

**Park and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee Meeting
April 3, 2018**

Chair: Before I call this meeting to order, the Recreation and Park Department has granted us a lovely collection of pizzas, please feel free to take advantage of this lovely opportunity the General Manager has provided us. I'd like to thank Gary again before we go on the record and say that he has helped us to keep this all going in the right direction and he's become my most valuable RPD staff member.

Welcome to the April edition of the Park Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee. We'll start with roll, I'll start to my left.

Jordyn Aquino: District 4.

Robert Brust: District 8.

Mark Scheuer: District 8.

Steven Currier: District 11.

Anthony Cuadro: District 7.

Ken McGary: District 11.

Elisa Laird-Metke: District 9.

Cally Wong:: District 7.

Wendy Aragon: District 1.

Nick Belloni: District 2.

Trevor McNeil: District 5.

Chair: Steffen Franz, District 2. So the first thing I'd like to ask is were you able to see and review the minutes? We had them sent around, I think Gary had sent around December, January and February. I will ask if any of you have had the time or haven't had the time to review the minutes. Is that a yes? Has anybody not reviewed the minutes that wants to review the minutes?

So we'll start with Tuesday, December 5th, you were saying?

Nick Belloni: Motion.

Jordyn Aquino: Second.

Chair: All in favor of approving the December minutes as is?

All: Aye.

Chair: Any opposed? Being none, we accept those minutes. The January 9th minutes.

Nick Belloni: Motion.

Wendy Aragon: Second.

Chair: Any dissent? All in favor of adopting these minutes?

All: Aye. Any opposed? Being none, we accept those minutes. And we're on to the February minutes.

Nick Belloni: Motion.

Kelly Wong:: Second.

Chair: All in favor?

All: Aye.

Chair: Any opposed? Being none, we accept those minutes. All three of these items have now been accepted. These minutes are adopted.

Male Speaker: On the record since I was not here December, January and February I abstained from voting.

Nick Belloni: [unintelligible] you cannot.

Chair: He can abstain because he wasn't here. He can't vote.

Nick Belloni: I know, I think that there's a rule in our thing that no one can abstain. That's why I say that. That's all.

Chair: Okay. You're a no-vote for this. No worries, just so you didn't say yes to something you weren't a part of.

So before I dive into the Chair's report actually this is a good segue. So we have a new member Steven Currier who is from District 11. As you all know we are trying to encourage Supervisors to appoint new people and in this particular case a member resigned recently and within a day I heard from the Supervisor directly and he said I will take care of this and within a day he told me there was a new appointment. So that's awesome.

Please, if you would give the committee two minutes about who you are and how you came to being a PROSAC member.

Steven Currier: I think a few people in here know who I am. I was cofounder and president for fifteen years of the Outer Mission Merchants and Residents Association. One of the things that we do among other social and civic issues was deal with the parks in our district. One of them, Crocker-Amazon, Excelsior playground, Alice Chalmers, McLaren Park actually borders our District which a lot of attention has been given to lately and a lot of things are going to be happening there. And a lot of DPW park properties in our District.

So I'm actually really proud to say that in 2000 the park bond that was passed by the voters of San Francisco enabled Crocker-Amazon to get the first new children's playground at Crocker which is called the Purple Playground on the corner of Moscow and Geneva. It was almost built entirely by the community. Now Crocker has three playgrounds one by the clubhouse and then a small sandbox playground that we really don't like. We've also got a dog play area that was unanimously voted on by the community. We've got the first skateboard facility. We were actually instrumental in getting three of our baseball fields out of five built by the San Francisco Giants Foundation. We had a football field that was donated by the 49ers Foundation. We were lucky that when Ed Lee became Mayor of San Francisco he was able to do the ribbon-cutting on the bocce ball court that has been there since I think 1935. So we were instrumental in doing that.

Excelsior playground has gotten a lot of attention. Oceanview playground which is not the Minnie and Lovey Ward Recreation Facility got funded I think under [unintelligible] and Avalos. So we've been actually looking and actually Fred Martin is here and we did a lot of work in Bayview-Hunters Point—I mean Visitation Valley which borders on near the projects. So we've been really active in open space, in Recreation and Park issues, and DPW open space.

And so I'm really honored that our Supervisor Safai asked me if I wanted to be on this board and I followed two great people that were on this committee, Linda D'Avirro and Sharon Eberhardt who put in a lot of work.

The other thing too is real quickly the Geneva Gardens which just opened up a few weeks ago the garden project and then we just had the groundbreaking of the Geneva office building which my association along with neighborhoods input organizations saved the Geneva Car Barn which is now under the auspices of the Recreation and Park Department and we just got funding through State of California by Phil Ting that by next year we will have the first phase of that project opened up. So glad to be here.

Chair: Thank you. Great to have you and obviously you do have some big shoes to fill as you and Ken both know. Linda and Sharon were here I think cumulatively for about 200 years. I know Sharon had to be at least 100 years. But they were both obviously very engaged and we would only hope that from District 11 since there's a lot of attention going your way, a lot of funding going your way that you will be—and a fairly active Supervisor, an encouraged and engaged Supervisor who is trying to be a part of that.

I'm going to try to make the Chair's report as short and sweet as I can.

It seems like March is a really busy month for RPD and I say that because every time I turn around there's another opening, there's something else happening. And so it's great to see them—Koret Playground, right? They burn it to the ground and what do these guys do? They build it back again and it's beautiful and it was awesome to see the Department and the Parks Alliance get so involved so quickly.

150 volunteers for the Eggstravaganza. Man, that is impressive. 150 volunteers as a huge park event which I got to attend by the way. Drew and I were judges of the cook-off. Wendy was my assistant judge. She pulled up and said oh what are you doing? I said here, try this. It went well.

I have visited Moscone playground and dog play area in advance of them doing officer ribbon-cutting. That was awesome.

What else? Balboa dog play area, awesome. Another great open space.

Quickly, two Thursdays ago the Recreation and Park Commission approved the design for Francisco reservoir. Basically for anybody who doesn't know what that is, that is a reservoir that has been docile for a long time and is now being converted to open space. The Recreation and Park Commission pretty much accepted what the plans were. Multi-use lawn, children's playground, dog play area, community garden. It's going to be a nice park in probably a couple years. They'll start to break ground I think they're talking about this summer.

I have a handout which most of you should have and we'll see if can find it. It looks like this. This is from the Parks Alliance as they offer their first park partnership conference which as part of their discussion today if they'd like to talk specifically about that. Certainly PROSAC members are welcome. They can tell you a little bit more. It's their first annual conference, basically a day of networking and sharing best practices. It will be city staff, landscape architects, planners, basically the ideal group of people for us to hang out with and talk parks.

PROSAC should be moving back to City Hall in May. I'm working so hard to do this. Actually Gary has been doing it as well. We both have been speaking to the Mayor's office. We're doing what we can. It's not for a lack of trying by anybody's standards.

Gary has also been championing a new initiative which I think with the Parks Alliance will continue, that is to try to establish some food and refreshments for current and future meetings and as you see by the Papa John's this I think was Phil's gift to us but in general they're hoping to provide refreshments and other items.

So that's my report for today. Again, we will touch on a couple of these items as we go into the agenda. Is there any committee comment on this? Any public comment? Hearing none, this item is closed.

Let's get into new business. Again, as we do in every meeting now I'm asking you to look at the list. If you see anything that you feel needs to be changed or removed, added. Robert Brust.

Robert Brust: I think it's at the top of the list.

Chair: Twin Peaks Inter-Agency project?

Robert Brust: Anthony suggested that. It's in our District, District 8, and I took a trip up there today and I reviewed some of the information on the web site and I'm thinking maybe you can just handle it either today or next month which a short, simple, explanation.

Female Speaker: Yes, so [unintelligible] she talked to me this week about it. She'd like to come this month. She would like to come in May and give an update.

Robert Brust: All right, if you think that's really—it's interesting. I like what they're doing up there.

Female Speaker: I do too. You know, I think it's worthwhile to hear about it. It's unusual and it's a good effort. So I think she should come and talk to you about it.

Chair: It's interesting because Anthony has had it on there for a long time and Robert finally decided to get in the car and drive there.

Robert Brust: I didn't know that much about it until the Bicycle Coalition people started pushing for it. But it's really it's opened up the whole hill, the new steps that go over the mountain and people aren't just parked—when I first went to Twin Peaks you just parked in the parking lot, you'd look at the view, you'd get back in the car, you drive away. But now you can actually use more of the hill.

Chair: So that sounds like a May item. I guess while the Parks Alliance is here we're trying to qualify the Strategic Plan presentation as well as the Rose presentation.

Male Speaker: [unintelligible]

Chair: So maybe June and what about the Rose?

Female Speaker: We can do it in May or July, it depends.

Chair: For you we will open up the agenda. You tell us when you're ready to do it.

Female Speaker: Let's do it later in July.

Chair: So Parks Alliance Strategic Plan in June, the Rose in July. Okay thank you. Are there any other items? One item I'll draw your attention to—sorry, Wendy?

Wendy Aragon: Richard wanted me to mention this, the Golden Gate Park edge improvement strategy.

Chair: That's where I was going. Got to cover Richard if he's not here.

Wendy Aragon: Yeah. His wife just came home from the hospital so he's not here tonight but it was a project that was done at Supervisor Eric Mars' time with SFMTA planning. Richard could go on and on talking about how great this was but he just wants to suggest to staff that when we have this presentation to work with Supervisor Fewer, SFMTA and Planning.

Chair: Certainly it's worth being on the list. I know he also wants to get a historical survey at some point. Anybody else?

Jordyn Aquino: Just for on the record to remove the [unintelligible] this was the Mayor's Office [unintelligible] challenge and just on the record to remove it.

Chair: It's done, okay. And I guess Gary that's off the list?

Gary: It is. It is also off further committee [unintelligible] is available for next month as well for best values.

Chair: Yeah, that's going to be a packed meeting. We should put them on for next month.

Female Speaker: We can do the historic one in June.

Chair: Fine.

Female Speaker: And also for the [unintelligible] for the Rose maybe you guys want to talk also about the accounting. So part of the work that the Parks Alliance is doing is going to look at different methods of counting park users and we're compiling the work that we've already done as well.

Chair: [unintelligible]

Female Speaker: No, there's all different opportunities to collect user data.

Chair: Interesting, okay. We'd love to hear more on that. Anybody else? Cally?

Cally Wong: I'm not sure this is part of this agenda item but [unintelligible] we're been pushing Phil regarding [unintelligible].

Chair: I wouldn't put that here unless there's a reason to discuss it. I would however mention it like during items not listed on the agenda. Anybody else? Any public comment? Hearing none, this item is closed. Stacy, welcome.

Stacy Bradley: Thank you. So you are all so well-versed in what's going on now that through your introduction and Steffen your discussion you pretty much have covered everything that I was planning on updating you on. But to recap the Geneva community gardens had a great groundbreaking. It was really successful. We've talked about it here a few times and it's been a

challenging project. We're very excited that it is open and the community seems to really be embracing it. As well as the groundbreaking of Geneva car barn it's [unintelligible] space for this project so it's also been a very long time in coming.

And then Moscone playground will open later this month. Some of you have already seen it. This project does have a dog play area and has a very unique for the Department a little area for children to learn how to ride their bikes. It's like a little ramps and it twists a little. It's just adorable.

Chair: I'll just chime in. The dog play area for an unopened, unannounced opening had like a hundred dogs on Saturday. It was bananas and people were so stoked. They were just like did you see, there's natural grass over here and there's other stuff. It was really nice to see. It was—it's obviously a community that needed that for having what they have just a few blocks away. This was needed in the community.

Stacy Bradley: I also just wanted to follow up a little on the OCII Hunters Point conversation from last time. There was a very robust conversation at the Commission ending with the Commission really encouraging the Department and OCII to work together to get a management strategy and so I think it went very well. They were maybe surprised by some things but I don't think it was in surprising in any way the Department wants to be very engaged in what's happening at Hunters Point and Candlestick.

And then Lifecycle. I think I may have given you this update last months but I can't remember so I just wanted to make sure I was covering our bases. We have our consultant BFA, they're onboard and they've started the very first phase which is sort of phase zero of assessing our properties. So that at Hamilton Rec and the Kezar Pavilion and this is going through a full lifecycle of our assets looking into help with our capital planning on getting enough information so that we know in advance when things need to be fixed in the future. So this effort we're trying to do this now for potential projects in the 2019 bond so that we have a good understanding of the realm of projects and where they should be prioritized. So the two that we're doing as the pilot are looking at the broad scheme, the most complex properties that the Department owns. So Hamilton has a pool, a rec center with a gym, multi-purpose facilities, playground, courts, and so it's kind of everything that we can do and the Kezar Pavilion is the most oddball one where it's old, it's large and it has regional means.

Chair: I've got a comment. On the OCII conversation I thought it was a fairly healthy and robust dialogue that we had at our last meeting. I think that there were some subjects raised after the meeting that really spoke to the idea—and again I'm sorry she's not here tonight—that Maya was in the dark on a lot of things and that was really alarming to us because again most of us are kind of engaged with our community, she is everywhere and for her not to know about these things and feel like they kind of came in, said their piece and then she kind of got caught up to speed was concerning to members. We just wanted to make the Department aware, we're not making a Federal case out of it but it was one that caught us off-guard.

Stacy Bradley: We've been encouraging them to make sure they're engaging as much as they can.

Chair: And this wasn't a case of us wanting to beat them up over nothing, this was really like everything you're telling us is awesome but for the community to feel underwhelmed.

Stacy Bradley: What they did at Northside on it being a community project with really strong community participation and I think what they were looking at was a very narrow scope.

Nick Belloni: By biggest thing was Maya is appointed by the Supervisor, why did they not go to that person, that's the question I have. I know it's not a question you can ask.

Stacy Bradley: I don't know how that happened because she is on their list.

Nick Belloni: It brings us back to other times when we've had discussions with certain project managers that have said they've done their work and they haven't.

Stacy Bradley: We're trying to improve on this and of course this is not our project.

Nick Belloni: It has that same feel to it.

Chair: Yeah and again it's a District that Maya is still on this committee but is definitely moving off this committee and that will leave that District with no representation and during this time here we're saying we're championing these two guys who are in 11 where there's all this progress well in 10 there's all this progress and again we're going to have to push back to the Supervisor and go what are we doing here, don't you want this representation on this committee. So again this is about the Department this is us saying to you this is something we all kind of say like wow this isn't going the way it should.

Stacy Bradley: I agree and we are trying to get them at the table.

Chair: We appreciate that. I think you know our position. Steven.

Steven Currier: So I don't know if this is the appropriate place to even mention this but I was disturbed a few weeks ago when I saw on the news about Balboa swimming pool and what PG&E is doing to uphold certain projects in the city after seeing the article that they are about sixteen projects throughout the city that are being upheld by negotiations from PG&E. Can you give us any light? I know that our Supervisor Safai was pushing forward saying you know what this is a done deal. It was voted on. Please finish this pool. The physical work is being done but apparently the electrical work or the panels are being held up.

Stacy Bradley: We have actually resolved that issue with PG&E for Balboa. We generally do have a problem with PG&E and how we work with PG&E and so this has surfaced at almost all of our recent projects we've had some issue or another that circle around PG&E so we are go address that in the Department because there's very little we can do to push PG&E as an entity

so we're making that we engage with them as early as we possibly can so they do not hold up our projects.

Steven Currier: What they do sometimes is they do these blurbs on news things that they're going to have and one of them was the Balboa swimming pool and then the advertisement was PG&E saying how customer service oriented they were.

Chair: So to keep this moving along, anybody else? Anything for Stacy.

Stacy Bradley: I should have introduced myself. I'm Stacy Bradley, the Department Director of our planning.

Chair: Before we move on to our next item—is there an public comment on this item? Before I close this item I've been requested by staff to potentially consider either this item standalone like the capital planning report or merging a capital planning and operations report. And why he's proposing this is because there are things that are happening that maybe aren't necessarily capital related and I don't know whether it really wants to be the same agenda item or two items?

Nick Belloni: We used to have them connected as one item.

Chair: Okay so let me ask you guys how do you feel about the idea of making a capital planning and operations, it's not going to take over operations planning as an item but I think it would be important to hear updates because again he's got stuff that kind of has to wait because it's not really on the agenda when I think we should at least give maybe some percentage of item.

Male Speaker: Who's going to own that?

Chair: Gary will.

Gary: So operations mostly that we have partnership things and just things that we give a brief announcement upcoming projects.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: Again, if it needs to be a secondary item certainly we can consider that but I think just marrying it as one item again Nick I don't remember that long ago.

Nick Belloni: It was Dawn and I forgot what her name was.

Chair: Karen Mauney-Brodek.

Nick Belloni: No, it was before you time. I think she was there for two meetings and then she got summarily let go.

Chair: Again I think there's a lot of things that Gary knows that is not in Dawn's purview or Stacy's and so I think it would be helpful for us to go oh yeah this park is opening or this thing is happening, there's a dog play area that needs attention. Whatever he wants to throw on the table.

Male Speaker: But it looks like that this meeting happens before like this week there's Operations.

Chair: It always happens before the Commission.

Male Speaker: It actually would be nice to know because mostly it's in these hearings especially if it has anything to do with District 11, like last month was Alice Chalmers playground and we really needed to be there to support that.

Chair: So I mean I feel like again this is something that he can give us a heads-up for the following month like oh this is going to hit the Commission next month if you want to be a part of it. So we don't need to vote on this. I feel like I can just add it as part of the agenda. So Gary I would say that the committee would like to have some sort of—

Stacy Bradley: Why don't we just call it departmental.

Chair: Departmental, I like that. Because Operations makes it seem like another conversation that we'll have to have.

So we're going to move on to Item 6 which we'll invite our friends from the Parks Alliance.

Lisa Bransten: I'm the director of partners. Nice to see you all. So I'm the Department point for the whole public-private partnership so we're going to tag-team the presentation. I'm going to do some parts of it. Drew is going to present from the Parks Alliance and then [unintelligible] is the point on the [unintelligible] will do part of it as well. As I suppose is fitting for a big partnership project we've got all the partners chatting away about it.

Since I don't know how much background everybody has on the initiative I'm going to start back from the very beginning, apologies if you've heard this all before because this initiative is one that we've been working on for quite a long time. But the project comes from the 2012 bond. There was a \$15.5 million pool of money in that bond that was dedicated for failing playgrounds and it came with the requirement that the Commission convene a task force to determine which playground would get the funding and so in 2014 a task force was convened and you have the list in front of you of the task force members. It was actually quite an amazing process. The task force members as you'll see were PROSAC members, there were leaders of youth-serving nonprofits, we had a youth representative from our Greenagers program. They were incredibly thoughtful about trying to come up with criteria through which they would filter the universe of unrenovated playgrounds to come up with a list of playgrounds that we would use the money on.

After meeting for six months and doing a playground tour they settled on three basic criteria which were presence of copper chromate arsenic in the wood which was the most important of the three criteria and then low median income of the neighborhood and high density of the

neighborhood. And sorting playgrounds through the filter they came up with a list of thirteen playgrounds and of course unfortunately \$15.5 million is not nearly enough to renovate thirteen playgrounds.

So the task force then we worked closely with the Parks Alliance on the task force so the Department and the Parks Alliance decided to continue the partnership and start a public-private initiative to raise the funds that we would need to renovate all thirteen playgrounds because the feeling at that point of course was why should we wait to give [unintelligible].

That's kind of the birth of the project. And then you'll see in the next page the map of the thirteen playgrounds. They're divided into tier 1 and tier 2. So tier 1 were playgrounds that we knew would could deliver with the bond money and tier 2 are those that we wanted to include in the whole initiative. And obviously for accountability reasons we're working on them in this order but in terms of the way we really thing about them we think about them as a cohesive whole that's something that is a citywide project to renovate all of them we're very much driving towards.

Male Speaker: May I say something? One of the things that we also strive in District 11 at City Hall is that District 11 is one of the most forgotten Districts in San Francisco and you look at this map and it doesn't even cover the end of Crocker-Amazon into Daly City. So you're missing parts that were on here which sort of makes us angry and I think that probably Linda D'Avirro would have rolled in her grave if she were dead.

Lisa Bransten: It may have got cut off on yours but Crocker-Amazon is all on here.

Male Speaker: It's not on the one that I have.

Lisa Bransten: So there's two playgrounds actually in McLaren Park that are part of the initiative.

Male Speaker: Not McLaren Park, Crocker-Amazon is in Crocker Excelsior.

Stacy Bradley: Oh, the Crocker-Amazon neighborhood, excuse me.

Male Speaker: Right. And Alice Chalmers is on here which was approved by Recreation and Park.

Lisa Branston: Absolutely. So I think there's two playgrounds in District 11, Merced Heights and Alice Chalmers.

Male Speaker: You are correct but it just doesn't go to the border.

Chair: The map doesn't.

Lisa Bransten: Maybe the map just cut off because the actual map itself does.

Male Speaker: If I brought this back to my District or my community organization they would look at this and say why isn't the rest of San Francisco on this map. So if I could get a better map I'd be happy.

Lisa Bransten: That's not the map that we use for the process. I fall on my PowerPoint making skills.

Chair: Hang on for one second. I see two members that both were on this committee on this sub-committee wanting to comment.

Mark Scheuer: District 8. Anthony Cuadro and I were on that committee task force which when it was formed was called failing playgrounds and they changed the name but failing playgrounds really described what we were doing, trying to fix as many as we could. Our task force was told that we could only afford to have X number to do. There are more than thirteen failing playgrounds in the city and so I'm kind of curious why for example you talk about well let's get the additional funding so we can do these thirteen. The reason that I believe we had two tiers was that we were going to do as much as we could for tier 1 and then with the leftover money attack tier 2. So what I don't understand is why if you're going to do fundraising for city parks of failing playgrounds why not include some of the ones that didn't make the cut to tier 1 and tier 2 because there are I think about ten more that should be considered.

Anthony Cuadro: District 7. We had identified additional parks that were outside. We actually [unintelligible] tier 1 and the tier 2 and then there were the other ones on the outside, there was another seven to ten, whatever they were. They were called out, they were identified but they're not listed anywhere.

Lisa Branston: But there was a big gap if I recall correctly between the thirteen and the next set so that's when the breakdown there.

Anthony Cuadro: Gap in funding but not—

Lisa Bransten: No, not in funding in like how they met the criteria.

Anthony Cuadro: No.

Mark Scheuer: It was really a funding issue. They said that a playground for example caused an average of this much and these many playgrounds and when you do the math you come up with the number but it was really a financial consideration only as far as I was concerned.

Lisa Bransten: It was focusing on we wanted to make sure that we could deliver this project so how we focused it was the minimum that tier 1 we knew we would be able to address and then as we were going through there was a tier 2 that we believed we could address with the funding plus a philanthropic drive. So as we were going through all those different options we came up with those two tiers that we felt like could be funded within the realms of this program. And so then the program switched from being failing playgrounds to being Let's Play S.F. with this drive, not that we think this has taken care of every single playground in the Department that

needs to be addressed but it's the ones that we can address right now, it's the most pressing needs.

Mark Scheuer: I appreciate that. I just think that those playgrounds that are not in tier 1 and tier 2 there should be some acknowledgement that these are really failing playgrounds and that was our concern as a group is that what happens to these ones that didn't make the cut, will they ever get taken care of? Because this process gets repeated we might have the same exact criteria and end up with the same. So those communities really deserve some attention.

Anthony Cuadro: At least a footnote they should be notated somewhere because they were called out, they were identified by the task force and then they're just not mentioned ever again. So that work was done so they should be footnoted somewhere so then we have somewhere to pick up from or at least acknowledged.

Lisa Bransten: That's a great point and I think as we go into the 2019 bond planning that is the perfect place.

Chair: I'll chime in and say that I was a member of this committee while it was failing playgrounds, when these guys got on that task force and there was a lot of conversation with Dawn about the 2008 and if there was perhaps money left over which we know there never is ever but the conversation went to in those days what are the parks that need to be renovated that didn't make the cut. It was really important at the committee that we identified oh there's these five or six parks that absolutely need work but don't make the cut because the money isn't there. I think what they're asking for just to clarify things is to say cool, you've got these X, you've got these in the bigger circle but they were identifying their six or seven more that they don't want to fall the wayside.

Lisa Bransten: Part of the impetus behind the whole initiative was actually to say we have the bond money to address six but let's do thirteen.

Chair: Right, we know Dawn, we know her game, she tries to parlay.

Lisa Branston: And there's a capacity to leverage so it's not saying that we're going to fix every park in San Francisco but sort of what was the appropriate leverage of public and private that would fit together so that we could do more faster. One other thing I want to add is that so eleven of the thirteen playgrounds are playground that have the CCA wood which was the number one criteria so when Let's Play S.F. is done there will be no more playgrounds in San Francisco with the CCA wood which was the most important criteria for the task force at the time. So that's a positive outcome.

Mark Scheuer: I think it's just important to note the initial parks.

Lisa Bransten: There's always work to do.

Mark Scheuer: Just as a footnote.

Lisa Bransten: Definitely.

Chair: Thank you. Keep going.

Lisa Bransten: So then the next slide you'll see this is the budget slide. This was actually very recently updated. So do you want to talk about the cost estimates for the tier 2 playgrounds.

Cara Ruppert: I'm Cara Ruppert a Capital Division project manager. I was here in the fall to talk about playground design trends overall. I think it came up at that meeting that I was in charge of this initiative from a delivery point of view in Capital and so I have my fingers on the pulse of all the projects right now and part of that is like Lisa said starting last spring, last summer, we started to plan for the tier 2 sites and one of those exercises was walking the sites with various different important technical expertise people and getting cost estimates done, scopes of work drafted. We got those cost estimates back and shocker like everything is over the budget that we had expected. But as I told many people many people many times to be forewarned is to be forearmed. We were planning for that budget now and hoping that we can adjust additional philanthropic acts along with central scope changes to make sure that all thirteen playgrounds are renovated and it's absolutely our goal.

We have gotten really good at this so at least for this initiative I feel confident. I've been closely tracking at an initiative level every cost estimate that comes back for all of our active projects. Everything was coming back on budget. We had our first project Washington Square go out to bid, came back on budget. So we are getting good and I'm confident as we move forward. But it does mean that we've adjusted as we go forward we're adjusting our budget to meet what is to be required for all the projects.

[unintelligible] you want to come up we can talk a little bit together about the private fundraising side of it which we've been working really hard together. That's gained a lot of momentum as we ended last year and went into this year.

Male Speaker: I think getting to some of the point here about taking these thirteen playgrounds as a group is really important. I think this initiative unlike many others it's not a one and done, we're doing thirteen, we're raising money for thirteen and the majority of those sites the neighborhoods would not have the capacity to raise money themselves and I think that should be duly noted. Alice Chalmers for instance, that community just does not have the wherewithal to raise \$1 million. So we're taking I call it the Robin Hood approach where we're raiding it from the citywide and then bringing it to the neighborhoods in need and I think that's really one of the lost pieces of this and you say six or seven other playgrounds, we want to be successful in these first two tiers and we may continue this on doing it this way because so far it's been pretty successful with Recreation and Park and Parks Alliance working together raising money for citywide initiatives versus what we were usually doing is these micro fundraisers for specific neighborhoods so it's pretty cool. It's not complete all worked out but so far we have raised over \$7.5 million for the program. Our goal was to raise \$11 million. We'll probably inch that up a little bit. We aren't quite sure of the dollar amount for that just because some cost escalations and other things that are happening but we're happy where we are and we're getting ready to move more into a public phase for the fundraising. We've been doing a lot of grant writing and touring

and that type of stuff, you wouldn't even know how many times Lisa and I are in your neighborhood on a monthly basis touring people around. I think you'd be really happy about that.

Trevor McNeil: I know no projects—well, actually no—if you are doing those tours I would love to be invited, it's in my district. I don't know if there are that many in District 5 but just FYI.

Male Speaker: We will definitely do that. It's just we can—you know, if we let everyone know then we've got to let so many people know but if you're out there and available we will ping you very so often.

[simultaneous comments]

Male Speaker: I just also want to say with the fundraising we've had a great piece, it's been a really great partnership that we've worked out and I think it's something that we're going to really look at in the future to take on the citywide campaigns in a much different flavor and looking at it in terms of equity as well and how it can work out.

With that we've also focused on community engagement and making sure that the communities involved with the design of these playgrounds and we've done a lot of work along with all of our friends at Recreation and Park and DPW to ensure that we have a lot of people turned out for these particular projects. One of those things that we needed to do was we needed to add some bandwidth to the Recreation and Park DPW world so we went out and we have private landscape architects to help us deliver all these projects at one time because these are thirteen individual projects with thirteen individual project managers, architects, that type of thing and we needed to make sure each one was getting it's due course and so far the first tier has turned out pretty good and we're looking to go out to an RFQ for tier 2. If you know of any landscape architects or designers out there who are good at doing this we would love to have them on our list, specifically neighborhood ones that you might know about. You can forward that to Steffen and he can get it to us.

And then with that I'd like to turn it over to Karen to go through some of the great community designs that are in your package.

Chair: Before you do that I think there's a couple questions. I want to start with Nick.

Nick Belloni: Just looking at the budget I just have one questions, what are the campaign expenses?

Female Speaker: So that's Parks Alliance staff.

Nick Belloni: No, that's here under staff and then we've got another 200 here.

Female Speaker: So that's pretty standard.

Nick Belloni: But what is it?

Male Speaker: Your printed materials, folders, nice fliers that type of stuff. We've going to be doing a ribbon cutting and groundbreaking for each one, those are wrapped into those expenses.

Female Speaker: It is over five years.

Chair: And we appreciate that between the two it's a \$1 million over five years, Parks Alliance staff coupled with the campaign expenses. I would say down the road those would be things as we represent the public that we want to understand what does it cost you to get this money. What's the margins there. What are you spending to what you're raising. Steven.

Steven Currier: So when you're talking about financing and budget raising one of the things I testified a couple weeks ago regarding Alice Chalmers and you're right it's not a neighborhood where we can pull resources out. [unintelligible] One of things I said was the school right around the corner Longfellow uses Alice Chalmers as its playground so this is going to be a tongue in cheek question, is there any way you can get the Unified School District to put in some money regarding the rebuilding of Alice Chalmers because they are besides the Mission YMCA which is actually throwing in a little bit of money as I understand it [unintelligible] is there any way that you can get the Unified School District to throw in a few dollars? And I know what the answer is.

Male Speaker: [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments]

Chair: Anthony.

Anthony Cuadro: So for your fundraising events or functions of whatever you've done so far I was made aware of one through like a random [unintelligible] and I served on the task force and I thought it was peculiar that those of us that are on the task force.

Female Speaker: [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments]

Anthony Cuadro: I thought it was peculiar that when you go out to do these things to include the task force members that served to start this in those endeavors and that it be better for us to hear from you guys about it not through random other sources.

Male Speaker: We definitely should close that loop. I'm going to fall on just sort of being the new person and not knowing that I should do that but I do think that some of the house parties and things that we have it's actually up to those folks to invite their friends so at least we sort of get in the cut with the Catch 22 every so often that we want some people to be there but they were like it's my party and I want to invite my friends my way and we have to balance that as well.

Chair: Yeah I would certainly echo in saying that PROSAC members are certainly very experienced, very engaged, very connected to the community and so if there are opportunities

whether they are task force members of just PROSAC members that you should feel free through us, through Gary let's say or Tiffany when she's back to reach out and say hey PROSAC members we are doing this thing in your District if any of you are available to come and speak on behalf of this I don't think there's anybody in this room that would not sell what you're trying to sell. So the idea of circling the wagon with us.

Sorry, Mark Scheuer.

Mark Scheuer: District 8. I was just curious, are there like four or five major donors that contribute giant amounts of money?

Female Speaker: Yes.

Mark Scheuer: Can we find out who they are.

Female Speaker: Some of them. [Simultaneous comments] So the biggest one so far is the Hellman Foundation and they've given \$1 million outright grant and then a \$1 million matching grant which we're now working to match. So that's the biggest grant to date.

Chair: Can they continue? Anybody else want to derail this freight train?

Cara Ruppert: We did a quick overview of the status of all the active projects we have on the table right now. Some of these probably you're seen the designs already. I wasn't planning to get too into the leads on the designs. I'm happy to answer as many questions as I can actually answer and follow on the design specifics if I need to.

So first one on the list is Washington Square playground, I had mentioned this earlier. We received the bids bad. We actually issues an MTP [unintelligible] the contractor just yesterday. The first part of the contract for the contractor is to start procuring—ordering the playground equipment. That's the longest lead item of the project, so they're going to actually wait to fence off the site and break ground for about another month. So the public can have access to the current playground for another month before we actually are on site. It's expected to be about six months, so reopening in the fall.

Merced Heights playground Is chugging along through design. Most of the rest of them typically are at this point. It should be the next one we put out to bid which is hopefully in the summer. Things are moving along just fine at that site as well.

Sergeant John Macaulay it's coming right behind Merced Heights hoping to also be ready to bid that project later in the summer. I do have a bonus slide on this one, it wasn't as pretty so it wasn't in this package but part of the—we talked about this one a lot in the fall—part of the change that isn't reflected in the pretty picture here is the incorporation of the Decroix restroom and have it incorporate that in. I'm just going to hold one up. The idea right now and we're still working. The Decroix restroom if you're not familiar it's the permanent port-a-potties that are on the sidewalks throughout the city. We have a few kind of right on the sidewalks of our parks throughout the city, a lot on the eastern edge of the city. There is currently one right on the

sidewalk along Larkin just outside the park. The idea is to move it or have a second one kind of within the park boundaries so that entry into the restroom is from within the park property, within the fence-line. So you can kind of just see right now this is like a little vertical rectangle. That's the current spot of where it could go. The Decroix's are all being redesigned and there's going to be a rollout of brand new ones throughout the city so we are kind of working simultaneously with them. The idea is we're providing a pad and all the hookups for the Decroix to come in later and be placed on site. So the size of that rectangle is going to shift around a little bit as that design of the Decroix gets worked out. But that's the current working design for it.

Chair: Does that put it here?

Cara Ruppert: Exactly.

Chair: So just on the visual on this visual.

Male Speaker: Is that a single bathroom?

Cara Ruppert: Yes.

Male Speaker: And to quickly add onto that the current [unintelligible].

Chair: Again just so you know my request is to make sure both District 6 reps are not here tonight and clearly one of them in particular will be doing cartwheels.

Cara Ruppert: I know [unintelligible] as a project manager is still coordinating with some of those key stakeholders including Ana Gee.

Chair: Who now lives [unintelligible]. She's obviously very engaged.

Cara Ruppert: So the next one is Alice Chalmers playground. It's the one that received the most recent approval from Commission just last month for the concept design and the SEQUA determination. It includes not just the playground but some renovations for accessibility improvements as well.

Steven Currier: So in that one of the things that I think was quite controversial which I think one Commissioner got into it were the sandboxes and we have an issue especially in District 11 because across the street—and I know this is not a done deal yet, it was just moved forward to Recreation and Park but across the street there's a halfway house, actually there are two halfway houses on one lot but there are a lot of halfway houses in the neighborhood and a lot of them generate drug use and I think that when we did the Crocker-Amazon playground back in 2002 is that we tried to eliminate sandboxes for that particular reason but in this one they did bring back sandboxes because in the community meetings they said we want sandboxes. What can you tell us about that? Is it going to go forward? Are they going to do it on a trial basis because if the sandboxes don't work and there are paraphernalia in the sandboxes and are they going to be kept clean? What can we do to proceed after that?

Male Speaker: I'm happy to speak on that.

Cara Ruppert: I can also speak on the design process. It obviously is a very complicated issue. Maybe Gary can speak on the policy decisions but as a design process like you said this is just a concept plan and it was approved by the commission. In my work what I always tell our staff is concept plans often get tweaked as they move through but what we've promised the community is the diagram that you see here with all of the elements that you see. So at the end of the day unless something radical changes we would deliver a sandbox generally within this configuration.

Chair: Gary do you want to just on police?

Gary: Well I was actually—your Supervisor Safai also was a huge push [unintelligible] sand element here and so that combined with some of the community requests. We were able to make that work. In terms of maintenance that's why one of the reasons there is this concrete pad next to it so that they are able to maintain the sand.

Steven Currier: I got a different very view from Kathy Mothy Meyer who is Safai's legislative aide who actually told me that they pushed against it.

Chair: Steven just to be clear we've heard about sand numerous times on this committee, the Department has its reasons why and clearly you're echoing those reasons but there was something in the community that pushed it to the point where it made it into the design.

Steven Currier: And the only reason why I'm bringing it up is because it was brought up after the fact.

Chair: Again I think the Deputy would say that concept plans are concept plans and when it hits the ground there will be discussion with the cup and with the stakeholders.

Cara Ruppert: Moving on to the next one, McLaren Park. This is the group picnic playground. I've included the most recent design concepts here. This project is currently has completed schematic design and working towards a 30 percent set . We are now working on projects in the next view including Alice Chalmers we place to bid in the fall of this year so start construction by this time next year on Alice Chalmers, McLaren Park and Panhandle playground. This one also incorporates a sandbox into the design.

Finally, I can share the first two of the tier two sites, West Portal playground and Jury Commons playground. West Portal is a [unintelligible] Community Opportunity Fund grant, they had a design worked out through that grant application and so we were able to hit the ground running with the concept plan and planning with this one. It received a SEQUA determination Commission approval in December and it's within the design phase right now too. And then Jury Commons we're just starting this one. We have a couple new project managers on staff in our Division so we're able to push forward a little bit sooner than we thought on Jury Commons. Community outreach will begin very shortly. We're doing some of the background stuff, some existing conditions analysis and things like that.

Chair: Is there a project going on there now? It looks like Jury Commons is all kind of—I just went past there.

Cara Ruppert: it could be the grass might be fenced off.

Chair: There's a whole bunch of it fenced. I didn't stop there because you know as you're driving you see just a piece of it but I drove past it, I was like are they already working on Jury Commons.

Cara Ruppert: Not yet. But Jury Commons is an interesting site too because it's also a Community Opportunity Fund application award winner and a playground winner so there's going to be some elements of the project that are beyond the playground here too. In many ways these bits and pieces, new gates and fences, moving those few site elements around.

Male Speaker: [unintelligible]

Cara Ruppert: We're just starting that. So the Jury Commoners is the friends group that put together the application for the Community Opportunity Fund award that they received, we are just starting to reach out to them and plan our community meeting that would really focus on the playground design somewhere to how we've done the other projects.

Chair: You mentioned Alice Chalmers and McLaren Park going out to bid at the same time.

Cara Ruppert: I think Alice will be a little after.

Chair: But around the same time. Do you benefit considering that their proximity to each other?

Cara Ruppert: Actually it's something that we're considering. It's not something we've done typically in the Department but I think given the state of the bidding climate it's something we should consider doing.

Chair: Right, I mean I think you have to consider any which way you can saying look we're bringing a truck full of X wouldn't it be great if we could have it be two trucks full of X or half a truck for Alice Chalmers and half for McLaren Park.

Cara Ruppert: It's been in the back of my mind to be honest and no one has made any commitments because as you tell things can get help up at certain times in this project and so we didn't want to hold up any more projects to wait for another but things are working out that way which is going to be interesting to see if we decide to do that.

Chair: I just know from myself and my District when Lafayette Park was redone was right after Alta Plaza had raised all this money and theoretically they probably could have saved some money had they done them concurrently as opposed to a five or seven year gap between the two. Here you've clearly identified within a District within probably maybe twenty blocks.

Steven Currier: District 11. I would concur with you because one of the things that I testified is that in all the years that I was president of OMA and be lobbied for Alice Chalmers and got nothing, not even a wink, then I think it's most deserving for that neighborhood Ancel Martinez: community that we get something done and if you want to collaborate with something on McLaren Park which will get a lot more attention than Alice Chalmers would be its hidden within a community. I would advocate for that 100 percent.

Chair: It just looks like you've got them next to each other so why not take advantage.

Cara Ruppert: I'm thinking about that for smaller projects in our pipeline too.

Ken McGary: District 11. Just back to McLaren Park for just a second. There's also the group picnic area which is also due for some upgrades, right?

Cara Ruppert: Yes.

Ken McGary: So can you talk about [unintelligible] are you going to do it all at the same time?

Cara Ruppert: Yes.

Ken McGary: I also have a question about a restroom there.

Cara Ruppert: I know a little bit less about the restroom but I have been tracking all let's call them three projects right now. The playground and the picnic projects have been merged together, kind of that entire zone is going to be improved where there's kind of like that bowl of lawn and then the two picnic areas and the playgrounds. All of that will be improved through the picnic area slash playground project. Coming on the tail end of that is the restroom project and I've been tracking that with the project manager to see if it's possible that—and I think it is, we'll just have to see it plays out kind of like what I was saying, like we don't want to hold up one for another, that the restroom project could be delivered at the same time as the others. And so it's hopeful that we have kind of a slam-dunk, everything is reopened at the same time in let's say fall of 2019. All three are moving forward.

The last slide on here is just an updated schedule of where we are with all the projects. The red vertical line is generally today was what I made for Commission a couple weeks ago. So you can see tier one is all within design or about to start construction. Tier two we've started and these are when we're hoping to start the next project for tier two as well. And the red stars are when we're expected to be at Commission as well as four different reviews and approvals. So I'm happy to answer any questions if there are any more.

Anthony Cuadro: Can you come back in six months to give us an update.

Cara Ruppert: [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments] asked up to present every six months to them so that's in March and August which is why we're here now because [unintelligible] to come to you all the month after so why don't we say September and April.

Chair: I have one question before we close this. Does any other members have any questions?

Male Speaker: I have a quick question. I see here that several of these are now designed [unintelligible] will there be one last chance for community input?

Cara Ruppert: So we have approved concept plans for all six tier one playgrounds and for west portal at the tier two—as the only—this is the first tier two playground because of the funding it had in place and we're starting now the community process on tier two. And generally we don't go back to the entire community for feedback on the design after that but we almost always work with the key stakeholders that are involved throughout the projects through the design phases and we try to keep the community overall updated through blog updates and things like that. Was there a specific one you felt needed more input?

Male Speaker: Not in particular. [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments]

Chair: Any other questions? So I have a question, this is a Drew and Lisa question. Speaking not on behalf of the committee now I'm speaking as a stakeholder, as a member, a park advocate. So you're caught, you're caught because you have all these great plans and really it sounds like you need money and I don't know how the committee feels—

Male Speaker: [unintelligible]

Chair: No. But I'm asking you in terms of public-private partnerships this is a brilliant opportunity to start talking to certain people about contributing to the next generation, to steward the future of our children not necessarily because public money always should be spent on the betterment of children but because private companies are making millions and millions off our city and that it might be the time for them and this Department to consider a hybrid, something where a large donor might come to the table and say hey I identified this playground because my nephew went to school near there.

Female Speaker: No, no, you're very brilliant. [laughs]

Chair: I'm just trying to put it out to you to say I know many times on this committee there were members that said if you put a little thing that says Pet Smart on your dog play area you're taking advantage of the system and it's killing our parks. Well, you have a committee here who is like fix it, it's broken, go find the money, find somebody or a few somebodies, that's why the question was very valuable how many big donors we have because this is what you can sell to them, this is really more than anything else we don't need a new something else, we need playgrounds for our kids so I guess I'm saying and this committee is probably saying that it would be nice to see larger entities contribute to this.

Lisa Bransten: I will add that another big donor—and this a big donor that has press concerns but is nonetheless isn't anonymous—and that is we got a \$500,000 from the Salesforce Foundation. So that is happening. Drew and I typically in fundraising you do a big quiet phase so that's why this is quiet. We won't announce it too much publically but you're exactly right, that's exactly what's happening and it's never quite as easy as everybody thinks it is.

Chair: I think we all know that and again I think there are many committee members—you know, specifically I'll speak about Toby Levy who tried to get South Park so many times and went door to door to people, literally like tech companies like hi you border on this park and you won't help us.

Lisa Bransten: One of the reasons that this public-private partnership is so powerful for me anyway and I've been working on this for a long time is that map. The power of saying like this is the whole city, this isn't just your park next door. I think that's resonated for a lot of funders. It's been surprising to me that funders haven't said I want to take that park and name it after myself. Almost every single large funder has said no I want to contribute to the bucket.

Chair: Right. And to me that's awesome because that does show that their concern is more about community that it is about names. I think the biggest donor in Lafayette Park actually it says anonymous. I am not at liberty to speak about who that person is and it doesn't matter because they're not really doing it for the money nor the glory they're doing it because it was the right thing to do and again I think you guys have an opportunity there speaking as a Chair, as a stakeholders in saying there are plenty of people that could support this and help this and it's an important project and whatever we can do as individuals maybe to help you with that or identify people or be a part of this we would want to be a part.

Male Speaker: [unintelligible]

Steven Currier: District 11. I want to second what you said whether it's on record or not. I've been a member of many nonprofit organizations [unintelligible]. I have done exactly what you've done where I've even gone to people that I knew or did not know and money flew. So you know if you need a partner in what you're doing I would be happy to sign my name on a grant letter.

Chair: And just think we all believe in this one and it's been at this committee for so long and it's one that we want to see through. It's one that for each of us yeah parks are great and we want to develop open space and we want to acquire open space and all those pieces but these are things we have that are failing and they need to be looked at and supported and maybe the public's money won't go as far as we need it to so what can we do, how can we help them?

Any other comments on this item from the committee? Public comment? Hearing none, this item is closed.

Female Speaker: April 14th we are having first inaugural partner conference. You are all welcome to come to register a partner so it's a great opportunity to work with people

[unintelligible]. So it's going to be a great opportunity. It's Saturday from 8:30, breakfast and lunch is provided, [unintelligible]. It's going to be really great. [unintelligible]

Male Speaker: And I just want to say that the first time I came in front of this committee many of the members of this committee mentioned that parks caucus that used to happen and how great it was and getting the networking and that type of thing and since then we've been going out and around the city talking, people wanted something like this but it actually had it's like birth like right here about a year ago. [unintelligible] introduce myself so if this is the outcome about that [unintelligible].

Chair: Anthony.

Anthony Cuadro: Are we able to [unintelligible] for the happy hour? [laughs] [simultaneous comments]

Chair: So I'll just say to all of you I'll be attending the opening of Moscone Playground at 9:17 or whatever time they decide to open it but I will be attending this for the majority of the day. I'm speaking on a panel I think at 1:00 o'clock but I would certainly encourage all of you guys to attend and I think it will be a good opportunity as PROSAC members to speak to other people in our passionate place. I thank the Parks Alliance for doing this, it's great.

Our final item—Gary are you presenting this with Marcus?

Gary McCoy: I'm going to start. Marcus is going to [simultaneous comments]. Marcus is going to step in. Also I apologize for having the staple on the wrong corner but if you're left-handed [unintelligible].

I'm Gary McCoy, policy and community affairs manager with the Recreation and Park Department. There was some interest in having a discussion at this meeting about sanctuary city status and how that relates to parks and open space. So I wanted to give just a brief overview. The ordinance itself mostly refers to how law enforcement does not work with Federal officials through the process of an immigration—I can't think of an appropriate word right now for that. But we do not help in any way. We don't spend money or resources in helping. We don't collect data information on immigration status. We don't share the data that we do collect generally as a city.

I wanted to also highlight that our park rangers are not police officers. They are not [unintelligible]. They provide citations. They can detain folks while they await the Police Department to do any booking if that's necessary or anything like that. They really assist the Police Department. So a lot of—and then I'll let Marcus take on from here to go over the rules and responsibilities of [unintelligible].

Marcus Santiago: Hi everybody, I'm Marcus Santiago. I've been with the Department as a park ranger for going on nineteen years so basically we're code enforcement officers so the park has its own code sections that only apply in the parks [unintelligible] make sure the parks are maintained and safe for users. We write citations which are basically infractions which are

something similar to a speeding ticket and basically it just requires the person who gets the citation to maybe just go to court or contest it, something similar to a driving citation infraction where you have to provide ID and then we issue a citation and then you take care of it.

We have issued citations ever since I've been here and it's mostly again like I said some park code violations. We do give out citations for smoking in the park, drinking in the parks that you're not supposed to be able to drink in. And a lot of people don't like it but we give out leash law violations in parks that aren't off-leash parks. So we do a lot of those different things and we're a 24/7 operations.

We do work with the Police Department, we do consider them our partners but as it pertains to the sanctuary city ordinance we don't actually book an prisoners, we just take them, we turn them over to the police if they're like somebody who fights or assaults somebody then we can't just give them a ticket we actually have to have the police come out, pick them up, take them downtown and whatever they do after the time we turn them over to them we have no idea. So all we do is write a supplemental report saying this is what happened when we were there and we turn it over to the police and they do all the rest of the things.

Chair: I think one thing I want to draw your attention to because Marcus is being very forthcoming on what his role is you know Gary I found it really helpful that you cited where this all originates from, that this comes from a 1989 charter amendment, so our city was way in front of this situation and I think Gary made it very clear to me when Wendy had asked for this presentation that basically the park rangers are facilitating a role of law enforcement only as it relates to the park so if somebody is completely acting within the legal premise of what they're doing within the park then they aren't going to do anything. But there are also—and Gary and I had this off the record conversation, Marcus can certainly speak to this—they're not actively trying to say here's this guy, come get him. There is nothing like that in their scope, right? Whether that's from Mike Celeste or from police from the Department, basically what they don't see they don't know, they don't care. As long as that person isn't infracting.

Marcus Santiago: As long as they're not violating any of the park code. We courage enjoyment of the parks. We want to consider ourselves probably about 85 percent park ambassador, more than enforcement. We wear a uniform but it's a way for somebody to recognize it. Like I said, the total amount of tickets we give out because there's a thing about vending here, we've given out only 26 for the years. So it's not our target that we pick but it it's something that is occurring. This case that somebody had brought up regarding this vendor and just for a little background this person was talked to three hours before he was issued a citation and he was caught at another park and the person who actually issued the citation spoke to this person because he's Spanish, he's Puerto Rican so he was able to [unintelligible] to explain to him the first time that it's not something we condone about stuff in the park that's considered an infraction. So it's not like we saw him and went to him and said okay come here, give me your ID, we're going to issue you a citation. We don't do that. We always give a warning first and try to get compliance. Education is our big thing and I think Robert knows that because we have two park rangers up at Dolores Park who do enforcement but at the same time take a big role in education, let people know what they should or they shouldn't do.

Robert Brust: You talk to them more than you give out tickets, I know that.

Gary: We prefer education. The Department doesn't receive any revenue on citations. It's all administrative and so it's really mostly about education, about 85 percent education. We don't cite everyone we see. We try to warn them multiple times sometimes.

Wendy Aragon: I don't want to digress on that too much. I think it's more that we have people who make \$50 or \$60 a day doing this and a citation can set them back like a week, two week's paycheck or pay and so how do we—I mean, like you said the warning process was really helpful in this case. Is there some way that Recreation and Park can work with these low income vendors especially like the [Spanish] are a vital part of the fabric in the Latino community. There's like the permit process is so expensive and so complicated and so how the Department can make that work with them. Because I think that they're putting themselves at risk selling every day so they put food on the table not just to break the law or the Park Code.

Male Speaker: Gary, can I ask a question for Wendy on this? Would this have to through and RFP or RFQ kind of thing?

Gary: So that's what I was going say, yes. So per city contract they require [unintelligible] not specifically the Department. Getting a permit to be a vendor in a park requires and RFP process which is an open process. It's available online, the information is there, I'll share it with everyone on the committee after this meeting. We don't just have like a desk where you can come and say I want to vend in this park, here's a \$100 for my permit. [unintelligible] And so there are contractor requirements and so that is something that would have to be amended or changed at the city level in order to do that.

Marcus Santiago: It's not that we don't understand that it costs them money which is the reason why we ask them to leave first. I mean, if they're standing on the sidewalk outside of the park we leave them alone even though technically they shouldn't be around the park but we leave them alone. We just don't want them inside the park because then that sets a bad precedent for other people who are vending things like marijuana edibles or jewelry or something like that. So these are the reasons why for vendors we just tell them do it outside the park and it's not within our purview.

Wendy Aragon: I think it was a concern of [unintelligible] and other people because you saw what happened in Berkeley at the Big Game last year it's been a pretty frequent problem throughout different cities where they're actively having to engage with law enforcement on this and I think that's kind of why it hit a soft spot because it's not like a one-time incident. Noe with you guys but just in general across California.

Marcus Santiago: We don't want to put our park rangers in a position of picking and choosing what vendors they cite.

Chair: Right, I mean that's—I think that having consistency across what it takes to get a permit versus how they enforce. I'll speak to the leash tickets that Marcus alluded to, many times we dealt with people who were off-leash and were warned and then put their dog back on-leash

and then were in fact in compliance at that point, right? But after doing that day after day and the rangers seeing that day after day finally if they don't enforce then it actually breeds more of that broken window concept so I think again in this particular situation they're not out trying to make a point about it at all. In fact I've seen them on more than one occasion just like they say hey you should leash up your dog, he if you want to vend this you should be outside of the park because otherwise Joe and Steve and Suzie all get to vend to enforce they enforce. It's a challenge.

Marcus Santiago: The vendors for the ice cream and the hot dog vendors have their own community. I don't know if there's a way that people can get the word out to them you can vend around the park just don't go in the park and if you see a park ranger just go because that's what we're going to say, we're just going to say can you please go outside.

Chair: And at the same time I would urge you—sorry—I would urge you, Gary is like the most open cat in the world, if there's a way to come up with a strategy that says it's a one-time vending permit or for this one park or there's something then at least do that because that's not really what this agenda is about.

Wendy Aragon: I don't want to digress more on this because I have some more questions.

Chair: Steven do you have something on this?

Steven Currier: I do! I'm actually very passionate about this. Wendy please don't take this the wrong way but when Crocker-Amazon's soccer fields were redone several years ago there was a concession stand that was built and of course that was the only person that went to Recreation and Park Commission and they got okay'd. When I was president of Homer I got a call from him saying there was a food truck right outside of the park on Geneva Avenue. So I went up to him and found out that he did not have a permit. He needed to get a DPH permit and I will not eat public food because I'm just too scared. I just don't want to get sick or whatnot. If they had a permit—and we have vendors that even go to Guadalupe Elementary School every single day who don't have permits and I know that's their livelihood and I get it but is there a way if they're going to have vendors in our San Francisco parks that we can get them as a education process to get a permit but at a reduced—I mean they do by law, city law, have to have a DPH permit to sell public food as a vendor. But is there a way that we can work within our group through the city that if we have the—you know, they're immigrants and they're low income and they're doing this on a daily basis just to put food on their family's tables, to get them to a reasonable priced permit so they can conduct business. And I would actually feel more comfortable if on their truck—on their little cart or truck or whatnot had a permit saying that I got a permit to sell food.

Wendy Aragon: I think Claudette would be amendable to that, absolutely so I think but [unintelligible].

Steven Currier: So what [unintelligible] says here they're saying you know what these immigrants or these people who take advantage of our sanctuary city maybe that's the only way that they can make money to feed their families but on the other hand if we're going to be a true

sanctuary city and we welcome them in and that's the only way that they can make money then we need to find a way for them to obey the laws the city has in selling food on the street.

Marcus Santiago: And on the same thing, the person out at Crocker-Amazon Louis [unintelligible] he's an immigrant and he came, you know, from [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments] . He has a hard time with the other people because [unintelligible] but he can't do any business because other people are doing the same business. We do get call from our vendors to you know to do enforcement. But again like I said there's no way we target anybody. [unintelligible] get our complaints and that's how we're pretty much complaints driven.

Wendy Aragon: I think that's fair. This was actually really important to me so I don't want to like again get trapped in that because I think that would be a completely different agenda item in itself.

Chair: Clearly it's a current even.

Wendy Aragon: And we talk about immigrants in the city and like what they're going through and things. So my questions on this and Gary thank you I know that you really tried to get this done for the last I don't know how many months and you're wearing like three different hats and you have a life outside of here.

So I guess some questions that I would like to ask because—so under SP54 which is the new California law parks and open space aren't protected spaces as where hospitals, schools and libraries are. And because you're not law enforcement you also don't have the loophole to say like I'm not going to cooperate with you because I think law enforcement aren't in the same category under that law. I guess what I want to get from the Department is what would be a contingency plan say if ICE showed up to George Friend Rec Center one day, what would happen and what would people be prepared to—because they can't ask for a warrant, it's a public space, but we also know that a lot of people in that moment that there's a rapid response because that's a very chaotic time, don't know their rights and I think what I'm asking for is would Recreation and Park—and this is maybe worded in a resolution—to provide those resources for patrons I wanted to pass this out, this is the public library after the election of Donald Trump. They had done—they just put up signs and that was like this huge deal that like people started like trusting the library and feeling safe there, to let our patrons know that they're going to be safe, that they have rights under the law, like that they have the right to remain silent, they don't have to give them any information, they don't have to give any paperwork. Like that simple little gesture that the library did is making a big impact and I think that's what I would ask. I would also ask that Recreation and Park work with organizations like Free S.F., Bay Resistance, I am a immigrant's right Commission, they would love to partner with the Recreation and Park on this and the City Attorney's Office for some guidance about rapid response and what to do. Angela Chan from Free S.F. gave me this, it's what was sent to the Department of Youth and Families and I think that this would be really helpful on that. I guess just following the lead of the library. I want to be here to help you. Like I know that gets really hard because it's like I gave this [unintelligible] and everybody is like wow I never really thought about this but people feel really vulnerable right now. We do know that ICE raids do happen in the city even though we are a sanctuary city.

Gary: You can do a resolution [unintelligible] we're happy to provide resources inside even if there is a hotline that somebody can all we can post that as well. We could also talk about maybe partnering with [unintelligible] but I think that might be a little risky because it sort of invites folks being [unintelligible].

Wendy Aragon: Being exposed, yeah.

Gary: But yes absolutely. We're prepared to move forward with it.

Wendy Aragon: And you can have these too because I mean I've printed them out for you guys because I think that they're really helpful in a way that's productive and not like just—because I think we put up like things like you have the right to remain silent like it would be scarier to people but if you make it that this—that you should feel safe in our parks.

Gary: [unintelligible]

Wendy Aragon: And I think a resolution just to back up that effort I think would be really good.

Chair: I don't know if you're going to get that resolution tonight. I don't think we have quorum.

Wendy Aragon: But also it's not agenized, so.

Chair: It's certainly something we can come back to.

Wendy Aragon: Angela Chan has offered to work with me on this, Urban Habitat, San Francisco Rising, they've offered how can we help you on this. They've been following whether or not it's going to happen for months and months and months and they ask me all the time.

Gary: [unintelligible]

Chair: I'll also just remind everybody who just stepped out of the room reminded me that the original ordinance that's mentioned in this was authored by Angela Alioto who's running for Mayor and if she becomes the Mayor clearly it's going to become a little more of a priority.

Wendy Aragon: I know that when talked to all the candidates for Mayor minute one they've all been actually the same thing, they've been very agreeable. My Supervisor Stanley Fewer is really a big proponent of this as well. She actually wanted to know if we had to have a hearing and I was like I don't think so, I think this will be taken care of.

Gary: [unintelligible]

Chair: Do you want to edit this?

Wendy Aragon: Yeah, so let me give you the Cliff Notes version of this Poder letter because they are very passionate about this issue. Those of you who are not familiar with Poder, they are an environmental justice organization. They mostly work in D11 and D9. They are my nominating organization because I've done a lot of environmental justice work with them. So basically just kind of a background, they organized immigrant familiars to create solutions with immigrant rights, social, racial, economic and environmental justice which are central [unintelligible]. He kind of talked a little bit about the issue of the [Spanish] but also just making sure that we have an equitable approach to our immigrant community which again as I've mentioned feels very vulnerable at this time especially when we have a President who is constantly vilifying them. And then also which kind of does fall under sanctuary city is that making sure that we're under compliance with the city's language ordinance because I guess they've done spot checks and they haven't seen that on all our facilities and if we're going to implement resources we want to make sure we're covering all the languages because we know not just Latino families have undocumented people in our community but also Chinese community, the Filipino community, the Arab community which had a big ICE raid happen a couple months ago. So that we make sure they're all getting these resources as well as our park language for everything else like Park Code.

Gary: [unintelligible]

Wendy Aragon: So I don't want to read the whole thing. There's an article that I'll let you guys read it if you want, it talks about basically the economic disparity between the double standard of vendors getting fined versus [unintelligible] and that's a whole other issue that not all of us will agree on but he did send me that as well.

Chair: So you're not going to read it in?

Wendy Aragon: Do you want me to read the whole thing?

Chair: No.

Wendy Aragon: Because it's very long.

Chair: No, no, no. That's fine.

Wendy Aragon: I kind of wanted to give a Cliff Notes version of it.

Chair: Does everybody have it?

Wendy Aragon: Everybody has a copy of it.

Male Speaker: [unintelligible]

Chair: Okay, that's fine, that's fine. Okay. So since Wendy brought this to us and wanted this as a presentation do you feel like your questions are out there at least?

Wendy Aragon: Yes.

Chair: Whether you got the answers you want or not at least you feel like the questions are out there.

Wendy Aragon: Yeah and I think that as long as it can be a topic because we haven't been able to discuss it I think now it's like I said I'm willing to partner and help you and I know organizations and people who are willing to help because other Departments are implementing this in a way that's proactive and not just—what I didn't want to hear from Recreation and Park is this is the ordinance we have to follow it. I wanted to hear like what efforts are going to be to—because it's an open space and people use it and we don't ask them their immigrant status.

Chair: I think your point is well made that this time of our existence versus other times is even more concerning because people are in jeopardy now more so than ever before.

Wendy Aragon: There have been raids like where people have dropped their kids off at school. Schools are sanctuary. They walk out of the school, they're nabbed. And a lot of times they don't know their rights.

Chair: And again I think I would just bring this back to the context of a park where you're hearing from probably the second in command of the park rangers and the mouth of the Recreation and Park Department. Basically what their prerogative is what we don't know, we don't know. We're saying at this point that there is no—Marcus is not going to push somebody into the hands of an ICE agent. He is not going to say okay got you.

Wendy Aragon: And I didn't think that. I think it was more like—

Chair: It was important for you to hear that.

Wendy Aragon: Yeah, it was important for me to hear that but also I think what was the most important thing is it might happen and so what will we do. Like I don't want our staff and our rangers to feel helpless at that point.

Chair: I think that's an answerable question. So Marcus I'll put it to you and we can close this item. So Wendy created a hypothetical. The hypothetical is pick any park you want, there's a situation that happens. You have to respond to it. There's some public nuisance, something going on, you're in the situation, you realize in the situation maybe it's an argument between a person who's a stakeholder, somebody who lives in the neighborhood, and somebody who is clearly illegal. They're yelling and screaming, there's an altercation, you get in the middle of it you say okay let's chill, go sit down, what's going on and you realize in that moment this person is illegal, they absolutely potentially could be detained by ICE. What's your next step? Where does it go from there?

Marcus Santiago: First of all, we don't ever ask status whether you're immigrant or not. That's not our role. [Simultaneous comments] So understand that in the State of California it's

not illegal to not have ID. So we can ask for ID, if you don't have it you don't have it because you're not required by law to have it unless you're driving a vehicle. [Simultaneous comments] .

Wendy Aragon: Can I give a better hypothetical?

[Simultaneous comments]

Wendy Aragon: So Steffan is in the park, he's an undocumented person. Nick is an ICE agent and he comes and he says are you Steffen Franz? And Steffen—

Chair: [unintelligible]

Wendy Aragon: And everybody is watching. There's kids there, it's traumatic. Like there is park rangers [unintelligible] maybe Recreation and Park staff there.

Marcus Santiago: Yeah, we won't interfere. We will not step in. We'll separate the parties but if they come in and ICE is prepared to come in and arrest somebody we can't stop them and we're not going to stop them but we'll try to help out the family and everybody else that's impacted by it and try to maybe talk to the guy, the ICE guys, and ask them what's going on. There's no way we're going to be able to step in. We don't even carry guns.

Wendy Aragon: Like I said it's a chaotic situation. It is well-known that they don't always have warrants. They don't ask people. They don't Mirandize people. They violate the law or the violate protocol constantly.

Chair: I want to go back to what Marcus is saying. Again. They're not in a position to stop the action. There is no way that a city employee whether it's the Recreation and Park Department or even the police are going to stop ICE from actually detaining somebody. They cannot encourage it, they can look the other way, but in fact they cannot tell you in good faith that they will stop that from happening.

Marcus Santiago: I mean we will [unintelligible]. We won't be holding somebody thinking that they're an illegal undocumented person. We just do what we need to do. Can't vend in here, you've got to go.

Chair: Your dog's off-leash. You're smoking in a park.

Marcus Santiago: Whatever it may be.

Chair: They don't care whether you're documented or not because it doesn't matter if you smoking in the park, they're still write you a citation.

Male Speaker: Why were recreation centers and parks left out of the SB bill?

Wendy Aragon: I don't why. It was public space but libraries are also public spaces. They're open to the public unlike a school or hospital where you usually have to be admitted. I mean a

hospital is kind of a gray area of public space or not but they were left out and I don't really understand why. I don't know if that was part of the watering down of the bill but it is kind of a weird situation. Especially with a rec center you've got kids there and families.

Male Speaker: And what SB was it?

Wendy Aragon: SB54.

Male Speaker: It seems like rec centers would have been perfect.

Chair: Why was that excluded specifically and would have probably actually given more power to the Recreation and Park Department had it been included in the bill. Okay, so any other committee members have comments on this?

Steven Currier: Is there any way we could write some recommendation to go to Recreation and Park Commission.

Nick Belloni: We have to do that next month because we're on discussion only.

Steven Currier: No, I know. [simultaneous comments]

Wendy Aragon: I would write a resolution. I mean if anybody wants to work with me on that and then we pass it through which it sounds like it's in process to just support that effort.

Chair: I think we would all support it. I don't think that's an issue. So I would say just work on the language of it and speak to Gary or Tiffany if she's back and see if we can't put it on the agenda for next month. So I would like to thank Marcus for coming. Thank you very much Gary. Thank you for that presentation. Is there any public comment? Hi Fran, you're going to speak on this item?

Fran Martin: I'm with the Visitation Valley Planning Alliance and Visitacion Valley Greenway Project. We were here two and half years ago, July, 2015, to ask you to support us to acquire this land that's at the end of Leland Avenue and it's right next to our community garden that's being built. And the strip of land [unintelligible], it's the only strip of land in McLaren Park that's accessible to people who live in Sunnydale, the biggest housing project in the city. There's also senior housing right next door and someone bought a church right next to this community garden for \$710,000 which goes from Leland down into Raymond Avenue, cuts diagonally across that strip of land right there and they're going to put in five three-story homes about 3500 to 4500 square feet. So actually I've been working with Linda Schaffer a lot and we took it to the Planning Commission in January, 2017, and we got a continuance until January, 2018. And they denied us. They said we had no standing. We found a couple of—well, through Linda and the Native Plant Society we found a couple locally rare plants and so we fought on that basis. [unintelligible] So we have taken it to the Board of Supervisors and next Tuesday it's coming before them [unintelligible] and the big issue is we're going to lose views of the bay and San Bruno Mountain from public space, from McLaren Park. So that's what the battle is about. I'm with the Visitacion Valley Planning alliance as I've mentioned. We're not [unintelligible],

we fought for high density housing in Visitacion Valley and parks and I'm also with the Greenway so it's not—we can't be [unintelligible]. And this is actually the first time we've fought housing. If this were mid-block I wouldn't even bother but it is affecting open space so that's—and when we came here you, this body, voted unanimously to acquire the land so it's on the roster for acquisition. So it would be really nice if anyone here could come to the meeting next Tuesday to support us.

Male Speaker: It's at the general Board of Supervisors meeting?

Fran Martin: Yeah, it's the full board at 3:00 o'clock on the 10th.

Steven Currier: Through the Chair I know that Linda D'Avirro has spoken my ear off this issue, is adamant about it, and she's said only good things about saving this piece of property and I'm with her and you.

Fran Martin: We need as much support as we can get from you and I want to thank you. We always put in that whatever we write we say PROSAC voted to acquire that land.

Chair: Thank you. Just for anybody who is new to the committee and doesn't recall this conversation we were very involved and did support the acquisition of this piece. Whether it happened or not or whether it happened in a timely manner or not I have heard from numerous Lindas and what are they talking about? They're talking about five homes that are built on this little piece of property that are going to inhibit other. So there is a lot of discussion on shadow surveys, on SEQUA. It sounds like sadly last straw attempts. If you are a member that wants to appear at the Board of Supervisors specifically District 10 or District 11 people District 9 maybe close enough, please feel free to support this and remind the Supervisors that PROSAC did support the acquisition of this property. Is there any other—

Male Speaker: Can you give me the actual address of this piece of property?

Fran Martin: 590 Leland.

Chair: Let's move on to any announcements. Any members have any announcements?
Wendy Aragon.

Wendy Aragon: I mentioned it last month on April 21st, Saturday morning from 8:00 to noon there is going to be an event called Best Buddies Friendship Walk. Best Buddies is a national organization started by the Shriner Foundation that helps support people with developmental disabilities. This walk garners thousands of people. My employer is a sponsor. It's a really great event if you want to come by and see it. You can also participate in the walk if you go on their organization you can register as a single person. April 21st at the band shell. It goes from the band shell to Stow Lake and back.

Chair: Any other announcements?

Jordyn Aquino: Richard Rothman is not here but he did want everyone to know that the City Services Auditor just released the 2008 Clean and Safe Neighborhood Park Bond report yesterday but it does show the Controller's Officer consulted a construction firm to provide the analysis on it. It showed that the Recreation and Park Department was in compliance with how they spent the money for our neighborhood parks.

Chair: I read it. It's everything from the 2008 bond and the Recreation and Park Department actually per the Controller's Office Report completely acted within their rights or purview and spent the money the way they were supposed to which is great. [simultaneous comments] Any other announcements? The only other announcement I will say to you is I'm reiterating on the 14th of April the Parks Alliance has an event, it's a park partner conference. If you didn't get a handout please ask Katie if she's still here. Please be present at that one. I'll also encourage you if you're in the neighborhood to come to the Moscone opening because I'm sure that will be a hoot. Gary and I will have our dogs there to say hello.

Finally, I just want to make one quick announcement and this is for the Department as well. So I heard from a gardener, my gardener in fact, who was at an RPDU event. Anyone know what that is? Per the Strategic Plan is basically like their internal training, retraining. One of the things my gardener talked about which I thought was amazing Casey he said there are these cards, multi-jurisdictional or multi-organizational cards to give out to homeless people that have all of the information like the city services that are available to them on one card. So you can walk up to this brother or sister and say listen I can't help you but here. And I thought what a great idea to arm PROSAC members with these cards and my gardener was like—Casey was like I don't know who had them or where I'm ever going to get them but I've got hella homeless people in this park I would love to give them to and so I said well let me just call up my friends at the Recreation and Park Department and see if we can get some of these fliers. So Gary how are those going?

Gary: HSH is trying to find more.

Chair: Find more.

Gary: They're the ones that made them. They're generally for—they list everything except for Park Code.

Chair: But all the services, phone numbers.

Gary: I'm still trying to get a stack of those. I think they're going to be updating them which may be why they have a low run right now and I can't find any. But we are working on making our own for the parks.

Chair: I would certainly encourage from our standpoint that would be something very valuable to us and to that end I'll reiterate for those dog people here I've also encouraged the Department to make a handout that has their new slogan is Barks and Rec, they've become the kinder more dog-friendly Recreation and Park Department. Gary, thank you, whatever you're doing is going great for us do owners. Why I say this to you is because the Department has

actually got 32 off-leash DPAs and that's a far cry from when I got my first dog in this city. To that end I would love a car that I could go to various stakeholders and say hey Lafayette Park is awesome, why don't you go to Balboa? Why don't you go to Alamo Square? Why don't you check out Moscone, Crocker, wherever. There's 32 off-leash DPAs so I would love to request some cards that say check out this website and here are some off-leash dog play area.

Gary: [unintelligible]

Chair: Okay. So any other announcements? Hearing none, any public comment? Hearing none, we are adjourned.

End of Document