

**Parks and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee Meeting
May 1, 2018**

Chair: Welcome to the May meeting of Park and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee. Thank you all for coming today. I know everybody has had some busy days leading up to this and there's a lot going on in our world. So I'm going to try to make this a pretty quick meeting. It's a very short agenda tonight so for all of you who attended thank you.

We're going to call the roll.

Jordyn Aquino: District 4.

Mark Scheuer: District 8.

Steven Currier: District 11.

Robert Brust: District 8.

Cally Wong: District 7.

Jane Weil: District 6.

Ken McGary: District 11.

Ana Gee: District 6.

Gisele Rainer: District 3.

Elisa Laird-Metke: District 9.

Wendy Aragon: District 1.

Katherine Jones: District 5.

Richard Rothman: District 1.

Nick Belloni: District 2.

Chair: Steffan Franz, District 2. Thank you for that. I would like to start by saying that many of us are clearly fans of a certain sports team that is playing tonight and I would ask that if you are looking at your phone during this meeting most of us don't want to know what's going on so if we could keep it on the down-low. Unfortunately, at our next meeting if things goes well it's going to be a problem again. There should be some discussion and I'll just make a point to staff, there is an election on the next Tuesday and I think we actually moved to move the meeting if I'm not wrong.

Nick Belloni: I think we did but I don't recall.

Chair: I think we actually looked at the calendar in January and we said we're going to move the June meeting because it falls on the special election day. So if somebody could just follow up on that.

Male Speaker: We had discussed it but [unintelligible].

Nick Belloni: We don't we make a quick motion.

Chair: If you like.

Nick Belloni: Motion to move the June meeting from June 5th to June 6th due to the special election that is happening on June 5th.

Male Speaker: I would like to discuss that. I don't like to miss meetings and I'm not coming back from Paris until the 7th. Is there any way we can move it to the following week?

Chair: No. Basically our choice is to have it on the Tuesday or the next day.

Nick Belloni: The way the charter is written you can move it over one day because of an election but that's it.

Chair: And that's the only reason you can move it.

Cally Wong: Second.

Chair: All in favor of moving the June 5th meeting to June 6th.

Most: Aye.

Male Speaker: I oppose.

Chair: One opposed. That item passes, thank you. Did anybody get a chance to review the minutes? Any comments.

Female Speaker: I called in one change and I think it was already made.

Chair: Tiffany did you make Jane's change? Yes. Anybody else?

Female Speaker: [unintelligible]

Chair: All in favor of accepting the March 6 minutes?

All: Aye.

Chair: Opposed? Hearing none, this item is closed.

So I'm going to do a quick Chair's report. I believe there are two members who would also like to speak during that time. I will start by saying that Robert Brust and Richard and I met with the General Manager Phil Ginsburg, Taylor, and Connie Chan, and we had a very good starting point meeting to discuss PROSAC's role in the Operational Plan for this year and years to come. The reason that we took up this meeting and the reason that Robert had started a working group around this was that we felt that the Strategic Plan took a lot of effort and energy. We all contributed to that when we sat on this committee during that time. But that Capital plan had also been pretty well vetted with us but that the Operational Plan was an afterthought and to us we feel that is an integral part of our role is to have oversight and discuss that. So we felt that it needed at least as much attention and a more consistent left of attention and so to that end Robert shaped that meeting, he came into it with some talking points and we left with some outcomes that I think are great and I'll let him to speak to that.

Robert Brust: We came away and Taylor typed up two things—we have a memorandum of understanding and a schedule of [unintelligible] starting in September and February we're going to get the plan and have at least a month or two.

Chair: To talk through it and see what their goals are.

Robert Brust: But the idea is that we identify key things like equity if we're interested in that and get the folks in here from the Recreation and Park that are responsible for that and present early on and Gary is also going to help with that presenting key notes on the Operations Department as we move through the rest of the year. I think those are two of the big highlights.

Chair: I would also say that you can expect that the General Manager we've invited him, he is going to come and present to us at the June meeting likely and he's going to speak basically about bond planning and our role in that process which is still quite a few months away but then he'll come back to us in September and he'll talk about what went well last year and what they hope to achieve for next year and that should set the stage for us to then consider okay now we've heard from him, we've seen some draft in September of what their plans are and we can comment on that in a timely manner before it goes to Commission which I think satisfies some feelings that we felt we were kind of a stop on the freight train but it was kind of an express stop. Robert kind of said no, let's put the brakes on a couple times and let's see what this train is carrying.

So I think that was great. We did achieve something great in the sense that three PROSAC members and three RPD staff really saw eye to eye on what we were hoping for. Would you agree?

Robert Brust: Yes. It's a good start. Can we enter these into the record?

Chair: Yes certainly. Gary has them.

Robert Brust: Send them out to everybody with a note.

Chair: Okay. I want to move on to my next item. Thank you very much. Again, if you're interested in being a part of this please offline speak with Robert, he'd be glad to talk with you. Any help in terms of the working group and shaping that particular policy document would be great to be a part of.

I and many of many others attended the San Francisco Parks Alliance Park Partnership Conference on April 14th. It was amazing to see most of you there. I thought we really showed up in full force to an event that really speaks to what we're all about, right.

Male Speaker: We had a table.

Chair: We were a table. And not just a table but I felt we were really honored. Like I wasn't there for the opening but I heard that they recognized PROSAC and said these people are an integral part. I felt that by putting me as a Chair but also somebody who tries to build groups on a panel it was like hey we're all here together, let's work together.

So I feel that was really well executed. I produce events myself as a side hustle and I was impressed by their first attempt at producing an event at the City Club. That's a hard venue. They just knocked it out of the park. So I want to encourage them on the record and for any of you who have any folks in Parks Alliance that they should continue to do this event.

My panel in particular was called Building your Group and I thought it was really helpful for people who were really just starting out trying to figure out what to do to build a Friends of group of how to approach and address the city on capital projects.

To that end that leads me to my third item. Currently I'm working on a fairly in-depth sister parks of Friends of group presentation and by that I mean a fairly lengthy PowerPoint that talks about how the Strategic Plan for Recreation and Park really is trying to foster, facilitate, sister parks and in doing that what they're really saying is why don't you help a couple people who don't know how to form a group, teach them how to approach the city, teach them how to use the resources.

So I put a lot of time into this, tens or twenties of hours. Today I had a wonderful meeting with a couple people in the Park Partnership side of Recreation and Park and they gave me some really good feedback. I have a meeting at the Bayview Hunters Point library next Tuesday to give this preso as take the training wheels off and see how it goes. So I'm kind of excited that in July hopefully I will bring you this and then give it to you and let you go off to your people. I think it will be really helpful for everybody. I really put a lot of heart into it and really I have to commend like Recreation and Park had five people on the phone with me today talking through it. Like hey, you know what might be better? This. It's like oh my God we're all working together here, this is killer. Again, Parks Alliance as well, has been really supportive of this and meeting both of those two entities to play parts in this.

So I'm going to turn the floor over now to Richard. You had a comment?

Richard Rothman: Yeah. About City Hall. So I happen to know the clear of the Board and I asked her why we can't use room 270A and she said that the President of the Board of Supervisors sent out a memo saying that room can only be used for Board of Supervisors business but since we have a Representative from District 5 and I found room 36 in City Hall but it's bicycle storage.

Chair: So basically just to inform everybody what Richard is talking about, the reason we're not at City Hall now is because Supervisor Breed, President Breed had said if it's not Supervisor business is can't be there. The reality is in the charter it actually calls for us to meet at City Hall. What do you mean, it says it in the charter. You want to take it out of the charter we'll vote it out.

Male Speaker: What about that cute little room in front of the Mayor's office?

Chair: And that's what we decide. Gary and I are going to go to room 200 and we're going to hang out for a while and see if anybody gives us a room to meet in.

Nick Belloni: For bail money I'll pass around the hat right now.

Chair: I would propose—I think it's really important for us to make a run at this. Gary and I have decided that the two of us together will go in our please give us a room hats but if it doesn't pan out I'm going to stop chasing my tail on it too because—

Richard Rothman: I think we should talk to [unintelligible].

Chair: Send an email please.

Richard Rothman: [unintelligible] called me about getting because there's going to be two vacancies in District 10 so they are looking for somebody and I also emailed District 9.

Ana Gee: District 6. So I just wanted to share [unintelligible]. Many of you know how much my community has been working on MaCaulay Park. The reason why I had to share this is because I w3ant to acknowledge the hard work for the community. So this [unintelligible], Recreation and Park was present, [unintelligible] and a few more community members and because the Police Department decided that they didn't want a bathroom or an activation for people with no kids. So it was really hard to take that in so we had that meeting. The Captain was there and it happens that two of the officers are actually nephews of Sergeant MaCaulay.

I understand their [unintelligible]. It was a really difficult meeting because I feel that the Police Department has their own views about what safety might look like and our community has a different opinion. But I want to report that the meeting went very good in the sense that now we have [unintelligible] but now there is an open window to conversations and I had to say that name, I don't know her last [unintelligible] I am very proud of the Department at this meeting because she was able to let the Department know [unintelligible] and how it was very important that kids by having this bathroom at this particular park it gives access to a lot of kids in the

neighborhood. [unintelligible] that they came out and supported the community of this really not very easy meeting.

Which brings me to this other idea of we always talk about [unintelligible] but it's very important that we start talking about implementation and I think the other view of this table has shown me that sharing resources is a way to go without [unintelligible]. So sharing resources not just on the capital level but the mind, knowledge is very important. [unintelligible]

Chair: Thank you. Okay so I am going to move us along. The one thing that I would really ask of all of you before I close this section, RSVP'ing. There is one simple ask we have and that's just for you to say yes I'm coming to the meeting next Tuesday or whenever it is. It should be up to staff to have to prod a few hours before the meeting and then it becomes unfair to people who think the meeting is getting cancelled because there isn't quorum. Please, a week before—and I'll ask staff, send it out a week before, send it out two weeks before, if you want to be on this committee RSVP because it is causing stress between us as members but also between us and staff. It's one of the few rough points right now.

We do have a new member and I just normally will give the floor just to introduce yourself. It's our way of saying hi, welcome, jump in the fire. Gisele Rainer is a new member and I'll let you have the floor for a couple minutes to tell us who you are.

Gisele Rainer: I'm in District 3. I'm not replacing Ken Maley, I'm the second appointment in that District and I came to this decision to try to get this seat because I have a 90 pound black lab and so I walk with my dog at least twice a day and we end up at one park or another somewhere in the city and so I enjoy the parks everywhere in the city wherever we walk and so does my husband. I just wanted to become a part of the scene and try to help do whatever I could to improve and keep the interest going. I put an application in and there was an opening and I had coffee with [unintelligible].

Chair: That's great. You are replacing somebody who got on this committee and then never showed up so already you're ahead of the game.

Gisele Rainer: One other thing. I also am a lawyer and actually a bond lawyer, I do bond deals. In my former job—I'm not an Deputy Attorney General so I do only California State deal but before that I was in private practice with a big New York firm that represented the City of San Francisco. So I know all the people in the city and do bond deals for the city. I have done GO deals and Recreation and Park deals.

Chair: That's awesome to know.

Gisele Rainer: If there's anything I can to explain how they work or whatever. I'd be willing to give a little tutorial on bonds.

Chair: That might be when the General Manager gives us his perspective on the next bond measure maybe the following meeting you can give us the rebuttal.

Gisele Rainer: You guys might need a little No-Doze.

Chair: We sit through plenty, don't worry. She's actually been confirmed by the Board of Supervisors Rules Committee so she's a voting member at this time.

Let us wrap this up. Is there any public comment on the Chair's report.

Female Speaker: Do you have an update on 1133 Mission?

Chair: Only on items not listed on the agenda.

Female Speaker: [unintelligible] would it be possible to send a calendar invite and then that way you respond?

Chair: Yeah, I wouldn't have an objection to that. I don't know that works for everybody. I think that having a calendar agenda is like another failsafe. I think we all need to be accountable.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: We see the email from Recreation and Park, we should respond back just to give everybody else a chance. If you can't do it that minute, that day, but don't let it wait and then don't make them come back and go hi, we have four people respond. We need more of you to let us know.

Any other items? Hearing none, this item is closed.

Quickly, I want to go over new business. There hasn't been much change in terms of we've got some stuff of there and we've added some stuff back. I will tell you that there are a couple of items and Gary might want to speak to this a little bit that we still in process on that isn't on this list. One of them certainly could be the General Manager's bond presentation which doesn't really need to be on the new business, it will become an agenda item. I think that Richard has really pushed and I think we'll see that next month the Golden Gate Park edge improvement. And ARG which I guess Stacy will do. Best Values I guess are we hearing that he has a standing appointment for Tuesday? Well guess what, our next meeting is Wednesday. Why don't you see if we can get him for that.

So we're trying to really move through this. I would ask the committee is there anything that you see on here that you would like removed? Anything to add?

Steven Currier: We've been talking about acquisition of 4650 Mission Street which is past Ocean, the Persia Triangle. The owners of that property are willing to give—I don't know if they're willing to give it to us but they want it to go to Recreation and Park. It is something that EAG has been working on for a long time, Supervisor Safai is all for it, community members are all for it and in it, property owners are for it and I think I'd like to get this in discussion at the July meeting so we can put this on an acquisition list since the new fiscal year comes up July 1st I'd sure like to get this.

Richard Rothman: [unintelligible]

Steven Currier: Well, we need to have a discussion here before it even goes there.

Richard Rothman: I think you should talk to them [unintelligible]. So they're prepared to come here. I think you should talk to Stacy or Dawn before you come here just to brief them.

Chair: Wait a minute, hold on.

Male Speaker: [unintelligible]

Chair: So my question would be who from Recreation and Park would present on this?

Male Speaker: [unintelligible]

Chair: So I would like to ask by July we'll put this on this new business but by July we'd like some sort of a preso.

Steven Currier: Could that come from a Supervisor?

Chair: Yeah, it could come from the Excelsior Action, I'm fine with that.

Steven Currier: I don't think we're prepared yet. [simultaneous comments]

Chair: I would like you to either reach out to the community group or the Supervisor's office and see if they want to make a presentation and obviously that means somebody from staff, Capital probably, needs to be able to discuss it, needs to be a part of that.

Female Speaker: Is there a price on that?

Chair: We can't discuss this in this item. We can talk about putting it on the agenda but we can't talk about the item. I've been warned about this again. We start talking about stuff we want to add and it says specifically in the language that we cannot discuss the item.

So let's move on, who else?

Ana Gee: District 6. Again, can we put something like [unintelligible].

Chair: All right, so here's what I'm going to say to that before we try to put that out there. Hey Gary, can you and Ana Gee have a conversation about how you would frame the Department's take on equity. Like some sort of a standing policy. Obviously she wants to know as it relates to her District and her parks but I think her point is she's taking up this mantle of like we'd like to know, it was a big part of the Strategic Planning discussion, where are we at now. Where is equity as seen by the lens of the Recreation and Park Department now. Is that fair? So just think about how to word that and we'll try to get it on the next agenda. Robert.

Robert Brust: District 8. I identified a couple of areas on the Strategic Plan and in the Operations Plan where they specifically are targeting equity and I could send them to you. For instance inspire play, develop and implement an outreach plan that increases—

Chair: You're talking about the item.

Robert Brust: I'm going to send it to Ana, Wendy and Gary.

Chair: Why don't you please have a discussion about how that would read as an agenda item and them—

Robert Brust: This is what I planned to do anyway and just picked two or three things and you guys can help craft it and then we can get people in here to talk about specific things.

Chair: Let's call it equity report card. Like where are we at? It's been such a big part of all this stuff, where are we at. Where do they think they're at. Okay. So we'll get onto those two items. I believe the Parks Alliance will be here next month for the Strategic Plan, the following month for the Rose which will be another interesting and long discussion. I think that's plenty on the list right now. Anybody else? Hearing none. Any public comment on this item? Hearing none, this item is closed.

Let's do a little capital planning and general monthly update. Before you start I was to just caveat and say there are going to be months were Stacy or other members of the Capital Division will present to us. There in general needs to be a more wide Recreation and Park presentation and so part of the discussions that we had with the General Manager was Gary can present both and if it seems like there needs to be specifics on a capital project and we can't the answer or he can't give you the answer then the next month we will bring whoever from Capital to speak on that item and we felt that was a concession so that somebody who comes and does exactly six minutes of update and then leaves isn't responsible necessarily to be here for every meeting. So Gary with that.

Gary: Starting next month I'll actually have a nice little packet for everybody that has this that you'll get.

Richard Rothman: Are you talking about the report that give to the Supervisors?

Gary: Yes, so I pull from that. All right, so for the Capital Planning update portion. Also, if you have time-sensitive questions about things that I'm discussing that I might not have answers for feel free to get on me and I'll try to get that for you real quick in the next meeting but if it's something y [unintelligible].

The third bond sale has been completed. The money is now available. I have a list of those projects, I'll pass around. I also have an email as well. The initial \$76 million will cover Rossi pool, Garfield pool, George Christopher Playground, Margaret Hayward, Potrero Hill rec center, Willie Woo Woo Wong, and remaining funding in the citywide parks and programs. Also, the

next [unintelligible] Rossi and Garfield are expected to start construction this summer in the fall. Some capital projects from the McLaren Vision plan have been assigned and that includes pathways, courts, and crosswalks. We also have the McLaren Park vision plan report available online.

New acquisitions. Guy Place construction starts soon, hopefully within the next one to two months. I will keep you posted on that. 11th and Natoma, we'll be closing on that property this month, so that's exciting news. Walter Haas VPA construction starts this month, General Fund project from former Supervisor Weiner. Contract was awarded to stabilize the exterior [[unintelligible]. We're in the midst of assessments for the property projects for the lifecycle project that we've been discussing. We'll talk about Twin Peaks on another agenda item.

So that's the Capital update. If you have any general questions about it. Yes?

Richard Rothman: District 1. You know about PG&E I don't know what adjective to describe them, if people are aware that since we're getting Hetch Hetchy power or community power PG&E decided to put in excess transmission equipment in the swimming pools and other buildings and how much more is this costing and how long is the delay? I know it's going to delay Balboa pool,

Gary: I wouldn't say they're asking us to put in excess it's that they're not telling us the equipment that we need to use and so that's causing delay and then trying to get the agreement with them has also been a huge nightmare, not just for the pool projects and Balboa. Fortunately for Balboa we have a verbal agreement and while working on the actual technical agreement and specifications they're giving us some information so that we can start working on that.

Richard Rothman: But I mean when Capital Planning planned this this wasn't in the plan, right, what PG&E is telling I guess not only Recreation and Park but other city projects that they needed to add this extra generator or transformer. So this is something extra that wasn't planned for.

Gary: This is the same thing we went through with the Randall Museum.

Richard Rothman: So are we coming to agreement?

Gary: Yes.

Richard Rothman: How much more is this going to cost?

Gary: We're still working on that but they're [unintelligible].

Nick Belloni: [unintelligible]

Gary: Yes.

Richard Rothman: So it's still one pool at a time they're going to?

Gary: It's not, because of the delays we need to start moving so Garfield—initially we wanted to wait on Garfield until Balboa was open but they're going to have overlap.

I will quickly go through some Operations projects that are happening. [unintelligible] I believe they've already finished the trenching for the sprinklers along Haight. Buena Vista tennis court resurfacing is going to begin soon. We've got notice to proceed on that. [unintelligible] We're doing sport court resurfacing at Julius Khan so that should be starting in the next month as well as Louis Sutter which will also be starting in June. [unintelligible] Any questions on this? Yes.

Katherine Jones: District 5. You mentioned resurfacing at Buena Vista park, the tennis courts. Is the playground just a completely separate entity that's not on the current list?

Gary: I don't believe the playground is on our list. The courts are separate.

Katherine Jones: They're physically in different part of the park, so.

Gary: A lot of the park projects are happening a mix between really large donations that we've got from San Franciscans for Sport and Recreation and then also money that we prioritized based on equity metrics.

Katherine Jones: My daughter was playing at Buena Vista playground this weekend and a couple screws fell out of one of the—

Chair: Did you bring them?

Katherine Jones: No, she put them in her pocket but we didn't know what to do with them and it seems like they could lose any more or else it would fall down.

Gary: If that ever happens feel free to [unintelligible].

Katherine Jones: It was right were the pole goes. There's kind of a slide, like a fireman's pole that kind of loops up.

Chair: Ken?

Ken McGary: District 11. Can you clarify, I didn't quite hear what you were saying about Louis Sutter, what's happening there.

Gary: Sports court resurfacing beginning in June.

Mark Scheuer: District 8. I'm kind of curious how we can find out when a court is going to be surfaced. At Dubois Park many of has filed 311 complaints and [unintelligible] and their answer that we're giving is there is a lot of courts that need resurfacing we'll get to but we have no idea how long that's going to take.

Gary: I can give you—we're almost done with it. So we receive a little over \$2 million from San Franciscans for Sports and Recreation so we prioritized the court resurfacing based on that and based on equity metrics [unintelligible].

Richard Rothman: District 1. Since the Capital Division is starting to work on the 2019 bond do you think it would be wise for PROSAC to have a sub-committee to work with staff? I know when I talked to Stacy on the bond she wanted to wait until Dawn came back.

Gary: I'll check in on it.

Chair: What I would propose before we start thinking about a working group is let the General Manager come and give us his talk because I feel like he kicks it off. Before we even start.

Nick Belloni: Can I jump in real quick on what happened last time? Last time they asked a group of people to go and deal with some bond planning and then they had a giant working group that came to Recreation and Park's office about 7:00 or so in the morning and everyone was sitting in the room and talking about what needed to be in that bond. There were representatives from the Supervisor's office and their aids, there were Parks Alliance people and stuff like that. So it was a big group that they had assembled to do that.

Chair: I would be certain that there could be some representatives of PROSAC as PROSAC and I'm also sure there's some representatives from the community that might say hey I'm a Friends of today I'm taking off the PROSAC hat.

Nick Belloni: No, I'm just saying, we were included in that.

Chair: I believe that we will be included in it again. I guess what I'm saying is the General Manager didn't really say before our meeting with him that we want him to come talk about it and then he said well how come you never invite me and we said well why don't you come? He said why don't I come and talk about bond planning. So that's early in the process.

Richard Rothman: Stacy at the last meeting said they were starting to put a list together and we might as well get in on the ground floor.

Chair: Any one of you, if you have something to talk about as it relates to the bond you know who to talk to. But I agree that there should be an organized discussion by PROSAC. Any other questions for Gary? I have two short ones. One, where is my little list of homeless outreach for my gardeners who want to assist in helping people? We talked about that.

Gary: Yes. I can't find any. No one has [unintelligible].

Chair: I would love to get those. For those members who don't know what I'm talking about I asked last month. My gardener had gone to Recreation and Park U which is their internal teaching seminar and they handed out these cards that basically have all the resources the city provides on one card. I thought that was a really great resource not just for Friends of groups but

for the gardeners themselves who generally have to be the first line and so I asked that they provide stacks to us and hope that we will have those as a resource. The other thing I asked is the dog park flier.

Gary: [unintelligible] So both of those will be coming. We are going to be doing our own. So the city [unintelligible] so it's a little more specific to the violations that we have in our park that points them in the right direction of resources and I hopefully will have more information on that.

Chair: I would love that. Okay, any other things for Gary? Any public comment? Hearing none, this item is closed. Melinda Stockmann you're up. Welcome to PROSAC.

Melinda Stockmann: I'm a project manager with Recreation and Park's Capital Planning Division. I've been working in project management with Recreation and Park for six years this month and I've been working on the Twin Peaks interagency project for quite some time. I don't know [unintelligible] I check in with Stacy or Dawn or Tokes and I saw that this had been on the standing list of future business so the timing works out really well. We have a community workshop one week from tonight to test some designs so this is a bit of a preview and a great opportunity [unintelligible].

I don't think I've presented this to PROSAC before [unintelligible] I wanted to give a little bit more of our background and then next steps and then if folks have specific questions or things [unintelligible] please let me know that as well and I can [unintelligible].

So the Twin Peaks interagency project. This project has had several names but the reason I'm involved is because I am the project manager for Recreation and Park who does most of the trail improvement projects from the capital side [unintelligible]. I've been working on the Twin Peaks project for a really long time. So this is kind of a quick doodle, the green on the left shows the roadway or Twin Peaks Boulevard coming from Portola on the south side on the bottom of the page, leading through the hairpin turn and then this portion here is what we have [unintelligible] figure eight just because in the plan view it looks sort of like an eight. And so when we set out the 2008 bond money to renovate the trails system at Twin Peaks but it became really clear that there were a lot of places where pedestrians and in some cases bikes crossing the roadway had [unintelligible] that did not have crosswalks.

The first phase of the Twin Peaks project was to work with the San Francisco Conservation Corp and [unintelligible] to rough out trail corridor here. There are no sidewalks around most of Twin Peaks and so people were using the roadway to walk, run and bike and so we provided a natural surface trail just east of the guardrail there and this is our park of our peaks to peaks trail corridor which connects to Glen Canyon park and so we completed that phase and then right as we were planning the contractor completed portion of the Twin Peaks improvement project Public Works approached us that they were going to repave Twin Peaks Boulevard in two phases. This presented a real opportunity for Recreation and Park to collaborate and say here is where our trail touches down, can we put some crosswalks in there? And so there's a really unique opportunity to work with both Public Works and MTA to implement a crossing here as well as here. So I would say [unintelligible] and it's a huge improvement. We have a lot of schools—School of the

Arts is right here, the Police Academy, other daycare places, and large groups are actually using this trail system.

Then there was an opportunity that presented itself for the [unintelligible] conservation area grant and this was roughly three or four years ago now that we discovered this grant opportunity and so the project was initiated as what was called the Twin Peaks connectivity conceptual planning project which really isn't that catchy but the idea was [unintelligible] but MTA had to sponsor it because of a certain kind of funding [unintelligible] and it also made sense that they be in partnership with us since Recreation and Park really was looking at the parkland but we do not own the roadway. And so this is the initiation of the project. Here you see a couple pictures here. This is looking south. So right now this would be here kind of in the middle, in between the two peaks is right here and then looking southeast so there's a trail that comes up from the road there but again it shoots you out to the concrete barrier, no crossing [unintelligible] on the south side of the south peak so here in this zone this [unintelligible] and this is a trailhead [unintelligible] lack of crossing and the old configuration was one way for vehicles around [unintelligible] two lanes. And so basically the roadway is overbuilt and we saw a real opportunity there.

So we worked with MTA's traffic engineers and livable streets planning Division as well as [unintelligible] Public Work to model different scenarios. The first one- [unintelligible] between Twin Peaks and unfortunately in 2012 there was a fatal car accident just some of Christmas Tree Point here and we already had been having some planning in the works but things do take a long time. That certainly was the an impetus for some of the inter-agency coordination that's happened in the years since then.

The first configuration that came to most folk's mind was sort of this [unintelligible] which is represented here in a full figure eight where why don't we just take one of the lanes, like why don't we keep vehicles on the inner lane and then dedicate the outer lane to pedestrians and bicycles. The challenges of that are mainly just the cost of hanging to have a robust physical barrier running that entire length. We also looked at the possibility of leaving through where again the bikes and pedestrian only is represented by the orange but that doesn't eliminate all of the crossing so again it's not super intuitive or straight-forward. This represents just the no action option which really was not our desire and then we also looked at putting bikes and pedestrians on the west side but that's windy, it doesn't afford many of the exciting city views and there is no real estate there that's not in a steeply sloping vegetated area.

So in 2015 after developing these graphics we had the first community open house and we showed that board as well as this one, showing that this was out desired alternative. By now the time that we're doing this the MTA identified the opportunity to do a pilot road closure and so they brought that to their Board in the spring of 2016 and Recreation and Park supported that action and the Board approved a pilot reconfiguration for up to two years. We did surveys during both—the pilot was approved. This again is just a slide that's been borrowed from MTA to extend the closure. Basically again just looking at a planned view with Christmas Tree Point and the overlook and one thing that's confusing for some folks, Christmas Tree Point is not a Recreation and Park facility, that is a Department of Real Estate. It's a real hodgepodge of land ownership up at Twin Peaks but Christmas Tree Point really is [unintelligible] so in terms of

design we're not trying to replicate Christmas Tree Point. There are a lot of really successful things about it, it's sort of your class tourist hop off the bus, take a few pictures spot. We're really envisioning that the green would be more of a linear part of the promenade facility in the future to complement what's already there. And so access to Christmas Tree Point is maintained and this current configuration of having this eastern half closed to motor vehicles eliminates four to five crossings.

Previous to implementing the pilot we did one survey and then MTA with Recreation and Park support did another survey during the pilot. We had a huge response of over 400 people responding to each survey we posted on the site as well as online and through social media and the pilot was pretty well supported. These photos are showing the top two I took on Easter Sunday April 1st when I was hiking up there with friends just showing the kind of casual use of the space. And then on the bottom these are showing trail improvements that were completed last year, again another capital project that I managed so this is the touchdown north of the north peak where previously it was really eroded out but it's not very clearly [unintelligible]. There's also a drain grate instead of being in the street it was up high so that [unintelligible] to replace the drain to actually drain the water. And then this is basically standing at that same spot and then pivoting towards the west Recreation and Park again worked with volunteers and the PUC to put a multi-use trail here. So both this trail segment and the [unintelligible] from Portola up are multi-use or bike legal and then the idea is that the bikes would then shift onto the street in the middle and not go on some of the delicate areas [unintelligible] that would be a challenge that maybe someone like my husband would try to take on but not any other people.

And so again as part of the [unintelligible] projects this [unintelligible] now we're looking down the west side of Twin Peaks Boulevard and looking south and there was not previously a stop sign here. So this is definitely [unintelligible] stop sign and a cross walk and [unintelligible] and that takes you up to this trail and now because of the pilot closure you can also just go onto the roadway.

So these are some of the survey results. More than 50 percent of the people surveyed supported making the project permanent. Not surprisingly a lot of the respondents are people who were up there to enjoy the space although we did do a targeted and focused outreach with tour bus operators, core stakeholders and stakeholder interest groups for this projects are the Bay Area Ridge Trail Council because they are actually planning to realign their trail which now runs on neighborhood streets west of Twin Peaks so they have been really supportive as have Walk S.F. and the San Francisco Bike Coalition and S.F. Urban Riders as well.

So MTA had to go back to the Board with some action because we're coming up on two years and initially we had considered making the closure permanent at this time but because we still have some design work to do and because there's some question of jurisdictional transfer which I'll mention the decision was made to extend the pilot up to another two years. And so on April 17th the MTA Board approved that extension, there was a lot of support and this next week we are having an open house to look at more permanent designs and in terms of also next steps the [unintelligible] grant that funded this was just for the concept design so our deliverable to them is some nice pictures and a rough cost estimate and there's another round of [unintelligible] grant coming out so we'd like to take a look at the possibility of applying for that grant and also for

somebody familiar with Twin Peaks you might know that not all of the trails have been included there. The South Peak is now looking sad compared to the north peak and there's the area just south of that and so we anticipate that there would be at some point a phase two [unintelligible] and so this could be a combination of a grant and citywide trail bond monies or other sources.

Again, we are planning to do the design. We've been working with public works on all the administration involved with taking a closed roadway and transferring it Department to Department during the [unintelligible] which is a pretty lengthy administrative process but we are in conversation with the parks about that and it's supported by both Recreation and Park management and [unintelligible].

This is a flier. We're posting this tomorrow to publicize the meeting that is next Tuesday evening and a flier went out to adjacent neighbors who [unintelligible] Supervisor Yee's offices and we've been comparing this a bit to Mansell. It's a different configuration, a lot of different circumstances but if you're familiar with the transformation of Mansell in McLaren Park it is another example interagency cooperation and also just some of those kind of photorealistic pictures that we're going to have here in the next couple months can really help to leverage funding and support for implementing the project.

With that, I'm happy to answer your questions.

Chair: Thank you. It's really informative. We have a member, and Robert will speak, who really kind of stumbled up all this progress. I remember—I forget what you called that first incarnation of it.

Melinda Stockmann: The Twin Peak connectivity conceptual planning.

Chair: That was a PROSAC agenda item. We sat here and we were like what are they talking about. But now we all do because this is obviously quite an important piece of San Francisco real estate. So with that Robert here is the presentation you asked for.

Robert Brust: I'm just surprised you only got 57 percent approval. What demographic is this against? There's plenty of road up there like you said.

Melinda Stockmann: That's an excellent point. So the main concerns that we heard were from neighbors who are concerned about safety and broken glass and vandalism. So there has been a real uptick in [unintelligible]. We actually just met with the Public Works structural engineer last month and we're hoping to remove at least part if not all of that concrete barrier so it's not actually retaining the roadway. That would help with that. And the other issues were around safety of course. I mentioned the fatal car accident that happened several years back. There was also a homicide more recently last summer and break-ins. So it took a while but we were able to make contact with Captain Una Bailey at the Park District, SFPD Captain, and she actually responded directly to a neighbor who had some concerns and wanted [unintelligible]. Basically she said in July, 2017, SFPD after a homicide at Twin Peaks implemented a fixed post, IE we have officer stationed at the location most of every day and night. Since the installation of both the figure eight and the fixed post we've actually seen the vehicle break-ins

on Twin Peaks plummet from an average of twenty per month to six per month and that number continues to drop each month. I can say that is due to both the figure eight and the fixed post. We have also seen a reduction in the number of robberies and then she goes on to emphasize—there was some back and forth with this neighbor, she emphasized [unintelligible] if there is a crime [unintelligible] please report it to 311. If you see it after the fact and if it is a crime of course report it, that's what helps them. That was super helpful because I think that was sort of a black box and I think some neighbors are just worried about [unintelligible]. But there were really only maybe two to five people emailing me and after we shared those concerns I haven't heard anything else. So it remains to be seen. I've been encouraging people to come to the open house to discuss the design because clearly there's a potential for it to look much different than just an open street, a decommissioned roadway. It's great as it is now but it will be a lot better without a lot of technical design intervention.

Robert Brust: I went up there and it's great. It's amazing the work on the trails, being able to walk along. It's a promenade now, you've got to have a name for it.

Melinda Stockmann: We are probably going to be [unintelligible] if you're not familiar with the roadway or you don't think [unintelligible] that might not be that clear either. So promenade [unintelligible].

Richard Rothman: District 1. It's not specifically about this project but I just wanted to know because tomorrow District 1 we're going to try to get Recreation and Park and MTA to work together on Fulton Street so I was just wondering how Recreation and Park and MTA relationship and this project you know if you found it harmonious or ran into any obstacles with MTA or Public Works in general.

Melinda Stockmann: I found the relationship to be excellent. I think the Public Works engineering and project management team that was tasked with repaving the roadway had a real pressure for a deadline. I think they were looking at a deadline and so it took some diligence on the part of Recreation and Park and MTA to say well look if we put a little money or time they can get a crossway or we can get an uphill bike lane or things like that and I think they were very collaborative after we had those conversations. The MTA staff involved from Livable Streets there were three staff and one assistant engineer who played the largest role. I think for a lot of the staff involved is kind of a passionate project as well. They grant definitely made it easier for us to work together because there were monies that were given to different Departments to do different functions. I think that certainly helps. Sometimes people have [unintelligible] projects and if they feel they have to squeeze something in as an extra it's hard. But I found it to be—

Richard Rothman: So was Recreation and Park the lead on this?

Melinda Stockmann: So Recreation and Park is the lead on the grant for the overall design but MTA has been playing a large role and initially we didn't even know that the pilot opportunity was going to be there and so I think that became MTA's focus because it's [unintelligible] that's what they can do. And so in the case where we're gotten some very specific questions about traffic safety and I've worked with Gary in our public affairs teams to say that we are a Recreation and Park Department, we have been working in collaboration but it

is not our purview to weigh in on questions of technical traffic safety but it is great to know that there are people on the team that we've been consulting with and they have studied this closely. There definitely [unintelligible] questions about traffic safety before the implementation and even during as we were up putting the paint on on a foggy Wednesday morning an elderly couple came over and said people are going to die up here! It was unfortunate and I referenced the previous incident and then also just told them that it had been studied quite carefully by engineers and [unintelligible].

Chair: Richard, I know that specifically MTA and RDP's relationship weighs heavy on some of this stuff that you've very interested in. I think that what we're hearing is there's a good collaborative effort with this project so I would certainly say for what your interest is to reference this and here you have the project manager who can say hey [unintelligible].

Richard Rothman: We'll see tomorrow.

Chair: You're see probably beyond tomorrow. Nick.

Nick Belloni: Just a quick question. You're saying they're going to take away part of that white barrier there? What's on the other side?

Melinda Stockmann: The other side is natural area, kind of vegetated. Just plants and then is slopes down.

Nick Belloni: And what width before the slope?

Melinda Stockmann: I would say probably four to six feet. I could tell that you generally the [unintelligible] grapevine interweaving and it looked fun for an urban plaza but I think a lot of people just like the openness and feeling like they're on a roadway but can look around and not worry about something. So we want to keep it pretty simple and let the designs speak for themselves.

Nick Belloni: I'm just thinking of falling hazards. I get enough of that over at Lands End. That's what I'm asking.

Melinda Stockmann: A little background context but more specifically to your question there's about 30-36 feet of width between these two lanes and so the plan right now is basically to take out this barrier, replant the natural surface trail that's on the other side of the barrier and then plan another four or five feet to create a larger buffer and then make somewhere between eight and twelve feet a more natural park surface and then keep a large part of the asphalt and have some plantings and boulders in between so that bikes and peds respect each other. But that has been a consideration.

Nick Belloni: I hear helicopters all the time going to Lands End, so.

Chair: Any other questions?

Ancel Martinez: In terms of the project and the scope can you size the economic costs?

Melinda Stockmann: Great question. Let's see—the planning grant, the PCA grant for the concept design I did not bring the number with me but I can send a follow-up email but it's somewhere in the order of I think \$200,000 to \$300,000 over the course of the last few years. The construction costs we have a very preliminary estimate and we're again trying to figure out does the budget drive the design or the design the budget and we want to make it something that's fundable. So right now we're somewhere between \$500,000 and \$1 million for construction and it's very early on. We're looking at the possibility of maybe \$500,000 from [unintelligible] grant partnering with other firms and then potentially folding it into the citywide trails programs for 2019 bond.

Ancel Martinez: And then you would request dollars from various buckets.

Melinda Stockmann: Correct. So the first step would be to apply for this follow-up priority conservation area grant, I believe the letters of interest are due in June, next month, and then our application is due in fall. So the timing works out pretty well for us to have this and complete environmental review as well.

Chair: And she said that could cover half. Any other questions or comments? Hearing none, this item is closed. Thank you.

It is time. We are going to discuss this resolution. I think you have all had a chance to read it. First of all I would like to thank the authors. It should start with the one author because Wendy you drove this, thank you for that. I would thank to that the other two who contributed. I'm concerned that it is wordy and I think there are areas we might want to address in terms of our position. I think in general it's a great resolution. I would open the floor to discussion now on anybody's comments, thoughts, about how it's framed. I would like this not to be the never-ending. We want to support this, right?

Female Speaker: Yeah.

Chair: I think generally we want to support this so let's not have to many counter—just say what you feel, put it on the table, and then take a vote. So anybody have any comments? So if you're reading it now for the first time I'm going to probably lose my fill in the blank because I think that's unfair for those of us who did read it and even worse the reps who wrote it.

Steven Currier: Thank you Wendy, you did a great job and I almost agree with you that it's wordy but on the other hand I think it's an education on where we came from and where we're going to.

Chair: I agree it's a statement.

Steven Currier: I think if this going in front of the Recreation and Park Commission I think they probably need a little bit of education on where we're coming from on this and I've read it several times. We did change a couple things. But I wouldn't know where to go to shorten it.

Chair: Anybody else? Jane.

Jane Weil: The only comment is sort of in the middle where you specifically mention the Trump administration.

Chair: I would agree.

Jane Weil: That's going to change hopefully and we don't want this to be that specific to this administration. I think it's a much more general policy we're looking for so I suggest deleting those two.

Chair: Exactly. If I show you my note those are exactly the same comments I made. Whereas there's an estimated 240,000 undocumented immigrants currently living [unintelligible]. I don't know whether to me that is sufficiently relevant for this. We're not making a judgment on how many homeless people. There may be more, may be less. I'm afraid we're making that part of the resolution.

Female Speaker: That's just a statistic.

Chair: Where is that from and why are we saying that? We understand there are—it doesn't matter if there's one or a million, it matters we're taking a position.

Female Speaker: That's an estimate from the census.

Chair: Certainly the next one the Trump administration—

Female Speaker: It could be a lot lower.

Chair: It could be higher too. I think that to Jane's point whereas the Trump administration has made a priority out of [unintelligible] that one and the next one. I certainly whereas on October, 2017, get rid of the next sentence. The State of California enacted the California Values Act. So is that a—do you accept that as a potential change to it?

Female Speaker: [unintelligible] Did you want to say anything?

Female Speaker: Yeah, I don't mind taking it off.

Chair: It's just that you're right in six years or four years we're going to look back and go why did we make this so targeted to this one.

Karen Wong: My only recommendation is that instead of listing the 240 I would just use the number for San Francisco.

Female Speaker: There is no number for San Francisco and I think that's because they don't want to cause [unintelligible].

Karen Wong: I actually have numbers for San Francisco.

Chair: I'd way rather see that because our jurisdiction is San Francisco.

Steven Currier: District 11. What I would do is if you have the number I would love to have an asterisk and on the bottom use that as it denotes where it came from.

Female Speaker: Because we looked at that and all we could find is the census and it was just that chuck.

Karen Wong: Because SFGATE a few money ago in policy link came out specifically with numbers for San Francisco

Ana Gee: [unintelligible]

Chair: Yeah but at the same time we should say we're a body, we're a board that is San Francisco based. And to that end I would only say maybe having those numbers. However you feel like it should be framed certainly we should say there's X amount of undocumented immigrants, this is what we're speaking to. Again, if we're trying to make a statement we certainly know that's a number that has to be included or a number that has to be included or a number.

Nick Belloni: [unintelligible]

Chair: Again, if you could provide that number I would accept that. But what we are saying is that we would take out all of the whereas the Trump administration, so we're going to take that out and we're going to take out the line as a direct response to the Trump administration's actions. So that now reads whereas in October, 2017, the State of California enacted—correct? Okay, the only—anybody else?

Female Speaker: We're going to change this one but Katherine pointed out that there is a grammatical thing, it says we're currently looking on the estimated number.

Chair: Currently living in San Francisco. And whereas—it reads right if you go to the next whereas in October, 2017. Okay, so the only other one I have is in the last be it further resolved and then I'll let you read it into the record as it reads, the first be it resolved I'm really good with that. I think it really speaks to what we are. San Francisco Park and Recreation Advisory Committee advises SFRPD to further that commitment by heartily recognizing the needs and concerns of immigrant communities and families. I think we all agree with that. It's the next one where it says advises SFRPD to follow the example of the public library system. Do we want—I love policy, I'd love to push policy around, do we want to say that this other agency is doing something better? I would how to frame that particular statement that doesn't sound argumentative.

Male Speaker: Or someone would have to look for that document.

Chair: How do we come to this?

Jane Weil: If you go back to the middle, fourth from the bottom on the first page it refers to the public libraries and the values that tells.

Chair: But specifically does not include Park Recreation and Open Space and what you're saying is okay so we're encouraging you even though it doesn't say that to act this way. We would say in our mind as a body we would support what the library is doing because that looks like a better way.

Katherine Jones: District 5. I read this and I thought the same thing about the statement about the Trump administration and also about the library in that we should be thinking about what in terms of like how we describe this, there shouldn't be these moving—these pieces that can move separate from what we're recommending and so I actually recommend that we remove the language around the public library and simply say that we encourage—PROSAC advises SFRPD follow-up to provide posters and other signage declaring that immigrants in just a very like proactive way.

Chair: Taking the library out of the conversation. [simultaneous comments] It's a good point. I certainly makes us look at it from the standpoint of this is the body, this is our purview, we're not talking about outside.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: 35,000 in San Francisco.

Katherine Jones: I think that the description of the library is probably going to be very important in terms of the narrative of why this should be passed. There's other entities doing this kind of work and making these efforts, I just don't think it needs to be in the resolution itself.

Male Speaker: It's the last penultimate paragraph, it's time to get to the point.

Chair: Again I think your point is well-taken, anybody who reads this resolution knows why it says what it says but I like the idea of separating us from other entities, other bodies. This is a situation, the thing that we have scope over doesn't really have a policy that is a real policy. We would encourage them to look at other people's policies. We would encourage them to be more in-line with other city agencies

Katherine Jones: One other suggestion but it might be more of a question, whereas while the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department is therefore unable to intervene on behalf of undocumented immigrant patrons in the event of an ICE detainer request, I would actually remove all of that and start with whereas SFRPD remains committed to being a safe and welcoming space for all San Francisco residents and visitors and I don't know if there was a policy reason for including a political reason.

Female Speaker: It was a policy reason because we were told last week that they can't do anything. [simultaneous comments]

Katherine Jones: But SFPD remains committed to being—you're not going to do anything illegal, you're going to be committed to being a safe—

Chair: But now I'll backtrack a little bit and say I think that language is there to kind of say like yeah we understand that your hands are tied but we're also saying maybe that's not enough. Maybe we would just as a body say that it would be really nice if RPD could act that way. That's kind of what we're saying.

Elisa Laird-Metke: District 9. Can I suggest that instead of saying unable that it be worded to say does not have the authority to intervene, that would make sense. [simultaneous comments].

Chair: Again I think the idea is not to point at Recreation and Park but say as a body that Recreation and Park happens to be our scope but that we don't necessarily [simultaneous comments] .

Nick Belloni: District 2. Can I ask for one quick—Callie, where did you get that number, one?

Cally Wong: I got it from [unintelligible].

Nick Belloni: And what was that number?

Cally Wong: The new one shows around 44,000.

Nick Belloni: Could we put an asterisk next to that and say where it came from please.

Male Speaker: That's what I asked.

Nick Belloni: I didn't hear it, sorry.

Chair: Hey, hold on.

Male Speaker: [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments]

Chair: Really, it doesn't have to be adopted by the Commission it only has to be read to the Commission. The Commission can choose to support it or not support our resolution. It's just us taking a stand, that's all it is. [simultaneous comments] This is our recommendation.

Jane Weil: I know the new member is an attorney and I don't know if anyone else is an attorney but it must be a good idea to have it reviewed. [simultaneous comments].

Steven Currier: As a former attorney this is just a resolution. This doesn't need to be legally binding except if the Recreation and Park Commission puts it on an agenda and votes on it as a binding policy matter and then it would go to the City Attorney.

Chair: I think what we're saying is we have a presentation by RPD Park Patrol. We liked that they were hands-off and wouldn't support the ICE detainees in theory but that that wasn't enough for us to feel like we are acting on behalf of these unspoken people and to that end we wanted a resolution that showed that support. That's as far, as little or as much.

Richard Rothman: District 1. Is one of us if I go to the joint Zoo Committee meeting I could stay over to the Recreation and Park Commission and under the General Manager's report there's a PROSAC report and we could read this in at that time to the members.

Chair: They're see it anyway, if we adopt it they'll see it.

Female Speaker: [unintelligible] 44,000 per—according to city figures and so those city figures are from [simultaneous comments].

Nick Belloni: Let's not make it longer than it needs to be but I just thought we should clarify.

Chair: It should clarify the source and I think we all agree with that. So with that said I want to move this along. Is there any other comment on how the wording of this resolution should read? Anybody have any other two cents.

Female Speaker: This is an existential question but is it our facilities or SFRPD's facilities?

Chair: It's Recreation and Park's facilities.

Female Speaker: [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments]

Jane Weil: District 6. Do you mind pushing it forward another month until we get it revised?

Female Speaker: I tried to get this on the agenda for like almost seven months, so yes.

Chair: I would propose that we adopt where we are now in saying there are a couple little loose things but if these things are acceptable to all of us then.

Nick Belloni: We have a full agenda next month.

Chair: That's not even the point. The point is we don't want to go through this discussion again, another forty minutes of talking. [simultaneous comments]

Steven Currier: District 11. Could you put in the changes and then sent it to all of us.

Female Speaker: Yeah, or send it to Gary [simultaneous comments] .

Chair: At this point let's just give Wendy the floor to read the resolution as we know it. If there are slight changes I would say that we accept it in kind that they will not be far-off of what? Do we agree? So Wendy read.

Wendy Aragon: Whereas San Francisco has been historically known as a city of progress and acceptance throughout the nation and the world often being a pioneer social justice based policies and whereas in 1989 the City and County of San Francisco passed the City and County of Refuge ordinance also known as a Sanctuary Ordinance to promote public trust and cooperation to keep our communities safe [unintelligible] regardless of all residents regardless of immigration status feel comfortable calling the police and Fire Department during emergencies and cooperating with city agencies during public safety situations and to help keep our communities healthy by making sure that all residents regardless of immigration status feel comfortable accessing city public health services and benefit programs and whereas all city and county agencies are bound to the policies put in place by the Sanctuary Ordinance which prohibits city Departments and employees from using city resources or funds to cooperate with Federal Immigrations and Customs enforcements also know as ICE, including the disclosure of personal information of San Francisco residents asking information on immigration status or eliminating any services or benefit space on immigration status and whereas there are an estimated—I'm assuming that there was 44,000, I'll look that up—44,000 undocumented immigrants currently living in San Francisco per whatever that source is and whereas in October, 2017 the State of California enacted the California Values Act through the passage of Senate Bill 54 in the state legislature and signed into law by Governor Edmund G. Brown Junior thereby declaring California an official Sanctuary State and whereas California Values Act creates provisions for public schools, hospitals, courthouses and public libraries to be determined as safe spaces but does not include Recreation and Park or open space facilities and whereas the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department is legally unable to intervene on behalf of undocumented patrons in the event of an ICE detainer request RSRPD remains committed to being a safe and welcoming space for all San Francisco residents and visitors. Therefore be it resolved that the San Francisco Parks Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee, PROSAC, advises SFRPD to further that commitment by ardently recognizing the needs and concerns of immigrant communities and their families. Be it further resolves that PROSAC advises SFRPD to provide posters and other signage declaring that immigrants and refugees are welcome at all SFRPD facilities as well as providing informational resources such as the Immigrant Legal Resource Centers red cards to be made freely available throughout SFRPD facilities and at community events wherever possible and are compliant with the San Francisco Language Access Ordinance. And finally therefore be it resolved that PROSAC advises SFRPD to regularly work with organizations which are committed to serving undocumented immigrant communities and their families as well as the San Francisco Immigrants Rights Commission to seek their guidance to make this effort successful.

Chair: All in favor of adopting this resolution?

All: Aye.

Chair: Anybody opposed? It is adopted unanimously. Any public comment on this item? Hearing none, this item is closed.

We are to our favorite part of the meeting. Jane do you have anything you want to talk about?

Jane Weil: Just a quick update. Last December PROSAC passed a motion supporting the acquisition of 1133 Mission Street which is a quarter-acre parcel that I have been working to get acquired in mid-Market. It was dropped in favor of the big 11th Street acquisition which Gary says is closing next month. In the meantime the Central SOMA plan is approaching its final approval, it will be in front of the Planning Commission on May 10th and there is a great amount of money, \$80 million, in the Central SOMA plan dedicated to open space. Most of us in the Parks Department and residents don't really like where Planning has allocated this money and so we have successfully gotten the acquisition of 1133 Mission included in the Central SOMA plan. None of it is written in stone. I mean when this money starts to come in this is just setting priorities up where the money will go but it's not committed to go there but at least we've gotten what we want into the plan. So I just wanted to tell everybody that. If anybody has any energy on the 10th to go speak in front of the Planning Commission in support of allocating the money dedicated to open space to go to acquisition of more real open space versus popos and under freeways and some of the places that Planning want to put them, I'd be very happy to share with you where they have it going as opposed to where we want it to go, that it would be great if a couple more people could go speak about it.

Chair: May 10th, what time?

Jane Weil: Planning starts at 1:00. It is the biggest item on the agenda and there will be a lot of people speaking about it.

Chair: One thing I would ask of PROSAC members if you can't attend it you can write a letter, you can always write a letter and submit it and I think that is a way that all of us get our voices heard many times. I can't attend daytime meetings a lot but I write a lot of letters.

Jane Weil: Would it help if I gave anybody interested some talking points.

Chair: That would be fine.

Jane Weil: We did pass a resolution already so it's already been a PROSAC resolution.

Chair: Certainly it's supported by us.

Female Speaker: Jane is the Central SOMA plan available online?

Jane Weil: It is under Planning. I could send you the link. It looks like they will approve it on May 10th. It still has to be approved by the Board of Supervisors.

Chair: But at least Planning would get you the next step.

Jane Weil: I think it's important that we go on record. I'm sorry we got this on this late date in the sense that Planning has got this \$60 million going to popos, which is privately owned open

space, so that's not open space at all. But then they have another \$80 million going to all these things like under freeway activation. So I think we need—Recreation and Park has to have a voice where we think we should have open space.

Male Speaker: The Parks Department have any official position? Dawn has talked about trying to talk to these developers and getting more designated instead of popos maybe some deeds and things like that?

Jane Weil: I think Recreation and Park has not been as vocal and pushy as it perhaps should have been in the conversation with developers about where we see open space but Phil and I have talked about that I'm hoping that we'll be a little more aggressive about expressing our desires.

Chair: Ancel.

Ancel Martinez: So a follow-up question. [unintelligible] what are you advocating specifically relative to 1133?

Jane Weil: We did adopt the resolution December 1, 2015, if anyone wants to see it. What I would be advocating for is almost exactly what [unintelligible] I would be advocating for more Recreation and Park voice in the allocation of this \$80 million first of all because the first \$35 million, the largest amount, going to the renovation of the Gene Friend rec center which is Phil's fervent desire and he would like—you know, the money comes in slowly, it doesn't come in all at once so he would like first of all to have the first \$35 million go there and I completely agree with that. So we would be advocating for that. We would be advocating to have Recreation and Park have more of a voice in where the money goes and then I'm going to specifically advocate for the acquisition of 1133 Mission.

Chair: Any other comments or questions? If you support this, you want to be a part of it, please feel free to email Jane. She'll send you some talking points. Any other announcements?

Steven Currier: I heard our new appointee received a pamphlet.

Chair: Yeah, you know what I actually think happened was it came before you actually were on the committee.

Steven Currier: Secondly I have to say something really funny and sometimes this pisses me off but I get a letter from the Board of Supervisors congratulating me on my appointment to PROSAC and it says Steven Currier, my address, and then it says Dear Mark. So I sent them an email saying thank you so much for the letter but could you put my name in the salutation and I got a letter again saying Dear Mark. So I'm going to it a third time. I just came back from Boston and I got emails apparently DPW had their annual [unintelligible] at Crocker-Amazon this past weekend where Crocker-Amazon besides Beach Chalet is probably one of the biggest soccer and athletic parks in San Francisco and they had on the perimeter of the park no parking signs only for DPW people. It really pissed me off. I don't know that this body has no jurisdiction but I

think that if this happens again I think that somebody needs to speak up since the athletes and visitors of the park had no place to park including myself because I walk my dogs there.

Chair: Thank you. One last thing before I let you go, how many of you have seen this little do-dad? This is our updated roster. It's been emailed to you. Please make sure that the information that's provided here is correct. If there is information that you do not want on here please let people know. I appreciate your willingness to give this information but it should be a resource for each of us so that you don't have to email Gary or Tiffany to get in touch with Richard. Please make sure the information on the roster is correct.

Anything else to talk about? Any public comment? Hearing none, this meeting is now adjourned, thank you.

End of Document