yes. So Alice Chalmers is—I have a plan for my staff that I would like to—you know and we have to chip away at this, And like what's hard for us is like well why this park and not this park? But Alice Chalmers is a Let's Play S.F. playground. It's also small enough that we could make a real impact by resurfacing one tennis court and one basketball

court and redoing one ball field and then on permanent program the YMCA is there but they are moving to a preschool model so we need to focus on the clubhouse. But that is a spot that is a small enough neighborhood park—and by the way it's right next to Longfellow School and there were kids all over the place there today. We could make a real impact there. I can't do it all in one year, I can't! But later. We're going to try to figure out where we can leverage the—Merced Heights is another one of those that is a Let's Play S.F. playground and court resurfacing field renovation where we could put some things into play.

Male Speaker: I think that really speaks to this because I was on that task force and [unintelligible].

Phil Ginsburg: We've rebranded it. That was to get the bond cast. Now we're Let's Play S.F. because we're trying to raise money which by the way we've been pretty successful.

Male Speaker: Mark and I would agree I don't think Alice Chalmers was really on that map as a priority and then through the metrics that we used it got pushed to the top and this is kind of building on that.

Phil Ginsburg: This is building on it so thank you because like that's become a park that I'm a little obsessed with because I feel like we can fix that thing. It's not that big. [simultaneous comments]

Taylor Emerson: This is just mapping the crime data. It's actually really interesting. But you saw the outcome of this but I just want to show the fancy crime data. So the red is within parks in the equity zones service area. The yellow is crimes near other parks that are outside the equity zone. The black dots are other crimes that aren't even within 500 feet.

Male Speaker: Just a quick question on the data on this one. You said it was illegal left turns. It was all sorts of stuff. Is there a way to get that parsed out?

Taylor Emerson: I think this is going to evolve in so many ways and one is getting better with data. Big data is the world that we're now in and the crime data we got this from open data S.F. and this is what we can do with it in the two weeks that we've been trying to do this. So I think the next step to refine this would be work with SFPD IT and have them work with ours and try to figure out what to do. But we're all getting better at showing big data.

Phil Ginsburg: [unintelligible]

Taylor Emerson: He really did and yelled at me twice in the last two weeks to get the real data. But I have not been able to.

Male Speaker: That's what I was going to say, that's what I was getting at because you're saying this is going to be used for deployment of Park Patrol. Illegal left turns?

Taylor Emerson: No, of course not.

Phil Ginsburg: So Taylor is a policy wonk and she's just giving everything like it is. An incident is everything. I don't know that illegal left turns but it is everything that the Police Department documents as an incident. That's the data that we have now.

Taylor Emerson: We might answer our remaining questions in the—go ahead.

Chair: I was just going to say, there are certain pieces here that would be very helpful to us like volunteer hours.

Taylor Emerson: I know, I know.

Chair: Because this helps us to understand the extras. I think Nick's point is very well-taken about what crimes and Phil I think we're all in agreement with you, those little pieces are really important to us.

Phil Ginsburg: I think it's important to understand—I keep coming back to that, this is a start, this is going to be iterative. Data is going to get better. We're going to be able to get more granular with this.

Taylor Emerson: Somebody wrote me a letter saying I should measure basketball courts as a measurement and I gave myself the challenge but I was only able to count outdoor basketball courts. But these are the ways we can get better.

Phil Ginsburg: Let us get through the rest of the presentation and maybe we can take questions after that. This is an example—we did this, we wanted to apply this new tool, this new lens, and we did it to our park maintenance scores. The park maintenance scores are part of the old Prop C the Controller and the Department worked together, we evaluate all of our parks four times a year. They are a control group. They go out and evaluate them once a year. They're weighted the same. They're once—the Controller goes out on a bad day we're screwed, it affects our scores. We get four and those scores are averaged and that becomes 50 percent and the Controller's once is 50 percent and that's the way it works and our park they're very specific and if you haven't seen them this could be another interesting topic. You could even come and do them join us and do one at some point. I go out and do them myself. They're very specific. They require—they're annoying. They require you to measure. They're very objective.

So we just got our sixteen scores and they actually toughened them on us a little bit too. We were peaking around the 90s and the park maintenance scores were changes and it's like version 2.0 or 3.0 and our scores have all settled a little bit which is good. It gives us something to shoot for.

This is our average park score so in an equity zone the average is 85 which is the threshold for a well maintained park. That is the definition is an 85. That's the bottom. If it's below 85 the definition of this particular tool says not well-maintained. Outside equity zones this is the other 80 percent Denis, a little higher.

Taylor Emerson: So this we did differently. This is 20 percent, 80 percent. This is not citywide.

Phil Ginsburg: So now we looked at in response to feedback we said well where are all your highest, your top-20 scores and where are your lowest parks, right? Because we have 220 of them so we took the highest 20 that were outside the equity zones, more.

Taylor Emerson: This is your best and your worst.

Phil Ginsburg: So 40 percent of the top 20 is in the equity zone. Okay, but only 37 percent of the parks are in the equity zone. So there's not great answer here, this is just a guide.

Male Speaker: Acreage is a better measure than parks. [unintelligible]

Phil Ginsburg: Okay, fine, fine. Okay look, the point of this is not to prove that we're bad or good. It's just more data. But this gives us something to strive for. It's a little bit of a baseline. It is worth noting that even before this tool was employed this was a better year for us in that regard. And then here are the lowest 20—50 percent of the lowest 20 are in equity zones and 50 percent are out. I don't think anybody knows what the right answer is.

I think as our bond projects are getting done you are starting to see some higher projects, higher scores in underserved neighborhoods. Like Gillman today versus as these renovations are happening it is definitely having an impact. [simultaneous comments]

This is stuff that we—I told you that next year's budget will be the first full planning budget until this measure. This is what's in the hopper right now in our equity zone. In 17, these are funded projects. They all may not be completed in 17 but they're all funded. The Buchanan Street Mall, that is happening. McLaren Park Mansell corridor improvement. These are all capital projects that are happening right now in equity zones. These are acquisitions that have been in play in equity zones designed to increase acreage and access, 11th and Natoma, 500 Pine, 17th and Folsom.

Programs—we have committed and I know for you McLarenites this will excite you—we are expanding our apprenticeship program in year two of this budget cycle and we are going to have two satellite, two homes for the apprenticeship program, one in Golden Gate Park and one in McLaren. The staff we're going to keep switching back and forth but we're going to kind of run kind of an east-side, west-side sort of program.

Greenagers, we have a second class of Greenagers coming.

Male Speaker: Who are Greenagers?

Phil Ginsburg: Greenagers are right now teenagers between 14 and 17 in 94124 who either live or work there. They go through a nine-month environmental education and workforce development program. A lot of them end up working for us.

[simultaneous comments]

Phil Ginsburg: So deferred maintenance projects that are happening that are not too sexy but [unintelligible] Excelsior roof I think is underway. Field renovations, here's your Alice Chalmers right, like I got a plan. Youngwood Coleman, Garfield are the first two synthetic turfs to be redone, they're the two oldest in our system. It's actually Franklin which is not in an equity zones. Franklin is getting done and Garfield, Youngblood Coleman I believe is third.

Court resurfacing. So because of Prop B we don't have like our budget is not raining cats and dogs but we had a really good General Fund capital budget in 15 and that's what was baseline and we made a policy choice to keep that as capital and not invest it in program or staff. It's capital.

This is a tool. This is like a—there's no policy that flows from this per se but we are sharing this tool and trying to get feedback. This is really important, this is what it looks like, this is our planning loop forever.

Chair: Thank you very much. [applause] Before I take questions from the members obviously I know there are going to be a few I would like to give our working group an opportunity since they met with you guys directly before everybody dives in with questions I'd like one of the members of the working group just generally summarize your conversations with the Department. It doesn't matter to me which one of you does it. Actually, before I ask you to do that, is everybody in receipt of their document of their equity metrics notes? I think this is important to recognize because these people did a lot of off the clock work to develop a position based on what their interpretation of the equity metrics are and since they're a sub-committee I think it's important for them to present before we ask general questions.

Male Speaker: We did put a lot of work in this. This may be the third time I've heard this presentation and it's getting better every time. I'm beginning to love it more every time. I'm still not 100 percent there but we have some suggestions and I do want to plead that we put equity metrics as an action item on the October budget. I don't think we need to load it up but I think I would like to see more comments from you guys, maybe you could even participate in this for this month. I would like to see this go forward. Phil, you just said just recently that there is no policy coming out of this but there still needs to be an action and it's stipulated in the charter, you know it's there, that when we get to the planning that this is supposed to inform that once we identify the disadvantaged neighborhoods, the disadvantaged communities, the parks that are disadvantaged the language [unintelligible] go into those park.

So what I think I really would like to say is that's something we should be doing as a body, PROSAC. We should identify those parks like you were saying like Alice Chalmers if you could do that to all the parks that really do need this that would be great.

[simultaneous comments]

Female Speaker: So I know that you guys got the email attachment of our working group talking points. That was something that [unintelligible] spent a lot of time doing some research,

coming up with ideas from our neighborhoods on how we could measure equity. I think one of our biggest concerns was how the data was being measured and I think [unintelligible].

I know that just from doing the research online [unintelligible] has a plan work with a technical consultant to establish the definition for defining what a disadvantaged community is. [unintelligible] So I mean on behalf of PROSAC it would be nice if we had more understanding of how just from the data what can we expect from having an equity policy [unintelligible]. Well, in addition to the Strategic Plan but a proposal of how going forward how are we going to want to evaluate equity but also [unintelligible].

Phil Ginsburg: That's probably my question to answer. This is the beginning of a journey. One of the most interesting presentations we did was at something called the Director's Working Group. Equity is a big issue. It's an issue in every city. It's an issue in San Francisco and different agencies are struggling with how to define and measure it and I personally believe there ought to be a coordinated approach and we have actually offered up our mapping tool as a way to evaluate a variety of city services in these equity zones versus outside, whether you're doing it citywide or the 20 versus 80, it doesn't matter.

I know that the Human Rights Commission has been passed with becoming a little bit of a point coordinating entity among city Departments and there are lots of different approached to equity learning. The Planning Department, the Health Department, our exec staff on Thursday we will all be participating in a day of learning about the topic in an offsite.

I sit on the [unintelligible] council and I will tell that equity is deeply embedded as a value but there is no measure. And so I think we all have work to do and we will come back. There's going to be a lot of Sunshine on this topic. It's embedded in our Strategic Plan. Prop B says equity has to be embedded in our Strategic Plan and in our Operations and Capital Plans and in our budget. So I just transparently showed you here are the things that we're doing in the 17 budget that are specifically in equity zones and I don't know that I captured every one, they're examples but it gives you some sense. As our tools get more sophisticated we can measure spending. I can't measure staff yet because I have a lot of—a big chunk of my staff are centralized, it's very difficult to actually measure how many minutes they're spending in different parks and frankly there's a horticultural debate about whether beat gardeners is actually the best way to do business versus in groups like the apprentices. The apprentices are a big swarm of bodies that show up, tackle a project and move on but that makes it harder to kind of measure staff time. So that's something that requires a little bit of a work in progress.

So what I would say in answer is we'll keep coming back and keep having the conversation. Like this is—we're all public servants. This is our value every bit as much as it is—you're public servants too. It's 8:00 o'clock and I don't think you're getting paid. The equity plan will be embedded in our—it's part of our Operations Plan and Capital Plan. It's not something that's separate that we stick on a shelf. It's part of what we do.

Chair: Linda, do you have—hold on. Jordan are you done?

Jordyn Aquino: Yes.

Linda D'Avirro: I just want to address the members as well. What we're going to do between now and hopefully next meeting is the list that you got was four pages long. I know when I gave it to you when oh, I can't read this right now which is true. It was like everything thrown against the wall. So what we hope to do is refine that and come up with some key priorities and that's a discussion and action item that we're going to bring back to you hopefully next month and have your yay or nay because what we'd like to do for you Phil and you Taylor is say that these are important items for us that really speak to ones that we want to have light on, action plans and dates and timelines. We really have certain ones that either you can come back and say we already considered that or now we're going to embed this and we're going to start giving you how that fits in with things.

Phil Ginsburg: I appreciate that. If I may respond—we're not ready to give you dates and times and specifics. And by the way all of this is really dependent upon resources and you need kind of manage expectation about resources. We're not sitting on a treasure trove of new money. We have a new focus and some stable resources based on the 2015 budget. Our budget grown by \$3 million a year. Our expenses actually grow more than our budget. So I need to manage expectations but what I would say that where the proof is in the pudding is when we come back to you not even with our strategic plan update but what our Operations Plan and our Capital Plan looks like for the next two-year budget cycle and that's really where we're going to lay it on the table for you.

This is good for us to do this planning ahead of our budget. We're going to have our Operations and Capital Plans done probably the end of 17 and then our budget gets approved by the end of February and then it sits for three months in the Mayor's Office as they figure it out. But we're going to reveal our work plan to you ahead of our budget and I think that will hope and hopefully make you all comfortable with our priorities.

Taylor Emerson: That's where the policy work really is.

Chair: So, do I see other hands? Richard, Anthony, Ancel.

Richard Rothman: District 1. Actually I got this idea from Alex on your staff. Every part of the city like what the needs for District 1 is a lot different than the needs for Districts 10 and 11 and I thought using, since we all represent our Districts, is that we sort of take the lead of having community groups in these Districts because what's needed—I know what's needed in the two parks that are in District 1 but maybe it's different than what's needed in the southeast part of the city. For our District I just wish for the two playgrounds in District 1 that are in the area there that they would just open the playground, have staff there more hours and maybe instead of dealing so much on the statistics is dealing actually with what's needs like maybe District is simple because it's only one are, but you know maybe if each council or group in the neighborhood could just come and see what's needed in this playground and this area and how can we bring it up and then maybe come back together. So maybe if Recreation and Park would want to decentralize this process.

Phil Ginsburg: We would welcome decentralized outreach, that would be very helpful to us but again this is where my job is less fun. I like to delivery nothing but joy but I can only deliver the joy that I can afford, that's the joy that we can delivery. We say well we'd like to put more staff at the playground. Who doesn't want more staff at the playground? There's 220 parks that want more staff and let's say we prioritize the 88 that are in equity zones and that's still a lot, right?

But I would very much—look, this is an awesome group. This is ground zero of people who love and care about parks. So we would very much welcome—maybe we all ought to do some sort of strategic planning kind of retreat at some point where we think about how we can really work together and I think we've made some great progress, like you were very helpful in Prop B. We have already incorporated a fair amount of input in this document and we would continue to welcome that so if you can channel some concrete suggestions for parks in your particular District some of which are in equity zones, some of which are not. By the way, the goal here is not to actually ignore the other 160 parks entirely. So we still have a responsibility to maintain them but we want to focus on this group and figure out a strategy to do that.

Chair: Thank you. So Anthony.

Anthony Cuardo: Very quick, just for clarification. Field renovation that you were talking about at Alice Chalmers is that baseball field specific?

Phil Ginsburg: Yes.

Anthony Cuardo: Then I wanted to echo what Denis was talking about, to get a real apples to apples comparison is talks about 100 percent of the city versus 20 percent of the city and then the next two slides there it's talking about 80-20.

Phil Ginsburg: We did than intentionally. What the charter says is how are parks in underserved neighborhoods doing compared to the city as a whole. That's how it's written. And that would speak to the 20. Here is the citywide average—all 100 percent of the parks, this is the citywide average and then this is what the parks, the 20 percent are. What we will do for the next iteration because I have absolutely not problem doing it, we'll have three columns. We'll show the 20, the 30 and the overall citywide average. This is not hide the ball, this is not about spin, this is about data.

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible]

Chair: Ancel.

Ancel Martinez: At large District. Thank you for the presentation. My commentary was covered so far [unintelligible] what are the policy implications, the public policy implications of this data and your analysis and it sounds like you're getting to a point where you're trying to arrive at okay what other public policy implications, the way your collect it, the way the mandate [unintelligible]. So just in the maturation process of what it means for the future I guess I would ask the fellow PROSAC members if we could device our own way to arrive at analysis of

interpretation of what public policy [unintelligible]. I'd be happy to hear any thoughts you might have on that.

Phil Ginsburg: I think transparency accountability are two important public policy implications of looking at our work and service delivery this way. Again, for the first time ever we're able to do more than a District 1 versus District 10 comparison. So that's the first thing.

Two, I think we are able to come to you, come to the Commission, come to the Board, come to the community and lay out on the table what our commitment is to park and program in these areas. I don't think that there is a target, an indicator. This is one person's thinking. And we do have a stewardship responsibility to the city as a whole but I think now we can—like we're tackling a whole bunch of court resurfacings. This is our first year under Prop B and this lens and we have a lot of courts that desperately need to be resurfaced and we are prioritizing parks in equity zones. You can kind of see it and hopefully you'll be able to enjoy them, you'll see them get done. So I think the policy implication is a new way of analyzing what we do and looking at what we do.

Ancel Martinez: We haven't applied to SFMTA?

Phil Ginsburg: You're right, they took a different path. So we're all stumbling to try to figure it out. I'm kind of proud of the tool and you'll get a chance—we'll work together on what we do with the tool. But I do need to manage expectations about resources.

Chair: Maya.

Maya Rodgers: District 10. So as I sit here and think about the overriding implications [unintelligible] but I kind of—it's refreshing that it's not focused on policy and that it is focused on the practice of doing—like incorporating that into the day to day operations of Recreation and Park because I feel like sometimes equity issues are all around us but not in parks and open spaces and I think people sometimes feel like it's not equity issues. I mean, it is. So I like the idea that it's a restructuring of how priorities are made and kind of how the Department does business day to day. Because that's what it feels like, a restructuring.

Chair: Any other questions from the members? I'd like to just add two quick things. The first will speak to this committee's work on Prop B. I felt like Prop B came to the table, the Department presented it to us. It wasn't exactly what we all thought it maybe should have been and we worked together to formulate what was acceptable for both sides. I don't think anybody on that working committee thought this is a home run, it's exactly how we think it should be. So to that end I appreciate this dialog. I think it is really important that this communication at this table puts it on the record in front of the General Manager, in front of the policy expert or the person who is really taking this data.

The other part of that, and I'll direct this to the General Manager, you make the case that it's the front end, this body's concern is that it's the front end Phil, that we don't yes something that we feel hasn't been properly vetted. And so I think what you're hearing from this committee is we want to be a part of this, we want to put our voices into it because we feel we represent our

communities. And so although I respect and really honor that this is your second time and you'll be here again, we just—again, I'm just echoing what I hear outside of this room, that the members want to feel like it's done right the first time, that we ask and ask and honk and honk because at the end of the day we're all stewards, we'll all trying to be on the same page here and the more we discuss it and the more it forms—I just heard from a committee member that says I've seen this three times and it's got better every time but that doesn't sell the people who are seeing it for the first time and you're telling them don't worry just believe, it's the first step. I want everybody on this committee to endorse this. I want everybody on this committee to feel it the way you do. So we're thankful that you came out and gave us this—again, and it's better than it was last time.

So I'm just putting my two cents in from District 2. Are there any other members that have any comment? Hearing none, is there any public comment on this item? Tom Borden.

Tom Borden: Hi. You heard this before and I keep on thinking of trying to figure out better ways to convey this but if you look at all of the capital methods that have been presented they're all surprisingly high. Like wow, three times more capital spending in the equity zones than elsewhere and there's a reason for this. These high numbers are bad because they represent that these equity zones are getting really well-served when maybe they're not. And so here's my example. Say that someone from Recreation and Park goes out to a park and he's got a bag of trees. He's got 100 treats and he's going to a park. IT's got five census tracts within a quarter-mile. So these five neighborhoods share this park and one of those tracts is an equity zone. So the Recreation and Park guy goes out, he puts on his blindfold for doing statistics. All the zones have the same number of people, and he hands out these 100 cookies to all these neighbors who come in to get their cookies, their treats. The question is, the equity zone how many treats do they get? Do they get a 100? Statistically they get 20 treats. But they're only 20 percent of the people there. Statistically they're going to get 20 percent of the treats but the analysis that this whole that's being presented by Recreation and Park assumes that the equity zone captures 100 percent of those treats and so that's the problem with this analysis, that's why the numbers are so high because they're not accounting for sharing and so when you go to a park and you want a picnic site there are a certain number of picnic tables you're not just competing with your neighbors from your equity tract, it's other guys from other neighborhoods too. So it's a Zumba classes, it's everything is shared and this analysis doesn't account for that and that's why the numbers are crazy high. And I presented a way to do it, it's not that hard but the key thing is to think it's shared when Recreation and Park goes and offers some amenity it's shared with not just the equity tract that's within a quarter mile capture 100 percent. They don't, they only capture [unintelligible] are also getting their share of that park. And acres per capita that's how many acres do you have to yourself. Times up?

Chair: Thank you Tom.

Nick Belloni: Phil, can I ask you a quick question? I saw when you were doing this you incorporated the permit stuff, is that included in what he's saying?

Phil Ginsburg: Totally. We share our parks and I can really appreciate Tom's sort of thinking about this but there are people that live in equity zones that actually go to Golden Gate

Park and that go to different parks in different neighborhoods that are not in equity zones. So sharing is sort of implied. Our parks are open and the idea of this what's mine is mine within this boundary is [unintelligible]. So the data does include—Tom is correct statistically, there are people that do not live in equity zones that go to Crocker-Amazon, who go to McLaren Park. Frankly we want more people to go to McLaren Park that don't live in the equity zones. And so that is true but the converse is true and so I don't understand. Tom and I can try to talk about this offline but I'm not sure I understand the statistical relevancy.

Taylor Emerson: The technical question of permits though—where permits were for an activity of a structured recreation and [unintelligible] on a Recreation and Park setting.

Phil Ginsburg: Not meaning the birthday party permits.

Taylor Emerson: Because the birthday party is not open to the public. This is public program permits.

Richard Rothman: I just want to announce tomorrow the Board of Supervisors the Government Audit and Oversight Committee at 1:30 is going to have a hearing on this matter. This is about Supervisor Avalos'. I think we got a copy of the resolution at last month's meeting. [simultaneous comments]

Chair: Okay. Any other questions or comments? Hearing none, this item is closed.

Taylor Emerson: The Strategic Plan, who has the strength to go on? This is mostly really familiar. The Strategic Plan every update going forward will have what I'm trying to call a result report for the current year. So this is our results report from the current year. This is our first results report, super high-level summary here. I just choose one example of each strategy to highlight [unintelligible] at Civic Center which brought people to Civic Center that had never been there before. It was an experience of activation.

The park at 17th and Folsom was on our Strategic Plan. As silly as it sounds this is one of my dearest achievements for this years, the 938 people who work for the Recreation and Park Department that are permanent civil service now have emails that we can communicate with them.

This one is for stewardship, just a little example of we're doing some great work visualizing data. This helps you see just the dramatic stepping down in our irrigation data. Now, this only goes through May but we're making great progress in complying with PUC's mandates to reduce irrigation. And our shining center, the passage of Prop B.

So those were initiatives that were achieved in our first year.

Looking forward to our update which will be another document that we're going to publish and produce the mission, vision, strategies and objectives, no changes. The two years that we've put into the work of doing all that is still really valid and really fits us and feels good so we're not making changes to that. We are going to update some initiatives, not just a one-for-one

replacement but really thinking about what are the initiatives that we want to both focus on, highlight and add to our Strategic Plan considering [unintelligible]. And we're also going to include of course a section on equity which is required so just as soon as we get that approved by the Commission following all the outreach and feedback we're doing then we will begin the work of implementing that data and integrating it. Then we'll have all the performance targets that we use to measure our achievement in moving towards the strategies and objectives will also be a separate kind of section. Then we'll come back to the Commission and PROSAC in November.

Phil Ginsburg: [unintelligible] So where are the equity action items, the implementation, those are initiatives. Those are specific things that we want to do to kind of drive the ball. And so you will see—and we'll probably highlight ones that are in equity zones—in the new initiatives as far as our core mission, vision, value and strategy, equity is embedded in all of them. We want to inspire great public space, we want to inspire play, we want to inspire stewardships. Those core strategies their equity is interwoven in them already.

Taylor Emerson: So we're just beginning the Strategic Plan work for this update. But of course the year that we're in is an active year in the currently approved Strategic Plan so it's not like we're waiting. We are continuing to implement our Strategic Plan and these are some things that in each strategy that are existing, ongoing initiatives that we're thinking will continue to be highlights in the next years. So the District 6 acquisition, 11th and Natoma of course. Safe bicycling to and through parks, this is I think even more important than we knew at the time we put it in. Definitely an emerging issue. Continuing to inspire investment even though we passed Prop B, another element of that strategy was to try to get a new website and we are making progress on that. Stewardship [unintelligible] eclipsed this as the focus so probably need to update this slide. But before that we were really focusing on the [unintelligible] and I think that's something we're going to be able to do. A very exciting program. And inspire team, we are going to do our PDU this year.

Male Speaker: Was it that?

Taylor Emerson: We're deciding that right now in partnership with staff about what they would like.

Phil Ginsburg: It's a professional development program, sort of internal learning. Like we all go to conferences—or professionals go to conferences. We never get field staff an opportunity to take off your boots, you are a professional, and give them learning opportunities. [simultaneous comments]

Male Speaker: What is meant by inspire place?

Taylor Emerson: Well, you're taking us back a year in conversation. I'll show you, you can read more about inspire place. [simultaneous comments]. Does anybody else want a Strategic Plan? These are now soon to be outdated documents. And we are just kind of starting this. On Thursday Phil mentioned we're having an executive staff retreat where we're really going to

look at taking the equity data that we have now and thinking about how we could implement our good intentions, just this data to guide our resource allocation decisions.

Female Speaker: What's park stat?

Taylor Emerson: Park stat is this really great tool. We're the third Department to start using it across the city. It's taking data and making pictures with it, that's what it really means, this software tool called Tableau. So they're using it at DPW and MTA, Transtat to help them interaction with this big data sets with members of the public. It's great to help see things.

So the first kind of module of data we're doing in park stat is recreation, because that's where we have the most data. And we almost completed a full dashboard of data about recreation so that Phil and anyone else would be able to see the kind of results last quarter or for fall registration compared to last year.

Phil Ginsburg: [unintelligible]

Taylor Emerson: It's a really great school for internal management and also externally to talk about what our services are.

Female Speaker: So we the public will be able to see that?

Taylor Emerson: Eventually. At first it's an internal tool so with the other two Departments that are doing it it's still internal but eventually and I would love to propose that as a topic to come back and to take you through park stat.

Phil Ginsburg: We can start with PROSAC and just show you the tool. [simultaneous comments] It's hard to turn over [unintelligible].

Taylor Emerson: You actually can't even print it. It's a strange program.

Linda D'Avirro: Where is Comet, is that in inspire investment at some point?

Taylor Emerson: Comet's a relic.

Linda D'Avirro: I understand but the replacement for it.

[simultaneous comments]

Phil Ginsburg: That's going to be a several year project and we're starting Lifecycle which is going to develop to a capital asset inventory and create preventative maintenance cycles, routine maintenance cycles, and then renewal cycles. So we can do a little bit more capital planning so we don't have to hear hey fix the tennis court, it's cracked. We know that tennis courts have a life expectancy of ten years before they need to be resurfaced. It's easy for tennis but a little bit more complicated for HVAC.

[simultaneous comments]

Phil Ginsburg: You're asking about the tennis court?

Female Speaker: Yeah.

Phil Ginsburg: I don't think there's a general [unintelligible] about how many times you can resurface a tennis court because what I now know a little bit more about this. It depends on the substrate, the subsurface and what's happening.

Male Speaker: The lifecycle, you want to have that [unintelligible]?

Phil Ginsburg: I'm not giving you a date. We're pushing a lot of rocks uphill. So this one is a bear. This is multi-year project.

Male Speaker: I agree with you. It's probably one of the more important things.

Phil Ginsburg: That's why we're prioritizing it. Thank you Denis. [simultaneous comments]

Chair: Ana Gee.

Ana Gee: District 6. [unintelligible]

Phil Ginsburg: Project life cycle?

Ana Gee: Yes.

Phil Ginsburg: At some point it's probably ripe yet. We've come to you before several times to talk to you about Comet which is the sort of older system. We are in probably—we started probably our planning probably about six months ago for this. We're not really ready. And I can tell you what we would come and tell you is that it's going to be a capital asset inventory and we can show you [unintelligible] I think we want to pilot a particular asset. I'm not sure [unintelligible]. There's one asset that we're going to try to pilot and capture data about that asset all around the system. But it's starting, we're actually doing some restructuring within the Department to create a little bit more capacity to do post-occupancy evaluations. So we've renovated more of our rec centers at this point so we now have some staff maintenance planning type staff that are going to go and look at the systems and the assets and collect data. But if it's done in three Denis has to buy me a beer but I think it's more a five-year project.

Taylor Emerson: That's a really quick, high-level.

Phil Ginsburg: Taylor just put up some examples.

Taylor Emerson: I did.

Phil Ginsburg: The ones that we did not are—you see all these initiatives that were kind of—there’s a bunch in here that we did not get done. We got a lot of work [unintelligible].

Taylor Emerson: 24.

Phil Ginsburg: 24 last year. So the initiatives will keep—it’s incoming and you might have some for us. In fact we’re supposed to be working with PROSAC, this was on your recommendation on a park ambassador program so we need to think about how we operationalize that work and pilot that.

Taylor Emerson: And a sister park program.

Phil Ginsburg: A sister park program you’re supposed to be involved in as well.

Chair: We like both of those.

Taylor Emerson: Those are both in the ‘not yet started’ categories.

Chair: And I will just say that knowing this body you will have no trouble finding members who are willing to support both the park ambassador and the sister park program.

Taylor Emerson: Great.

Mark Scheuer: District 8. I think that could go under the RPD [unintelligible].
[simultaneous comments]

Phil Ginsburg: Potentially from my staff if you’re referring to how my staff engages sort of park patrons and visitors RPD University started like an internal education program giving staff more professional development opportunities. We’re only as good as the people we have and we want to make sure our people are in a cycle of continuous learning and that was that one is. The park ambassador idea is really—there are certain spaces that would benefit from more of a presence. You see community ambassadors that are paid for around Civic Center and around Union Square and a couple different hubs but could we create—is it a paid program, is it a volunteer program? But like some folks that can answer questions about a Junior Ranger type thing, they can answer questions, they can keep an eye on the park, they know who to call if there’s an issue, that sort of thing. We actually are piloting this with our own staff at Delores or we do have ambassadors out there on the weekends and they have a little pop-up tent, they give out information and they remind people to throw their cans and bottles away sometimes less successfully than others.

Male Speaker: You’ve got to put garbage cans back in the park.

Phil Ginsburg: Oh Denis, all of the data says you are incorrect about that. Trash cans beget trash.

Chair: Phil Ginsburg, thank you very much. Trash cans begat trash. [simultaneous comments] Is that the end of the presentation?

Taylor Emerson: That's it. [applause]

Phil Ginsburg: And by the way a special acknowledgement to Taylor both on our Strategic Plan and on the data involved in the equity metrics. This is Oscar award winning work.

Chair: Thank you. Any other questions from any of the members regarding this topic considering that we are coming back to visit this topic again in October? So let's all meditate on this topic, shall we? Any public comment on this item? Hearing none, that item is closed.

So before we move on, quickly, I would like just briefly as I think this falls within our purview to have Mark Scheuer talk a little bit about the incident that happened this past week with regards to the dog play area. I think it's important to just bring this up briefly. We brought up the tree branch. Mark, just give us two minutes.

Mark Scheuer: Okay. So it was 6:00 o'clock, prime time in the Duboce Park dog play area. Two dogs got into a scrap and it was a very minor scrap according to witnesses. I was not there but I know many people who were. After the dogs were separated and it was apparent there is not a lot damage to either dog and everything was fine one—this guy who was a stranger to the park, and most of the people that have their dogs or know each other—for some odd reason he decided to go over to the dog that had been involved, the other dog not his dog which was a basset, he went to a black lab and grabbed it by the collar and started choking it, kind of like pulling it. And after a certain amount of time people said wait, this is not right and so somebody go in like not a headlock but like a neck-lock like this and you can see this on the video. There's some parts of the video that are not shown but you can see that clearly on the video.

And so then they just told him to leave the park, that his behavior is not appropriate so as he's walking sort of west of the park he sees the woman with the dog again and he goes over and he kicks the dog. And this unfortunately brought out a lot of road rage and one of the bigger guys that was a park regular went over and tackled him. Nothing happened and he got up and eventually the guy picked up his dog and left the park and that's what happened.

The feeling in the community is that the people in the park were really proud that they came together as a community to sort of take care of this situation and protect one of their own community members. But it was a total stranger to the park, he'd never been seen before in the park and that's pretty much what happened. The police came a little too late and no one knows who this guy is so no arrest was made?

Chair: Again, these are items that need to talk about here because clearly park safety as it relates to DPAs falls within our purview. I appreciate your comments. Are there any other items not listed on the agenda that anybody would like to announce or talk about?

Linda D'Avirro: District 11. I want to announce our last event. I want to thank Phil Ginsburg who stayed for the second program which was the Acoustic Soul Fest. We have actual pictures of him dancing.

Phil Ginsburg: Fantastic Negrito.

Linda D'Avirro: Fantastic Negrito was there and it was a great show of support by Recreation and Park. I do want to thank you before you did get called up there and had to say a few words and hadn't really prepared for it but that also brings into focus the fact that these are really good events and you are really missing out as you said the smarted people are here in the stands, that's true. So you all better come this coming October. This coming Saturday is a children's show so I don't know if you're up for that but in October we have a rock show on the 8th, a bluegrass show on the 15th and our Blues Finale and birthday part of the amphitheater on the 22nd. So do come and support it. If our General Manager can come on a very busy weekend and spend three hours there dancing his head off. Malia Cohen came, I thought that was great too. I think that is really a good show of support but we really would like you to spread the word and support the concerts by showing up and enjoying what we are putting on because it's really I think a good show.

Phil Ginsburg: If I could just tell this very quick story. I was just going to say I showed up as a park General Manager because I wanted to support Linda and May and everybody who worked so hard on this thing and Stefan. I stayed as a lover of parks. It was a beautiful day and McLaren Park looked great. The music was awesome and this is s special thing. If we could spread the work we could build some momentum. You do a wonderful job.

Chair: I'll mention just two quick things about it. To have Fantastic Negrita out who played Outside Lands two weeks before and came to our show and tore it up and it was amazing to see this cat who is obviously—wasn't billed, we couldn't bill him on the show, special guess. Poof, awesome. The fact that the community is now respecting this event, that it's a part of the community and we see kids and we see adults and it doesn't matter what kind of music it is, it's just people coming out and having a great time. I had a real staunch person who basically goes to that park, that amphitheater every single day. He lives five minutes away and he said I just happened upon this, what could be better? A beautiful day, walking with my dog, and seeing some fantastic music. Again, it's just one person at a time but it's changing that neighborhood, just that one event is changing the neighborhood.

So to the people from District 10 and 9 and 11 who have really worked hard on this, thank you very much for doing it. It's great to see the park come to life.

Any other items? Thank you Phil. Denis, do you have something?

Denis Mosgofian: I just wanted to make sure that when we got to the part about setting the next month's agenda that we got back to the issues Robert and I have raised.

Chair: I have noted all of those items right here. I will discuss them with the Department and get them on the agenda for future meetings.

Denis Mosgofian: Specifically about both the equity metrics and the strategic plan as an action item as well as discussion.

Chair: Yeah, I'm open to it.

Denis Mosgofian: I don't think that needs to be discussed with the Department, I think that's our event.

Chair: That's fine, that's fine. I mean after this presentation I feel like at this point they can't really present much more. I feel like we've got a whole heap of new information, some more information that we've had in previous meetings and so I wouldn't be object to both items being action items and I don't think anybody else would either. I think the Department would be fine with that as well.

Mark?

Mark Scheuer: District 8. One more announcement. As Friends of Duboce Park is having their 19th annual Friends of Duboce Park tag sale this Saturday from 9:00 to 2:00 and it's really a great event and the bargains really are bargains.

Chair: Guys, just hang with me before we adjourn for one quick minute. I want to invite you to Lafayette Park's first movie night which we are going the Pixar movie Inside Out. We are doing it next Friday night, September 15th. But what I really want to invite you to is this ever-popular event called the Lafayette Park Fall Social. I try to get everybody involved every year. Certainly Linda, Sharon, May came in years past. The reason I want to hand these fliers out is because we're getting guilt gangster on everybody who comes to our little party and what I mean by that is our friends of group puts on this party. We don't really spend a lot of money. We get donations, we get donations. We get support from the community but you're see on these fliers that our cleaning and greening is on the back of every flier and the reason I'm showing you this is because again with community members if you go up to them and say hi, how are you doing? Would you like to come a cleaning and greening, you know what they do? Yeah, but if you go hi, you want to come to a party where there's free food and it's really awesome and when it's over you can flip that puppy around and leave it on your refrigerator. I'm just showing you effective marketing for getting people to come to cleaning and greening. Feel free to come to our Friends of Lafayette Park fall social, PROSAC members will be honored. There will be a lot of food. I got the School for Performing Arts to come out with their full choir and do a little piece. I'm sure there will be people.

Are there any other items that anybody want to raise as items not listed on the agenda?

Linda D'Avirro: The fundraiser at Glen Eagles is next Friday the 16th. That's as the sun sets on Glen Eagles. Everybody wins. There's going to be a prize for everybody that buys a raffle ticket so you can't lose and you'll go and see what the pre-apprentice program is all about. If you haven't heard of that it's a really good program that engages at-risk and I guess troubled people.

They learn job skills, they become apprentices when they go through the program but they are dedicated to Glen Eagles and they've done a wonderful job.

Chair: Sorry Ana, you looked very scared when we said that number. We were just discussing what the latest PROSAC meeting [unintelligible] and that was 10:35 since I've been on this board.

Male Speaker: What was the issue?

Chair: Oh my God, you don't even want to talk about it. This is not a good conversation to have. Okay, any other questions, comments? Hearing none, this item and the meeting is adjourned, thanks for coming.

End of Document