



# MEETING MINUTES

## Glen Canyon Park Improvement Plan: *Community Meeting #1*

**Time/Date:**

Thursday, December 16, 2010  
6:30 – 8:30 pm

**Location:**

Glen Canyon Park Recreation Center  
Near the corner of Elk and Chenery Street, Glen Park  
San Francisco, CA

---

101 Montgomery St.  
Suite 1100  
San Francisco, CA  
94104

T: (415) 495-5660

[www.tpl.org](http://www.tpl.org)

*Minutes prepared December 23, 2010. If you have comments or corrections, please contact Trudy Garber*

---

TPL held the kickoff community workshop for the Glen Canyon Park Improvement Plan (PIP). Approximately 80 people attended.

### Welcome and Introductions

Dawn Kamalanathan: Director of Capital and Planning, Recreation and Parks

- Two goals of this community process: (1) big vision that defines GCP as a 21<sup>st</sup> century park and (2) first part of the park improvement plan to build with the bond money.

Karen Mauney-Brodek, Deputy Director for Park Planning, Recreation and Parks

- For questions about the project, please contact Karen at [Karen.Mauney-Brodek@sfgov.org](mailto:Karen.Mauney-Brodek@sfgov.org) or call (415) 831-2789
- Karen described the basics of the 2003/4 Glen Canyon Park planning efforts.

Gillian Gillett, Aid to Supervisor-elect Scott Weiner

- The supervisor-elect is eager to support the community planning process

### Kickoff and Overview

Jennifer Isacoff, Program Director, Parks for People – Bay Area, The Trust for Public Land

- TPL received a grant from the state Coastal Conservancy for work on the PIP
- TPL has a deep commitment to outreach and community participation in the design process. TPL will gift the PIP (final product of this 6-workshop series) to the City in order to extend the funds that the City can spend on capital improvements.
- Timeline: Meetings every 4-6 weeks at which we will do work together, but there will be numerous other outreach efforts to include people that cannot attend these Thursday evening meetings.
- Goal is to look at the natural areas and the active recreation areas as one unit and enhance the beauty, charm, and treasured feeling of this place.
- Introduced WRT as the landscape architecture consultant who will participate and help facilitate the community workshops and prepare the Park Improvement Plan.

### Existing Conditions and Impressions

Steve Hammond, WRT (Landscape Architecture consultant):

- Will build on the 2003/4 plan, but we want to think freshly about what GCP could be.
- WRT has a team of technical consultants to provide expert advice regarding natural factors, architecture, infrastructure, etc.
- Park as a Cultural Resource:

- Historical uses of site: dynamite factory, housed refugees of 1906 earthquake, Sutro's blue gum ranch
- Entrance: The main entrance is ungracious (squeezed between the tennis courts and a wall, and poses many challenges such as safety, providing a welcoming feeling, and being difficult for pedestrians and bicycles to coexist. There are many formal and informal entries along the park perimeter.
- Facilities: This process will look at how the existing spaces are used and if they are meeting the needs of the City and neighborhood, with an eye for deferred maintenance.
  - Recreation Center: Under historic review. Where is front of this building? Architect, William Merchant, designed the building as a group of spaces. Do these spaces work together today and do they meet the current programming needs?
  - Silver Tree: Well-loved and well used. In poor condition and could work with its natural surroundings in a more engaged way.
  - Active Sports: Ball fields for baseball, soccer, tennis.
  - Passive recreation in natural areas: walking, hiking, running, nature appreciation
  - Active recreation in natural areas: rock climbing, mountain biking, etc.
- Hydrology: It is only of the only open creeks in San Francisco. This community design process will look at the park as a space within the Islais Creek watershed and the greater San Francisco area.
- Natural Areas management plan: Enhance of native plants and minimize the expansion of invasive communities. Many different vegetation communities at this site. Rock outcroppings are dramatic features in the park.
- Interpretative signage: Provides children and adults with an opportunity to learn about the park.
- Neighbors: How do neighbors influence the park and vice versa (quality/character of adjacencies, volunteer trails, homeowners, SOTA, Christopher Park, etc.)
- Citywide context: Regional trail and park networks.

Meghan Tiernan: project manager at SF Recreation and Parks for the trails program

- Gave an overview of the Glen Canyon Park trails project. \$900K is earmarked for trail improvements in Glen Canyon Park from the bond, with the goals of accessibility, connectivity, and increased public safety. Trails traverse many different habitats, help connect people with nature, and have a rustic/low key quality. MT will be working with TPL to do community outreach and some fundraising for the trails. All are invited to attend special focus groups to discuss trail details on January 20<sup>th</sup> and February 17<sup>th</sup>.

### **Community Input**

Community Feedback: After hearing the presentation, the community offered feedback/ideas about Glen Canyon Park.

- Majority of workshop attendees primarily use the natural areas. TPL will make an effort to outreach to a representative group of park users and gain comprehensive community input.
- What do you love about the park?
  - Natural Areas: Refuge-like 'wilderness area' in the city. The trails are steep and rustic feeling and provide views and a sense of exploration. Natural areas accommodate different user groups (children, adults, teens, dogs) in an informal

- manner. Park also feels very intimate and private. Park offers many learning opportunities about natural factors and coexistence.
  - Active recreation: Children playing in the park and neighbors meeting and bumping into each other here. Ball fields are great for sports
  - Silver Tree is a beloved amenity for children and families.
  - Recreation Center: Beautiful wood floors. Free basketball here. This is one of the only areas in the neighborhood to have community gatherings and meetings.
- What would you add/change about Glen Canyon Park?
  - Natural Areas: Need a long-term plan to manage the invasive species. Benefits of low allergen plants. More water in the creek for aesthetic purposes and to flush out sediment. Explore daylighting portions of the creek.
  - Active Recreation: Frisbee advocates want high quality of playing fields that drain well during all seasons. Opportunity to program/design for modern recreation activities – such as biking, skateboarding rock climbing, and ropes. Consider playground improvements, such as increasing its size, targeting a range of ages, using nontoxic materials, and making the character of the playground relate to the natural areas (wood structures, nature/adventure play, etc.)
  - Accessibility: Trails that accommodate wheelchairs and strollers. Rethinking the entrances to the park; some are interested in having a more permeable boundary, while others just want the primary entrance to feel safe and accessible. Redesign Silver Tree drop-off. Access to Glen Canyon Park can be difficult because O’Shaughnessy is a dangerous street to cross. Look into traffic calming designs.
- Additional feedback collected through a worksheet that asked community workshop attendees to answer (1) what do you like about Glen Canyon Park and trails, (2) What would you add/change about Glen Canyon Park and trails, and (3) Tell us about your other visionary ideas.

**Next Steps:**

- Information to be posted on website, including survey
- TPL wants to have a comprehensive outreach campaign – please tell us who else we should reach out to during the park improvement plan process.
- The workshop attendees are interested in being educated by the consultant team about what innovative park ideas are being implemented in other cities.
- The meeting adjourned at 8:30pm.

Community Input Details:

WHAT DO YOU LOVE ABOUT THE PARK?

- Many users without separation – youth, families, elderly. For the most part, users are sensitive to other people’s needs. Self-policing
- Silver Tree
- Beautiful wood floor in Recreation Center gym
- Free basketball
- View over park from home
- Coyotes, opossums, raccoons, hawks
- Steepness of trails, variety of experiences
- Loves dogs off-leash and intimate trails

- Potential for learning opportunities, shared experiences, coexist
- Majority attending this meeting use natural areas; some use active areas
- Refuge: Place where one can get away from the city
- Love seeing the community members playing there – soccer, tennis, kids, parents
- Wildness; not managed; overgrowth – not just another city park
- “God’s country”
- Urban environment that is unique and rare
- Intimate character
- Notion of ‘shared treasure’
- The clubhouse is one of the only areas available for community gatherings

#### WHAT WOULD YOU ADD OR CHANGE ABOUT THE PARK?

- Maybe there should be a designated place for dogs, and other areas should be regulated
- Control exotic species
- Replace: Eucalyptus, scotch broom, pampas grass (make room for more natives)
- More water in creek; increase hydrology/creek capacity
- Short, accessible trail loop – wheelchair and stroller accessibility
- Better ball field upkeep. Fields don’t drain in the winter. At other places in the city, artificial turf enables high use. Some community members objected to having artificial turf.
- Improved entrances
- Bathroom upgrades
- Silver Tree drop off system is insane
- Opportunities of skateboarding, outdoor rock climbing, wall climbing in the gym, ropes course
- Entry sequence needs improvement
- No artificial turf
- Lower allergen plants
- Non-toxic play equipment
- Non-toxic options for play areas. Upgrade playground. New playground should keep park character (ie: wood structures) and should be for many ages. The current playground is undersized for use and safety zone codes. There is a conflict between the playground and building access. Think about having a “nature playground.”
- More capacity for activities in the building
- Facilities improvements all around
- O’Shaughnessy Boulevard Impact: makes access from neighborhoods west of the park difficult. This study should look at crosswalks that are lit.
- Some say daylight the creek; Others say don’t daylight the creek
- Overlapping zones of the park
- Expand auditorium area for community recreation use (other than basketball)