

**PROSAC Meeting  
September 1, 2015**

*[Transcriber's note: The audio recording was poor. Some of the speech was inaudible, however, with increased background noises.]*

**Chair:** We are meeting for the September 1<sup>st</sup> monthly meeting of the Park and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee and our meeting is being recorded differently than it had been if you'll notice with the minutes. So I wanted to mention that we need to have single speakers because this is all being transcribed now so every little statement and sound is being recorded. And also if you would please respond when being called on and you acknowledge who you are and your district so that the minutes will be transcribed. So with that in mind the first thing we do is we take roll call. If you would say what your name is and your district.

**Les Hilger:** Les Hilger, District 1.

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

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

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

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

**Patricia Delgado:** Pat Delgado, District 9.

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

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

**Sharon Eberhardt:** Sharon Eberhardt, District 11.

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

**Nick Belloni:** Nick Belloni, District 4.

**Steffen Franz:** Stefan Franz, District 2.

**Chair:** Linda D'Avirro, District 11. For the minutes I'm not sure that you all had an opportunity to read it. I do want to apologize we apparently had a miscommunication with our secretary and she did not print out the copies of the minutes or agenda. So we'll still ask for a motion to approve the minutes of August 4<sup>th</sup>.

**Nick Belloni:** Nick Belloni, District 4. Sure.

**Chair:** Thank you. Do I have a second?

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

**Chair:** Thank you. Is there any discussion about the minutes? Okay, Sharon first.

**Sharon Eberhardt:** Sharon Eberhardt, District 11. It's kind of hard to vote to approve something I've never seen.

**Chair:** We have a hand up over here, Linda Shaffer.

**Linda Shaffer:** Linda Shaffer, District 10. Not wishing to cast aspersions on anyone but I am going to vote not on approving these minutes because I do not consider them to be minutes. A literal transcript of every word that was said during the course of a meeting doesn't constitute minutes.

**Chair:** We had a hand up.

**Steffen Franz:** Steffen Franz, District 2. I would say with regard to the editing of the discretionary minutes, what they're calling minutes, use of technology like Google Docs or—is that what we use to share this? [simultaneous comments]. It's actually a very easy form for those of us who you use that particular technology. I'm not saying that it works for everybody but the idea that I could go through all of my pieces and clearly say that was me or that wasn't me, those words are correct rather than multiple drafts to me ends up being a good solution for this. I agree with Linda these aren't really minutes they are a literal transcript of what was said but at the same time I feel like if this is becoming [unintelligible] our ability to edit them rather than multiple drafts would be better.

**Chair:** Richard.

**Richard Rothman:** Yeah I called, there's a mistake on page 5, the bottom, it's the wrong Richard. I didn't talk about the Panhandle project. So the bottom of page 5 and the top of page 6.

**Chair:** So do we know who that speaker was?

**Richard Rothman:** That would have been Richard Ivanhoe

**Chair:** Thank you, that makes sense. I'll make a note of that. Now, any other discussion. I'm sorry, Tom.

**Tom Valtin:** On a separate topic, are there any more agendas?

**Chair:** No.

**Tom Valtin:** I should have printed one out. It's cool.

**Chair:** We can share, yes. And that was Tom Valtin.

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

**Chair:** Okay, any other discussion before we do the vote to approve? I do want to say just for the record that the transcription actually gives you a real full flavor of the meeting. It is done for the Recreation and Park Commission and so on the plus side we get every nuance and one of the—I won't say complaints—but one of the discussion items that has come up from time to time is that members comments were not in the minutes where this side of it is everything is in the minutes including every comment made. So on the plus side your comments will definitely be contained in the transcription because it's just literally everything that was said. So that's just another point of view that was explained to me. Do we have any other comments? Richard Ivanhoe.

**Richard Ivanhoe:** Richard Ivanhoe, District 5. I would suggest that if we're going to use a transcription that we just call it a transcription and not minutes.

**Chair:** I don't know that the etymology charges from one work to the other, I'm not sure if that's a major difference or a violation of the charter or whatever. Does anyone know about that? We have a member of the Sunshine Committee here. Can I ask you Mr. Pilpel?

**David Pilpel:** Yes, and I can probably writ my public comment at the same time. David Pilpel. The ordinance contemplates having minutes for the body that reflect the actions that you took, what time the meeting convened, what time it ended, a brief summary of the public comment and it's up to you how much more you want to sort of capture the discussion. I would say that the ordinance does not contemplate having an actual transcript of every meeting into minutes, that's sort of a different course and I would, so I don't have to repeat myself, I agree with everything that Linda Shaffer said about the minutes not really being minutes and I would encourage you to continue having this discussion and figure out what content you want and not to sort of make these major shifts in content. Thanks you. Does that answer your question?

**Chair:** So do we want to call for a vote? Let me say, I'm sorry, what I started to say earlier was that Steffen and I were invited to meet with Sarah Ballard about the role of Tiffany Lin who is our secretary [unintelligible]. We haven't set up a date but this would definitely be a discussion. There may be an issue with the personnel and the hours available, I don't know but I'm not sure how much time preparing minutes take and their use of resources so that would definitely be on question that could be answered. Yes, Les.

**Les Hilger:** Les Hilger, District 1. I will say that the transcription was a conversation that happened when I was Chair due to the fact that some members felt that their comments were either misquoted or missing and so I think this may be a problem that we were attempting to solve with the transcription and we may have just created another problem that we need to deal with. But I will say that the reason the transcription—the benefit of the transcription is it at least addressed that issue.

**Chair:** Okay, Richard.

**Richard Rothman:** Yeah, I'm just upset that I called her and told her about you know like we did with past secretaries here and these changes weren't made, what I told her to make. And so I don't know, are we going to pass it with amendments or how are we going to deal with this? Because this isn't accurate—I mean Richard Ivanhoe should be quoted, he said that so either are we going to pass it with amendments or if not then I can't vote for it.

**Chair:** Thank you. Nick Belloni.

**Nick Belloni:** Nick Belloni, District 4. I was just going to say why don't we table this.

**Chair:** Thank you. That's what we will do. So noted, we will table approval of Item 1 which is the action to approve the August 4 meeting notes. Okay. That item is closed. Do we have any public comment before we close the item? Seeing none, the item is closed.

Okay, Item 2 is Chair's report, which is me. What I have is just to let you know public comment not listed on this agenda. I received this email addressed to the PROSAC District 11 reps to be read to all of the PROSAC committee so I will bring that up in Agenda Item 8 Announcements. Also, I would like to change Item 6 with Item 5 and have that item going first so that we can have a general discussion of an item that I raised and not hearing any objections I'm going to go ahead and move that so that we have PROSAC discussion of public-private partnerships for open space and parks as Item 5 followed by the 925-967 Mission Street item. So unless there's an objections I'm going to go ahead and make that change, all right. Thank you.

Other than that I don't have any items to discuss. Do we have any member comment? Seeing none, is there any public comment? Seeing none, the item is closed. Thank you.

All right, we're on Item 3, Capital Planning monthly update with Dawn and Stacy. Thank you, thanks for coming.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** Just two minor updates I think this month. One, the ARD study that Richard and I lobbied for from the Historic Preservation Funding Committee has been completed, our first draft has been completed which is very exciting. [unintelligible] Next we have to figure out when we're finalizing those recommendations and how to connect with the Zoo Board members and HPFC and other folks to try and get some thinking about what our plan could look like for those immediate repairs that need to be done to stabilize the [unintelligible] artwork as well as longer-term plans. So that's good.

Then also for D6 open space acquisitions for the property I think of as Item 2 Knights of the Red Branch property we extended an offer and have received a counteroffer to which we are actually open and amendable of \$4.8 million. And so we're going to be moving forward and do our due diligence on that but assuming everyone is okay and onboard we're going to move forward to PROSAC hopefully in October we'll start recommendations and discussion and then if PROSAC and the community are amendable then we'll move forward to the Board of Supervisors and the Commission as well. So that is progress, those are the D6 task force set out two properties that they wanted us to prioritize for acquisition. The other property we have extended an offer but have not received a response yet.

Les Hilger Are those two—

**Chair:** Les Hilger.

**Les Hilger:** Sorry, Les Hilger, District 1. Are those two sites already on the list of possible sites to be purchased?

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** I don't think they've been placed on the roster by PROSAC. Yeah, they haven't been placed on the roster yet so that would come back and we'd have that discussion and seek your recommendation or feedback for the commission. But we have talked about them in multiple presentations.

**Chair:** Toby.

**Toby Levy:** I think you know where my comment is coming from. Toby Levy, District 6. I am really concerned that we're proceeding with acquisitions of property before we know what we're going to do with them and that's especially about this property. It's on Mission Street, yes it has housing across the street, it's very small, it's very expensive and we do not need another community garden or plaza and I'm very concerned that we're spending vast amounts of money and not getting proper open space for District 6 and I know it's what we found but I don't know if it's what we need and I don't know how we are going to establish it and whether it's worth purchasing if we don't know what we're going to do with it. So I think this is going to be a thread running through today's meeting.

**Robert Brust:** What are we calling this property again? Robert Brust, District 8.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** The current occupant of the property is an organization called the Knights of the Red Branch which is I believe a cultural, fraternal organization.

**Toby Levy:** And it's \$4.8 million?

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** That is the counteroffer.

**Toby Levy:** And what is the size of it?

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** It's just over 6000 square feet.

**Male Speaker:** Oh my God!

**Toby Levy:** I'm telling you, it's like what is it 75 by—it's not even 75, it's like [simultaneous comments].

**Chair:** This is Linda, Chair. Can we have those lists of those parcels and certainly the one you want to bring up at next month's meeting so that we can actually have it on the agenda so that we can speak to it, thank you.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** I think one of the challenges just to acknowledge Toby's perspective is that this is a challenge, you know. Acquisition without improvement dollars is something

we've talked about and then we also have kind of a crushingly mad real estate market that if you don't participate in that's a different kind of problem. But I think the question of what is the strategy which I have begun to articulate some thoughts around that I can share with your guys about how we move forward is a real question and I think the other challenge has been the constituent discussions have been fairly fragmented. So one of the things is we have this D6 task force, two recommendations came out of that. Toby and I have talked about it, other people have talked about it. That task force I think was done from a sense of urgency and a scarcity perspective rather than a strategic let's change the rules of the game that participating with the rules that we are. But how we close that loop is a real questions and where that conversation takes place, the policy conversation, what forms it takes place in and how we get to the point where there's agreement about what a strategy should be is a real question. We'll talk about that later today as we're—

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Also, I know three members are interested in meeting with you informally just to get some more ideas so that we can bring it back for a further discussion and expand that conversation so we can move forward and recommend something happen more directly.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** So I just wanted to acknowledge Toby's perspective and also the challenge.

**Chair:** Richard Rothman.

**Richard Rothman:** Richard Rothman, District 1. This is about Cabrillo playground, the 39<sup>th</sup> Street side, has it come across your radar about making the fence taller? Because apparently various basketballs or whatever are going over the fence and hitting the dahlias.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** [unintelligible]

**Richard Rothman:** I don't know if that's Capital planning or Operation.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** I have not heard that one. That one has not yet gotten to my desk. It's on my radar. So is a lot. [laughs]

**Richard Rothman:** Thank you.

**Chair:** Richard Ivanhoe.

**Richard Ivanhoe:** Richard Ivanhoe, District 5. I'm not sure if this should be discussed here or if I should just ask you offline but there's an item on the Capital committee's agenda for Panhandle safety improvements and there are about four or five different things that are defined—could be defined that way. Can you give us some details?

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** Yeah, as far as if it's the project I'm thinking about Supervisor Breed funded an add-back I believe about a year ago and so it's both I think installation of LED lights swapping out the current lights with LED and then too a number of kind of path improvements as well to the pedestrians, signage improvements like trying to bring a little

law and order to the Panhandle. And then also I think some improvements to the pedestrian paths.

**Richard Ivanhoe:** So this is not to replace the path irrigation that [unintelligible]

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** Yeah, it's not tackling the whole project, it's kind of a phase 1 is my understanding.

**Richard Ivanhoe:** Thank you.

**Chair:** Are there are other questions?

**Chair:** I have one question on the Capital report. One of the things I had asked Tiffany to find out if Sean Stasio was up to date on posting those because the last time I as this it was three months old.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** The Capital Finance monthly report? Okay, I can totally check on that.

**Chair:** I know it's always—isn't it delayed one month?

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** It is. And also my finance officer resigned so she's going to be there for another week and a half or so and then I will be stressed. We'll continue to produce it but again some of the production schedule I assume is going to be impacted. So we will continue to produce it but I think the production schedule [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments] for the PM2 position, so if you know someone send them my way and then also well do after that recruiting for a 2PM1 position. So my goal is to have all those people on board by January and that will help a lot.

**Chair:** Is that posted somewhere, where the job is?

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** It's on the city website. Thanks.

**Chair:** All right, is there any public comment? Seeing none, that item is closed. Thank you very much. Now I'm pleased to introduce you to our Director of Operations, Denny Kern. Thank you Denny for coming tonight.

**Denny Kern:** Good evening PROSAC. I'm going to direct your attention to this piece of technology down here. I was invited here, thank you very much, talking about my favor subject operations and kind of acquaint you a little bit more with the Operations Division of Recreation and Park and how we go about maintaining our parks, planning and delivering our recreation, doing environment and ecological protection and that type of thing. So I'm going to step through quickly—you've given me thirty minutes and so Linda either you or you can appoint somebody to be the timekeeper and give me the hook when I go long. I've got a series of very boring but hopefully not dense slides to walk you through to acquaint you with Operations. And then you have three handouts on the table in front of you and I tried to import these into the PowerPoint presentation and it turned into a very painful eye chart and so I decided I'd rather give it to you so you can do this with it in front of you

because it's still bad enough just on paper but I'll refer you to these three documents and two points in the presentation so you can see how we do our operations within the Department. Fair enough?

I call this Operations where it all happens every day and ideally when I'm done with this presentation you'll understand why I gave it that subtitle. I'm sure you know there are six existing Divisions within the Department—Finance Administration headed up by our CFO Katie Petruccione; Operations, yours truly; Capital and Capital Planning, Dawn Kamalanathan; Property Management is a Division; Permits and Reservations is also within Property Management and that's headed up by Dana Ketchum; Partnerships, our philanthropic Division that works on partnerships and philanthropy, Lisa Branston is that Division director; and Policy and Public Affairs is Sarah Ballard, so she does that work along with all the community outreach, volunteer programs and that type of thing.

But I'm not here to talk about that, I'm here to talk about this. So we're going to get into Operations. The way we look we look at it, the Operations Division we do the day to day service delivery of Recreation and Park. And why do I say that? Because we actually do the day to day mission accomplishment by the field staff in our 220 plus parks we have around the city and outside the city as you know, and that mission statement to refresh your memory here—provide enriching recreational activities, maintain beautiful parks and preserve the environment for everyone of our diverse community. So Recreation and Park and environment those are the major things that constitute both the Department and Operations Division in carrying that out.

I'm going to start large and kind of drill down as we go through here. I have 775 FTE, fulltime equivalents, those are fulltime employees, in the Operations Division in all classifications of park maintenance, structural maintenance, recreation, and everything else that we do. When you look at the Department 933 budgeted and funded FTE, that's 84 percent of the Department just in one Division so we're the big hulking 800-pounder. When you add in the \$7.5 million temp salaries in our budget for the as-needed or temp or seasonal or part-time employees Operations kind of grows above the 90 percent category in terms of the percentage of the entire Department. I'll talk more about this as we get further into the presentation here.

So in Operations Division is have seven major work units and they are these right here—parks and open space, Golden Gate Park which yes is a park not an open space but we categorize it separately since it is our biggest park and 1017 acres of contiguous parkland all the way out there so we manage this one separately from all the other parks and open space. Recreation and community services, there's the rec half of the mission. Structural maintenance—so park maintenance which is landscape maintenance and custodial maintenance of all parkland is done by parks and open space. The trades, and I'll talk more about this in a minute, I have ten trades in a structural maintenance yard and they do all the crafts or the trades type work to buildings, park structures, park infrastructure, irrigation, electrical. We'll talk more about that in a second, that's what structural maintenance is. Urban Forestry, I'm going to talk a lot about this in a little bit because this one is very near and dear to my heart. Park Patrol, well I mean I shouldn't say that because I love all my children equally [laughs] as I'm sure you do but they all have different needs and they're all different and unique people in their own right. Park Patrol, park rangers, the very important

aspect that I call the enable enforcers because they make all the rest of this happen and then lastly a very small but important unit in Operations called Operations Asset Management. And this is where all of my database, metric major infrastructure Supervisor like fleet management and that kind of thing occur. So these are the seven units of Operations right here and now we'll drill in a little deeper.

We're going to start with parks and open space and with I direct you to the first one. Find the one that says San Francisco Recreation and Parks and has all these multicolored stars scattered across the entire city landscape right there. About a year after I here—I've been on the job ten years—and about a year after I got here we kind of did a big park reorganization on how we did park Operations and I divided the then 220 parks up into well what we have now are six service areas, they're called PSAs, park service areas, and you'll see that the multicolored stars overlies the 11 supervisory districts. We didn't categorize our measurement units into the Supervisor districts number one because it would be eleven and I could spread the staff that far and number two I had to create service areas that had pretty much like distribution or magnitudes of parks so I didn't have one service area that had a bunch of mini parks and another service area that had enormous parks and I tried to divide it up and we did not pay attention to political boundaries here, we tried to pay attention to neighborhood boundaries and then ended up with six service areas that pretty much had like magnitude parks and even distribution of big, medium and small-sized parks so that I could manage the parkland in the city that way.

So we have the legend if you were is up here in the top that tells you what the various colored stars refer to. So park service area one which is the orange there that's up in the northwest corner of the city, that's the Richmond, Marina, North Beach area. Park service area two is Civic Center, Western Addition and South of Market. Park service area three is the Bayview, McLaren Park, Excelsior area. Park service area four, Sunset, Lake Merced, Stern Grove. Park service area five, Buena Vista, Glen Park, Sunnyside. Park service area six is the Mission, Bernal Heights, St. Mary's area. And so you can look at the various stars and where the colors are and see where they kind of cluster in the service area and then you'll also see that we have three—what is an OS? That's called an open space area. So open space one, the black star, that's the Natural Areas Program which is here and we have 32 natural areas in the city on various parks throughout our park system. Natural areas include the actual natural areas, integrated pest management and our trail construction, trail maintenance folks who do the trails for natural areas and do that connectivity throughout the city.

Open space area two is golf and turf. Now for those of you who are real Recreation and Park geeks you know that we have five golf courses but Operations on has four of those golf courses. Glen Eagles is now run by Property Management, it's a lease. So we don't consider Glen Eagles ours, that's done separately, but we have the other four. So we've got our crown jewel TPC Harding with the PGA tour, Lincoln Park, Golden Gate Park, the pitch and putt par-three course, and then down at Pacifica Sharp Park. So those are the four golf courses and then also they have a crew that does all of the turf renovation. Now, most turf renovation is primarily our grass athletics fields but to a degree have to other park turf renovation—Alamo, Alta Plaza, most recently we were down at Patricia's Green doing turf replacement down there. I have a crew that does that.

Open space area three is the Marina Yacht Harbor. So that's down there on the waterfront. The west harbor and the east harbor with the west harbor renovation which is beautiful we have now 727 berths in those two harbors.

And then lastly I have for the last five years a gardener apprenticeship program and this is a joint endeavor we have with Local 261 the Laborers Union where all of our gardeners are represented and on any given year we have up to 25 apprentices going through 4000 hour, two to three year program also taking courses at City College in their horticultural curriculum.

So those are the big areas of parks and open space within operations. We're going to look at each one of them individually now so first parks and open space. So the resources I have for the six park service areas—we're going to leave the open space part aside for this slide. Just the six park service areas which are gardeners, custodians, their respective Supervisors and a manager for each park service area, the average MTE for each PSA is 32 FTE in gardeners and custodians and Supervisors. The materials and supplies that they have for their PSA which averages 35 parks per PSA they have only \$106,000 for tools, smaller equipment, seed, fertilizer, horticultural type of materials and supplies. I was telling Pat before we started our operating budget this year is \$178.7 million which seems like a lot of money until you start spending it and then it's like you're living hand to mouth still.

But anyway our park service areas of the six PSAs has on average 32 gardeners, custodians, Supervisor in that budget. If I switch to natural areas they have 12 FTEs, all gardeners but and IPM specialist, Supervisor, Manager, and that's where the 32 natural areas in the program plus the trails maintenance and they have \$93,000 to do their work annually.

**Robert Brust:** Is that all one natural area or there's two you said?

**Denny Kern:** There's 32 natural areas throughout our parks. All 32.

**Chair:** That was Robert Brust.

**Robert Brust:** Robert Brust, District 8, thank you and sorry to interrupt.

**Denny Kern:** Looking at golf, I'm going to separate golf from turf so you can see what that is. All gardeners plus Supervisors and a manager, 43 FTE for the four golf courses and the materials and supplies budget of \$724,000. We spend a lot of money under contractual obligations with the PGA tour. When we made that place a Tournament Players Club with the PGA tour there was a level of obligation that we incurred contractually so they take a big part of this but there's also money which is not here which is separate in a golf fund. This is all general fund money.

And then the other half of that is the turf management resources and I have a turf management crew of 17 FTE with a couple Supervisors and for all of the turf maintenance, mainly like I say athletic fields and the renovation that we do to regular lawn, green space areas, is \$94,000.

The Marina Yacht Harbor. They are not general fund, they are on own, what's called a Marina fund. This was funded from berth fees of those 727 boats in those berths down there. I have 13 FTE which are mainly dock attendants. I have a small admin staff with a business manger analyst and a Harbor Master for those 13 FTE. In terms of supplies \$72,000. They do have a dredging budget because the stolling and the silting in at the yacht harbor there with the currents is a big problem so we have a \$250,000 annually to keep the fairway and the roads there clear so that the boats can navigate in and out and they also have a facilities maintenance budget. What I mean by that is that this is \$288,000 annually the Marina Yacht Harbor has to contract with my maintenance yard and pay them for their work because this is non-general fund and so this money largely gets spent on carpenters, electricians, plumbers, that kind of thing out of my maintenance yard maintaining the two yacht harbors, the east and west basin down at the Marina Yacht Harbor. Yes Toby?

**Toby Levy:** Toby Levy, District 6. Where is South Beach, is that the Port?

**Denny Kern:** That is the Port, that is not ours. I can't tell you why.

**Denis Mosgofian:** Denis Mosgofian, D5. Just so I understand, that money is identified or it comes from berth fees, all of it but it's spent with the Department, personnel for the Department to do the work dredging as well as facilities?

**Denny Kern:** Well, the dredging is a contract. We have to contract with a dredging service that comes in with their boats and cranes.

**Denis Mosgofian:** But the rest of it is Recreation and Park personnel?

**Denny Kern:** Yes. Okay so then lastly I've got the gardener apprentice program. We've been in this for five years so we're sort of growing our own gardeners along with our own horticultural landscapes. I can have 25 apprentices, a Supervisor and a gardener. These numbers fluctuate based on how the gardeners promote, how the apprentices promote to gardeners or [unintelligible] because they're not hacking it. It is a very rigorous program and they only have \$10,000 to spend but the reason for that is when I put the apprentices out doing their work they're working in one of the park service area and that park service area budget is then supplying them with their supplies. These are just a workforce if they get out there and works, learns their skills, learns the trade, does the OJT and anything that they need tool-wise, materials-wise are provided by the park service open space area in which they're working. Richard?

**Richard Rothman:** So what percentage have actually graduated and become permanent gardeners?

**Denny Kern:** We're in our fifth year so we weren't making any new gardeners until maybe the second half or third year because they had to finish the program and I think we probably have maybe almost twenty gardeners now which are graduates of the apprenticeship program because we do attrite some of them out, they're just not hacking it and we say you're not what we're looking for. So I'm actually proud of that.

**Richard Rothman:** Do they get a leg up when they take the Civil Service exam?

**Denny Kern:** They don't have to take the exam. If they finish the program that puts them on the list and they always get selected because those are candidates that are highly vetted, we've seen them every day on the job. So if you graduate you know we want you.

**Chair:** Richard, would you please.

**Richard Rothman:** Richard Rothman, District One.

**Denny Kern:** Denis?

**Denis Mosgofian:** Denis Mosgofian, D5. Going back to the apprentice, do they replace retiring gardeners or—

**Denny Kern:** They're a referral list, they're a sublist, they're a list. As I had a vacancy I can then select from that list.

**Denis Mosgofian:** So they wait for shifts basically?

**Denny Kern:** I haven't had anybody on the waiting list. As they become eligible I've got a slot waiting for them.

**Denis Mosgofian:** So when they get the slot do they then get slots in addition to the fulltime gardener?

**Denny Kern:** They fill the vacancies that are retiring or resigning gardener when they leave the Department.

**Denis Mosgofian:** When they fill a retiring gardener do they become a fulltime gardener?

**Denny Kern:** When they graduate they're journey level. Okay, so that's parks and open space. Golden Gate Park, I think everyone here is familiar with all the various elements. This is just all the lists I could fit on the slide. There's more that they do. So I've 80 FTE, and that's gardeners and custodians and their Supervisors and the Superintendent for all of Golden Gate Park. They've got the \$356,000 but that is for not just the park that's for the Conservatory of Flowers, the Botanical Garden, the Tea Garden, Polo Field, all those things I listed on this previous slide a lot of which have very high maintenance requirements, the Music Concourse, the landmark property. Robert.

**Robert Brust:** Robert Brust, District 8. A lot of those properties have their own fundraising and endowment like the Conservatory, the Botanical Gardens, don't they?

**Denny Kern:** But the society provides—they fund specialty garden build-outs, so they'll fund the build out of the Asian cloud forest or something like that but the ongoing maintenance is actually on the Department plus we have an agreement with the Society that if I provide the ten gardeners for the Botanical Garden the society will fund the eleventh. If I don't fill those ten gardener positions I actually lose an extra one because they're going to have to fund the eleventh gardener there.

**Robert Brust:** Not to dig too deep but what else, does the greenhouse, the Conservatory of Flowers have a—

**Denny Kern:** So, the Parks Alliance is our philanthropic partner there. They do fundraiser and their money goes to programs in terms like special exhibits, [unintelligible] the current exhibit there right now. And they also fund a maintenance accounting like we're reglazing. To do the reglaze of the conservatory guess what, that's \$1 million. So they fund the maintenance account for us and fund the exhibits to keep people coming in but the rest of the operation is all on us.

Now I'm going to switch to recreation and community services, the rec part of our Mission. So now I'm going to refer to you the next paper here where it says recreation centers. You can see we have about 26 or so what we call full service recreations centers spread around the city and so these are the buildings I'm going to be talking about here as we go through the rec staff. I have five what we call competencies in recreation—cultural arts, all the visual and performing arts whether that's at the Harvey Milk recreation and arts center, Sharon Arts Studio, Randall Museum is in there as is half of Mission Rec Center. Community Services—this is recreation by age cohort, preschool, after school care, seniors program, all of those things that would be basically for a specific age group. Leisure services, this is the big one because they have all of aquatics, all nine of our swimming pools, and all of the aquatics programs. One of our most popular offerings now is outdoor and extreme recreation, this is—whether that's paddle boarding and kayaking on Lake Merced, if this is rock climbing, if this is skateboarding, this is doing all of those things that are very popular right now and Camp Mather comes under them as well.

Sports and Athletics is basically focused on if you're learning an athletic endeavor, so this is where the coaches are, if you're going to learn the sport, all ages groups, and then all of our league sports.

Lastly, the fifth competency, support services. This is program registration, this is the scholarship program. As you know, we award over \$1 million in scholarships for rec programs annually. They do all the program planning, the program guides, getting it on the website for the four recreation seasons that we have and then all the metrics to measure how we're doing. So we're going to go through each one of these individually and then of those 25 or stars, each of these rec centers we divide them up mainly by what kind of program you mainly have there and then each of these competencies due to program planning and then those 25 rec centers are divided up among these four facility management also.

So cultural arts about 35 FTE and rec planner and facility coordinators and their Supervisors. My fulltime staff for rec in all the competencies do the planning. They plan the programs, put the whole curriculum or the course content together and then the program delivery, the actual yoga instructor, the actual watercolor instructor, the coach, the kind of thing, they are all as-needed. So that's \$7.5 million as-needed budget I told you in that first slide or second slide this is where we're going to start spending it right here on the recreation side.

[unintelligible] supplies for cultural art resources are 133.

**Richard Rothman:** Richard Rothman, District 1. So like the rec center the staff that comes out to like the small rec centers like Cabrillo and Fulton playground they come out of this budget?

**Denny Kern:** Well, Cabrillo is a clubhouse but at the Richmond rec center the facility coordinator and the guys who are—the people who are planning the programs there those are these FTE here.

**Richard Rothman:** And then where are the clubhouses?

**Denny Kern:** The clubhouses that's a different discussion I'm going to have to take you through separately because that's partially property management and some of it is recreation.

**Chair:** We need to hold questions because poor Denny is running out of time.

**Denny Kern:** Let me pick up the speed here. There are 43 FTE, again property delivery staff is as-needed and there's their materials and supplies budget. Leisure services this is the big guy in recreation. All of the leisure programming I've got 15 who plan it and do a facility management. Delivery staff as needed, materials and supplies, aquatics, lifeguards, pool managers, swim instructors, Camp Mater as you know that's basically June, July, August and we only have three full-time FTE. All the rest of the staff up there are seasonal and there's their budget right there, largely the food budget but also some other recreational supplies.

Sports and athletics 34 FTE. There's that one there. I'll keep going here, support services—this is really a critical competency in recreation. Running the recreation all the program plan, scholarship program, everything, I've got 18 people to do that. Day camps are also kind of wedged in here and so this is the resources they have for that, plus you may have been to some of our four special events that we have a year—the holiday tree lighting extravaganza, playday on the green, Scaregrove of course, the one coming up.

Park Patrol, my park rangers, I love these guys. They have two missions, they have two roles they perform. Number one is positive one they are go be out there, why are they in uniform, they are out there so the public can see them knowing the Department is doing their part. I've got people out there modeling good behavior, reinforcing the people who are out there in the parks who want to be the good park users and that presence also should deter people ever thinking huh, I think I'm going to tag that wall, better not there's a park ranger. But then deterrents may eventually fail and in that case they move into their code enforcement role where they're out there to stop the bad actors, issue citations and work with SFPD for greater penalties. Please note, our rangers are not sworn peace officers, they are not armed and their primary focus is as public safety and property protection which is a different focus than SFPD. SFPD is really focused on personal injury, criminal behavior, homicides, grand theft auto, that kind of stuff. We are focused mainly on property protection and protecting the public.

So to do that I have 43 FTE currently. I've got 11 more FTE coming in this year's budget, we're excited about that. And this is the materials and supplies they have for uniforms and other code enforcement equipment.

Urban forestry. We have an estimated 131,000 trees on our park land and that's a lot. So I've got the urban forestry unit are both my tree climbers and my reforestation gardeners, it's about half and half when I show you the FTE. They also run the compost yard. We take all of our green waste, all of the brush that we clear or cut or whatever, take it to our compost yard in the middle of Golden Gate Park and we recompost it all up into topsoil, mulch, chips and fines and we recycle that all out into our parks and for our own horticultural materials. We are the city's largest waste diversion operation in the city.

**Male Speaker:** What's fines?

**Denny Kern:** So topsoil—mulch, you know what mulch is. Chips are the fine wood chips. Fines are the things that are in between chips and top soil so it's a little higher granular organic matter which will decompose slower.

**Chair:** Denny, we'll give you five more minutes. No questions please right now.

**Denny Kern:** This is an important one here. My current tree climbers I can only touch each one of these trees once every 102 years. So we're trying to build up the unit. Our issue is we've got even these monoculture tree stands, Mt. Sutro, Mt. Davidson, are prime examples, we're fighting pine pitch canker, pine bark beetles, sudden death oak throughout the tree stands through the city and trying to grow that next generation of understory. I've got 39 FTE, half tree climbers, half reforestation gardeners, they've got that and they do miracles with that \$150,000.

The craft structural maintenance, this is my largest single work unit in Operations. These are the ten crafts that I have and I've got 100 FTE in those ten crafts plus a small front-office staff. They've got \$815,000 just to purchase lumber, irrigation pipe, everything like that. We also have that amount of money to do work orders to DPW because we do not do asphalt, we do not do glass and we do not do locksmithing and so we have that work order with DPW.

My last one Operations asset manager. This is for all of my technology and database analytic capability.

Fleet management. We have almost 700 pieces of rolling stock, everything from utility carts to overhead cranes, dump trucks, garbage trucks, street sweepers, so we manage that.

TMA, total managed assets. This is our electronic work order database and this is my whole asset management database for all properties. We do about 15,000 work orders annually. It's linked to 311, the citywide customer service database so if you call 311 Recreation and Park it get transmitted over here, converted into a work order and we go out and work then close it back out.

And then our park maintenance standards. All of our quarterly park evaluations of all the parks in our tenth year we're doing very well. We partnered this with the Controller's Office and we have a lot of good to show for it there. These are the three people that run that whole thing. And then they have some significant budget authority. We spent \$3.2 million annually on vehicle maintenance and fuel and this is amazing that we had this much done. We actually need more of it because the work out there in the parks is a lot of our work were on the vehicles. A \$250,000 is diesel retrofits, \$160,000—all of our vehicles are equipped with GPS and this helps us monitor their environmental performance and it also keeps an eye on where they are. We manage our TMA database with \$20,000 year improvements and new this year we are adding a night shift to our vehicle maintenance crew so we can turn around vehicles in vehicle repair and maintenance much quicker and that's going to be a game changer for my field staff.

That concludes my presentation.

**Chair:** We'll open up the floor for questions. Mark Scheuer is first, Steffen is second.

**Mark Scheuer:** Denny, one of the problems we have is we'll complain about something like a broken [unintelligible], nine months later it's still not fixed. Is there anything we can do? And when Adrian tells us oh we have the work order in there's just a lot in line before you is that really true?

**Denny Kern:** It's really true Mark. Our TMA database, our electronic work orders we have four tiers that we work from. We have emergency work orders where I've got an irrigation gusher coming out of the ground. I've got to get that fixed right now both for water conservation and to get it fixed. And those are fixed immediately. I have health and safety which these are things that would impact either the staff's public health of the public's health and safety using their parks. We are committed—our service level agreements get those worked off in 48 hours. The third category is sort of our special categories of water conservation, non emergency, vandalism—this is where all the tags are—I have to get those worked off by the Mayor's directive by 48 hours and we try to get those taken care of because there's something actually broken by vandalism in the parks so in our broken windows theory you know about if you see and get it fixed right away before somebody else comes around and does it again. And then the final category which is what you're talking about is what's called routine and that's where everything else is and we have to work through those top three tiers before I can get to the routine and so this is one the conundrums I have in terms of I've got twelve plumbers, I've got seven painters, I've got two cement mixers, I've got ten carpenters to do all of this work and they do heroic trying to keep production going as scheduling but it's just one of these things. Does that answer the questions satisfactorily?

**Steffen Franz:** Steffen Franz District 2. Denny, thank you very much, it's a very informative presentation. I don't think anybody in this room really understood the depth of which you—what you have on your plate. It's a noble challenge. That said, there's some areas that weren't really discussed in this presentation and I think those are the ones that some of the membership would like to know more about. Deferred maintenance probably would be something that would be inviting for a conversation amongst the body. I'm not saying it has to come up right now but I do think it substantiates the idea there is some consistency

between Operations and Capital because I think that's where this body is going in the future, wanting to know more about not just funding Capital ideas but having maintenance initiatives, having funding in place to make your job a little bit easier. So I guess maybe what I'm asking is for you to give us an understanding or at least just one minute on—this is sprawling, man, you're showing us something I don't know you keep on top of all of this. To Mark's point, the little ones are the ones that actually affect the stakeholders. I understand the gushing geyser is once in a while but that broken fence that was hit by a lawnmower in 2012 that hasn't been fixed but has had 30 311 calls, when does it rise? Where is the oversight there on the ones that are really kind of affecting the stakeholders? I guess that's the root of my question.

**Denny Kern:** I'm going to only give you the one-minute answer because I don't have a comprehensive answer for you although I will say that even with due deference to my General Manager the two people who are most focused on deferred maintenance are in this room—Dawn Kamalanathan and me. We're trying to get our hands around this thing. Deferred maintenance is actually not the fence that got hit by a car in 2012, deferred maintenance is major infrastructure that was beyond its lifecycle. It is beyond what is actually designed and manufactured to deliver—irrigation system, roof systems, electrical systems, irrigation systems. These things that are worn out or so close to wearing out that they cannot be repaired and then we're devoting a lot of valuable stuff that should be routine maintenance to trying to put yet another clamp on that broken irrigate line in Delores Park and I finally clamp it and pressure then breaks another spot further down the lines before the thing is shot.

So how that happens, I'm going to give you the cheap answer, is that this is through years of underfunding and I'll go ahead and use the word, neglect, by the city and because of the city by the Department that has just accrued. This thing has just been a bow wave, it just keeps going like this. Deferred maintenance gets worked off only two ways, Dawn does it through a major on-Capital renovation of a property which should sweep up all the deferred maintenance for that particular location and then other by large deferred maintenance projects which I try to do those with the money I get from the Commission every year but that's very limited and this is a major resource challenge going forward for the Department right now. Let me zip it right there and we'll have to come back and talk more about that.

**Steffen Franz:** And we'd like to I think invite you to come back and talk more about that.

**Chair:** Linda D'Avirro, Chair. I do want to say that we have some members here that are planning on meeting and then going to talk to Mark Farrell as they get ready to put something on the ballot next year. I'd also like to ask you if that would be possible that would could sit down with you and see where you'd like to see things—I'm not asking you to support the ballot or something that we can't do either. Just so we give your perspective on where we can help you because this is where we are all about as Steffen said and everyone else, it's like we want to see more money go to maintenance and have stuff like these routine things and these things that have been broken for years fixed as we go along so that they don't become major problems or send a message that we don't care.

**Denny Kern:** I would welcome that, yes.

**Chair:** Thank you very much. Any other members' questions? Linda Shaffer.

**Linda Shaffer:** Thank you, Linda Shaffer District 10. That was the large scale perspective, I just have two specific questions about tree maintenance. First of all, the Department of the Environment is working its way through coming up with something it calls its Urban Forestry Plan. Do you have any sense of how that's going to affect what you do?

**Denny Kern:** It's after the Urban Forestry Counsel?

**Linda Shaffer:** I think so.

**Denny Kern:** I don't have a bead on that right now. We've been through—we have participated in two studies with the Department of the Environment and Planning Department called Financing the Urban Forest. The first report was on street trees, that was just DPW, and then we insisted on having a follow-up study for park trees and that completed and so I'm up to my neck in that one and I told you we can look at each individual tree every 102 years. We are trying to get to a place where we have a programmatic tree cycle of 15 years. I plant the tree, I establish it, I come back in several years and do a structural prune and then come back ten years later and so another side prune or something and we're trying to get to that and that's going to be a combination of city tree crews and my staff in urban forestry unit and then also coming up with a regular source of contract money where then we can bring in contract tree crews that would then help us take—I would like to take a sector of the city and do all the parks and all tree work there and then the next sector of the city—I should just say park service area, shouldn't I—and do all the trees in that park service area and then the next one, and the next one and then if I can get on that kind of a cycle I can get to those trees every 15 years.

**Linda Shaffer:** Thank you, I'm glad to hear you're working with them, I just wanted to get that on the record. My other I hope quick question, four years of drought have not been kind to the trees in this city including the trees in our parks. Is that causing any special problems for your tree maintenance?

**Denny Kern:** It's not causing special problems. All of our established trees get their water from landscape irrigation so if I'm irrigating the park, watering the park, watering the grass that's penetrating and infiltrating the tree root system too. Most people don't know this but 90 percent of a tree's roots are in the top 18 inches of the soil. Everyone thinks the roots go like this, they go like this, in fact they grow out further than the crown, they go out further than that. So they are susceptible to drought and so to the degree that we are still irrigating we're very mindful or what we're not irrigating. Do I have trees that are there as well? So I think we're doing as good a job as we can. We've had trees that are used to having a lot of irrigated water over the years and so there's a little bit of a shock to some of their systems right now and what that does it then—if it's significant it will stress the tree and if a tree is stress then it's more susceptible to disease. And those four major diseases that I mentioned to you are not drought caused, they've been around for a long time but they certainly aren't helped by the drought. So that's kind of a diffuse answer but we're not seeing "oh my God we've got a horrible tree problem" right now because of the fourth years of the drought, we are not seeing that right now.

**Chair:** Denis Mosgofian.

**Denis Mosgofian:** Denis Mosgofian, D5. How many gardeners—I mean how many arborists and the folks in that 39 FTEs that you have in that program how many do you think you'll actually need in order to get from 102 down to 25, 20, or 15 realistically?

**Denny Kern:** I have that number. I didn't bring it with me because I would like to have four tree crews of eight arborists a crews plus two laborers and a Supervisor so that would be eight times four is 32 plus four Supervisors would be 36 plus eight laborers would be 44.

**Denis Mosgofian:** We've got 39 now.

**Denny Kern:** Half of those are gardeners. I want a forestry team. I need a minimum of four urban forestry teams of at least eight arborists per team and then my urban forester can manage those and then could also manage the contracts of tree work as well.

**Denis Mosgofian:** So next questions. How much additional funding would that require annually to get from where we're at to where that—

**Denny Kern:** I had that number, I didn't bring it with me.

**Denis Mosgofian:** [unintelligible] You'd be basically going from half of the 39 all the way up to 44 in order to get a team that would do that. Do you anticipate behind able to do that in the next five years?

**Denny Kern:** Supervisor Scott Weiner has been a real fan and champion of tree work in the city both for DPW and for us. I just hired five and I'm going to get three provisional hires of arborists this month and I'm seeking more next year so we seem to be—we've hit rock bottom and we're starting to bounce back up.

**Chair:** Any other questions. Anthony.

**Anthony Cuadro:** Anthony Cuadro, District 7. Just real simple, easy question. When there's been like Outside Lands, things like that at the Polo Fields, is part of that contract that they pay for the fixing of the field if there's problem with it or is that part of that budget that we saw?

**Denny Kern:** The money we get from Outside Lands which is substantial and we're very appreciative of it goes into the general fund and our license with them is that if they break anything they fix that but in the—I think it was like \$2.5 million—in that money we allocate some of it out to maintain the meadows and that kind of thing. Hardly Strictly Bluegrass is a little different. Since they're free they're pay a permit fee for their October event and then they give us usually every year it's about somewhere between \$77,000 and \$90,000 a year which is dedicated just to meadow improvement and we've done some good work with automatic irrigation systems and that kind of stuff.

**Anthony Cuadro:** [unintelligible]

**Denny Kern:** That was the gift I was talking about.

**Anthony Cuadro:** So it covers any issues that come up from [unintelligible]

**Denny Kern:** It does. We factor that in to the overall—that's how they end with some of the money they have.

**Chair:** So if I can go back to your question then even on the first case Outside Lands that goes in the general fund so you do have to draw from your maintenance budget to redo turf in the meadow.

**Denny Kern:** Yes.

**Chair:** Thank you. All right, any other questions from the members so we can go on? Do we have any public comment? I see a hand from David Pilpel.

**David Pilpel:** I think this is very helpful [unintelligible]. I think it would be good to invite Glenda. I think it would be good [unintelligible]. And I would do a follow-up on both the playground issues and programming and turf maintenance. Those are both good [unintelligible] discussions in addition to your 750 people. A couple of specific questions—the Golden Gate Park Senior Center, is that an example not [unintelligible]

**Denny Kern:** [unintelligible]

**David Pilpel:** I'm wondering if the Golden Gate Park Senior Center staffing is through the Department through Denny's or some other way and I don't know what the current program is across from Sava Pool, I think that used to be project insight [unintelligible] I don't know where that is. And my last question or point I recall the Department budget that I reviewed a long time ago had specific line items for things like dance instructors, did all of those get [unintelligible] and replaced by as-needed staff for whatever group that is, cultural arts [unintelligible] and is the Department just essentially custodians, gardeners and rec directors [unintelligible]

**Chair:** I will get those answers [unintelligible]. Anthony.

**Anthony Cuadro:** Anthony Cuadro, District 7. You quickly mentioned that clubhouses were something else you were going to touch on.

**Denny Kern:** Not at this meeting. [simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** It sounds like what we're going to have to do is have one of these drill-down things and so we'll probably—we would really like to see it before the end of the year or soon thereafter we can choose one of those presentations just on clubhouses for example or deferred maintenance so if you're amenable to that. We'd love to have you come back, we appreciate it.

**Denny Kern:** Thank you. I'm talking about my favorite subject [applause]

**Chair:** Our next item, we have set aside fifteen minutes for this, again I moved Item 6 to Item 5. You should all have received, and it's a two-side document, [unintelligible] Item 6 was PROSAC discussion of public-private partnerships for open spaces and parks, discussion and possible action. So as Chair I'm putting this out there for discussion purposes and my statement to open up that discussion shall it be the policy of the members of PROSAC that PROSAC shall be concerned with and shall urge the Recreation and Park Commission to address the need for and require developments to provide ground-level open space and usable park space, not only hardscape and that this new ground-level public park space be coordinated with the Recreation and Park Department. [unintelligible] but the point is the last meeting, again District 6 members expressed along with District 10 members that there's a lot of development going on, it's happening here, there, everywhere, we had a huge deficiency in open space and what I heard from our representative in Capital Planning was that Recreation and Parks is not involved necessarily with the planning that goes into these spaces and I think that's the genesis of my question to you. I think we should discuss how and where our role is going forward in the face of all this development that's going on that seems to be absent Recreation and Park's input and does not necessarily meet the needs of that district where this is going on. So I'm opening it up to comment. Denis you're first, Toby you're third.

**Denis Mosgofian:** Denis Mosgofian, D5. I have a simple answer. The answer I think is yes. But let me—I wasn't moving it because it's a questions and it really suggests a policy that makes some sense. I happened to attend a hearing last night, a forum on a huge development on the west side of 460 units and the reason that it's relevant is because the developers have decided that if they use planned unit development they do not have to provide the open space that the code requires of the same number of units if it's not a planned unit development. And so there's 460 units packed into four acres going up to eight stories and they've just included a roadway, a small plaza of about 14,000 square feet and planted stairways and something else to constitute the open space that is supposed to be provided for 1000 people. So it really brought home the idea. We're like open space should be there on the ground level and I like this because it's on the ground level and it should be on the ground level. I'm not convinced hanging flowers off a balcony and a roof constitutes the kind of open space that people really need and since I'm a native San Franciscan I've grown up with the kind of open space that we used to have around here in Golden Gate Park and playgrounds that is shrinking and as we move towards something called a million people this place is going to get real crowded and land has become so valuable that it's really hard to find land for open space. So I think the answer is yes.

**Steffen Franz:** Steffen Franz, District 2. I think this is a good starting place and I thank the Chair for bringing it to us as a body. I think there needs to be some qualifiers here specific to we're not talking about RPD's acquisition of open space we're talking about a contingency, what we would call it, that a developer provide some open space in exchange [unintelligible] So Dawn, who is the end-all, be-all here, who is she really trying to target when it comes to a developer saying today I want to build X and I'll give you a park but you don't get—you are the Recreation and Park but you don't have any say in that park, you can't tell us what you want, we're just going to put concrete and maybe four trees and two benches and that's your park.

**Steffen Franz:** That's exactly what I'm talking about. Let's bag the idea that everybody in your world and Denny's world actually knows what a park should be and what people want [unintelligible]. Who is the body that tells them no? [simultaneous comments] So can you explain to us before we go to the work of trying to pass a resolution that doesn't have an end, that doesn't go anywhere.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** So I think it's helpful to think of this as one of the many situations in which there is not a government [unintelligible] so much as a total decentralized system that does not have one fluid exchange of real time information that will allow everyone to kind of participate so to speak and [unintelligible] in a coordinated way but still be decentralized or a centralized place of authority that makes that decision. So the Planning Department does review and sign off on and decide ultimately whether or not the privately owned public open space is acceptable or not.

**Steffen Franz:** With zero RPD oversight.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** With zero RPD oversight but it doesn't have to be zero RPD influence and one of the things that I have been talking to City Planning about over the past year is actually the thought that we would develop guidelines for the provision of some of these spaces and so we're starting to have a really interesting conversation with City Planning and I won't say for the first time there's a partner across the table who is interested, like Bill Kelly the new director of long term planning and his team is very interested in this question and wants to partner with us. And so I think there's a couple of steps we can take. One is for these small little patches that you can't put a field in and that you can't put like a barbeque picnic area per say that there are—and recreational uses, whether it's community gardens or for example dog runs, dog play areas, that we could say hey if you are required to do a little space we'd like the little space to look like this and actually I think both City Planning and the developers would welcome some clear feedback or suggestions along that front or a small play structure, so that's one thing. I think the bigger question around developing these bigger amenities I think we have to be realistic that it's going to be very difficult for us to deliver a Palega in SOMA, that would be very, very difficult for us to pull off. But thinking about some of these core amenities whether it's tennis courts, a rec center, a community room space and requiring the developers as they provide projects provide those amenities on the first floor of their building or provide rooftop access for certain types of amenities is something that we can negotiate and should and what we've been lacking is a real strategy about what that looks like so I've actually been working with Stacy and Jordan to start to do a service-level analysis that begins to ask practical and metaphysical questions like how many people do you need before you need a new rec center, like how many more people do you get before you need a new rec center. [unintelligible] are interchangeable over times, they're come out, they're go in, we're really trying to grab some larger spaces that can be provided not just outdoors but indoors and I think that's the other one of the other frames of reference that we have to be open to is that not all these facilities need to be provided out and trying to think about the things that can move inside which we might be able to require and then really trying to focus on what kinds of open space do we want. We're having a very interesting conversation around Gene Friend right now which we're working with TPL to do a design and our current proposal which we're going to start concept planning for—right now what we're thinking is we want to double the size of the building, we want to build a second floor but that question of as you

understand that growth that's coming is it more important to have a green space or to fill that area up with like playground with rubber surfacing and then courts. Right now in our current framework I think the temptation is to just load that place up with sport courts but when you think about ten years from now where are the green spaces going to be left, that's going to be one of the few oasis little spots in this whole area where you'll be able to actually have the experience of a park space and we've had a lot of people be like oh well VMD is the green space. I'm like VMD is already totally impacted and relying on that space to serve everyone in this area seems unlikely so I think we have to become much more granular in our strategy decisions and get very specific about what it is we're looking for so we can begin to hand out those requirements because I do think City Planning is open to having that conversation and very interested because they get that there's such a strong demand from constituents that it's going to be harder for them to pass neighborhood plans and get the support they need for projects unless they figure this out. So they're very open to that.

I think a lot of developers are too. What's missing is an organized constituency to work with us to fully articulate what that strategy should look like and push. Sorry, that was super-long answer to your question.

**Steffen Franz:** No, it was an awesome answer. So I guess a follow-up to that would be Hannah Shulman came and presented, there was an example of a bunch of wayward moving things where they were just like listen you're really into this, right, how about [unintelligible] to you, you deal with all the Departments [unintelligible] because that's really what you need is somebody who's going to look at a space and go no one is going to use this or wow this is a great idea we'd like to [unintelligible] because all I keep getting from what you're saying is there is a centralized location, there isn't one person or one Department that's pulling for this.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** I mean I am now.

**Steffen Franz:** You clearly have a lot on your plate. Denny clearly has a lot on his plate. From our position this is an area where we want to help. Everyone in this room understands what the challenge is and I think that's why the Chair put this here so it's not a discussion I think we're going to end with, it's just understanding how this goes.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** So as we develop these ideas I think to have PROSAC be one of the forums in which that strategy is vetted and developed is a productive endeavor. And I also think—you know, I got Phil to [unintelligible] I could develop these guidelines and get direct Park Commission and Planning Commission and then they would really be, you know, it goes in the packet as all the planners are going through their checklist oh sorry you need to [unintelligible] or build a dog play area or put in a play structure.

**Toby Levy:** That's all we get South of Market, we have two dog play areas and how many community gardens.

**Chair:** You're on after Dawn, Toby

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** I think—so I think the popos is just one part of the strategy. I think it would be good to provide some structure there so we can move away from tastefully landscaped office worker lunch plazas to things that [unintelligible] while we do need these bigger spaces there is a backlog, an overwhelming need for both those two amenities, right, those two things have high demand associated with them and are very tough things to come by in dense areas. And so one of my thoughts is those are the perfect types of things also to get developers take on because they're very [unintelligible].

But then this bigger question of what are the bigger features, what are the assets that we need and how do we begin to get developers to contribute towards those or use the impact fees in a strategic way to deliver those resources that's the big open question and that's the one that I think Toby really wants to get to, it's the one that Jane really wants to get to, it's the one I want to get to of being able to say like okay but where are we putting the park-park, where is that going to go and how do we make that decision and again that balance between being very ambitious about what we're looking for but also realistic given the opportunities that are presenting themselves.

So that's great to hear that PROSAC is interested in that conversation. We hope to be bringing something to you soon, at least a first shot. We actually had a nice conversation with Supervisor Kim where we kind of said this is the status of things as they are, this is where we could be and she was supportive. I think one of the things we want to do is PROSAC as a forum is a good thing and we also want to take the District 6 open space task force and reconfigure it and recharter it. The D6 task force was kind of a loosey-goosey pulled-together deliberative body and what I'd like to do is pull together that something much tighter, that's much more like the bond working group where we're like look this is what we're here to do, I need your feedback on these ten questions, I want to know which of these ideas you love, which of these ideas you hate and really use it as a very focused kind of focus-group, feedback provider that we can then use to shape a platform because I think that's what we really need is we need a platform for open space development and so on that people can sign on to and that again everyone can—you can do some constituency building around so it's not project by project but a platform could look like something that say you know eastern neighborhoods one of the promises was we will renovate four parks and build four new parks so we would say like we want two neighborhood parks of X size that provides green space, we need one or two more rec centers provided over the next twenty years in these general locations of this square footage and then here are five other ancillary asset classes that also need to be provided in this area and we can think about—we need to start thinking about playfields on roofs, we need to start thinking about some of those things and breaking up the courts and the playfields and those other things and finding a way to make them feel very accessible but also not hoping to co-locate everything in the same spot.

So I think having that kind of platform—and then also [unintelligible] provided, they have to do this, it can't just be like some benches and two trees. So I think really laying that out is something that City Planning can then get on to, we can at least start to build a constituency around and then we can put that out there as an act that needs to be responded to.

So those are some thoughts, it's a really complicated question because I think there's three ways to participate right now. You can participate in the market itself as just another buyer

which is kind of what we're doing right now but we're doing it poorly because we're a very poor buyer. Like we don't have \$50 million, \$80 million to sink in up front. And so if you're going to participate in the market as a buyer as your strategy then we have to figure out how to get more cash so we can do that. One of the things with the revenue measure if that moves forward is that we would extend the life of the open space fund right now and then double the amount of money into acquisition and then I can do debt service against it like the bond so you could like basically get [unintelligible] cash payment up front that we could use to participate in the market as a buyer.

Then you can also be government and say this is a public good and because of that we're going to eminent domain and that is not without—you'd better have a constituency backing you up because that is a complicated endeavor that requires a lot of people's support and championship.

And then the third strategy is I guess more along the lines of what I've been talking about which is kind of trying to be very strategic and not just deliver parks as we've always delivered them but start to think about kind of alternative ways to provide a same level of recreational amenities but in a [unintelligible] and different way with a very different feeling.

So those are I think the three options that are on the table for how we can move forward on these goals. Each one of them has real pros and cons and each one of them requires a very different strategy and kind of a different level—different types of champions.

**Toby Levy:** Toby Levy, District 6. To be quite honest I'm totally frustrated. The D6 open space from before was a joke and that is the reason we are here two or three years later and we're getting dog runs and community gardens and that's exactly the idea that—that's what developers like, we're putting them on rooftops just as amenities to projects that nobody even asked us for. So I think time is of the essence. I appreciate this. I would like to propose an amendment or sort of some working that goes it shall be the policy of PROSAC and PROSAC shall concern and urge the Recreation and Park Commission to address the need for required development to provide—we need a needs survey for each district that we can require them—create a needs survey for each district that has—if you just look at the maps [simultaneous comments]. Let me finish. So I want the survey because if you look at the maps Denny presented and see just how little there is in District 6 and District 10 you know that we're underserved but we don't even know how we're underserved. So I do think there has to be—you have the metrics, you have what it takes per pool, per this, per clubhouse, whatever, and I think District 6 and District 10 need to get whatever other neighborhoods have in terms of recreation and open space is a little different because we'll never get McLaren Park. Then I think we need to urge—you know, sort of taking on a role what Dawn said to create a working group to monitor this and I would like to at this point I feel bad about the develop that's in—because I know which one is it—you know and that's a perfect case where your district is probably a little less, District 5 is probably a little less in need but this develop needs guidance but in terms of District 6 and District 10 I think we need to be far more proactive both with the survey, be a working group to do that and you know I appreciate it, we did you know. And so those are the things that I would like to insert and increased—you know I like ground floor but I can see tennis courts on the roof somewhere being acceptable and you could say where appropriate above grade that is

usable park space and publically accessible. I think we need to start really doing stuff as opposed to reacting or whatever.

**Chair:** Did you want to answer Toby directly?

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** I just wanted to respond to one point that Toby make about the needs analysis, we actually don't have that and what you're find is that if you were to look at the Sunset as well I wouldn't describe the sunset as open space poor and yet the number of rec centers that the Sunset has are few and far between and so if you look at you know geographic populations to think about the challenge for us is really articulating a goal that makes sense of the context of D6 and who's coming there and I think this is a lot of the efforts that have gone awry have been like traditional let's draw a circle around this building and see if you're outside the circle [unintelligible] that has never really worked and we've tried to do two nexus studies, actually three since I've been in the city to talk about open space but they're all based on that kind of analysis and they haven't gone anywhere because at the end of the day they don't feel real, like it doesn't resonate with you, like connect with your understanding of the reality of the situation so we need to start there but we want to create something that's actually very custom to SOMA and make sense.

**Toby Levy:** I totally agree because I sat in too many meeting where you say everything you need and they put it on Gene Friend. We need a swimming pool, put it on Gene Friend. We need a tennis court, you put it on Gene Friend. You want basketball court it's in Gene Friend. You need a rec center, it's Gene Friend! So suddenly Gene Friend is eight stories tall you know and so that is the last thing, that is John [unintelligible] idea about recreation space in South of Market.

**Chair:** Linda then Nick.

**Nick Belloni:** I like what you're saying, I think it's good but I think we should change that a little bit if you don't mind which I think we should request Planning and RPB to do a strategic plan for D6, to have a plan with Planning to basically how they will work together, what kind of spaces they can make together and work on that as soon as possible and I think that's something that's needed and I think we can get funding for it, I think we can lobby the Commission and I think we can lobby for the Park Commission to get funding for it to get that done to bring in stakeholders and to have a plan like they did for the park as a whole I think if we do that specifically for D6 and maybe D10 I think that could be an over-compassing and get everything all done in one.

**Female Speaker:** I for one want Recreation and Park to be the lead, period. They can work with Planning but Recreation and Park has to be the lead because we'll see in the next one where Recreation and Park did not get to have a meaningful say.

**Nick Belloni:** I agree that Recreation and Park should be in the lead but I think we should for as a strategic plan with Planning involved because if we don't have Planning involved it's worthless and I think that's kind of what we should ask for instead, that's what we should put forward I would think. What do you think?

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Linda Shaffer.

**Linda Shaffer:** Linda Shaffer, District 10. What I wanted to say about this proposal is that I love it and to me the interesting part of this is involving Recreation and Park Commission and I guess I would change the wording a little bit to somewhere insert that PROSAC would explore with the Recreation and Park Commission ways in which the Commission could expand the scope of its influence beyond what it has traditionally viewed that's going to be. The Recreation and Park Commission typically just deals with RPD stuff as far as I can tell and I'm not well-versed enough to know if exactly how the statement, what its charge is. But I think it's a very interesting and important idea to explore the possibility of having the commission agree to step in at least and staff issuing opinions and agree to work with Planning and participate in all of these discussions that Dawn has been having. I think that would be fabulous if we could somehow urge matters in that direction.

**Chair:** Did you have your hand up Denis?

**Steffen Franz:** Denis did. Denis is it okay, it's just on this point? Dawn, can you qualify that statement in the sense that we all take the Recreation and Park Commission for what their job is and I think Linda used a really good word, nontraditional like we love your [unintelligible] and we love what your energy is like hey let's look at these spaces differently. We, those of us who have ever been to a Recreation and Park Commission meeting know that the Recreation and Park Commission is different than RPD in terms of kind of what they see and what they do. Would you say that it's in their purview now to expand past what the traditional roles of Recreation and Park Commission are to include new and different concepts in park planning or in building spaces but what I think Linda is really onto if we can get them to see this vision that you have then all of a sudden now we have like—we as the community, you as RPD and [unintelligible] as the Recreation and Park Commission could make a much bigger push for this.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** I think there are definitely members of the Commission who are very interested and open to this conversation. I think there definitely are. I'm been talking to people, a couple of Commissioners and briefly them on the issues that are kind of going and you know actually it was on our list actually I think our last acquisition either Schlage or Francisco we were having a hearing and I remember Commissioner McDonnell was actually asking a lot of these kind of similar questions and I made the point that [unintelligible] as a strategy not a policy and he said let's do it. So I think at least he's been very much on the record I think of supporting some of that kind of thinking. So I think there is a lot of openness to it. Again, it's been a question of kind of I think we're seeing the natural kind of build of some energy and that's what—it's encouraging to me because for two years I've been saying this is important. So I think that we're at a point now where we can being to articulate what needs to happen and [unintelligible]

**Denis Mosgofian:** Denis, D5. I think if when I drill down and I look at what Dawn has just described and this conversation including what Linda offered I don't see who's actually going to do the work. I can see that there are people on the Commission and people on RPD who all of whom have—either they're a Commissioner or they have fulltime jobs and they have plenty on their plate. They're going to have conversations of a strategic nature.

What I don't see is who is going to actually do the work for example that would actually come up with a needs survey? That would be the kind of thing that's truly real. I mean you've got plenty of work to do.

[simultaneous comments]

**Denis Mosgofian:** So that was the question actually, who would do the work, that's the real question.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** It's us. And I think actually again City Planning would help with our direction. They expressed interest but I think the fundamental question of the needs analysis and kind of articulating what [unintelligible] and I think we are ready and interested in providing it. I think it's not that—honestly it's easy than doing a bond, you know what I mean, and I've done that two times. And so I think that this is the point—I think this is the why we have a Planning Division at Recreation and Park, that wasn't always true that we had a Planning Division. We have a Planning Division to tackle explicitly these kinds of questions and I think that it's really our role and mission to—consistent with our mission to weigh in. Not just weigh in but to provide leadership on these topics and I think there's broad support for that. I also think that when you think about a needs analysis—anyway, I can talk for a long time.

**Denis Mosgofian:** The answer is—

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** Yeah.

**Denis Mosgofian:** There are people who would do this.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** Yeah, no, there are. Yeah, there are.

**Chair:** Nick and then Anthony.

**Nick Belloni:** Toby, I'd like to ask you because [unintelligible] if you want me to throw that on the table to vote on to ask the Commission for a strategic plan with Planning to work on a plan for open space and—well, parkland and open space in District 6 and District 10.

**Toby Levy:** And then the follow-up would be and to create a working group. You know, they developed the analysis but then it be part of a working group to vet it.

**Nick Belloni:** Let me add that to this and then—

**Steffen Franz:** Can we do this out loud so we know what you're after?

**Nick Belloni:** I'm writing it at the same time I'm thinking.

**Chair:** Anthony.

**Anthony Cuadro:** Anthony Cuadro, District 7. Are we going to have a conversation at some point about different financing methods that we might be able to utilize.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** I'm a little—I can ask Cristina. My schedule is a little impacted to use the word over the next two and half weeks, three weeks, but after that [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments] On the revenue measure stuff because I heard you guys talking about that [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments]

**Nick Belloni:** Toby, here's what I got. PROSAC request Planning and RPD or RPD and Planning to work on a strategic plan for open space in D6 and D10 and to create a working group to enact that plan. Does that sound good to you?

**Toby Levy:** I think Linda thought that we should ask the Recreation and Park Commission, don't we have to ask them to direct the Department?

**Nick Belloni:** That's what I'm saying, we request RPD Commission [simultaneous comments] to request RPD Commission—well, and Planning but do we want Planning involved?

**Toby Levy:** I think what the point is we have to request the Recreation and Park Commission to direct the staff of both Recreation and Park and Planning.

**Nick Belloni:** So PROSAC requests the RPD Commission to have Planning and Recreation and Park staff to work on a strat plan.

**Toby Levy:** I think I want Recreation and Park win consultation with Planning. I have more faith in Recreation and Park than I do in Planning.

**Chair:** Ancel has a question.

**Ancel Martinez:** Ancel Martinez, **At-Large**, I'll just add to that in terms of the words like instead of work on a plan I'd say work, devise, and complete. [simultaneous comments]

**Nick Belloni:** So PROSAC requests the RPD Commission to have the Recreation and Park Department in consultation with Plan to work, devise and complete—to work on, devise, and complete a strategic plan for open space in D6 and D10 and create a working group to enact that plan. Everybody good with that?

**Female Speaker:** I so move.

**Female Speaker:** Second. [simultaneous comments]

**Nick Belloni:** I'm going to actually identify myself. Nick Belloni, District 4.

**Chair:** And seconded by?

**Linda Shaffer:** Linda Shaffer, District 10. [simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** So we have any discussion now that the motion is out there and seconded? Any other discussion? Public comment?

**David Pipel:** I think the only word that I would add to it after Planning is Department so it's not confused with the Planning Division.

**Nick Belloni:** Okay, Planning Department, thank you.

**David Pipel:** I support that, I think this is a good conversation and there needs to be more of this, I think whatever tool is developed for the needs and it shouldn't just be open space but I agree with what Dawn said about stratifying or subdividing the need by type and then sort of reaggagating that. It's not just what do you have in a half-mile, it's like what do you have in a half-mile and oh by the way there's not a 100,000 of you in a half-mile so yeah you've got one tennis court in a half-mile, enjoy. Whatever tool is developed really should be citywide starting with District 6 and 10. So if this works and hopefully with a lot of [unintelligible] for 6 and 10 then yeah, we should do it in the Sunset, in the Richmond.. And I think all of the other things that Dawn talked about in terms of different models I'm not sure you need to choose one of those three, I think it's going to be bits of all three but we should really be doing this better as a city and not just the staff and the Commission and Planning, it's the Board, it's the Mayor. And I also wanted to observe that although Recreation and Park, Commission and Department sort of sometimes see themselves narrowly as just the assets that they have, MTA sees themselves as like all the transportation in the city, that's their problem. And PUC, all the water, power, and sewer, that's their problem. Well, Recreation and Park can be all of the Recreation and Park in the city even that that's not owned by the city. So think broadly. If you've got more need than supply then we need to—and to the extent that the Commission doesn't see that it's in their powers talk to Mark Farrell and get that in the charter amendment, if that's going to have money that's a charter amendment, whatever changes to their power if they can do a plan, fix that right now, now is a good time.

**Chair:** Good point David, thank you. Any other comments before we call for a vote?

**Denis Mosgofian:** one quick one, the record should show that the intention of the body is that this is what David just suggested starting in District 6 and 10, but really these tools if they're viable and they turn out to be good they should be for the entire city at some point.

**Chair:** Thank you.

**Denis Mosgofian:** Sorry, that was Denis from D5.

**Chair:** Okay, I'd like to call for a vote, all in favor?

**All:** Aye.

**Chair:** Anyone opposed. Seeing none, that has passed. Thank you very much. Let's move on to the next item which is 925-967 Mission Street 5M project. Review, discussion and possible action to approve a resolution requesting a delay [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments]

**Toby Levy:** So this is actually a District 6 issue and this resolution or proposed resolution was created by Jane Weil and I'm presenting it for both of us but we have a certain different take about it.

This is about the 5M project that Jane shared with us last week and I think that her concern and like I said it's different than mine, is that she would really like the essence of this motion was that she would really like the Recreation and Park Commission to postpone its vote on the EIR about the shadowing due to the shadow studies from the 5M project on Boeddeker Park. I don't mean to undermine her but I think this is a little bit part of outside of our purvey but the issue that I am interested along with this is that there's quite a bit of public open space on the ground level that's been touted as part of their contribution and it's really unclear to us that it's really useful open space. So part of the resolution really is that the shadow studies that have been created as part of the EIR be updated to include all park properties and that we should have view of them and that revised open space on this project be considered and that her motion also urged that this survey of all D6 open space be completed so part of what we need would be included in this 5M property.

So that is the general gist of the area. I should say that I have been called by the Mayor's office of Community Development saying that they have done the shadow studies and the impact is within that acceptable level of daylight hours blah, blah, blah, but it was only done on Boeddeker Park. So I should also say that this is a very controversial issue and one that Jane and some of her—there is a whole group of people that have been working on it. So that is the issue.

**Chair:** Do we want to open discussion on that? Denis.

**Denis Mosgofian:** Denis, D5. What's the intent? I'm going to ask Toby—what's the intention here, do you want us to take a position that supports the idea of asking the Commissioners to postpone their September 17<sup>th</sup> hearing until the following conditions are fulfilled?

**Toby Levy:** Yes, that is the intent of the motion.

**Denis Mosgofian:** I don't have any problems supporting that, it doesn't hurt, in other words it doesn't hurt anything to get these kinds of things addressed. It hurts if we ignore them so I think it's within purview to support this kind of request.

**Nick Belloni:** Actually I disagree totally, this is way out of our scope and we need to be careful especially now that we're asking for a strategic plan to make sure that Planning understands we're serious about what we're talking about by not going in and saying look we don't want this project because there's a little shadowing effect. It's just not in our purview to have them try to stop and EIR on those grounds and I know that we wanted to talk about going farther and past what we can do a lot of times but if we want the respect that we need especially to work on something else we need to pay attention to what is in our purview at this point. If we get that changed, then it's time to change it. But not at the moment.

**Chair:** Tom.

**Tom Valtin:** Tom Valtin District 9, what is a really dweeby editor's comment that in the first line of what we're trying to resolve it should be affected, not effected. And secondly I just want to bring to everybody's attention that John King wrote what Jane termed a very fair article about this very project in the Sunday, August 9<sup>th</sup>, Chronicle if people want to find out more about it and see diagrams of where the open space is that's affected. Not Boeddeker Park but on the project site. So I just wanted to bring that to the body's attention.

**Chair:** Thank you, **Steffen**.

**Steffen Franz:** So I've read this a couple times and I would say that at this point half side with Toby and half side with Nick's position in the sense that I think this is slightly out of our scope. I do think that some of the pieces within this resolution actually make sense and I think it may take us a little time—unfortunately, this meeting is on the 17<sup>th</sup> of September so this has to be [unintelligible]. At the same time I have concerns because some of the shadow studies that have been bantered back and forth relate to a fifteen-minute window at Boeddeker Park at 8:15 in the morning and I think that has to be clear amongst PROSAC that if we find ourselves fighting basically against this one situation that is a fifteen-minute window in Boeddeker Park maybe that's a hard fight to win, maybe that's the wrong fight to take. I do think that at the end of the resolution it really talks about this survey which speaks to the strategic plan we all agree with. I would have trouble passing this resolution or voting for this resolution as is and the fact that Jane isn't here and that I don't know that we're going to spend enough time crafting this—I don't know how much time it's worth us putting into. I think Denis asked a good question, what are we asking for.

**Chair:** Did you want to answer before I—

**Toby Levy:** I don't want to totally color this because I do think that the EIR and Jane is much more—really limited what it looked at and we're talking about Boeddeker and that I think Recreation and Park's their Commission is actually solely—they're looking at the project solely from the point of this shadowing otherwise it would never come to the Commission again or ever. I think one of the concerns you have is large when these project do make it a benefit to create open space I do think that is the purvey of the Commission to rule on it, accept it, and in terms of a precedent I think this is a good once where you sort of say you know just don't give us that crap that's left over that might be a wind tunnel. So I think that even if we don't get the delay it would be good to ask the Commission in this case to look at the location of open space because we do want to extend our—their purvey on the types of open spaces that are created and that they do really consider the open space of these type of developments as the community benefit they're supposed to be.

**Chair:** The next person was--.

**Robert Brust:** Me. Thank you. You sort of answered my question [simultaneous comments] Robert Brust, District 8. So they're only looking at the shadow issue. Have they ever really stuck their noses into big projects over the popos or the open space that's being given?

**Toby Levy:** I don't think so.

**Robert Brust:** I think that's what we're asking for them is to have them like you just stated extend their interests.

**Toby Levy:** I think that's part of this whole even earlier discussion is that if we're creating open space as part of these development deals Recreation and Park as it's the godfather of open space or godmother of open space should have its Department and it should be involved with it.

**Robert Brust:** I would support that. I would support if we can get that wording in there. [simultaneous comments] I asking for the amendment to be—the resolution that it be rewritten.

**Linda Shaffer:** Linda Shaffer, District 10. I'm trying to think how to word what I'm about to say. I happen to know that there is a different version of this resolution that I'm a little bit puzzled as to why that was not presented rather than this. [simultaneous comments] I'm a bit puzzled as to why this is what was presented as opposed to the other—

**Toby Levy:** I'm sorry.

**Linda Shaffer:** No, I'm not complaining I'm stating—the reason I'm stating this is because I think that Robert for example you would have been happier—

**Robert Brust:** I would have amended the language.

**Linda Shaffer:** But specifically on this version at the very top the resolution says it is asking the Commissioners to refuse to sign off on the proposed project and then further down where it says be it hereby resolved PROSAC requests the Commissioners postpone the September 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. Those are two different things and one question that needs to be answered that was addressed in this other version to which I am referring did resolve that question. [simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Nick and then Denis and then—

**Nick Belloni:** While we're talking about all this what is the Commission's legal—and I'm talking legal—definition to what they jump in on specific projects? What can they jump into, what can't they legally if you can eve comment on that.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** Yeah. Well the charter in its establishment of the Recreation and Park Commission says there shall be a Recreation and Park Commission and these are its powers and it has to do with the jurisdiction over parklands and actually has some very kind of specific language about play fields and a few others—it calls out playgrounds and a few other assets because when it was created those [unintelligible] much expended the services that we provide. So we have jurisdiction over the properties that are transferred or bought by the Department and providing—and setting policy guidance basically for the Department and the operation and care of those facilities.

The Commissioners can send comment, they can make recommendations to other Commissions. There have been exchanges when like Central Subway is being built and

there is a connection because the Central Subway project and our project where we provide feedback to them on their part, we approve the part that's on our property and then we might provide feedback on other issues that we think might impact us.

So that could happen. The Historic Preservation Commission has provided [unintelligible] on several occasions on issues related to preservation but that are on our property and our responsibility to carry out. So it's a little more nuanced, it doesn't bullet point out everything they can and can't talk about but the things that they have jurisdiction over [unintelligible]

**Chair:** Denis.

**Denis Mosgofian:** I want to respond to some of the things that were said. There's a resolution at the top recommending that RPD Commission refuse to sign off says until further studies are completed which is consistent with down below that says until following conditions are fulfilled. I understand that since this is time sensitive it's different than if let's say this were set for December. Okay, we can be nitpicky. I think that in fact the whole concept of these kind of spaces are within our purview. These are concerns that we have, that's what we talked about in the piece that we just dealt with, that's what we've talked about in D6 and I think in terms of whether or not we all agree with every single point I don't think any of agree with every single point when we go to the ballot and we vote on what resolutions and politicians, we don't agree with everything they say, we don't agree with everything that's on the thing. I think we need to take a position—the position simply says the Commission would postpone the September 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. They might not agree with all these points. We're advisory, we're not compulsory. There's nothing in here that say thou shall. This is a recommendation and if they decide that they don't really care about some of these conditions but they'll check into one or two of them that may be what they do but for them to hear from the advisory committee that we think that this is another consequence of development and its impacting open space one way or another I think it's appropriate that we support this kind of thing in part because its timely, not because I agree with every single word, just because I think it's appropriate and I think it's the proper thing to do, it's the right thing to do.

**Anthony Cuadro:** So just a sort of general question about what we're talking about because before we were talking about coming up or figuring out a way to have a overarching strategy primarily for D6 and D10 and can we or should we logistically be asking the Commission to set a new precedent of something they've never done before, before we've actually come up with that strategy, before the strategy's been developed? I mean the chicken before the egg, like before we even have the strategy in place aren't they really going to go out on a limb and change the precedent that they've been doing forever? I don't really see it happening but—

**Toby Levy:** Toby Levy, District 6. I think what I would urge is a more general instead of such a complete resolution. I think we don't want to get into the debate of whether we're stopping the project or not stopping the project, I think our concern is really much more focused that we want the Commission to be assured that there is no more shadowing on all existing parks, one, and that we want them to look at the potential open space and make sure that it's usable and it meets the community needs. I think all that is within our purvey and their purvey and we make it very simple and I don't know, do we ask them to postpone

it until they do? Probably yes but even if they don't at least we've made our two concerns, issues on all public parks and two, that the open space that's being provided is usable and meets the community needs.

**Chair:** Is that in the other version?

**Toby Levy:** It's in here in many words and even in this other version it gets too much into the specific politics of turning the project down so that's why—

**Chair:** Well then we have to do something with that resolution. [simultaneous comments]

**Richard Ivanhoe:** Richard Ivanhoe, District 5. I tend to agree with Denis that we're not going to agree on all the wording and after saying that I'm going to suggest some changes. So I guess the one question is [unintelligible] the shadowing is a big issue but I'd go for the first two whereas. I'm not sure about the middle. And then the last whereas just stop with [unintelligible] go down to it be hereby resolved. Take out the first two ones with the shadow studies and keep the rest in. Maybe the shadow studies are necessary to have Planning deal with it but I think that gets kind of the bigger pictures. [simultaneous comments] Let me just read—if I can read it. So I start with keeping it up to the second whereas suitable for parks and open space [unintelligible]

**Toby Levy:** We eliminate one—how many other paragraphs?

**Richard Ivanhoe:** We eliminate all the rest of the whereas until the last one, the last one would be whereas the Recreation and Park Commission [unintelligible] on September 17<sup>th</sup> to approve the EIR and general plan and then as for this project. [unintelligible]. And then go down to the hereby resolved until the following conditions are fulfilled, let's start with revise locations then down to the end.

**Female Speaker:** I think we should include something more general about the shadowing of all parks and not name them but just all parks period.

**Richard Ivanhoe:** My idea is just to make it more general and no specific to this project even though we're asking for a delay on this project.

**Female Speaker:** And what was your proposal for the first two whereas? [simultaneous comments]

**Male Speaker:** How about the fifth one, the one with the list? [simultaneous comments]

**Richard Ivanhoe:** We going to keep it in—probably want to keep it all in or maybe just take out the part on the winds and shadows even though that's sort of what Planning focuses on.

**Male Speaker:** Will the Commission understand why we're saying this if we're taking out everything about the shadows.

**Chair:** Well I'm going to have the other resolution right behind it. I'm going to do both.

**Toby Levy:** I just think if we—I support Richard’s idea about eliminating it because they have discretion, you know. I don’t want to get into the EIR debate. It is and it isn’t covered.

**Male Speaker:** What we are asking is simply is the hearing on this be postponed.  
[simultaneous comments]

**Les Hilger:** Les Hilger, District 1. So I actually really like where you’re going with this, I already circled the two whereas I really like them but I would like to change the first sentence to reconcile with really what we’re asking and just say resolution recommending that the Recreation and Park Commissions postpone their vote on 5M project until further studies are completed. [simultaneous comments]

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** I want to take [unintelligible] and describe what the actual action is by the Commission and what they’re being asked to do because I think [unintelligible] Nick’s question about jurisdiction I gave a very high-level answer and I think what I probably should have done was just explained a little bit about what the motion is that’s actually in front of the Commission for them to consider and how that process [unintelligible] So the joint action is going to be on raising the shadow limit on Boeddeker.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** So the EIR part, the general plan amendment that’s all Planning Commission, Recreation and Park Commission doesn’t take any action on those votes. Likely, they’re all be heard at once. The joint Commission hearings will start with the EIR and then they’ll probably hear all of—this is all still being debated on the mechanics of the joint Commission but usually how it works is that the [unintelligible] whole project. Then the Planning Commission takes a vote on the EIR, then the joint action happens where the Planning Commission, Recreation and Park Commission, vote on raising that shadow limit on Boeddeker. Then it goes to the Recreation and Park Commission to take its action as it does on every Section 295 project that says they find that the shadow is not adverse or significant to the use of the park. Then the Planning Commission moves on and does all the rest of their entitlements and actions and after the Recreation and Park Commission takes a separate action they may leave, they may adjourn the hearing and then it will continue with the Planning Commission taking its votes after.

**Dawn Kamalanathan:** And of course there’s public comment too.

**Toby Levy:** It’s that discussion, public comment, and then votes start. [simultaneous comments] Only on Boeddeker, Boeddeker is the only Recreation and Park land that’s being shadowed, that has a new shadow from this building. So they have shown—we’ve seen a shadow study and we’ve seen two—one from the original version of how the 5M project was developed and then as it changed we got a revised shadow study and the shadow shifted a little, it’s still under [unintelligible] percent addition. It’s 0 [unintelligible] the number is small but it is an addition which is why we’re going through it. But Gene Friend and EMD doesn’t have any new additional shadow. And then the other shadow—the other parks are outside of that section 295, Planning Code Section 295.

**Female Speaker:** Because it’s Yerba Buena.

**Female Speaker:** Right. Planning Code Section 295 only talks about property under Recreation and Park jurisdiction of slated for acquisition so like Schlage Lock they're going to have to come to the Recreation and Park Commission when they build their buildings and they're going to have to say it's okay.

**Female Speaker:** So we're talking about UN plaza, Halliday Plaza, Yerba Buena Gardens, Jessie Square. [simultaneous comments] Open spaces which they could shadow and probably do [simultaneous comments]

**Female Speaker:** I move the way Richard has edited this motion.

**Female Speaker:** I'll second.

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** [unintelligible] Les, Tom.

**Linda Shaffer:** Linda Shaffer, District 10. If I understood it correctly you want the whereas that begins the Recreation and Park Commission is currently scheduled to meet—we've eliminated the last two lines of that?

**Male Speaker:** Starting with [unintelligible]

**Linda Shaffer:** No, we can't do that. Well, we can do anything but the whole reason—that's what the Recreation and Park Commission is doing. So eliminating that kind of doesn't make any sense for purposes of this resolution and it also should be Planning Code Section 295 no Planning Cod. [simultaneous comments] So I would amend the motion to include incorporating the rest of that section. [simultaneous comments]

**Tom Valtin:** Richard, were you suggesting that we keep some sections under be it hereby resolved or that we—which of those sections? Only the last two, so revised locations and the survey of all D6 open space.

**Female Speaker:** I was hoping that we'd have the shadow study mentioned since that's exactly what they're voting on, all parks and open space, that's all that revised all parks—shadow studies are completed on all parks and open space.

**Male Speaker:** So we need to work that. [simultaneous comments]

**Female Speaker:** That isn't dealing with what they're going to be talking about, that's the only thing, it's a little broad considering that we're only talking about this one part of this one shadow.

**Female Speaker:** But since we're going to ask them in our future to be the goddess of the parks we really want them to have a broader view. So we can ask, they can even turn us down but we can ask.

**Male Speaker:** But this is sending a message, isn't that what we're trying to do.

**Male Speaker:** [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments]

**Linda Shaffer:** Linda Shaffer, District 10. What as I see as an equally important part of this is—and I wish that I had different wording, is a request that the Commission recognize that part of the open space that is being proposed for this project, that the open space that is being proposed as part of this project has many problems, it is interior to the project which means that you cannot see it from surrounding streets, it's very much like Totooby Plaza which I had never heard of until I asked which fits the same description and in which so many awful things are going on that apparently residents in the area are asking that the plaza be gotten rid of. [simultaneous comments] It's hidden and you can't see it and people are dealing drugs and doing all kinds of things is my understanding. It is also subject to the highest level of window and shadows, that open space. So in essence I think what we should be asking the Commission to do is pay attention to the fact that the open space being proposed for this project has many, many problems and it would be very nice if the Commission would suggest that they rethink many things about this open space and there's also supposed to be a playground proposed for this and that the Commission should make sure—should urge somebody, Planning, to make sure there is an actual playground that is provided as part of the open space.

**Les Hilger:** Les Hilger, District 1. Could I just say I think we could create a resolution where we ask them to do one thing, postpone the vote, and then say furthermore PROSAC is concerned and then list our concerns. They don't have to be—they can be listed. [simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Let's hear public comment. I have Diane Lewis. [simultaneous comments]

**Joseph Smooke:** Joseph Smooke, President of the Board of South of Market Community Action Network. [unintelligible] So just to clarify what our main concerns are is that yes PROSAC look at the quality of all open spaces that are proposed by the developer and I think one of the things that was missing in the conversation is looking at there's a proposed rooftop open space over the Chronicle building which is where the [unintelligible] activities are proposed that would also be in shadow similar to the ground level open space that people are talking about as being similar [unintelligible]. The other things just in terms of [unintelligible] Section 295 issue, the last time we had a District 6 Section 295 issue was on Victoria Manola Draves Park. It was a very small shadow, right—when we're looking at zero tolerance parks and so the impact on Boeddeker is really similar in our view to the impact on Victoria Manola Draves Park which Recreation and Park Commission rejected if you all remember. So what we're asking for in terms of process is for PROSAC to be able to evaluate that, make some recommendation to the Recreation and Park Commission, have the Recreation and Park Commission actually be able to hear that in its own hearing before going to a joint Commission hearing with Planning. We're asking for some process because the problem is that the developer and Planning are trying to fast track this project which doesn't allow for the kind of review that we were able to have on Victoria Manola Draves Park. So that's what we're asking for. I know it's kind of obfuscated in the resolution, so I just wanted to make that clear.

**Dyan Ruiz:** Hi, I'm Dyan, I'm from South of Market Community Action Network. I really appreciate you considering this project and the effects that it will have on open space in the area. I really agree that [unintelligible] resolution that's coming before Recreation and Park is quite narrow and I think PROSAC can take a position that is larger than what Recreation and Park is chartered to consider when it comes to this is going to affect the children's playground at Yerba Buena, there's other open space that's technically not part of Recreation and Park but the shadow will overshadow it and it is a zero tolerance park. So there's a lot of questions that I think as Joseph said that should be discussed openly that is separate from the joint Planning Commission hearing. The reason is because of Prop K and so the shadow ordinances on a zero tolerance park they technically need to be at a joint hearing at some point but it doesn't mean that you need to just slam it through without significant public comment out of Recreation and Park's only hearing in order to talk about the things that you're discussing here and I think as far as the things that are going on with the EIR we are in general requesting a continuance on September 17<sup>th</sup> of which the Recreation and Park [unintelligible] but that's definitely not the only reason but I think that PROSAC should definitely consider making a stand similar to the previous proposal about there should be a larger view to these issues. You're a community body and there should be a community process to providing input before the Planning Commission hearing which will be a huge hearing, there will be a million other things going on and what is really going to be available for people to discuss only—you know, to discuss the things that are relevant to open space, shadows, and the quality of the open space on the project itself. There isn't going to be a time for that. [unintelligible]

**Chair:** That comment, that's a consideration. Should we [unintelligible] a resolution that would precede that hearing. [simultaneous comments] In which case we would be requesting a separate hearing. [simultaneous comments] Do we have another public comment? Mr. Pilpel.

**David Pilpel:** Several things. Your agenda for whatever reason I think could have been written a little better on this item. It suggest action to approve a resolution requesting delay of the decision. I would have just had it regarding this project so that you have a little more flexibility. I appreciate the comments that were just made. I think adding a whereas referencing the past Commission action to disapprove the shadow on VMD would be very appropriate because I think that whether or not it set a precedent I think you can use that as an argument, that it sets a precedent in District 6 and that at least on the parks over which they have jurisdiction they should have no further shadowing and since there's these other spaces that don't qualify for which there will be additional shadow, etc. you're certainly making the resolution better and I look forward to hearing Les' latest. To be clear on the whereas in the middle the Planning Commission has jurisdiction to approve the EIR and project approvals and entitlements and the Recreation and Park Commission only has jurisdiction over the shadow of Boeddeker under 1993's Prop K and [unintelligible]. So I think you can talk and you know if you have additional concerns [unintelligible] this is fine but I would start out with the shadow that you don't want them to approve or at a minimum they should postpone until there's further work and I think you're getting there.

**Chair:** Okay, Richard Rothman.

**Richard Rothman:** District 1. If my calendar is right that's the same day as the full Commission meets on the 17<sup>th</sup> and the Planning Commission meets that day too so [simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** That's the joint hearing.

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Okay, Les.

**Les Hilger:** I may flop here but this is an attempt at sort of reconciling everything I've heard. So it would start with a resolution recommending that Recreation and Park Commissions postpone their vote on the 5M project until further studies are completed, whereas the San Francisco—the first two whereas basically saying whereas the San Francisco Recreation and Park and Open Space Advisory Committee have not had a formal presentation on the open space component of this project and whereas District 6 has been identified as the most open space deficient in the city and in which active efforts to identify sites in D6 suitable for parks and open space are ongoing. And then it goes down to and whereas the Recreation and Park Commission is currently scheduled to meet jointing with the Planning Commission on September 17<sup>th</sup> to approve the EIR and general plan amendments for this project and to approve the raising of the absolute cumulative shadow limits of Boeddeker Park. Then we say be it hereby resolved that PROSAC requests the Commission postpone their vote on September 17<sup>th</sup>. Period. After that it says furthermore PROSAC is concerned that—and then we list, ground level open spaces is poorly sited, location is subject to the highest level wind, the site is primarily hardscaped [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments] It basically takes the section that expresses all of our concerns about the project and we drop it below our request for them to postpone the vote and we just say this is what we're concerned about. [simultaneous comments]

**Male Speaker:** Can we read this now in its entirety?

**Les Hilger:** We're getting rid of Planning Code Section 295? Code? [simultaneous comments] So do I need to read it? [Simultaneous comments] A resolution recommending that the Recreation and Park Commission postpone their vote on the 5M project 925-967 Mission Street until further studies are completed. Whereas the San Francisco Recreation and Park and Open Space Advisory committee has not had a formal presentation of the open space component of this major project and whereas District 6 has been identified as the most open space deficient in the city and in which active efforts to identify sites in D6 suitable for parks and open space are ongoing and whereas the Recreation and Park Commission is currently scheduled to meet jointly with the Planning Commission on September 17<sup>th</sup> to approve the EIR and general plan amendments for this project and to approve the raising of the absolute cumulative shadow limits for Boeddeker Park pursuant to Planning Code Section 295. Be it hereby resolved that PROSAC requests that the Commissioners postpone the September 17<sup>th</sup> vote. Be if further resolved that PROSAC is concerned that: ground level open space is poorly sited, enclosed in the middle of the complex, surrounded by towers and not visible from any major street, the location is subject to the highest level wind and shadows identified in the EIR, the site is primarily hardscaped as described in the EIR, a nearly identical park one block away tucked inside alleyways is

nonfunctional, a haven of antisocial behavior and a detriment to the neighborhood and neighbors are asking for the removal of Totoobie Plaza as a failed experiment and 50 percent of the open space will be rooftop and accessible only during business hours via elevator.

**Male Speaker:** [unintelligible]

**Tom Valtin:** Linda, may I make a comment to Les?

**Chair:** Yes.

**Tom Valtin:** Tom Valtin, District 9, in the bullet point on the nearly identical park one block away I think we should name it there. Nearly identical park one block away, Totoobie Plaza.

**Chair:** Any other corrections, comments? Denis.

**Denis Mosgofian:** Just a questions. Les, have you cut out the entire section at the bottom, it's gone?

**Female Speaker:** Yes.

**Denis Mosgofian:** Thanks.

**Nick Belloni:** I'll call the question. Nick Belloni District 4 calling question.

**Chair:** Okay. Can we have a show of hands, those in favor or voting in favor of this version of the resolution. Okay. [applause] Toby, you and I will be going to the Commission meeting together.

**Toby Levy:** Just how I want to spend my Thursday. [simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Let's move on. Item 7 on agenda setting. I want to point out to you that the update on urban agriculture was supposed to off of there so that should be crossed out. [unintelligible]

**Richard Ivanhoe:** Just so you know, the dog plan from the GGNRA is coming out in the next couple of months.

**Chair:** All right, so Richard would you let me know when you want to agendize this. As soon as you know for sure let's agendize this. That would be a really important item. Yes Richard?

**Richard Ivanhoe:** Richard Ivanhoe District 5. One thing that I think should be added is the interaction between Capital and Operations [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Any other items? If not that's it. Any public comment on the agenda setting?

**David Pilpel:** David Pilpel. I think the two items [unintelligible]

**Chair:** Okay, I'm going to close that item if there's no other public comment. I want to read into public comment an item not listed on this agenda. This was sent to me from one of our constituents who couldn't be here tonight. It says as my District 11 PROSAC representatives—and that's to me and Sharon—I would like the current situation at Crocker-Amazon playground be brought to the attention of the full PROSAC community. With the recent shooting incident it's quite evident that the park code regarding loitering in the parking lot and gambling are not being enforced by Park Patrol. It's my hope that those charged with assigning Park Patrol duties will focus on those areas that have the greatest need. Ingleside police could benefit great by Park Patrol's presence. Our association, the Excelsior District Improvement Association, has issued a letter to Police Chief Suhr asking for a meeting with Recreation and Park Department to implement an action plan, [unintelligible] President, Excelsior District Improvement Association and the genesis of that is that once again we had another shooting incident at Crocker-Amazon, no one was deceased but once again we have asked for Park Patrol to be present and unfortunately that hasn't happened and so now it's being escalated to have a meeting with Mr. Ginsburg who is copied on this and John Avalos and Police Chief Suhr and our local Captain McFadden but they want you to know she does that this is an ongoing problem, maybe you've had other parks as well but we don't get served in the southeast district, Districts 11 and 10 like I say [unintelligible]. With the discussion that took place with Park Patrol and the additional when will we see some results of that remain to be seen because we certainly are not seeing it. Yes, Robert, is that it, did you want to add comments?

**Robert Brust:** You might want to also consider copying Denis and Bob Lotte.

**Chair:** I had some conversation with Bob Lotti about meeting with him. I'm waiting for a date [unintelligible] apparently differs from Denny's information. Okay, any other comment. Richard?

**Richard Rothman:** On this issue I don't know if this related to Scott Wiener's ordinance about the park hours. The more I study it, I mean it has good intentions but it's just really—you know, to change park hours it's going to take six months the way it goes. So we're starting it at Cabrillo playground and if we have our first meeting in September it will be lucky if it gets to the Commission by December so I don't know if this has to do with park hours but I think we had some unintended visitors over the weekend.

**Chair:** Are you having Park Patrol issues?

**Richard Rothman:** No, it's just they close the bathroom at 8:00, they leave the park open until 10:00 and then I found out if somebody is there at 10:00 they can't kick them out until 12:00 midnight and there's no lights in the parks so you know it needs to be tweaked or something, I don't know, but it's—

**Chair:** Why don't we put that on the agenda, how about that?

**Richard Rothman:** Well, we can put it on the agenda. [simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Is there any other general public comment on items not listed on this agenda? David Pilpel? Any announcements? Yes, Richard Rothman.

**Richard Rothman:** I just want to say I'm giving my Coit Tower tour this Saturday at 11:00 o'clock. It's free.

**Toby Levy:** And I want to thank everybody because one day we will have meaningful open space in D6.

[simultaneous comments]

**End of Document**