

**PROSAC Meeting**  
**August 2, 2016**

**Chair:** Welcome to the August meeting of the Park and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee. We have a full agenda tonight. I'm thankful for the members who showed up. We are not at quorum at this moment. We had an RSPV from at least twelve members. I'm incredibly disappointed in the members who did not RSVP at all. So I'd like to start by going on the record as saying we accept this responsibility and it is part of our responsibility to be here when we say we are going to be here and I feel like after this meeting, especially with certain members, I have to take a tougher stand with their Supervisors in saying our time is as important as their time.

So I know I'm speaking to members who come to every meeting or most and when you don't come you're excused. When it comes down to a quorum if Ken had not RSPV'd yesterday we wouldn't have a meeting tonight, I would have postponed the meeting. So I'm asking you to please—your brethren and sisters on this committee—if you're not going to come please let us know. If you are going to come please do not say in the last minute oh, there's enough people I'm not worried about it. That's everyone in this room, not just our time but their time too.

Specifically, the General Manager is on vacation and he is coming to present this to us.

**Female Speaker:** Here's Richard.

**Chair:** Hi. 6:30. So all right, we'll start with roll to my left.

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

**Jane Weil:** Jane Weil, District 6.

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

**Jordyn Aquino:** Jordyn Aquino, District 4.

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

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

**Kenneth Maley:** Kenneth Maley, District 3.

**Linda D'Avirro:** Linda D'Avirro, District 11.

**Ana Gee:** Ana Gee, District 6.

**Chair:** Steffen Franz, District 2. We are still waiting as I said on two other members who RSVP yeses, that's Maya Rogers and Tom Valtin. They're both en route, they both texted me that they'll be here shortly.

So we are not really voting on any items tonight. I have the review of minutes, unfortunately I cannot actually pass that if we approve so Tiffany we'll start by tabling the minutes until next month.

I will quickly on to Item #3. I would like to introduce our new member from District 6, Ana Gee. Ana, maybe just start by giving us a little background on you and how you got here.

**Ana Gee:** I apologize, my voice is very soft. So how I got here—right now I'm currently working with the Tenderloin Housing Clinic [unintelligible].

**Chair:** Welcome. We see that you have the ever-growing PROSAC packet. Please feel free to digest that if you have any questions or want to discuss certainly your fellow district representative has had great experience here and any of us are open to speaking with you about it.

The only other stuff I'll do in the Chair's report is I have some handouts. There are two items that have been email exchanges between Tom Borden who is sitting behind me and Taylor who is sitting right there. These are addressed to PROSAC so they need to be dispersed, you need to digest them when you have a chance so I'll pass them out and ask you to please pass them on. I don't expect you to read them now. There's a lot of interesting dialog going on in there.

I would also like to take a moment to hand out a motion that was introduced by Supervisor Avalos. Again, please take some time to digest these items, take them to read at your leisure. Any extras just pile at the end.

I don't have much else to report other than the September agenda is starting to shape up. We are going to have Build Public come and do a brief presentation. Stacy has also asked to put an item on the agenda related to SNRAMP which I know is near and dear to some members hearts. I would hope that we have a good attendance for the September meeting and I think we'll keep it fairly simple with those two agenda items unless something else comes up.

**Richard Rothman:** What's the date for this?

**Chair:** The September meeting is the Wednesday after Labor Day. Tiffany can you confirm this. Yes, Tuesday September 6<sup>th</sup> is the next meeting, thank you.

Any public comment on the Chair's report as you've heard it so far?

**Kenneth Maley:** I have a question. If the September agenda is going to be fairly short I'd like to ask the procedure for moving up Item 10 to a little farther on the agenda to discuss potential new agenda items. I've noticed this list for the last several months has stayed fairly static but we continue to have reports added and stuff to the agenda before we get there so I'd like to know if

there's a procedure in the committee for moving that agenda item up either temporarily for September or more permanently because I think that subject deserves more time and attention.

**Chair:** Certainly. Clearly, if it's at the end of the meeting it's harder to address those items.

**Kenneth Maley:** It also doesn't seem to be very moveable and my observation is I think members may have other—I should have said Ken Maley, District 3, I'm sorry. Also, a discussion of adding an agenda item is something that's at least to my fairly new membership is unclear.

**Chair:** I'll address as far as the items that are already on here many of these items are in process, they're people we've asked to present and they haven't been ready to present. The example I can give you is the Community Gardens. I've been asking for a presentation on the Community Gardens for three months. There hasn't really been somebody in a role to actually do that presentation. So that has been sitting there stagnant. With regard to Lenore and Candlestick those are two items that Maya as the District representative is in discussion with members. So it's not that it's stagnant it's that some of these items we wanted to address and they haven't either had a staff member or time to put on the agenda.

**Kenneth Maley:** I would end my comment by asking that there could be other agenda item suggestions that might be more accessible to the committee and so I'd like to ask that at some point that item be a little earlier in the meeting.

**Chair:** Absolutely and I'm more than happy to move it up most likely in September to Item six or seven.

**Kenneth Maley:** Thank you.

**Chair:** Any other member comments on the Chair's report? Any public comment on the Chair's report? This item is closed.

I would like to if this is okay with the body ask for a motion to switch Item #4 with Item #7, 8. Basically I would like to move the Capital Planning report to after Phil's presentation. Can I get a motion?

**Richard Ivanhoe:** Moved.

**Patricia Delgado:** Second.

**Chair:** All in favor?

**All:** Aye.

**Chair:** So moved. Okay. So we are moving agenda Item #4 to Item #7 and moving up all of the other items.

**Female Speaker:** Point of order, we need to hear who did the motion and the second for the record.

**Chair:** For the record, Richard Ivanhoe for the first and Pat Delgado for the second. It was unanimous.

Let's give our attention and focus to Phil Ginsburg, the General Manager of the Recreation and Park Department. Phil, thanks for coming.

**Phil Ginsburg:** Thank you. It's nice to be back. I was here I think a year ago as we were putting together our Strategic Plan and I want to thank you guys very much for your input in what I believe your role in making the Strategic Plan a lot stronger and I also want to thank you for your help with Proposition B, your help and guidance is really I think will allow the Department long after all of us have moved on to other pursuits will help ensure the Department has financial stability and robust planning to make sure that the next generation inherits a park system which is thriving.

Today we wanted to do a couple of things. Everybody knows Tokes who comes pretty often. And you know Stacy Bradley on our acquisition work. I wanted to introduce Keller Emerson and Eric Pulowski who have spent basically since June 7<sup>th</sup> working and thinking through how we develop a set of equity methods which I'm really excited to present and notwithstanding whatever communication breakdowns or drama happen in the board chambers just a little while ago this is a really good start and we're really proud of the data, how it's been collected and what the metrics are. It's iterative. This is our first crack at this and what the charter amendment says is that we are supposed to bring these equity metrics to the Commission for approval. There aren't other entities that are involved in the approval process of the metrics themselves because it was essentially a data exercise.

Then the metrics get rolled into our Strategic Plan and that forms the basis for our annual Operations and Capital plans that will influence our budget and our spending priorities. So we're actually really pleased with the robust planning requirements. They're logical but they do require a certain sequence and we have to start now. So that's why we're here.

What I thought I would do first since I'm here before sharing a little bit of information about our equity metrics is talk about our Strategic Plan. When I came a couple years ago this was in a draft document, it was approved by Commission. I hope you all have this. My one mistake was not bringing a whole bunch of extra copies. We worked this document out. We spent the last year—my executive staff gives me their weekly updates, all of their work needs to be linked to the Strategic Plan, our performance management, performance evaluation system all linked to the Strategic Plan both our organizational values and the work. And it really has guided us.

So our Strategic Plan has five core strategies and then under each strategy is a series of objectives. The Strategic Plan is really the strategies and the mission and vision value, the strategies and the objectives. The initiatives that are listed in the plan is work that we as a Department want to do in furtherance of these objectives in an effort to drive our core methods.

**Taylor Emerson:** 24 of the 82 initiatives are done in the first year. 49 are in progress which leaves 9 or 10 that we haven't really gotten to.

**Phil Ginsburg:** So basically there's a lot of work that's been done and we've accomplished a lot and one of the biggest things that we've accomplished is Prop B which was actually one of our core initiatives.

These were the initiatives that are underneath these strategies and you can see a lot of it is in progress such as working on the 2012 bond, working on acquisitions, the kind of stuff that is so neatly packaged that it can be done in one year. So you can see we really are tracking the work that we've committed to do.

We also said we said under each of the objectives in our Strategic Plan is at least once performance indicator and a target. These were metrics before Proposition B required equity metrics. These are the metrics which guide our Strategic Plan work and I think in this document here which is in your packet you can see our work in our data and collection and again the work that we do, the initiatives, is intended to actually drive the metrics that are under each objective. We have these five core strategies, then we break them down in a little bit more of a refined way, under each strategy there's either two or three objectives. Under each objective there is a metric to see how well are we doing and then the work, the initiatives, are designed to move the metrics.

In year one of Strategic Plan our goal is to capture data so that we can have a baseline. You can see here our efforts in collecting data. There is some data that is year-end data that we're still compiling but where we've got it we've given it to you. So for example in the first six months of fiscal year 16 we had 13,762 individual participants at our recreation program and that's under objective 2.1 which is to strengthen the quality responsiveness and accessibility of our rec programs. We're collecting data on what the year-end will be. I imagine it will be closer to 20 is what I would suspect because we'll have a lot of campers but we do get a lot of repeat customers. That forms the baseline.

So then in future years we can say did we get more people participating in our programs. Similarly, if you look at under objectives, strategy three inspire investment and objective 3.1, increase public investment to better align with infrastructure needs and service expectations. Well, one of the ways we're tracking that is looking at the annual increase in percentage of residents visiting a park at least once a month for the city survey. We know that our benchmark is 72 percent, 72 percent of San Franciscans are visiting a park at least once a month. So we're going to strive for increases and we'll get that data every two years when the Controller does the city survey.

Similarly with park satisfaction you can see the annual increases in percentage of residents who rate overall quality of the park system is good or excellent. Our benchmark is 75 percent and we're going to try to drive that.

If you look at strategy five which is inspire team, that's our internal, really an internal strategy for how well we're doing with our own staff, you're only as good as your own team and you can see we've collected some really interesting data that's going to guide us internally with respect to

our human resources and our organizational development. So for example 67 percent of my staff feel that they have they've got the tools that they need to do the job. I'd like to see that higher.

83 percent feel like they've got the training that they need to do the job. That's pretty good but I'd like to see that a little bit higher too.

Percentage of facilities with high speed internet, 27 percent. That's a big problem for us, connectivity. And that ties into accessibility because that's how your register for classes and programs onsite.

Our customer service rating—annual increase of percentage of residents rating the overall quality of Recreation and Park staff customer service as good or excellent, 78 percent. Pretty good.

So you can see, year one of our Strategic Plan our goal was really to establish these benchmarks.

Where do we go from here? This is a five-year Strategic Plan. We think that the strategies that we worked on with you and our parks community and our own staff are really good and robust and we want to work this plan over the next five or six years. So the basic core strategies and the objectives in the plan are really not going to move. We want to continue to work them. What will evolve as we collect more data we'll be able to gauge a little bit how we're doing compared to this previous year and since we actually have been pretty successful at knocking off some of our initiatives we're going to add new ones and begin to attack those.

So that's the overall update on where we are Strategic Plan. We're going to keep coming back to you because the Proposition B in addition to requiring us to develop equity metrics which we're actually interested enough--the measure doesn't require us to come to you but I feel like we've worked very well with PROSAC on this and we want your feedback on the equity metrics and where we are. We are going to come back to you with a formal Strategic Plan update which is not going to look that different. We'll have some data filled in and we may have some new work initiatives but you can see on the back of this page what our FY 17 priority initiatives some of the work that we want to tackle. So under strategy one which is inspiring play we want to continue to pursue our D6 acquisition and we want to continue our lifecycle analysis which is one of the most important projects we're tackling which is to develop a more comprehensive asset inventory that allows us to do preventative maintenance and develop renewal cycles for our infrastructure assets.

Under play we really want to focus on pedestrian and bike safety. You know that there was a fatality in Golden Gate Park a month and a half ago. It is our belief that there is too much traffic in the park, too many people are using it for commute purposes. We'd like to tackle that. We are in the process of working on the Mansell roadway in McLaren which is awesome. In fact this is an area where McLaren Park is probably ahead of the game on McLaren Park because Mansell is really going to have the pedestrian and bike safety improvements that we need.

The McLaren Bike Park is an exciting play initiative that we're going to tackle this year.

We have a new website and new registration system called Active Net which just went live and will make it much easier for people to register for our programs, to get information about our programs, to manage the waitlist for our programs. It will be translated into a number of different languages, you'll be able to actually you no longer will need a pool script, you actually are going to be able to sign up for a little Recreation and Park tag that will actually automatically charge your swims straight to your account. It's going to be a much more customer service friendly program.

We'll continue to focus on water conservation. We're going to bring the SYNAMP forward which is a really important environmental document and there are going to be stakeholders and you've heard from them over the years that will be unhappy X, Y or Z. But if we're serious about climate change and biodiversity we have to manage our natural resources. It's very serious. That will be an initiative under inspiring stewardship.

Under team in addition to doing a little bit better on tools and training we are—and I want to come to PROSAC to actually show you—Park Stat which is a new data-driven tool that we've developed the first unit for recreation so we know exactly what classes are in what facility and who's registering and it's a really good data capture system and will help us with the equity conversation and will also help us with allocating resources at different sites and know where programs are working and know when they're not.

Also under training we want to start something called RPD University which is an internal professional development and training program in our Department.

So that's just a little bit of a preview of some of the initiatives to come.

The thing that honestly I'm most excited about is our first stab at these equity metrics which I'm going to have Taylor take you through while I help guide the conversation. We have done a lot of homework. There is no park system in the country that has anything close to what you're going to see today. None, zero. Frankly, even though equity has been a big conversation in different city agencies within San Francisco and in different cities across the country we have not identified or stumbled on anything that we think is as robust as the model that we're going to present.

I want to emphasize that it is iterative. That we have to start somewhere and I think that how we've defined where our equity zones, our underserved communities, the data is pretty unassailable and it comes from the State of California and I think you'll see I hope that you would agree that it captures some core concepts in defining underserved communities. After doing that we develop some metrics and we started very broad. We started with a metric that essentially aligns almost with each of our strategies which is we have some metrics to help us gauge how we're doing inside our equity zones with respect to park maintenance, with respect to recreational access, with respect to capital investment and with respect to both financial investment and sweat which is both volunteers and capital dollars.

Basic park access. So it's good. Welcome. I'm going to have Taylor take you through it and guide the conversation along. Here we go.

**Taylor Emerson:** Just as a reminder, the task ahead—this phrase [unintelligible] to be used to establish a baseline of existing Recreation and Park services and resource in low income neighborhoods and disadvantaged communities [unintelligible].

So that was the challenge that we had and when we set about to do some research and benchmarking and peer agencies we found almost nothing. As usual, San Francisco is way out front in social justice kinds of things. In fact, the two most robust examples we found were from other agencies, the San Francisco MTA, MUNI has an equity strategy and the Department of Children, Youth, and Families also has the same phrase in some legislation of theirs also. So they've done an equity analysis as well.

Theirs are both different than each other and ours but I want to take you through ours to show you how to where we got where we are.

We started out looking for what is the definitely of disadvantage. We looked in other public sectors, agencies, and resources and a week into found this incredible tool by the California Environment Protection Agency, that was actually tasked to do it in the State's carbon trading because just as quick background the Governor said 25 percent of the revenue from our carbon trading must go to disadvantaged communities and the legislation says that Cal EPA has to define what disadvantaged communities are.

So they did. It took them years and millions of dollars and they made it open data so that everyone could use it which is great. These are the other agencies that I was able to find using the data that Cal EPA has collected. It's the first statewide standard. So there is local, state and federal legislation that uses that phrase to disadvantaged communities but they all use different definitions of that. So this is an attempt to standardize it by the State of California.

So what it does is looks at the city in terms of census tracts and yes it starts with the 2010 census information but it supplements and enriches that data with other sources. It's called the population characteristics and online it's really amazing, you can click one of these—say H—so the census tract with the most people or the most people who are seniors, those are considered more vulnerable populations. You can click on a map and see just those census tracts with the highest incidence of that characteristic. This map right here is the layer of all of these characteristics equally weighted. So remember that the legislation says low income and disadvantaged, so it's more than just poverty. We interpret that to be these other characteristics that create a disadvantaged.

**Phil Ginsburg:** And to be clear because obviously people will have a different view about this, we didn't interpret anything. These are the population characteristics that the state uses to define an underserved community. So we are trying in this process—and I think this is important—this needs to be linked to actual data as opposed to anecdote because everybody has an experience and so we are really trying to closely align with existing data.

**Taylor Emerson:** Linguistic isolation is an interesting one. You can get just that layer and see. What it means is no one in the household over age fourteen speaks English and there are a

lot of census tracts with a high instance of that and you can imagine it really would create disadvantage in your home.

So the other thing that the Cal EPA data set does is it ranks not just the rate of incidence of these things but it ranks census tracts compared to all census tracts in the State of California. So you could see how San Francisco looks compared to Fresno or your home down. What we were able to do was actually extract just the San Francisco data and then rank the census tracts compared to all San Francisco census tracts. Then what we did was defined disadvantaged as the San Francisco census tracts with the highest 20 percent of those characteristics compared to the city as a whole and then we renamed them equity zones instead of disadvantaged communities.

So let's go back to this. So it would be the darkest purple which is 90-100 and 80-90, the two darkest purple census tracts on here. So this is those layers showing Recreation and Park parks. In the light purple is what we're calling the buffer. That term is from the Rose, you might remember it. This is a five-minute buffer. The Rose in some of theirs uses ten is actually standard.

**Phil Ginsburg:** The reason we don't use ten minutes is because 99.8 percent of San Francisco lives within a ten-minute walk.

**Taylor Emerson:** Regardless of your income level.

**Phil Ginsburg:** We would not be able to create an equity zone using a ten-minute buffer because it would encapsulate all of our parks, the entire city. To be clear—and I think this has come up in a little bit of the debate—the five-minute buffer relates to parks and facilities within five minutes of people living in an equity zone. We're not counting the people that live outside of the equity zone. So the people we're counting or we're referring to are those that live within these two census tracts, the equity zones. But if you live in one of these equity zones it may be that your park and your playground is right outside.

**Taylor Emerson:** Like this one, it's like if you're in that corner of course you're going to cross the street. So we counted those as acknowledgment that you might walk across these imaginary lines to the parks closest to you.

Okay, so when you just use the data it does create some strange bedfellows. I want to point out a few of them. Telegraph Hill Park, Huntington which is actually Hollis P. Huntington Park, it's hard to look at that and think that is in an equity zone.

**Phil Ginsburg:** It's perceived to be pretty well-cared for. Equity zone doesn't mean not well-cared for but it's perceived to be in a posh neighborhood but the truth of the matter is that on one side is Tenderloin and the other side is Chinatown. It's actually in the equity zone. Again, this is a really important point. So the data is the data. I think it would be a mistake for us as park advocates to say well that park deserves to be in, that park doesn't deserve to be in. This is based on data and what the data says is that there are enough people living around Huntington Park in the top twenty percent of incidents of linguistic isolation, poverty, unemployment, low birth rate, asthma. That's what the data says.

**Male Speaker:** Somebody with asthma is hardly going to be able to walk to that park.

**Chair:** I'm sorry sir, if you have a comment you can fill out a blue card.

**Taylor Emerson:** There's also another quirk of the data which we didn't know how this was going to come out at all but when you look at this pocket in the Richmond the buffer goes into Golden Gate Park so we did not count Golden Gate Park. It seems to stretch the imagination even more than Huntington. So we excluded those neighbors acknowledging that of course for these people this is a neighborhood park for sure.

**Phil Ginsburg:** Golden Gate Park is unique, it's a citywide asset. It's got our institutions in it.

**Taylor:** And didn't want to create a situation where Golden Gate Park was listed as an equity park and therefore any dollar we put into it helped our equity analysis. We strove to make it as accurate as possible. And there are some things missing also. The first time we showed this map it's like where are the projects, the Potrero Hill, southern side of Potrero Hill isn't there and that feels inconsistent with the gut also. And all I can imagine is that there is obviously poverty and unemployment there but maybe there isn't as much linguistic isolation. So again, just looking at the whole of what makes a disadvantaged community, it includes poverty but is not only that.

So there's eighty parks on here which is about one-third of our system.

**Jane Weil:** Can I ask that for people that are somewhat geographically challenged in reading a map really just sort of a rough description of like right smack in the middle there's the little sort of rectangle.

**Phil Ginsburg:** The Mission.

**Jane Weil:** Could you do that, like this is the Mission.

**Phil Ginsburg:** Sure. So the Mission. This is sort of the southern waterfront. Bayview. This moves into Excelsior are here. This is Vis Valley down here. This is more Bayview up in here generally speaking. And then moving from east to west, Bayview, Vis Valley area, Excelsior area, Mission. Up here is Tenderloin, Chinatown and pockets of the North Beach area. This is SOMA. In here is Western Addition and in here is mid-Outer Richmond.

**Taylor Emerson:** I think the language isolation score must have been high in the Richmond. It's curious.

So now we have defined what disadvantaged means, the 20 percent highest incidence of these characteristics. We have designated those areas and defined the parks that are in them and then we said about okay what are the things that we could measure that would be proxies. Equity is such a qualitative term and measuring is quantitative so there's apparent tension there. Just looking at what data we have that was available and reliable. GIS information which is awesome

and high tech and we have a couple of great GIS analysts. Park scores is something we have that are very reliable, the Controller audits them, they produce them alongside with us.

**Phil Ginsburg:** They are subjective but we have a good data source for them. These are the Prop C—for those of you who have been around a long time you certainly know them. Between the Controller's Officer and Recreation and Park we actually inspect all of our parks quarterly based on very delineated criteria. There's still some subjectivity of interpretation of how well a park is doing based on that.

**Taylor Emerson:** But they try to train that out of us and we try to adhere to objective measurements. We all have to do it every quarter. It's actually really fun.

We also have our own internal database called TMA which is the system for requesting a work order for fixing a sink or clean up graffiti or irrigation systems.

**Phil Ginsburg:** And what this is—this is the hard core nuts and bolts maintenance requests that are either internal or come through 311. 311 is a broader subset of sometimes they're a little obtuse and they may or may not be things that we can fix or they are things that are very temporal, like I see a pile of stuff here and that stuff may be gone in an hour or whatever. This is our hard cord something is broken, something needs to be fixed, internal maintenance database system.

**Taylor Emerson:** We had the budget, although our budget doesn't budget by park or anything like that, although the Capital budget does have specificity in it so we could use that as a source to evaluate allocations of capital dollars.

Another internal database called Class which is thankfully gone and now upgraded to Active Net which is the way that people sign up for both programs and permits. And then we had internal records from volunteers, things that are not in class like Mobile Rec, free Zumba, those are not in class. Clubhouses are open just for kids after school. Scholarship data was another source. So we kind of collected what is all of our universe of data and then what could we ask of that data that's meaningful. So that's in the next tier of questions is like what speaks for our mission that we can get out of these data sources—geographic access, of course recreation for everyone, something about clean and well-maintained parks, that's what everybody wants, and then investment in parks.

So we then set about data crunching and looked at the list of parks and all the services and resources offered at the sites and counted up what we had and came up with this set of metrics. So the first one is acres of park. So in your handout you should have this charter with the footnotes at the bottom, hopefully they're big enough. The population data just to clarify again this is very out of data, I'm sure it's 875 or something now, it's the 2010 coverage data. So when this comes out, when the American Community Survey comes out next year the 2015 update, we'll be able to update all this.

So, in access to parks the people who live inside the equity zone definitely have more access than people citywide, a higher number of [unintelligible]. Yes, McLaren throws that off, you can see

that in the list. Park scores is the other way. This is by the way FY 15 park scores. We don't yet have FY 16 completed. but I think in the next month or so we'll be able to replace this. Citywide it looks better, the park scores.

**Phil Ginsburg:** It's a differential of 2, 3, 4 percent but that tells us that's a [unintelligible] of work and an area of focus for us. Everybody looks at data based on Supervisorial District but this is the first time we've ever actually looked at the data this way and it's interesting. This isn't a horrible story for me but this says that there's work to be done here and investment to be done. Getting park scores to move by the way, not easy. It's a mix of cleanliness and infrastructure. So this measures is the bathroom clean, it also dings you in there's a crack in the sidewalk or a root coming through a pathway and cleaning a bathroom is pretty easy. Fixing a pathway that's been cracked by a root is much hard.

The Controller recently switched its methodology a little bit throwing our year to year consistency off. Our park scores under the old system on average were in the nineties and they made the criteria a lot more stringent so it dropped citywide from 90 to 85.

**Taylor Emerson:** Out of a 100 points possible. The parks inside got a B, 83.1, as did the parks outside, 85.2 but these a little higher, overall taking the score from each other.

**Phil Ginsburg:** There was deemed to be grade inflation. We were hovering around an A minus for several years. You've probably seen the headlines, park scores at 90, 91, right and the Controller had said anything 80 and above is acceptable. 80 and below needs work. There was a shift in the criteria that made our grades overall throughout the system a little lower so now we're seeing stuff in the mid-80s.

**Taylor Emerson:** And then this is the TMA, maintenance and repair requests completed. This is FY 16 data so we just looked at, let's just choose a park Palega, it had all the TMA work order requests that were initiated and then the ones that were completed during the year and the closure rate for that park. It averaged the closure rates for every park.

**Phil Ginsburg:** I will tell, this is the one for me that is most interesting for me. If you're a student park operations expert where is our structural maintenance yard? It's Golden Gate Park. So we want to make sure that there are a couple of different strategies, we want to make sure that our folks aren't just rolling closest to home. So we're going to pay attention to this. All our maintenance requests come in coded. One is life safety. So life safety gets priority no matter where it is. Then two right now is water conservation and that's been a big reason we've been able to reduce our water use by I think 35 percent. Then three is everything else. Emergency is one, life safety two, water conservation three, everything else four. So your broken swing set is everything else.

**Sharon Eberhardt:** Does each category have a timer? Like the priority ones have to be done within 90 days?

**Phil Ginsburg:** It's not as easy as just wiping over graffiti. They have to be scoped.

**Sharon Eberhardt:** I ask because I hear people complaining about work orders months and sometimes years to get completed so that's why I ask that question.

**Phil Ginsburg:** It depends on what the fix is. We have a general standard—graffiti should be once it's called in within 48 hours and I think we keep data on that. We're in the 90s on that, we're pretty good. Again, emergencies are an emergency. And we do every year we look at our close-out rates of TMA and there is a percentage of emergencies that get done, they're close to 100 percent. Life safety pretty gosh-darn close to 100 percent. Water conservation should be. It's a little bit lower but much higher than it's ever been. The backlog is everything else. That crack in the path if it's presenting a health and safety issue because it's that severe or it causes ADA access issues maybe that gets prioritized but if it's just a cracked curb that's where our backlog. Again, we have over \$1 billion of deferred maintenance.

**Taylor Emerson:** Moving down into the investment category we looked at dollars of investment and this was using the annually appropriated capital budget which is a bunch of different sources, it's General Funds and in this case this year and last year a bunch of development fee dollars. So the cranes in the sky do trickle down to money for parks and there's money in here for acquisitions, money to expand the scope at Margaret Hayward, all from development fees.

**Phil Ginsburg:** This is everything in the Capital A and is a mix of three sources. This is General Fund Capital dollars. It is bond dollars—well, actually four sources—bond dollars, development dollars, impact fees, and then four is grants and philanthropy. That all goes in this category. This is the thing where I remember talking about the 2012 bond and those of you advocating on behalf of McLaren Park or those of you advocating on behalf of SOMA, District 6 or advocating on behalf of Mission you should feel very proud of this. We might have some maintenance problems up here but look at the new investment, where the new investment is going. It's pretty dramatic.

**Taylor Emerson:** The first time we did this number it was even more crazy skewed so Phil had to go back and look at the last three years. This is an average of the last three years.

**Phil Ginsburg:** This is a three-year rolling average and the reason we do that is because first of all capital project budgets last longer than a single, capital funding is lumpy, it depends on the timing of when bonds are issues. So you can get a little bit more—you get a better picture over a 36-month horizon of what we're doing on capital than on a 12-month.

**Taylor Emerson:** Hours of volunteer service are sweat equity. This analysis is unfortunately timed, we're replacing the volunteer database and so we're not going to have that data quite yet but we'll have it by the next time we come back in September.

**Phil Ginsburg:** Let's talk about this one because I think Tom I think this was another one that I think you have actually commented on. These are all really interesting points. We wanted to track this because this is a form of investment. Not everybody has philanthropic dollars to spend. This is sweat and yes it comes from neighborhoods who care about their parks but it also comes from we get a lot of corporate volunteerism, it's a big chunk and I think regardless of

where you are from—first of all, you don't—these hours don't get recorded unless it's a project that is actually sponsored by the Department with Department staff. So we made decisions about where we are bringing volunteers and volunteer hours all the time and we're open to debate about this but I think it's very relevant to make sure that we are cultivating volunteerism and cultivating corporate volunteerism in the parks that need it most. It would be very easy—every corporate group that wants to come in wants to do Stow Lake, they do, or the Rose Garden. They all want to come to Golden Gate Park and we actually aggressively say you know what we've got some other projects for you. We actually are trying to steer volunteer projects, we've gone to Bayview Playground quite a bit, we've gone to the Tenderloin quite a bit. I do happen to think this is an important indicator of equity.

**Taylor Emerson:** Recreation. So the heart and soul of what we're doing here, providing recreation. Recreational resources—the intention here was to include everything provided by Recreation and Park staff or overseen by staff or our recreation partners. So Self Help for the Elderly is at Betty Ann Ang Rec Center on Wednesday or Vis Valley Y has a clubhouse that they activate.

So we counted all of those forms of structured hours of recreation, all together. This one was really—I was nervous pressing the Excel button to do the calculation. We really had no idea how it was going to come out. In eighteen years of working for the city I had—you know, I'm used to doing everything in units of eleven. This is a completely different paradigm so we were excited to see and it does look good which kind of made us nervous. We did all the calculations over and over but I think it does also reflect that equity has long been a guiding principle in our elevation decisions and we have the data now to show it.

Scholarships granted per 1000 people. Yes, of course, let's hope it's going to be higher. We were all gratified to see okay, good, our business model works. We sent Lillian out to 75 different community activities to get the word out and yes the word is getting out or what's needed citywide.

**Phil Ginsburg:** Honestly, we had people that qualify for scholarships all over the city regardless of whether you live in an equity zone or not.

**Taylor Emerson:** We map every address of every recipient.

**Phil Ginsburg:** And to get a scholarship is based on very specific eligibility. What is important for you here is outreach and are we getting into communities that we need to be getting into.

**Taylor Emerson:** This is the proposal.

**Phil Ginsburg:** It's not really a proposal. This is our first crack at this. Again, I want to go back to where we started because this is iterative, this should be thoughtful and kind of academic and if there are other metrics where we've got good data over time we can add things to look at. You have to actually have good data. This is our first crack in year one.

**Kenneth Maley:** Questions—Kenneth Maley District 3. We have here several pages of the proposed Strategic Plan and then we've just gone through defining equity by metrics and we've identified 80 parks as equity zones. I'd like to ask if you could give a little insight into how does the Department reconcile resources and addressing those resources to equity in alignment with the Strategic Plan but also how they're allocated between the equity and citywide plans. You've got these elements but where is the connecting factor between deciding where that 55,000 or whatever it is number and investment how is that determined. And I think also an alignment with the Strategic Plan goals.

**Phil Ginsburg:** I look at this as the equity metrics get to tell us where we're doing okay and where we're not. Don't forget, this is the first time that we've done this. A lot of our initiatives in here actually do speak to projects and things that are in equity zones. We also have general buckets in our general funding buckets in our General Fund maintenance budget for court resurfacing or erosion control or various fixes that are not site specific. They're general buckets. But now that can actually influence what parks were targeted because now we know what parks are within this equity zone.

So I think over time—and again if there are other metrics where we have good data we would look at them too to see how well we're doing with resources and where the data can tell a story, right, like the structural maintenance yard gets dispatch, so hours in a park isn't really good data for us. Even hours in a park for—we have a lot of roving crews, roving apprentices, roving whatever. So it's like the data actually has to kind of make sense.

**Kenneth Maley:** But where within the Department are these resources compared to the data and that allocation?

**Phil Ginsburg:** You'll see it in two primary places which is in our operating budget each year and in our capital budget each year going forward. So remember—we're operating now under our 16-17 budget which was done and put to be before this ballot measure passed so really these equity metrics are going to be a starting point for when we submit our Operations and Capital plans along with our budget for next year. Ken, the last thing I'll say is this is the most concrete stat.

**Kenneth Maley:** My final comment is that I would encourage including in the strategic plan the enforcement of dog leash laws. I couldn't find that anywhere but that's related to maintenance, it's related to enforcement, it's related to Park Ranger enforcement.

**Phil Ginsburg:** I think what we say there which is more generally under the objective rather than an initiative which is steward and promote good park behavior which is really where that belongs.

**Kenneth Maley:** I know that in my neighborhood park it's the biggest issue of maintenance and destruction to the park may exist.

**Phil Ginsburg:** We agree. And so one of things that we try to do, we just opened—we're trying to work on new off-leash dog parks to inspire people to bring their dogs. We've talked

about creating community ambassador programs. We've talked about increasing the size of our park rangers. There are a lot of Park Code sections that we should be enforcing but we don't specifically say those. But you are correct that it is our responsibility along with all of you to help us steward park behavior. In fact I think one of our initiatives is supposed to be to work with you on helping to create a—

**Kenneth Maley:** Enforcement is the key issue here!

**Phil Ginsburg:** Work with PROSAC. 4.3, increase echo-literacy of park users [unintelligible] dogs are probably included in that but you're right.

**Kenneth Maley:** We are where we are with the problem because of a lack of enforcement.

**Chair:** Ken, I think just to speak for the Department's sake I think it's simply due to the fact that they have nine Park Rangers.

**Kenneth Maley:** Well, that's why I say in the initiative going back to the increased Park Rangers is important as well as education.

**Phil Ginsburg:** We're in the process of filling a bunch of Park Ranger vacancies. I'm pleased that we've gone under my tenure from 9 to 45 Park Rangers. So we now will have enough to have 4-5 Park Rangers on each shift. Don't forget there will not be 45 Park Rangers on at once because we operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. But we have 4-5 rangers on three shifts and sometimes they will overlap so there will be more. Now, again, there's an attrition rate. People get sick, people go on vacation, people get hurt. So you know that's good. We actually did this analysis and we talked to you about it last year. We think we need to be at 85. You are someone who is pro-enforcement on dog leash laws. As you know there's a community that disagrees with you. So what we do is we do target and spot enforcement education. We don't automatically site. We educate and then when someone continues to violate we issue a citation. We pick different parks and part of that is based on where we know we have dog challenges. We take your feedback seriously.

**Chair:** Ken, I'm pro-enforcement. I'm a dog owner. I try to find myself in a off-leash dog area as much as possible. I believe that when the Department puts resources into off-lease dog areas as we saw last week I have between 200 and 1000 dogs use the Lafayette Park Area. So I think part of it is to provide and an area, not just enforcement. In Lafayette the dogs used to run amuck and the Department could have made a lot of money sitting there writing tickets. But the reality is when they built something that people could use now there are must less incidents. I would say 80 percent less. So the reality is once they can muster enough to put something there—and part of this unfortunately isn't their problem it's that the city has a moratorium or there was a moratorium on new DPAs. Clearly the Department understands the need—there's an ever-growing population. It's either you're a responsible dog owner or you're not and if you're not then you fall into the percentage of people who are unfortunately part of the problem rather than the solution. So certainly your point is well taken. Richard.

**Richard Rothman:** District 1. A couple comments. One under where it says FYI priority incentives inspired to play safety and bicycle to and through the parks. McLaren Park I think Golden Gate Park, Fulton Avenue. For District 1 residents is very challenging to get into Golden Gate Park walking across Fulton Street. I live on 38<sup>th</sup>, I won't cross Fulton rarely. I have to go to 36<sup>th</sup> to the light. And the senior center is on 37<sup>th</sup>. I don't know if MTA is going to put up a light but I hope you would work with the District 1 residents to slow down the traffic on Fulton so District 1 residents can cross the street safely there. And then the other object, what I talked about last year, the object 1.4 the cultural resources and if Recreation and Park is going to list buildings there I think they should add the Mother's Building and also what I think is going to be a big challenge is 900 Innes Avenue. I saw it a couple weeks ago and it has a lot of potential but I think it's really a challenge. If you're going to add things or maybe make a general statement saying Recreation and Park has cultural resources and we need to take care of our cultural resources as we take care of our natural areas too. If you're going to single out certain buildings and put other buildings in there like you put the completion of the Murphy and Dutch windmills so if you're going to add that I would add the Mother's Building and 900 Innes or just put a general statement that the park's goal is to fix all the cultural resources.

**Phil Ginsburg:** As you look at the Strategic Plan I ask that you focus primarily on the strategies and objectives and the strategy with respect [unintelligible] we do talk about supporting opportunities for safe bicycling to and through parks and increasing opportunities for recreational bicycling within parks which is sort of a general statement and you are going to see some work on bike safety in a number of parks in the coming years.

With respect to cultural resources Richard you've been a long champion of that. We had some other project that were specifically referenced but preserving and celebrating our historic and cultural resources is an objective in our Strategic Plan. We definitely take that seriously and one of the first things we did was actually reserved a certain percent of our deferred maintenance funds for evaluation and or stabilization of historical resources. We know that you are a champion of the Mother's Building and we get that. It does happen to be—while it is within Recreation and Park jurisdiction it is also in the Zoo and there is a little bit of sort of—well, we're working on it, right? Hopefully we'll get there. You did amazing work for Coit Tower and those mural at the Mother's Building deserve to be preserved and that building should be utilized but we have a key partner there that needs to drive that.

**Jane Weil:** District 6. Looking at footnote #2 where basically the six parks that you have acquired that are actively acquired and in development. So 17<sup>th</sup> and Folsom, Noe Valley, Town Square, etc. I think it would be very helpful and actually more accurate to include them in both the acres per thousand people category because they are actively acquired and in development. So I don't know if it's possible. I wouldn't think it would be that hard to add those, you know what you paid for them.

**Taylor Emerson:** We do actually count the dollars for those.

**Phil Ginsburg:** We counted the dollars but we didn't count the parks because they're not open yet so they don't really impact—you have to look at all of the data. So we don't have recreation there because the parks aren't open yet. We can't really gauge maintenance and park

scores because they're not open yet, volunteerism because they're not open yet. The dollars themselves were actually—that's why we went back three years, that's captured in this stat.

**Jane Weil:** That wasn't clear. Still, I would be fairly interested. I don't know, it's kind of what you were saying earlier when you pushed the button on the data you don't really know how it's going to come out but I would be curious to see how it comes out, how those six acquisitions affect the access in the equity zones. I don't know if you can do that and just punch that number in. I would be curious.

**Phil Ginsburg:** We can take a look at it. I think most of them are in terms of acres with the exception of Innes. Well the Innes site is only 900 Innes. And by the way India Basin Richard just getting back to that, that's one of our key park development projects in the next five years. That may or may not drive the acre piece because after the acquisitions they're not super large parcels but we can figure it out.

**Tom Valtin:** District 9. I apologize that I was late. I'm look at the art, the graphic that appears on the front of this and puzzling over it only because it seems to me it follows something that Recreation and Park strives for, equity is I'm sure something that Recreation and Park strives for, but I don't understand these are two separate objectives or if we're trying to move from quality to equity. I wouldn't be able to explain this graphic to somebody.

**Phil Ginsburg:** Let me take a stab at it. In some of the National Park conversation equity is an issue that we all are very—we tend to live in a bubble here but these are conversations that are happening all over the country and I've had an opportunity to participate in some big city urban park conversations where we're learned about the concept of equity. There is a distinction—and this is a pretty well-known academic slide actually—and a quality is good but as you can see the boost that people of three different heights is the same but it means that the smallest person still doesn't get to see over the fence. Whereas equity is helping the person that—it might mean a larger pedestal, a larger stool to help that person see over the fence.

**Tom Valtin:** A larger stool translated to easier access?

**Phil Ginsburg:** I would say to achieve an objective equality is not necessarily equitable. Equity might mean taking our communities as they are because equality if you go back to the map that we did the whole point of this exercise is I think if you really looked at how we do our business it's very easy to make a case that we're equal. I think the purpose of the language that was in the ballot measure is that we have some communities that are underserved because of their social demographic and those seven characteristics that were up here whether because of education or isolation or poverty or unemployment and I certainly believe that parks for those communities are perhaps even more important than for other communities that have more means at their disposal. Parks are important for everyone so it's tough to make that generalization but the idea of equity is to support, to make sure that we're really supporting our underserved communities.

**Tom Valtin:** Is the equality, the graphic here, is this undesirable?

**Phil Ginsburg:** It's not undesirable it's just a mere statement sometimes it's a difference.

**Tom Valtin:** Can one have equity without equality?

**Phil Ginsburg:** It's a fun conversation. This is really a national academic graphic about equity and I think it's making the point that equity might mean equality but equality doesn't necessarily mean equity.

**Chair:** I just want to chime in and say on the surface I think it's easy to say it looks like you're trying to be balanced. In this room everybody has their own District at heart, they have their neighborhood at heart, and I think it's important to recognize that what somebody might see—that you guys might see something through the data or on the surface but other members might see something for themselves and so I think part of this discussion is always to leave the equity piece open-ended so that other metrics can play a part once you get a baseline. Once you see it—because what you're presenting to us, the numbers seem very good but again I think in engaging with us and us going back to our districts you present the opportunity for us to continue to make your numbers better and that's I think again Tom's trying to understand it from his perspective. I think Maya's up next and she's going to try to understand it from her perspective.

**Phil Ginsburg:** That's exactly the reason why we think the data is really important here both in defining equity and selecting metrics. Because everybody looks at life through their own lens and that is appropriate it's hard to actually ground that conversation when it's totally subjective. So that's why we've really tried to be quantitative here rather than qualitative.

**Chair:** Understood. I think you'll probably see a time that having both. Everybody is going to have feedback.

**Maya Rogers:** District 10. The first thing I said is this is awesome. I've seen it before. I like the idea of it because it's very true. So the equality is I think in this city is something that is talked about a lot and is very coined and equity is more of where we want to be because I feel like we can give everyone a dollar but everyone will look at that like somebody may be like that is the only dollar I'm going to get for the next year and then somebody may be like I'll throw that over there with the other \$100 I have. I feel like the measures that are used are good and I agree with it being a draft and that is a conversation that has to happen because there are pockets of the city that aren't reflected but that I think it's a good first step.

**Patricia Delgado:** District 9. I think we also have to remember that these numbers are not static. They will change because each neighborhood changes and as each neighborhood changes then the data that you're going to be capturing is going to be [unintelligible]. We need to look at this and remember that it's only a picture. It's like a financial record. It's just a snapshot of the time because there used to be a lot of Irish and German and Italian in the Mission. They're almost all gone. The neighborhoods change.

**Phil Ginsburg:** I think we're on the verge of getting the 2010 census data which may actually alter the demographics a little bit. This is guide us. For those trying to come up with some sort of formula that's going to link a dollar of investment to an output here that really can't happen and I

would encourage—if you agree with it I would encourage you to remind your constituents and your elected of that fact. This is a guide and I will tell you that there is not another park system in the country right now which is proposing to make sure that as we define it at a moment in time that we are doing right by our underserved communities. This guides policy conversation. Is this right or have we over-invested in equity zones. I don't know. We have a responsibility to our entire park system. This is a guide for our conversation. Where should we be with respect to hours of recreational resources or maintenance and repair request completed. I would argue that I would like to see our equal or higher than the citywide average within our equity zones. Again, I think over time we would be also very open to looking at other metrics provided that we can really capture reliable data.

**Chair:** Are there any other questions from members?

**Richard Ivanhoe:** District 5. Will updates to these be available online? There's a lot of things that will be completed in September or fiscal year 16-17.

**Phil Ginsburg:** Right now our plan is to have our Commission take a lot at these metrics and what the charter language says is this doesn't—so the equity metrics helped build our Strategic Plan update because our next update which we wanted to bring to our Commission in September needs to have the equity metrics incorporated and so we wanted to share them with you before they were finalized. So we would bring those to the Commission, we would then do an update on our strategic plan which may have a sprinkling of new initiatives. It's going to look a lot the same but it will have a report out on how we did on year one with our various initiatives and where they are and it will have our metrics. That will form the basis for year two.

**Linda D'Avirro:** Is that data going to be available to all of us that you presented here?

**Taylor Emerson:** The equity measures?

**Linda D'Avirro:** The whole thing.

**Phil Ginsburg:** You might have to give us a specific data set. We are very much a believer in open source data so if you're technologically sophisticated most of our data already is open source data. I think we have some records on what locations Mobile Rec is. We have a little bit of our data is not open source but we're pretty transparent so if there's something—

**Linda D'Avirro:** At some point in the future I would be able to pull this in between the time that you report back?

**Taylor Emerson:** I don't anticipate updating them mid-year.

**Linda D'Avirro:** So it's not live data.

**Taylor Emerson:** No.

**Phil Ginsburg:** This required a tremendous amount of—I mean Eric and Taylor have literally spent the last four to five months analyzing our various data.

**Jordyn Aquino:** District 4. I want to ask a question and it's mainly about the TMA maintenance. Is that open source?

**Phil Ginsburg:** I believe it is? No? It's not open source?

**Jordyn Aquino:** Is it possible to track and monitor work orders or repairs? [simultaneous comments]

**Taylor Emerson:** We're getting more I don't want to say tech savvy but the future is more data and reporting.

**Phil Ginsburg:** We're working with the Controller's Office right now actually on a new TMA. So first of all one of the reasons you can't pull it is because it's not web based yet. Believe it or not it's client based, so it sits on individual laptops. We are working on both a cloud based model and a mobile TMA which we want to get to the point where right now when our staff or a complaint comes in they have to go to a desktop and enter it whereas being able to enter it by phone. I think that once if you're tech savvy which it sounds like you are once it's cloud based and mobile based I think the data will be more manipulatable by the public.

**Richard Rothman:** District 1. So the next update won't be until the census in 2020 then?

**Phil Ginsburg:** No, midyear.

**Taylor Emerson:** 2015, it's called the American Community Survey, it's like a mid-point census. It's smaller but they extrapolate and use the same methods. So that should be available in 2017.

**Richard Rothman:** Will that cover all these that Phil is pointing to there?

**Taylor Emerson:** I'd have to go back to that screen. This is the second iteration of data that they've released. It's now 2.0. So I don't know.

**Richard Rothman:** What year is this, is this still 2010?

**Taylor Emerson:** This is actually—the population is 2010 but they enriched it with additional data sources in 2.0.

**Eric Pawlowsky:** The population figures on based on the 2010 annual.

**Richard Rothman:** So this is 2010 data.

**Taylor Emerson:** Yes.

**Eric Pawlowsky:** The metrics where they collect low birth weight—this is all online. For example low birth weight is a data set that's over a two-year period so you have to cross-reference that.

**Phil Ginsburg:** It's called Cal Enviro Screen. This is a State website and their methodology is on their site.

**Taylor Emerson:** You go to [unintelligible] and you look for this which is a Division and they you look for this, that's the data and it's fascinating if you're from California and look at your home town, it's really interesting.

**Phil Ginsburg:** That data is absolutely accessible. This required months of work by some data analysts. If you guys have specific questions or want to see specific data we want you to be comfortable with it. We won't be transparent. You're more than welcome to come in and sit with Taylor and Eric a little bit and they can kind of who you the methodology and remember this is a thirty-year project, this is year one of a thirty-year project So this will iterate and this will get more technologically sophisticated, more transparent, etc.

**Chair:** Thank you very much, I know this was a lot of work. Thank you for the presentation. Before I open it up to public comment I'd also like to recognize the working group that came and met with Phil and his staff last week, that's Linda D., Robert Brust and Jordan contributed to that. I would like to charge you with continuing this dialog with the Department and bring us an update at any point that you feel we need to be engaged in this discussion.

Are there any other questions from the members? Hearing none, I am going to open the floor to public comment. I have three public comments. I will remind you our rules are a two-minute presentation and you cannot ask staff directly any questions, you can ask the members but you cannot ask the staff directly. So I'll start with Tom Borden who you've seen and have his email exchanges with Taylor. Tom, two minutes.

**Tom Borden:** You'll notice there's a fatal flaw in the calculation technique that's being used here. It can be fixed and it's reflected in the fact that the calculation doesn't work for Golden Gate Park and it's also reflected in the scores that they've already shown you where somehow miraculously there's 29 percent more parkland per capita, 2.9 times the capital investment per capita and 67 percent more recreational resources per capita than the average resident receives. Why is that? If you have an equity zone and it's surrounded by other regular zones and there's a part the resources of that park are shared with all of those zones, every one of the census zone tracts. So if you have a hundred picnic table, twenty tennis courts, fourteen Zumba classes, whatever, the way their systems works right now is that that equity zone if it buffers or touches that park it gets 100 percent of those resources where in actuality those resources are shared. There's a finite number of picnic tables, there's a finite number of places to put your beach towel on the ground, they're all shared. And so the way it really should be done is you should go park by park and say okay here's the population within striking range of this park, we're going to split the assets per capita amongst all of those people and then that equity zone gets that per capita loading times their population and from there you can build this model up. So that's the problem,

it's not an apples to apples comparison what they're doing. It can be fixed and it's not that hard to fix it. That's what needs to be done here to get meaningful numbers.

**Chair:** Thank you. Jamie Whitaker.

**Jamie Whitaker:** My name is Jamie Whitaker, I live in District 6 South of Market. I wanted to thank the staff for working on the different sources and I have some suggestions for others. But first I want to recommend maybe doing a survey like they use next door at the MTA, Planning Department, some of the other City Departments are utilizing nextdoor.com to do surveys, a survey monkey or whatever, and get tons of input but I know there's a lot of smart people here in San Francisco that might know some other data sources that are good for this equity metric. One thing I wanted to mention because I live in Rincon Hill where the 400 foot tower, 600 towers of residential are going up alongside 110 unit supportive housing buildings, all affordable [unintelligible] building, sometimes the measures get a little diminished, in other words if you just look by zip code there's a median income of \$170,000 which sounds crazy, right? That includes that 110 unit supportive housing building. So with the Rose, with the Planning Department, I cajoled them into using census blocks rather than census tracts. It's really important in mixed used parts of the city—Bayview, South of Market, the Mission, because we have these residential buildings but you also have these huge commercial buildings and roadways that are taking up a lot of space. Harvey Rose did a report—this is from the June 5<sup>th</sup>, 2013 budget committee, Supervisor Avalos asked them to prepare an equity report and I think that's where the impetus District 6 has the least amount of park space table comes from, from .17 acres per thousand residents or 12.2 acres total. So I think they source the Trust for Public Land park score so maybe that's something to look into. Also consider workday population, they have the plazas that are built with the buildings but they also have dogs and other stuff. So I think the main thing is I would suggest going out for some community input because there might be some other great resources out there for us to utilize.

**Chair:** Thank you. The final card is from Otto.

**Otto Duffy:** I live in the North of Market sometimes called the Tenderloin. I'm listening. I haven't made up any minds about it but I did notice a technical thing when you opened up with Huntington Park which stretches the imagination a little bit that provides service to the Tenderloin and what I think is that you didn't maybe take into account topography when you came up with the margin zones there. If you figure there's a lot of mobility impaired people in the Tenderloin one mile an hour is probably the maximum they're going to do on a hill and that's really just one block or even less than one block and in fact having lived there for a long time let me tell you it's not a big draw for people in the Tenderloin. You see them going to Civic Center here, you know the flatter areas, the Yerba Buena Garden, Union Square, but personally it's just a technical thing because I've been to all the parks all over San Francisco and I don't think I have a baby memory in any of them, I'm particularly fond of West Sunset Park which is in District 4, my ancestral homeland that had famed battles between the Pen Arms and the Lugheads. It was a while ago.

**Chair:** Thank you. Do I have any other public comment? Hearing none this item is close. Thank you again very much. Mr. Toks Ajike is going to give us the Capital Planning update.

**Toks Ajike:** I'm with the Recreation and Park Capital Division. I intend to keep my report very short.

I am happy to announce to you that we are getting new project managers, they are going to be replacing two that were lost, Marvin Yee and Karen. The two project managers one of them is Ann Baskerville, she is coming from the GGNRA. She's a project manager and we're very excited to have her. And also Brett Desmarais and he is very the private sector. We're excited about him coming aboard also. We're working on project allocations that they're going to be working on.

I want to announce that we had the first official opening to the first all synthetic DPA at Lafayette Park, we're very excited about it. It was a very good day. This is sort of a cast pilot that we're doing in terms of sustainability for our parks and also access as Phil mentioned.

We continue to make progress in our 2012 bond program. We had the second meeting to Washington Square children's playground about two weeks ago, it was well attended. We also had our first community meeting for Merced Heights, that was a good meeting also. Also last Saturday we had the huge McLaren treasure hunt, a huge success.

Last but not least I am happy to announce that we will be starting Balboa Pool renovation, the actual construction itself 1<sup>st</sup> of September so thanks for your patience. It should be done in about twelve months. That's my report.

**Chair:** Any questions for Toks? We'll start with Pat.

**Patricia Delgado:** Two questions—Garfield Pool and also 17<sup>th</sup> and Folsom. Any updates?

**Toks Ajike:** So on 17<sup>th</sup> and Folsom the actual construction started about two months ago. It's actually going well. I think we are going to be done on time, earlier. So things are going quite well on that. On Garfield Pool we are planning in having the next community meeting in September, we'll be doing some data and design work with [unintelligible] by internal staff but I think we'll have the next meeting in September.

**Chair:** Any other questions? Richard Rothman.

**Richard Rothman:** District 1. So after Balboa then Garfield then Rossi?

**Toks Ajike:** That is correct.

**Richard Rothman:** So Rossi is about two years?

**Toks Ajike:** Yes.

**Richard Rothman:** Also, we talked about maybe putting a mural on the outside of the building.

**Chair:** Jordyn.

**Jordyn Aquino:** District 4. Toks I was wondering if you had an update about West Sunset Playground and 43<sup>rd</sup> boat playground what's the status?

**Toks Ajike:** So the West Sunset boat restroom is actually in design, we're about 60 percent complete on that. We intent to be done in about two months so that would put it out to bid and get it done. I think we're still about six to seven months out before actual construction starts.

**Chair:** Any other member questions?

**Toks Ajike:** West Sunset also—so West Sunset is starting on Thursday.

**Chair:** Any other questions? Since Toks brought it up I get to say something about it. I obviously have been a spearhead for having artificial turf on Lafayette Park DPA. It has taken years, two project managers in addition to Toks. Mary Hobson was the first one, Margot was the second one. There was no funding. I want speak to Dawn about it but Dawn said there's no way, go away, that's what she said to me. It took a lot of work and a lot of time and now I see a lot of happy faces, mostly adult humans, plenty of dogs.

We're super thankful to be a pilot because the hope is that this creates sustainability, this creates a way to have user-friendly dog parks. Our park would be flooded for two, three, four months out of the year and unusable by the dog owners. What did that mean? It meant that they used the rest of the park which meant that there were enforcement issues. So again, this all works back to if you build it correctly they'll come and so I have to give the Department some love for that because again this wasn't because anyone was special, it was that the squeaky wheel gets the grease and so squeak my friends. You need to have dialog with these people. You can't expect that it happens without consistent effort and I know most of you do that. I just want to tell you that after tireless effort it paid off and we love what we have now. I would say it's about 98-2 on the love to hate scale and that's about what you hope for in DPA. So anybody who needs some DPA love some see a brother and we'll talk DPA.

**Female Speaker:** The dogs actually like the artificial turf?

**Chair:** They actually have no—most of them can't tell the difference, they don't care.

**Female Speaker:** But they like to dig in the dirt.

**Chair:** Sure they do. And what does that create? A maintenance problem, that's what.

**Female Speaker:** They do like to do that though.

**Chair:** They might like to do that and there are probably plenty of places for them to do that but in this particular urban environment where we have very limited resources for dogs and they seem to be getting more and more limited this area is like almost an acre of free-wheeling dog fun.

**Female Speaker:** How do you clean it up?

**Chair:** Actually, the sprinkler was designed very well. The sprinkler system comes up through the artificial turf and it actually washes the turf. Generally that sprinkler system goes off around 3:00 a.m. so when we come out in the morning it's clean.

**Female Speaker:** So nobody has to actually go out there and scrub?

**Chair:** Only me. So thank you for your report Toks. Any other public comment? Being none, public comment is closed. Thank you

Let's move on to the last couple of item on the agenda. We're at announcements. I'd like to make one. Anybody else who has announcements please think about them for a moment.

I'd like to make an announcement that Matt O'Grady who was formerly the head of the S.F. Parks Alliance is no longer the head. This occurred about four days ago, three days ago. Rachel Norton is the acting Director of the Parks Alliance now and I believe that at some point she will hand that over to somebody who they choose. I also heard that Julie Richards is gone too.

**Male Speaker:** Do you have more information?

**Chair:** No, I don't. Unfortunately I don't have more information. So what I would suggest is that for those of you who have park groups that are registered with the Parks Alliance I would immediately find out who your next person to talk to is. Friend of Lafayette Park which I'm a part of is consistently having dialog with them and I don't have any more answers than you do but I will say as the Chair of PROSAC I will inquire with them about what the next steps are so that I can bring that to you in a Chair's report next month.

**Female Speaker:** [unintelligible]

**Chair:** I follow them on Twitter and I follow them on Facebook and there's been no official announcement so I would really suggest for those of you who are engaged with them to continue your dialog with whoever—with Steve Swaggart for now and when that changes it changes.

Any other announcements? Linda.

**Linda D'Avirro:** August 20<sup>th</sup> we kick off our fourth of Saturday in the Park, McLaren. I hope you can join us for the free concerts. Our very first concert is going to be a Latin jazz concert featuring Louis Ramero, he is very well known, he's like the father of Latin jazz. We're also going to have Alphonzo Lopez whose sister happens to be Ariana Lopez and he's known very

well in the theater side of the house as well as musically. They put together something that Ariana was the star of in the Mission last year and it was very successful.

So that will start at 1:00 on August 20<sup>th</sup>, Saturday. That should be a really great show.

The following weekend we have a return of Martin Luther McCoy who is going to do acoustic soul. Last year was a fabulous array of different performers and he hasn't told us who his lineup is but I'm sure it's going to be fabulous.

**Chair:** It's pretty fabulous. I've been getting some little hints.

**Linda D'Avirro:** Don't miss it. See you there.

**Chair:** I would really upsell both shows but specifically Martin's show. It's just not to be missed. I mean here's a guy who is from the community, he is from that area. He farms talent from all over the Bay Area. He's dropped names and again I don't know how many of these people you're know but Fantastic Negrito is one, Cody Chestnut. I mean he's talking about bringing in mainstream acts for a free concert on a Saturday afternoon.

**Linda D'Avirro:** August 27<sup>th</sup> for Martin and August 20<sup>th</sup> will be Louis Romero.

**Chair:** Maybe next year we can live stream for those of you who can't come. I would really encourage what's left of us in this room please tell your people about it. We're trying to get the word out. We have a kid's show in September. We have a blues show in October.

**Linda D'Avirro:** There is construction going on so part of [unintelligible] is close but the amphitheater is open.

**Chair:** And Linda has promised to drive you, just call her and she'll pick you up. Any other announcements? Is there any public comment? Being none, public comment is closed.

I do want to touch on two quick things. Ken makes a good point that we perhaps need to bring new business up in the agenda and I will discuss that with Tiffany when we do our call. I would ask of those of you who attend this meeting regularly if you do have ideas drop me an email rather than bringing it up at the meeting send me an email and say hey I'd really like to hear this. Jane did it, it took months, a couple months to talk to [unintelligible] but we're bring them here at our request. So again please feel free to have that dialog that's part of my role to kind of shape the agenda.

**Female Speaker:** What's your email address?

**Chair:** Standout1@earthlink.net. Thank you Phil. [applause]

I have just one other item and it's how I started this meeting and it's not really directed at all of you but I feel like each one of us devotes time to this committee. You choose to be on this committee. If you cannot RSVP or you cannot give us the decency of saying you're going to

come and then come then you shouldn't be on this committee. Again, I'm not saying it for your benefit because you're here. I really feel strongly that if we are going to be instrumental in our role here what our charge is then we have to show up and in past administrations of this it was kind of let go and meetings went by the wayside or were cancelled because there wasn't enough attendance. So I just want to stress to you please. Again, it's not for my benefit, it's certainly not for Tiffany's benefit. Her and I have had an ongoing dialog since Thursday is it happening, is it not happening. But then when you start to involve other people, staff, the public, it's just not fair. So again this isn't for you, this is really big picture this is for everybody else, this is for the record so that the other members can hear this. Again, I have people that haven't RSVP'd to this meeting and that's unacceptable to me. Again, it take one email, that's all I'm asking. Yes Sharon?

**Sharon Eberhardt:** I had problems today because my car is in the shop. I tried to get a hold of Tiffany by email but she told me she's only there until 4:00 o'clock and hasn't had access to her computer afterwards. So I asked her for a phone number but that probably won't work either.

**Chair:** My phone number is in the spread, Maya texted me, Tom Valtin texted me.

**Sharon Eberhardt:** The only question I had to ask, I needed to know whether you had more than twelve people. If you would have had thirteen people then I wouldn't have come. I can't help it. I can't worry about whether I'm going to be down as a non-excused. To me that was an emergency situation, I had no other choice. Fortunately when I called Linda she said no, it's only twelve so I said okay I'll make the effort and go and she was nice enough to give me a ride.

**Chair:** Again, I would say that if you weren't here we wouldn't have had quorum and that would have relegated us cancelling the meeting.

**Sharon Eberhardt:** So now I have your email so now if I can get your phone number then I can check with you last minute. I don't care about being down as non-excused.

**Chair:** That's not what the issue is. I think what the issue is—I don't care who is excused or not it's do we make quorum, that's the number one. And number two is are the people who aren't making it over and over again or leaving early or whatever it is are they really committed to doing this or is it just kind of a hobby and they'll show up when they want to? Jane?

**Jane Weil:** Tiffany could I ask that you add our new member to the roster and send us an updated roster with everyone's names and emails.

**Tiffany Lin-Wilson:** I can do that. I actually just got the phone number today, so I can go ahead and update them and send out a new roster to all of you. I do want to note that for me to come here and set up for the meeting I do leave the office at 3:45 because otherwise City Hall is shut down by the time I get here and none of us would be able to get into this room. That being said, I check my email up until the moment that I leave the office. So If I get an email that say you guys aren't going to be able to come I do let Steffen know. I did make sure that I let him know yesterday. The last person I heard from was Ken. There are members I didn't hear from at all.

**Chair:** It's unacceptable.

**Tiffany Lin-Wilson:** I did make it very clear that we did only have twelve confirmed RSVP so it was imperative that everybody does come because we're all giving up our time to be here.

**Chair:** It's all been between her and I where I'm in Hawaii on vacation and I have to make a decision whether we're cancelling the meeting or not and again for me I feel like it's respect for all of us, that's what we're asking for is just each one of us to respect the other's time and effort because again we've had a lot of meetings in the past, not during this age of PROSAC but years ago and those of you who were on that committee remember we'd show up here and sit here for a half-hour and then we'd get to eleven and be like we can't even vote on an Item. I couldn't even approve the minutes today because I didn't have quorum and so that's not acceptable. That's not how a committee operations.

Again, this isn't a thrashing of you guys this is really more like the rest of brethren need to be more conscious of our time.

**Sharon Eberhardt:** Also I believe there's one person that has left before.

**Chair:** We are aware of that Sharon.

**Sharon Eberhardt:** So does that mean then that we lose our quorum?

**Chair:** Yes, today it does.

**Sharon Eberhardt:** So technically we couldn't have voted on something?

**Chair:** Not after he left.

**Female Speaker:** Can I also ask that you add the relevant staff contact on the roster, that is you and maybe Phil and Stacy.

**Chair:** I think it would make sense to have Stacy and Dawn on that because they make presentations.

**Female Speaker:** Anyone you think is relevant and decide would be helpful.

**Chair:** We'd like Phil's home number. [simultaneous comments]

**Linda D'Avirro:** The only comment is I think we're only short one member if I'm not mistaken.

**Chair:** We have one vacancy.

**Linda D'Avirro:** That's 22 people and even though we have people's vacations and stuff I find it very hard to accept that we could only get twelve people. I think that needs to go out what you've said, having been in your seat I know it's very hard because you cannot get people to come to the meeting to speak unless you work months in advance to prepare to have that speaker and then not to have quorum because all of a sudden something comes up is an issue.

**Chair:** What I would propose to that—thank you Linda for your point—I would propose that Tiffany and I will work on an email to the membership that will be a general email that says this is specific to this one situation that we can't continue to have people come and go as they please if we have a meeting on the calendar and it's the challenge of every Chair that I've been here for to try to manage 22 people showing up one night a month and that's all we're asking. Richard.

**Richard Rothman:** Isn't there more than one vacancy?

**Chair:** District 6 just got filled but there's one other, District 10. So Maya is working for District 10. Hopefully you'll get us a District 4 and then we'll have a full committee. Then at least we can be lenient about people going okay I took that month off, fine. There are certain people who are here month in and out and I appreciate those people coming. I know that we all have busy lives. I know that we all have other things outside of here. We just need everybody to commit to two and a half hours a month.

**Patricia Delgado:** Am I incorrect in my understanding, I thought we had to have a decision by the Wednesday before the meeting in order for the public to know that there was going to be a meeting.

**Chair:** There is always going to be a meeting as long as we are close to quorum. If I feel like we are within one person—and that's exactly what happened. We almost canceled the meeting yesterday based on only having eleven and I said wait, don't cancel the meeting, let me just see if somebody comes in and Ken Maley happened to come in ten minutes later and said yes he was coming. That doesn't excuse Ancel and Les Hilger the ex-Chair who still hasn't RSVP'd.

**Male Speaker:** He's away.

**Chair:** He should have told Tiffany.

**Tiffany Lin-Wilson:** That's the other thing, if you know that you're going to be gone please let me know in advance. I understand people make plans, you have vacations, we all have lives outside of this. Nick Belloni let me know last month that he wasn't going to be here this month. Just let somebody know. It's really not fair to everybody else who does RSVP if you just decide not to answer at all.

**Chair:** Right, that's the problem is not answering at all is worse than RSVPing no the day before. I would rather you just say no I'm not coming than to just leave us all hanging like it doesn't matter what our time is about. And Sharon to your point an emergency is acceptable.

**Sharon Eberhardt:** But then I would have felt guilty if I didn't show because then you wouldn't have a quorum. I just wanted to have some contact with somebody that I could find out at the last minute if there was a 13<sup>th</sup> person.

**Chair:** Sharon, I just want to go to one thing—if two or three of the people that are on this who haven't still yet responded had responded it wouldn't have been an issue because we would have been at fifteen and you could have not shown up and it wouldn't have been an issue. Anyway, I'm not going to beat this into the ground until I go home and compose the email.

**Bill Wilson:** Bill Wilson, former PROSAC Chair. I have sat in your seat and experienced the frustration. I want to suggest that the email not only go to the members but go to their appointing powers so that the Supervisors understand. Because it just floors me that we have this process, this open place where the public can have input and it's sometimes hard when you're sitting in your seat but you do have an impact and there's a lot of frustration that goes with this job, that goes with dealing with Recreation and Park but the fact of the matter is if we don't show up we can be guaranteed that nobody will hear our voice. So I think you need to let the Supervisors know that this is another way that they can say to their constituents your voice is being heard because you have representatives and these are the ones you can contact. [simultaneous comments] I think that people who are here are the committed, understanding great people. I don't know that we need to have any more conversation about this.

**Chair:** Any other announcements? Jordyn?

**Jordyn Aquino:** This weekend is Outside Lands so just in case you're not attending be aware of road closures.

**Chair:** Good point. Anything else. May Wong.

**May Wong:** Have you considered maybe the ones that aren't here could attend via teleconference?

**Chair:** No. We did it once a long time ago. I feel like that's an out and I don't need any more outs. I need ins not outs. I like the concept of somebody is in Uruguay and have a good internet connection and they want to be a part of the meeting that's awesome but if they're in the Outer Richmond get on the bus. Take an Uber. Thank you for suggestion. Anybody else with items not listen on the agenda? Being none, this meeting is closed. Thank you.

**End of Document**

