

**San Francisco Park, Recreation and Open Space Advisory Meeting (PROSAC)
December 6, 2016**

Chair: Good evening. Welcome to the December, 2016, meeting of Park, Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee. We're going to get this meeting rolling real quick. We have a lot to cover tonight. I thank you guys on this holiday month for attending and coming out in force. Let's take attendance starting on my left.

Richard Rothman: Richard Rothman, District 1.

Mark Scheuer: Mark Scheuer, District 8.

Patricia Delgado: Patricia Delgado, District 9.

Jordyn Aquino: Jordyn Aquino, District 4.

Winnie Chu: Winnie Chu, District 7.

Sharon Eberhardt: Sharon Eberhardt, District 11.

Anthony Cuadro: Anthony Cuadro, District 7.

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

Jane Weil: Jane Weil, District 6.

Ana Gee: Ana Gee, District 6.

Kim Hirschfield: Kim Hirschfield, District 3.

Richard Ivanhoe: Richard Ivanhoe, District 5.

Tom Valtin: Tom Valtin, District 9.

Nick Belloni: Nick Belloni, District 2.

Chair: Steffen Franz, District 2. I would like to move on to Item #2, the review of the minutes. Has everybody had a chance to review said minutes? Anyone have any comments? Richard obviously your comments were taken by email. Anybody else?

Nick Belloni: Move to approve.

Tom Valtin: Second.

Chair: Any public comment on this item? Being none, that item is closed.

I'm going to move on to the Chair's Report. I have prepared some remarks for my report, I'll try to keep it as brief as possible.

After reviewing the transcripts from the last meeting and discussing the general decorum of the Committee during that meeting with RPD staff and the various committee members I wanted to take a minute to apologize to members of the RPD staff who attended and presented our last month's meeting. As Chair it's my responsibility to keep our meetings on track and it was clear that our last meeting got a bit out of control with some members making somewhat disrespectful comments to the staff.

To be clear, these comments and positions don't reflect the thoughts and the feelings of the entire committee or even the majority of our members. On behalf of those members who do not share the positions or thoughts, moving forward I would like to ask that we keep our comments to staff and to other guest who attend and present at our committee respectful and keep decorum.

RPD presents items to PROSAC with the hope of creating discussion, getting feedback and eventually support as a body and we'd like to continue to have a positive relationship with the Recreation and Park Department. The only way to achieve this is to keep a mutual level of respect. This in no way is an attempt to silence anyone's comments of position but there must be a level of respect for each other as that's the only way to make our voices heard and make the work of our committee meeting meaningful.

Please consider this, when asking questions or addressing concerns or issued with presenters or guests let's try to be respectful no matter what our personal thoughts or positions might be.

Item #2, tonight is Sharon Eberhardt's last meeting. Sharon has served on PROSAC for almost ten years now. [simultaneous comments] Twelve years ago. An eight-year term. Sharon has served on PROSAC for many years now and she has been a vocal supporter of projects in her District and a longtime park advocate. I want to take a minute to say thank you to her for her service and efforts. We hope you will come back and visit as a member of the public and continue to work to support District 11 and the McLaren Park project. [applause]

We have a new member, Natalie Dillon who represents District 4. She was appointed this past month and cannot attend our meeting tonight but will be attending her first meeting in January.

Finally, I wanted to bring up an item that has been mentioned a few times in the Strategic Plan. I wanted to discuss the Sister Parks program with you briefly. This is a program that RPD has created as part of their Strategic Plan is clearly something that PROSAC members should be involved with. I'd like to ask members who might be interested in forming a working group or subcommittee to talk about this topic. I myself would like to be involved and I would like to ramp up in 2017. So if you have some interested maybe I could talk with you offline about it. There's been a suggestion that we look at Hilltop Park, maybe my Friends of group, Friends of Lafayette and Hilltop could have a little test run. But I really encourage PROSAC members to

consider this part of our role. If you have a successful park group I would like to see you take that across town and try to help some other park groups.

So basically that concludes my Chair's report. Linda D. I'm very let down by your Supervisor who was supposed to be here to give me something for you.

Linda D'Avirro: Who? The current one or the new one? Oh, the new one can't do anything then.

Chair: But the current one did something very nice because I want to honor your [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments]. Okay, let's move on, let's keep this meeting rolling. That's the end of my Chair's report although Richard you had something?

Richard Rothman: Two things. One is we passed a resolution about the speed humps in the park and we don't always say nice things about MTA but they are working and doing what they're supposed to do in slowing down the traffic. A couple meetings ago somebody asked me a question about can Park Patrol give tickets like Parking Control Officers and I said no but I happened to be at a meeting with one of the Park Patrol officers and they can. They have the same authority as meter maids.

Nick Belloni: Thank you for [unintelligible]. Finally, after as many years as I've been pushing you to get it repaved. Thank you.

Dawn Kamalanathan: Oh good. Actually that wasn't my shop. That's great though, good. I think Denny did that.

Chair: Any other comments? Any public comment? Being none, that item is closed.

Moving on to Item #4, Capital Planning with Dawn.

Dawn Kamalanathan: Question one, how long have you been bring cupcakes and cookies to meetings? [laughs]

I have a choice for you guys tonight because my main item is about the annual capital report which is going to cover all the types of things that we normally cover in an update so if folks have like current business that they'd like to ask my questions about I'm happy to respond to any quick Q and A but I think a lot of the types of things I normally talk about we're going to do in the item tonight so I was going to defer and not repeat myself.

Richard Rothman: Thanks for coming to our meeting about the lights. This is from Dana and Richard, we need more soccer fields with lights in them although not so much lights that I'm curious why they didn't put dimmer switches in the lights and nobody answers that question.

Dawn Kamalanathan: Dimmer switches. You can't dim them but we do have timers so you can control I think actually remotely for almost all of them when they turn on and off.

Richard Rothman: Go up to Sutro Heights sometime at night and see the lights. And the other thing is we're going to need more dog parks because the GGNRA is going to cut back.

Chair: This is so not this item Richard. This is capital planning. Anything else? Let's go. Anybody else have specific questions about specific open capital projects for Dawn?

Ana Gee: District 6. I know you're in the process of defining the Macaulay Park and Turk and Hyde mini park and I'm just wondering what will it take for Recreation and Park to provide a bathroom for one of the parks?

Dawn Kamalanathan: I am aware of this debate. Now, for one of the parks you have a preferred park, I thought it was at Macaulay. So I think that there's a couple of thresholds that need to be crossed here around creating a bathroom there. First, we do need our colleagues buy-in from operations because they would have to maintain the bathroom and the second piece is you're going to have to find money for the bathroom. Bathrooms are not inexpensive. Our bathrooms run \$600,000 to \$1 million depending on where they're located, what kind of utilities they need, what kind of ADA access is going on and so given the tiny budget that we are working with within Macaulay because it's such a small park like you could spend all the money on a bathroom almost or you could spend the money renovating the rest of the park. So there's a financial tradeoff that needs to be made there or there needs to be additional resources.

There have been parks, for example Noe Valley Town Square, where we developed a plan for the park with a later idea about where a bathroom could go if resources were located or acquired to do the bathroom. So we need operations buy-in. We need community consensus that in the tradeoff for such a small park that you could have the restroom and all the play features and other things that you might want in that space, that there's consensus around all the goals that can be accomplished there because that's often another piece. A lot of time restrooms, again, not just the box of the restroom, like there's access issues that need to be mapped out and so your footprint can really eat into a tiny space, a tiny park like Macaulay.

And then presuming you can get those things aligned, community consensus, funding, operations, support, then you'd have to get the Commission's support to approve that plan but those are your steps.

Ana Gee: Mission impossible.

Dawn Kamalanathan: We can talk more about that offline. I don't think it's impossible. I do think that the question, there's a real tradeoff to be made around Macaulay in particular and maybe a restroom inside the park—I'm willing to brainstorm with you about ways we can tackle the challenge.

Chair: Any other questions with regards to capital planning? Any public comment on this item? Being none, that item is closed. Dawn, thank you.

So we're going to quickly move along here. We're going to try to tackle the big one last I'm sorry to say.

Item #5 is the calendar for 2017. Everybody should have reviewed this, it was sent out to you. Is there anybody who has any concerns with regards to any of the dates that are already on this calendar? Richard?

Richard Rothman: I don't think [unintelligible].

Richard Ivanhoe: District 5. I have an ongoing conflict on second Tuesdays but I'm the only one person out of the group. So January 10th and July 11th.

Chair: Are hard days for you, all right. Anybody else with concerns about dates on this 2017 calendar? Being none, I propose a quick resolution to support and adopt the calendar. The resolution goes something like whereas PROSAC meets every first Tuesday of each calendar month unless otherwise scheduled and whereas PROSAC must set calendar dates for the year 2017, whereas members of PROSAC agree to those dates set forth in the 2017 PROSAC meeting calendar, therefore be it resolved that the members of the Park, Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee adopt the 2017 PROSAC meeting calendar presented as it is December 6th, 2016.

Nick Belloni: So moved.

Jordyn Aquino: Second.

Chair: All in favor?

All: Aye.

Chair: Opposed? Being none, that item passes unanimously. Thank you. Any public comment on this item? Hearing none, thank you.

We are going to switch Item #7 and Item #6 because Item #7 is going to happen fairly quickly and we'll get on into Item #6.

Dawn Kamalanathan: I'm the Director of Planning and Capital Management for the Recreation and Park Department. I am here tonight to present on our annual capital expenditure plan which is a requirement which was resurrected as part of Proposition B baseline measure that passed this past summer and so in addition to our normal report for GOBAC, our monthly financial report, we're going to start producing an annual capital expenditure plan as well. The point of that plan is to really give you a preview of the year ahead and to talk about the state of the state of the capital program, particularly with an eye as well towards how we're meeting key objectives in the Strategic Plan, acquisitions, things we want to do in a five-year horizon.

Before I start on my presentation I wanted to take a moment to introduce two new staff members—Jackie Ho and Charlene Angsucu who are new project management who have joined our Division last month. They are going to be working on lots of your projects. Feel free to reach out to them. Charlene has a lot of work having everything to do with water given her prior experience in Long Beach. Jackie comes from a private sector architectural background and

there's a number of large projects including Mission Rec and a couple of other big buildings that we've got coming down that we also would like to have Jackie's help with. We look forward to working with them.

Tonight I'm going to go through—no one else has seen this presentation yet. You are the first to see it. I will be giving a modified version next Thursday at the December full Commission meeting prior to the SNRMP joint hearing and so whatever feedback you give me tonight I am going to try and incorporate to the extent that is feasible for the presentation next Thursday. Also, the staff report that I'm submitting to the Commission is going to be a modified version of the staff report that you received in your packet. So I am here to listen, I would really like your feedback not just on this report but also as we think about like how to set this report up to be the most useful for you in the long run. I know that monthly financial report is tough to get through, you have to know a lot just to be able to read it. Same thing with the GOBOC report. So I really look forward to hearing tonight what your frequently asked questions are about the capital program and how we can make this report a useful document for you going forward.

I wanted to start off because we have a lot of new Commissioners and new PROSAC members I thought it would be helpful to talk a little bit about why Recreation and Park has a capital Division and what our history is. This timeline is of general obligation bonds passed for parks since 1958. The light green colors represent bond measure that failed. The dark green circles and bond measures that passed. This dotted line represents the bond in 2018.

The pattern I want to point out for you is that prior to 2000-2006 the city's capital planning was something of a mess, particularly with respect to parks. You can see very little investment between 1958 and 2000 and to the extent that bonds pass they were focused on single topics—Palace of Fine Arts, park irrigation. There's one general purpose Recreation and Park for \$38 million in '87 which I actually think a chunk of it went to Golden Gate Park. And then you see a Golden Gate Park bond in 1992 for \$131 million. These bonds all failed. There were two Recreation and Park bonds and one for Bayview parks. They all failed. It takes a two-thirds threshold to pass a GO bond in the city and what I don't even show on here are also there's Steinhart Aquarium bond and de Young Bonds that also passed. So the theme is kind of you are organized single topic, had a constituency, maybe you could get a bond on the ballot and pass it. Steinhart and de Young both failed multiple times. The zoo bond failed before being successful. So this is the history of park investment—nothing in neighborhood parks.

In 2000 there is a parks bond, just a blank check neighborhood parks bond, \$110 million. The only limitation on that bond is that money can't be spent in Golden Gate Park because of all the prior investment and the perception that neighborhood parks had suffered in the tradeoff between Golden Gate Park resources and other parks.

That bond in 2000 also sees the establishment of a Recreation and Park capital program. Recreation and Park gets what's called Chapter 6 authority. So rather than having to use DPW to go and issue our construction contract Recreation and Park Commission is given the authority to issue and award construction contracts. Only six Departments in the city have this authority—PUC, MTA, DPW, the Port, the Airport and us.

So we Chapter 6 authority and we get a capital program created but what we do when we create that capital program is we just actually have designers and something called project leads. We don't actually have project managers. The project managers are at DPW driving the projects. By the way, these dollars are all adjusted for 2016 value so these are not real dollars, this is adjusted for 2016. That's why it's actually a \$110 million bond but it's worth in 2016 dollars \$153 million so you can just see the comparison of the values equally.

In 2000 we launched this bond, \$110 million, first investment in the neighborhood park system in fifty years. There's a lot of demand and expectations are not managed well. The whole system is promised, renovating the entire system, 3000 acres for this \$110 million. We do manage as a city to leverage another \$300 million in grant money and other sources against that one-time but it's still not enough. And actually what service is in the early 2000s is the fact that there's this mismatch in expectations and that we are actually as a city \$50 million short in just being able to deliver on what was called phase A of that capital program.

In 2006 two things happened actually which are related with each other. First of all the city finally develops a ten-year capital planning process. Looking back at this checkered history of you only get to do a bond if you mobilize the resources. It's like pay to play. You get in line if you have the cash. And the core city needs like parks, public safety, hospitals, were not being dealt with in a strategic manner. So the ten-year capital plan is created and basically the idea is we're going to sequence GO bonds as we retire old GO bond debt. So taxes won't go up and we created this tax constraint in a series of bonds. Since that time all those bonds have passed and the Recreation and Park 2008 bond was the first bond in that series.

And so with 2006 we started getting ready for that 2006. Yomi Agunbiade creates—we had a capital program—he actually swaps the pieces around so that now we taken learning from our experiences with the 2000 bond and that expectations problem we create a team of project managers who report directly to the Commission and send the designers to DPW.

So that's the start of the modern Recreation and Park capital program that all of you know. 2006 I start as Planning Director, the first Planning Director which is alarming because we are the largest landowner in San Francisco. We get ready, we order the Comet inventory, we start to get ready and we do 2008 bond successful and then we do 2012 based off of that same dataset. In 2010 we merged the planning and capital Divisions which had been separate and that's the team that you see today.

So I think one of the things—I like this chart a lot. It's nice for good government, right? A series of fairly innocent sounding boring steps. They actually have huge positive gains for the park system and also for the city. Other Departments have seen that kind of success as well in the GO bond program but creating that direct line of accountability from project managers up to the Commission is very important for aligning and making sure that one entity isn't making promises that another entity is left there holding the bag. Now all of it under one chain of command up to the Recreation and Park Commission.

So what comes out of that? A bunch of awesome projects. Like hundreds of projects. This is Joe DiMaggio before and after. Quite the epic story. Ten-year projects. Good things take time. This

is a quick smattering of other successes. You have Chinese Rec in the middle, Sunset Rec, our now ubiquitous swirl towers.

This is a little bit about our overall portfolio. So we've done like over 450 projects since 2000, that's pretty astounding. But we're actually a smart project portfolio. So you look at the airport and the PUC their charts have like \$50 million is no big deal, just another day for them. Our biggest projects tend to be in the \$25 million to \$30 million range with the Marina Yacht Harbor being our biggest project to date. But 80 percent of our projects are under this \$2.5 million threshold and that has implications for how we run our program. It actually means we're fairly administratively complex. Like small projects have all the same problems as big projects but less room to solve them in.

And so we are constantly looking to leverage funds. We are also heavily invested in partnerships. The PUC does not have partnerships around the [unintelligible] program. We're doing lots of small donor relationship cultivation, lots of partnership projects to deliver all these. You know \$2.5 million is about the size of your average playground budget at this point.

In terms of the program's overall sources again like since 2000 what we think of as the capital program looking at all our sources we've actually done \$1 billion worth of worth and that includes things like the zoo bond. A good half of that is funded through bonds of one sort or another, mostly General Obligation bonds, a little bit from lease revenue, we did that one time, got a few million dollars out of that. And then you can also see open space and the general fund have also been consistent sources of revenue. Special area refers to impact fees and other kind of restricted funds.

So that's the overall shape of where our funding comes from.

Female Speaker: Dawn, what do you mean by open space?

Dawn Kamalanathan: That's the open space fund. Acquisitions is included this but actually open space also has put in money routinely for everything, for all sorts of capital renovations particularly in the past before we even had a lot of these bonds the open space fund was a source of like Richmond Rec, like a lot of Richmond Rec was funded through open space capital dollars.

We're also submitting with the baseline a general fund expenditure plan. It's a lot like last year's, \$15 million for projects in fiscal years 18-19. We're going to continue to address deferred maintenance, all those old categories—fencing, erosion, boilers, they're all rolling forward and continue to seek funds for forestry, grass field rehab, irrigation improvements, etc. Kati is going to be giving a more detailed look at this budget proposal tomorrow at capital committee.

Then open space funding also \$7.9 million and that's going to include our acquisition and contingency funds as it always has, taking our charter mandated slice. And then there's also some money for Stanyan Street planning that's going on and also the continued 900 Innes India Basin planning for those soft costs.

So that concludes the presentation. I have printouts for some of the handouts that we gave in the attachments. The two that I thought would be of most interest to you are one, an overall pipeline of the projects. We have 88 projects assigned to us next year, that means projects that will be in progress, wrapping up or initiating sometime in the next year. That's a lot to keep going and when you look at the fact that most of our projects again take about two to three years that means we're kind of booked up until the next bond. We have some capacity—the yellow lines show that right as you're getting heading into 2019 we free up again. The dark green represents projects that are active right now, they're in progress. The medium olive green represent projects that are scheduled to start but they're flexible, like we can make swaps around their placement in the schedule. We can defer them still if there's agreement about that so if they're in the pipeline they're flexible and then yellow shows like the open on program space. We're busy.

The other piece here is just a very specific look at the 2012 bond projects, their current schedule which I know is of frequent interest and this shows kind of our current projected actual through the end of 2019. You can see the construction times are cut off on some.

Any questions or comments?

Linda D'Avirro: District 11. I notice on your chart for the upcoming bond it's not filled in green yet obviously but will that be specifically dedicated to parks or will you also have Port in there again?

Dawn Kamalanathan: Good questions. It's going to be I think a real topic of discussion this January at the capital planning committee. I think there are always emerging needs. There's been some discussion about the seawall needing maybe some significant capital investment. The Department of Emergency Management. There are other folks—now that we've been so successful people want to get in this life and because we have a tax constraint as other people come into the program it has implications for how much money other people get and when they go. I am emotionally prepared for the fact that our bond might go back from 2018, November 18. Not until like 2025 or anything but like it might move back a year. I'm comfortable with that mostly because I look at these schedules and I'm like we can use that time.

Linda D'Avirro: Will we be seeing a discussion about what might be in there in terms of bidding for favorite projects?

Dawn Kamalanathan: Yes but I need an end-date to plan towards and so if we kept November, 2018, then that would mean theoretically this coming summer I would kick off our community planning process. If it moves to let's say November 19 then we'll have another extra year. The other reason why I welcome the extra time is to finish the lifecycle project which will not be done by this summer but will definitely be done in like a year or a year and a half from now. The data that comes from that project, the lifecycle is the name of our deferred maintenance analysis project. The data that comes from that I would like to inform our bond planning in the same way that the Comet data helped us do the last two bonds.

Chair: So we can expect that you will present to us whether it's in 18 or 19 when it starts to formulate?

Dawn Kamalanathan: You guys are very important. First stop and ongoing stop. I tend to use PROSAC over and over again. You are a very valuable focus group for me in those endeavors and as we're developing proposals and vetting them it's really helpful to get your feedback and generally again we start a working group of which we invite PROSAC members to participate and it's a multiple ring circus for certain. We have a working group that has lots of different constituencies in it. We'll be at PROSAC, we'll be at the Commission, we'll be at the Board. We will be in many different settings collecting feedback but I have used PROSAC and worked with you quite collaboratively in the past two bonds to develop a proposal that works for everyone.

Richard Ivanhoe: District 5. Don't you know Prop K not passing, next year's budget is over budget \$2 million? Do you know how much of that is going to hit Recreation and Park?

Dawn Kamalanathan: Well, now we're in a baseline so we're absorbing our own cost increases but we are not going to be taking a cut, we're not going to receive budget instructions that look like the budget instructions we've received in years past. We will be expected to absorb our own cost increases and as we get closer into budget development I'm sure Katie will be here to do her annual road show and explain how we're going to balance within our existing resources but we will not be receiving cut instructions like we might have in prior years.

Richard Rothman: District 1. In planning for parks I think more soccer fields at night. I didn't realize soccer is a year around sport. And the other is dog parks since the GGNRA is going to cut back and there are areas really full. And the other is I don't know how many more buildings but like at Rossi and the other swimming pools they put the artwork inside and I think more people would appreciate it on the outside of the building. So I don't know—I guess it's your Department? I'm working with Lev to try to get us some artwork on the outside of Rossi and he's been very helpful, I appreciate that. Maybe in the future with buildings and playgrounds like Cabrillo they have the artwork right on the things so something to think about.

Dawn Kamalanathan: Totally. I actually love that and it's a joint decision actually. The Arts Commission has more say that Recreation and Park in the placement and selection of the art pieces and how we use that funding. I love the Sunset Playground, the personification of the wind coming off the beach. I love that. I like the Cabrillo. I like the Mission Playground fence which also has kind of a Mesoamerican motif. I love having the art as part of a functional part of the park that is outside that people can see so I mean I'm with you, you have my vote on that. But that needs to be something the Arts Commission supports as well.

Richard Rothman: I'm not sure who makes the decisions.

Dawn Kamalanathan: The Arts Commission.

Richard Rothman: But not where it goes on the inside?

Dawn Kamalanathan: No, they do decide that Richard. They decide that too. We can make recommendations but they decide that.

Chair: Any other questions for Dawn on this item? Dawn, one thing I will say is since the packets are so thick and there is plenty to go through I would like to ask that if any of the members do want clarity on any of these items.

Dawn Kamalanathan: Absolutely, call don't email. [simultaneous comments]

Chair: So no other questions from the committee is that correct? Is there any public comment? [simultaneous comments]

Jake Sigg: I merely wanted to know about the trails.

Dawn Kamalanathan: All right, trails have a green light go. The project has been fully funded. Melinda has started it again.

Chair: Any other public comment? Being none, that item is closed.

Dawn Kamalanathan: Thank you.

Chair: Thank you. Before I move on to the next item I would like to ask any members of the public if you would like to speak on this item I need a blue card filled out with your information please.

[background conversation]

Chair: Stacey Bradley is going to present the NRMP program.

Stacy Bradley: The Natural Resources Management Plan. Dawn is actually going to kick it off and we're also joined by Lisa Wayne who is the manager of the Natural Resources Division.

Dawn Kamalanathan: Thanks everyone for coming tonight to hear this presentation and provide your feedback. I wanted to start off today because it's been an interesting year for thinking about issues like climate change and biodiversity and fifteen years ago I moved to the Bay Area. I grew up on the East Coast, in Connecticut, and when I was growing up I was an ardent naturalist, enviro—even as a kid. I spent a lot of time hiking and also deeply in love with cities and amenities they offered. And I felt like torn between those two interests like well into college and as I was trying to think about what to do with my life I actually came out to the Bay Area to visit a friend and kind of fell instantly in love with the Bay Area as many people do, so many people come for some sort of California dream or another. My California dream was about having both things in the same place, having a vibrant sophisticated urban environment that also had incredible access to a rich array of natural resources both in parks like the fancy things that we see—Muir Woods, the things that require a drive, but also to be able to be someplace that has everything San Francisco can offer and then to be able to escape to a place like McLaren or Glen Canyon, to the top of the 16th Street steps and enjoy the beauty of the city in a totally different way and be able to feel some sort of connection to nature.

I don't think I'm alone in that. I think many San Franciscans cherish the presence of open space in our urban environment as something that makes you San Franciscan and a core part of the experience of living and working in the city.

I think that's really important. I just wanted to highlight that's fundamentally what this plan is about and I think it's often been lost as we have side negotiations around the edges of the plan. We have negotiations around a tree here, an anchor there, dog space here. We're negotiating around the edges all the time and thinking about the edges as if they're about what the center or the core of the plan is about. It isn't. Those are the edges and those edges can be negotiated. The core of the plan is the commitment to preserve our open spaces and natural resources. In the '70s, there were a group of stakeholders who moved to use the first batch of open space acquisition funds to buy the hilltops that we take for granted with a very intentional view of preserving these scenic vistas and also the parks that you could access those views from. Going to the top of a dusty mountain to look at a view that is unattractive is not the same thing as being able to go to the top of Mt. Davidson or Twin Peaks and be able to take in both San Francisco's natural beauty and its urban beauty.

So there was a conscious decision to seek out those properties and acquire them for the purposes of preserving use and also to again conserve our habitat. But acquisition isn't enough! We also need to have a very intention philosophy about how to conserve those spaces for the future. It is not an exaggeration to say that the top of Bernal Hill could be gone in another thirty years from erosion or that the Buena Vista hill which is actually a sand dune, the largest dune west of the Mississippi, could also significantly deteriorate over the next thirty years without an active conversation strategy and preservation strategy on the part of the Department. That is the core of this plan.

And so I would just really ask people to keep that in mind. We have a new administration and I won't make assumptions about people's political viewpoints but I would say that there is a clear shift from being in a place where we thought of climate change as a real issue that we were dealing with to maybe thinking of a lot of environmental issues as something off to the side. We have an opportunity in San Francisco to make a policy statement about the fact that the core of our values is around preserving these kinds of lands and ensuring that we have biodiversity, ensuring that we can be adaptive in responding to climate change over the long term and that's the core of the plan. I want people to keep that in mind as we continue for years to come to negotiate about the edges of the plan. That there will be—this is a statement of policy. This is a statement of guiding principles about how we want to manage and steward our land but there will be many opportunities to negotiate around individual projects, individual sites, and make sure that they're flexible to user needs in the same way that we do with all of our park design processes. There will be numerous opportunities to discuss whether things are funded or not funded. Many opportunities to continue to negotiate around the edge, to negotiate around sites. But what I'm really hoping that people can embrace and get on the same page about is embracing and really celebrating these core values and the core of the plan which is around conserving these very fragile and critical open spaces.

With that, I turn it over to Stacy.

Stacy Bradley: Thank you. I think you covered it all.

I'm going to go into some more detail and just to share my personal story, when I started working here I wrote a cover letter about the Green Hair Streak Butterfly corridor along 6th Street—the 16th Avenue steps and throughout the area up there and how that called to me as somebody who had moved here from New York as what was really special about San Francisco and why I wanted to work for the Recreation and Park Department. This is a dream come true, honestly, like working here. Having it start with the natural areas and then revisiting it here and now at this point it's exciting to be part of this biodiversity plan.

The plan moves us forward with our progress, our being a climate resilient and interested city in biodiversity and sustainability. You've seen it in previous plans that we've adopted, the sustainability plan, climate action plan, the recreation and open space element of the general plan all refer to elements that are within this plan. This plan will move us forward by promoting this biodiversity. The resiliency to climate change. It's also an advocate for environmental justice and getting kids and people who live in the city into natural areas and seeing and being with nature, doing volunteer activities, stewarding these natural spaces that make San Francisco so unique.

And the details of the plan—these are all of the parks within city. There are 32 natural areas and 1100 acres. This 1100 acres does include Sharp Park which is in Pacifica. And there are 30 miles of trails. Some of the parks like McLaren have natural areas and then other parts of the park as well. So not all of every park is a natural area but some of them are completely natural areas like Hawk Hill.

Plan development and public input. This has been a work in progress for the past twenty years. The first plan was adopted in 1995 by the Recreation and Park Commission. We then started detailed surveys and working on creating the plan which was drafted in 2006. It went through a number of iterations and public comment and a plethora of meetings and comments. You can see here there was 2700 comments received on the first public draft but it brought us to where we are today with the volume that was released in February, 2006.

Since then we worked on the environmental review. That was originally released in August, 2011, and since that time we've had public comment periods, public hearings, we've received over 1000 comments and we released the response to comments last month. The response to comments with the EIR those two things combined together into a final environmental document.

Actually, I wanted to just point out that the plan as Dawn mentioned is programmatic so it provides the general overview policies and guiding principles in how we manage these lands. It provides a project level review for the Sharp Park restoration project, again for routine maintenance. So there are small projects that would happen. There are some half-acre threshold. There's some volunteer work that can be done that's looked at a project level. But larger projects are looked at on a programmatic level.

The plan is divided into three different management areas. The first one is where it's most sensitive. This is where there's sensitive species. There is endangered or threatened species. And

these are areas that are at greatest risk and the area are first priority for doing conservation and management. So most of the activities would happen in a MA1 or highly sensitive areas.

MA2 I like to call is the buffer zone so they are less significant but still significant. There's a lot very—still, there's significant wildlife, there's a lot of habitat benefit here and conversation benefits. This is the next level of priority for management actions.

The third is the one that offers the greatest recreational opportunity and the least special status species benefit. So often this is where we see our eucalyptus trees, the large swaths of forest that we have. And most of the plan in here mostly encourages maintaining those forests and the health of the forest.

Linda D'Avirro: District 1. On the MA1 areas are those also part of the historic parcels? Because Linda Shaffer gave us a really excellent presentation and showed us citywide all the historic parcels. So are those also accommodation of historic parcels or how does that work? You had the presentation where you said that there were historic parcels throughout the city.

Stacy Bradley: We made a presentation about these natural areas?

Linda D'Avirro: Yes, so I was just asking whether the MA1s here are all history.

Stacy Bradley: I think it's most of the—I'm going to go back to the map because it's actually most of them. It's most of these natural areas are the remnant.

Linda D'Avirro: So they are the historical remnants, okay.

Stacy Bradley: This is where there are some parts of what they still look like before everybody moved in, but not all of them. So the ones in the MA1s are the most sensitive.

Twin Peaks is—so the next few slides are going to go into a couple of parks to give you a closer look at what the plan says. I think the presentation I gave you had a few more of these and we have more of them at the end so we can go into any parts that you want to but I picked three, Twin Peaks, Bayview, and Glen Canyon, to give you a bit of a closer look.

So Twin Peaks has really an amazing story where we were able to bring back the endangered Mission Blue butterfly. They've been seen on Twin Peaks. There is a lot of habitat that is growing there and encouraging the butterfly to repopulate. It also has a lot of erosion issues and it needs to be vegetated mindfully and encouraged to allow to have Twin Peaks exist and not erode. And also we'll be able to improve access on designated trails.

The next one is Bayview and I don't know if anybody has been able to go out there. I went a couple of years ago. It's just beautiful. This one—actually a lot of these areas have WPA remnants facilities like staircases and just really unique pieces of our history that you don't see elsewhere and it's sort of built into the trailscapes, the vegetation, as you walk around these trails you're able to experience something that's very unusual. This hill was mined too. A lot of the

space around Bayview was taken to I think fill in a lot of the bay. So we have this in any case is amazing and it's this rich area that we don't want to lose.

Next is Glen Canyon. I recently went out here with my husband and my son. It was an incredible walk. We went on the new trails which you should not take a baby stroller, that was a bad decision. [laughs] It was beautiful and we had a great time of looking at the different aspects of this natural area, the park has boulders and grasslands and a creek. I'm going to show you images of the restoration that was done a few years ago. Here is pre tree removal. The creek is down here. Here is post tree removal. Here is during the restoration. You can see the water in the creek. And here is one year after restoration and it's still looking beautiful and lush. It's really incredible.

Male Speaker: [unintelligible]

Stacy Bradley: It's near this area. So a lot of people who grew up here went to camp there.

So that was delving into some of the parks and now I'm going to go over some of the higher level aspects of the plan. So our forest management, this allows us to protect 200 acres of urban forest. It preserves 95 percent of the trees in San Francisco and over 26 acres of native oak woodlands. For every tree that we'll remove in San Francisco we will replant at a one-to-one ration. We're also focusing on removing trees in poor and fair condition. 80 percent of the trees in our natural area are in poor or fair condition. So we won't be addressing anywhere near as much as we likely should be we are addressing the most hazardous trees first with this plan.

Male Speaker: You're saying a one-to-one ration of replacement of trees. In the same spot?

Stacy Bradley: Likely not in the same spot and likely not with the same species. It's likely going to be native trees that will go into a place of urban forest. So not exactly the same location. Denis?

Denis Mosgofian: District 5. Stacy, if they're not going to be in the same spot does that mean that after a number of trees—I'll ask questions later about which trees and what criteria you use to remove them—but then you're changing the habitat area by planning elsewhere and leaving, what, empty space?

Stacy Bradley: So the trees are generally going to be left. The tree stump is going to be left in place generally to ensure that the ground itself doesn't get disturbed. But yes it is to encourage then the native species and restoration efforts to flourish in those areas.

Denis Mosgofian: So then the habitat is lost. Whatever species then exist.

Stacy Bradley: No, it's actually growing. So it's adding new species. It's encouraging more diversity of species.

Lisa Wayne: This is not unlike what we do in many [unintelligible]. Vegetation dies and we replant. Do we replant in the exact same species? No because it might not be the right plant in

the right spot. We have to take into consideration a lot of factors. Does it have the proper drainage, soil, is it a sustainable species? Many of the species we planted way back when required a lot of pruning, a lot of maintenance, a lot of additional effort on the part of staff. Nowadays we have a different view of what we could look at that last decades of work that has been done and we can say these are the species that will last in San Francisco, that require the least amount of maintenance, that promote habitat, that promote diversity and support all the [unintelligible] species. So just as a comparison there's been some research done on the value of say, oak trees. And oak trees, native oak trees, support and order of magnitude more wildlife habitat. They have nesting birds, there are birds that eat the acorns and birds that clean the insects off the tree. So a tree like an oak tree is actually much more valuable from the standpoint of wildlife than something like [unintelligible] which yes some red tail hawks will nest in them, some hummingbirds will nectar off the flowers but we know that an oak tree is order of magnitude better in terms of promoting wildlife habitat and when we have so many—all the properties are so reduced, it's really important to maximize that on a per square foot basis, like if we're really trying to create habitats for these species, places for them to migrate to and adapt to climate change you have to think about—and that's part of sustainability is thinking about maximizing the value of each individual species.

So it might not be the same eucalyptus tree that goes in but we're looking to plant higher-value species that can promote more and support more wildlife.

Male Speaker: Can you explain the relationship to climate change?

Lisa Wayne: Sure. I think the idea is that we don't know, we don't really know what's going to happen. We think that in San Francisco we're going to have episodic big rain events, big dry spells. We don't really know. So in order to I think at this point in time I think maximize the adaptability for those species we need to plant the species of plant that can support the most amount of individuals whether they're insects, birds, mammals, so that we're capturing a broader net. So that if one of those species loses its habit it can maybe rely on a more generalist species of plant for example I mean these are questions that we don't know the answer to but I think it stands to reason that by planting species that can survive those kind of climatic shifts and that can support the most amount of species that we're taking steps towards positioning ourselves to have better environmental resilience.

Stacy Bradley: Thank you. So next we go to recreation. This is where maintaining and improving 30 miles of trails, we're restoring 10 miles of social trails to natural areas to reduce erosion and to increase biodiversity. We're maintaining 76 acres of off-leash access within the natural areas. We are restoring 16 percent of the off-leash job play areas to habitat with on-leash trail access in three parks. So that's McLaren, Bernal and Lake Merced where the reductions will happen. We are also retaining on-leash do access throughout the system, so this plan of course doesn't go beyond the natural areas but we have over 30 DPAs throughout the city and we're growing Richard as you brought up a few times, we are continuing to look for off-leash dog play areas throughout the system. So we're hoping that we can make dog space closer to where people live, have it be more accessible to neighbors and that they don't have to get in their cars and drive to a dog play area.

Integrated pest management is a program that we rely on, the Department of the Environment to govern. And we work with them and we have seen over a 91 percent reduction over five years in our tier one chemical use. We use a variety of methods before using any herbicides. So the use of herbicides is a last resort method and the first methods are hand removal, volunteers, and digging it out mechanically. Where these things are not effective we will use chemicals but only after exhausting other options. And the pesticides are never used for aesthetic purposes, only to increase biodiversity.

The next big topic is Sharp Park which is outside of San Francisco. This is home to an endangered San Francisco garter snake and threatened California red-legged frog. They live over here, this is the Pacific Ocean, here is Laguna Salada, this is the golf course, this is Highway One, there is more golf course over here. We also have an archery range and there are acres of canyon and open space off to the east. It's an incredible space. It's over 400 acres this whole acres.

So this plan has a project level review of a restoration where we're connecting Laguna Salada and Horse Stable Pond. Right now there is a gold course hold of here, hole 12. So we have to remove it to do this connectivity. It's also removing sediment that's build up in Laguna Salada and Horse Stable Pond over the years constricting the habitat quality for the frogs breeding. The frogs like to breed in water that has some vegetation but isn't clogged with vegetation. So emergent vegetation is most cattails and what you see in shallow water. This is the end of a 800 acre watershed and there's an outflow into the ocean here that helps control the drainage for an area that's much large than Sharp Park. It also hits Pacifica residents as well.

So this plan is going to create some critically important habitat for the San Francisco garter snake. It's really promoting the red-legged frog because it's the garter snake's food so by having more frogs you're able to sustain more snakes. This plan doesn't affect the golf course too much. It removes hole 12. It shortens a couple holes, 10 and 13, and these brown areas on the golf course they're shown where we would put the dredged materials from Laguna Salada and raise the fairway elevations. Right now what happens is the frogs lay their eggs in a shallow body of water which could be on a fairway. By raising the elevator it helps to allow the water to drain from the golf course into the water bodies and encourages the frogs to lay their eggs where they should in the water bodies instead of the fairways.

Male Speaker: The hole is gone?

Stacy Bradley: So we're knocking out a hole completely and mitigation measure it to find a place for the hole 12. This project doesn't contemplate where that hole is. So there is a significant impact on cultural and recreation impacts. But the mitigation measure is to find a hole 12.

Male Speaker: But you just said it's not getting through of.

Stacy Bradley: It's not being thought of as part of this project. So at some point in the future.

Female Speaker: So it will go from 11 to 13?

Stacy Bradley: They would likely renumber it. [simultaneous comments]

Sharon Eberhardt: District 11. I'd like to know, do you know what the population count is on the snakes and frogs?

Stacy Bradley: I don't know that.

Lisa Wayne: We monitor very closely the frog [unintelligible] and each year for the last five or six years we've counted well over a hundred egg masses. An egg mass is about the size of a grapefruit and can contain up to 2000 eggs. Now, the reproduction—not all those become frogs. Maybe one or two make it from those but just in terms of the number of egg masses we probably have at least conservatively over 100 females out there.

The snakes we don't know as much about. They are very highly protected. Very few people have permits to trap them. The last time we looked out there there were no snakes found around Laguna Salada. The Federal property to the south there, Maury Point. We keep trying to get out of our consulting biologist how many do you think there are and she's willing to say maybe a dozen or two. It used to be in the 1940s there are records of snakes using areas all around that Laguna Salada area so we know historically there was an abundant population there. I mean there were records like you could walk by and see them everywhere. That's not the case now but that's the idea of this corridor is there's this historic and available habitat around Laguna Salada. If we open that up and allow the migration of those snakes back and forth from the upland to the wetland it will actually be helping the population.

Sharon Eberhardt: Now I have another question. Are there other areas in and around—I think I heard where there was a population or either the frog or snake down by the airport. So are there other areas where there are these populations of endangered frogs and snakes?

Lisa Wayne: Yes. The frog is more abundant, hence it has the one tier level of protection below endangered, so it's at threatened level. It's still been reduced by over 90 percent of its range within the State of California. So it's not in great shape.

The snake is an endemic species that is known to really just exist in this northern San Francisco peninsula. There's probably a half a dozen populations out there. The one near the airport is probably the largest. Reports of maybe more than a couple hundred snakes in that property. That's a property that nobody gets access to.

Sharon Eberhardt: So even if for some strange reason the snakes were wiped out at Sharp Park they would still exist in abundance somewhere else?

Lisa Wayne: Yes.

Denis Mosgofian: District 5. One quick question on garter snakes. When I was a kid there were snakes in the backyard. I lived near Tank Hill and there were snakes all over. We always

had garter snakes. Does this program intend to protect the garter snakes in city or are there really any left? I haven't seen any in a long time.

Stacy Bradley: I don't think there are any San Francisco garter snakes left in the city. I believe there are other garter snakes that are in the city so the plan encourages more habitat that would be good for staying opportunities for other snakes.

[simultaneous comments]

Lisa Wayne: [unintelligible] These are in terms of the species that are supported by those landscapes that's one of the critical species.

Stacy Bradley: Okay. So last I'm just going to sum up with what's happening next. There's going to be a joint hearing with the Planning Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission next Thursday. It will happen right after our regular meeting where Dawn will be presenting the annual capital plan. It's going to be at 1:00 o'clock in City Hall and also—so what's happening there is that the Planning Commission is going to consider certifying the EIR. If that happens the Recreation and Park Commission is able to approve the—consider approving the project and adopting the CEQA, the environmental findings.

Also, I just want to highlight what Dawn had said that this plan is guiding principles. There are some project level reviews. The Sharp Park restoration project, the maintenance plans, but all capital projects are going to be going through the typical community outreach process that we do with all of our capital plans. It means there is at least one community meeting but typically there's three, sometimes there's more. I think all of you have been involved in our capital projects so you know how this isn't the end of this discussion, it's really the beginning.

Denis Mosgofian: District 5. I have a question I mentioned earlier. I wanted to ask some questions about the trees that are being removed and I had read anywhere from 16,000 to 18,000 trees. I don't know if there's any truth to that.

Stacy Bradley: So there are 3000—

Denis Mosgofian: Let me ask my question.

Stacy Bradley: Sure, go ahead.

Denis Mosgofian: So how many trees and which trees are being removed, if you can identify them by location or species, and what criteria determine which ones? And then I would ask a follow-up question but I really want to understand.

Stacy Bradley: Sure. So the plan calls for 3400 trees within San Francisco which is 5 percent of the total tree number within natural area. So this doesn't count the other 2000 acres that we have, it's only the 1000 acres that we've looked at.

Denis Mosgofian: Just to be clear, it doesn't include Sharp Park?

Stacy Bradley: So Sharp Park we're looking at a removal of much more, 15,000 trees. And that is to convert the canyon into grassland, certain areas of the canyon into grassland. There's still—this is about 30 percent—

Female Speaker: Over how many years?

Stacy Bradley: Over twenty years. It's expected to be twenty years, it could be much longer. The plan contemplates removing dying trees, trees that are hazardous at first and doing the revegetation along the way so it's not something that will happen overnight or quickly in any way. It's going to be a gradual change. If it's a change some of it's going to be promoting healthier forests.

Denis Mosgofian: Do dying, hazardous trees, thinning trees for health or fire?

Stacy Bradley: That's right, promoting their health and allowing trees to grow better as well as other species, other plant species.

Denis Mosgofian: And then is the plan for example those 3400 trees that are going to be removed in San Francisco will they be—

Stacy Bradley: Possibly over twenty years, this is not to say we have to remove every tree, this is not saying that in any way. This is providing the ability as we move forward with these projects to remove these trees.

Denis Mosgofian: Presuming at some point they were maybe targeted. Will they be replaced one for one?

Stacy Bradley: Yes.

Denis Mosgofian: And that's maybe else so some areas become grasslands and other areas with trees.

Stacy Bradley: But most of the area—Lisa, you can probably describe this better but most of the areas where there will be tree removal trees will remain, there won't be any areas where we're removing all of the trees, it would just be a smaller amount of trees instead of it being incredibly dense it has more light, there's more other species that are able to grow in these areas but no areas are we asking for every tree to be removed.

Denis Mosgofian: So the 15,000 trees in Sharp Park seems like a lot over twenty years.

Lisa Wayne: In 400 acres. Sharp Park is huge.

Stacy Bradley: There are 65,000 trees down there.

Denis Mosgofian: So that would be the equivalent of 40 percent of Golden Gate Park, so 15,000 trees even in that area is a fair number over twenty years. Will those be replaced?

Stacy Bradley: That will basically be converted into grassland and the EIR looks at the greenhouse gas conversion between changing over these trees into a different habitat species and it shows that the greenhouse gas conversion is beneficial, we don't end up losing any carbon sequestration from this conversion.

Denis Mosgofian: You're saying if you remove these 15,000 trees over twenty years in Sharp Park and not replace them you don't lose any carbon sequestration?

Stacy Bradley: We are replacing them with other plants. It's not a tree for a tree but it's we're revegetating the area.

Lisa Wayne: The canyon above Sharp Park has [unintelligible]. There's rich coastal scrub and woodland habitats in that canyon. So it's a mix. There are some areas with grassland. The property sits between two Federal properties, Sweeney Ridge and Malaga Ridge. So if you've ever gone hiking on that that skyline area off of Highway 35 that's the kind of habitat that you find. So in the areas you find woodlands along the creek and then there's a mixture of scrub and woodland and grassland in the upper slopes.

Denis Mosgofian: [unintelligible] When you plant new plants and you plant other trees you're not going to be planting twenty-foot trees I presume.

Lisa Wayne: Right.

Denis Mosgofian: So that's going to make the carbon sequestration much less so it looks to me like this particular aspect of it adds to the challenge despite the promises.

Lisa Wayne: The trees themselves in they're not burned up, right, they had sequestered their carbon. An aging tree is going to sequester actually a lot less carbon than a young growing tree. So while in the end, like maybe year to year it might be a little lopsided one way or another but in the end when those trees get larger—so you sequester the carbon in the fallen trees and there are many slowly releasing it as they decompose but at the same time you've got new trees or new vegetation that's been planted that's sequestering at the same time then when they get to be larger they're actually sequestering more carbon than the original state of the aging trees.

Denis Mosgofian: Okay. I have another question. In the course of the presentation there was some reference to that this plan will enhance both environmental and social justice and since I'm an advocate of both I'm wondering just how this plan will do that, especially the social justice part of it.

Lisa Wayne: So you probably know that our Department has a very vibrant nature education program and we work with these kids all the time, youth from San Francisco, from all different neighborhoods that come to experience nature in these natural areas. I work with kids who that is their nature experience, bringing them to McLaren Park, experiencing the banana slugs, seeing a

red tailed hawk, their whole world is like blown apart. These are kids that have never seen the Pacific Ocean. These natural areas and the nature experience that they perceive and that they experience is invaluable. Many of our youth of San Francisco are not able to drive to Yosemite and have those kinds of experiences. So particularly in certain sections of the city like in the southeast and McLaren Park, Bayview Hill, I really feel like we are serving and providing for that nature education and nature experience for our urban youth. They wouldn't necessarily get that same experience from Mark's Meadow in Golden Gate Park if they even went that far afield. Like McLaren Park is the back yards of many of these kids—Viz Valley Middle School is right there. There's a ton of schools [unintelligible].

Denis Mosgofian: [unintelligible]

Lisa Wayne: You know, I think it's both honestly. I've seen it firsthand with some of these kids and it's powerful stuff that they experience.

Denis Mosgofian: There's a thought that any kind of outdoor educational program [unintelligible]. Not that this program isn't doing what you just described. [unintelligible]

Chair: Thank you Denis. Anthony.

Anthony Cuadro: District 7. I don't know if this was covered and I missed but what is the funding mechanism?

Stacy Bradley: So that's a great question. There is no funding identified right now. The Natural Resources Division exists and is funded so at the moment I believe the funding will hold as relatively the same for next year as it is for this year. So every year as funding comes from one level or one space or another, so that's another point to provide comment.

Anthony Cuadro: Would the theoretical 2018 bond have funding in it for something like this?

Lisa Wayne: The structure of the next General Obligation bond would be a process [unintelligible]. So there has not been funding for natural areas projects as such in the past two months. There have been funds for McLaren Park and parks that include natural areas and there is also a trails program which received funding to improve access to natural areas and not just [unintelligible].

Linda D'Avirro: I thought some money came out of the open space fund?

Lisa Wayne: There is some money from the open space fund that [unintelligible].

Linda D'Avirro: Okay, thank you, good. But not for the program?

Lisa Wayne: [unintelligible]

Ancel Martinez: Just a note on the last item there, you say that [unintelligible] What would be the next step?

Stacy Bradley: Well, the next step is if the votes go forward it's approved and adopting CEQA findings means you adopt everything that's within the environmental review, so all of the mitigation measures [unintelligible] part of the plan. So it's everything that's spelled out in the EIR is what we are committing to do and if anything else comes out at the certification we would adopt that as well.

Ancel Martinez: So from a staff perspective would you participate coming back to PROSAC with any requests of information [unintelligible]?

Stacy Bradley: Yes, absolutely, as the projects are developed absolutely. We would come back whenever there was a project to discuss. The projects would be implemented in the same way as a typical capital project would be implemented where we go through the community engagement process.

Jordyn Aquino: District 4. My question specifically is about a natural resource area. So I wanted to know why Pine Lake wasn't identified on the map?

Stacy Bradley: Oh, was it not? That might have just been an oversight. [simultaneous comments]

Jordyn Aquino: [unintelligible] from this past fiscal year it listed Pine Lake Park as one of the lower scoring parks and so I think it would be most beneficial.

Stacy Bradley: Thank you, it's funny how you look at things so many times and you miss then something that's very obvious. [laughs]

Chair: Any other questions for Stacy on this item? I'm going to turn this over to public comment. You have two minutes to comment. I have a huge stack of public comment. I'm going to default to ex-PROSAC members who are both in attendance presenting publically. We're going to start with Linda Shaffer who just recently left us as a member of PROSAC.

Linda Shaffer: Good to see you all again. This will not come as a surprise. I'm of course here as a strong supporter of the natural area program and its proposed management plan. I'm glad someone remembers that with Jake's help I gave presentations on what natural areas are. Very quickly, I congratulate everyone who has been working on this for what, a hundred years now? It's a really incredible document and I would say more but I have no time. Two things that I just wanted to speak about today, first of all I'm still—I'm a member of the California Native Plant Society and that's the hat I'm wearing today. I'm still hearing evidence that people don't follow a stiff difference between nonnative plants and invasive plants so I would like to remind everyone that the natural areas program when they are doing habitat restoration and everything that they do and when this plan starts to be implemented it's invasive plants that are going to be the target. The natural areas program does not take plants out just because they're nonnative plants. So please people stop saying that. Jake is going to give you examples as to when invasive

plants are really a problem. I know you're not taking a vote tonight but I'd just like to encourage all of you who feel moved to do so, show up on the 15th of December, individually email the Commissions with support of measures I hope and look forward to seeing you all there.

Frank Triska: I'll try to talk real fast. I started back [unintelligible] was actually planting native plants on Billy Goat Hill and a few months later I went back and most of them had died. Within a year all of them had died. Then a couple years later we did another thing, some software company donated thousands of dollars worth of plants. All of us went in there, we did our best, we planted them. Within a year they were all dead. They also planted two oak trees which did very well. So it wasn't a complete flop but I would like to remind you that having a native plant goal is fine but the goal has to be realistic and to make it realistic what you need is very strong oversight and evaluation. Whenever you do any projects someone has to come in later, find out which species lived, which died, why they lived or why they died. And if you don't do that you're just wasting a lot of money. Number two is that a natural forest—if you go to a virgin forest it has dead trees, it has live trees, it has tall trees, short trees. A natural forest is kind of a mess. So if you never cut down any of the trees which don't look good—remember, a natural forest isn't according to man's aesthetic, it's according to nature's aesthetic and nature is putting it there. So if you want to control the aesthetic you make it into a park, you trim all the leaves and you prune everything. But that's not really natural anymore, it's a man-approved, manicured area rather than what was formerly a natural forest. Thank you.

Chair: Lisa, on that subject I would assume just for the committee's reference that you [unintelligible] as this is happening like he's saying that you're now taking stock of areas that were replanted and seeing what's living, what's dying, giving the best suit for the future.

Lisa Wayne: Yes and every site is different.

Chair: But like he's saying you're learning and using that information.

Lisa Wayne: Yes.

Chair: Let's move on. Nadine Weil.

Nadine Weil: Thank you for having me, this is my first time here. If you want to be a climate-resilient city then the proposed one-to-one replacement rate needs to be increased to at least three. Per the most recent US Geological Survey research larger, older trees continue to sequester three times the carbon of younger trees so to recreate the climate benefits of the 18,000 trees that will ultimately be killed San Francisco needs to plant a whopping 54,000 trees. If you don't plant three-to-one this program will cause climate change. Number two, San Francisco Recreation and Park as we all know has \$1 billion in deferred maintenance and the public would rather spend the taxpayer dollars on doing those essential maintenance needs than cutting down beloved sanctuaries and poisoning children's parks with pesticides. Those stumps by the way are sprayed with herbicide that bio-accumulate in the environment so trees will not grow back. There are forty species of birds living on Mt. Davidson right now, not just two, forty species. If you kill the 1600 trees on Mt. Davidson you are killing the home of forty birds. I'm concerned about the slide that talks about the poor condition of the trees. On Mt. Davidson they only surveyed the

perimeter trees and then extrapolated that data to the entire 1600 trees. Peter Earland was out there this past weekend. Those 1600 trees the majority are healthy and can live for another 200 years. It is absolutely false to say that 80 percent of the trees in a natural areas are in poor to fair condition. Unfortunately, anyone who votes for this project right now is remarkably voting for a project that contains serious environmental misrepresentations [unintelligible] Google Earth Outreach all support the saving of Mt. Davidson. And removing Mt. Davidson from the natural areas program or saving many of the 1600 trees as possible. Thank you for having me. Please save the trees.

Chair: Moving on, Denise Louie.

Denise Louie: I studied ecology at City College and today I want to urge you as individuals to speak in support of the NRMP at the Recreation and Park Planning hearing on December 15th. Why? Because San Francisco is an important part of the biodiversity hotspot that is California. What is a biodiversity hotspot? It's a place filled with numerous and varied indigenous plant and animal species which are at risk of extinction due to human activities. We humans have converted habitats, introduced invasive nonnative plants and contributed to climate change. These are the three major threats to the biodiversity that San Francisco and California are internationally known for. Now is the time for you to act. The city's 32 significant natural resource areas are what little remains of our natural heritage and it's up to us to support the NRMP. Thank you.

Chair: Moving on, Tom Borden.

Tom Borden: I'm an engineer in case you can't figure that out. I have so many comments I'd like to make, I don't know where to start. I've provided this information and also the backup information, there's a much more extensive document that's on a CD, hopefully that will be put up so you can see it. It backs up every assertion made in this paper and I want to say first of all the carbon sequestration thing is the king's new clothes. The idea that you can cut down 15,000 trees, replant it with grassland and you'll be sequestering more carbon is incorrect, it's false, and I would say [unintelligible] the EIR and the supporting documents which I have it's a sham and it's a purposeful miscalculation, they purport to use a method that's presented by CalEEMod and they actually don't use the method. The other thing I'd like to point out is that the natural areas program requires on-trail use only in natural areas, the SNRMP only says MA2 which of course implied MA1 is also on trail only or no access and the signs were put up in January and February of 2015 require that you stay on trail in all natural areas. The penalty, a \$100 fine. And so social justice—half of McLaren Park is natural areas, actual accessible land will be 5 percent of that. Bayview Hill is almost all natural area. You're getting way less than even 5 percent of that park. They closed off the two—the whole western side of the park is now closed for the trail improvement project. They put up a new fence and along with the signs it means the whole western side that used to go around the radio station, now it's blocked off. Thank you, please read the rest of the documents.

Jake Sigg: I love trees. I love the trees on Mt. Davidson. In 1990 many years before the city through of managing these areas by creating a program I talked to the Miraloma Park improvement club drawing attention to the menace of ivy monopolizing the understory and

crawling up trees. I was enamored of its beauty and the mood created and hoped to generate interest in taking steps to save the trees. I was not successful in this with a result visible today. Trees growing too close together, succumbing to the ivy, reaching up into the crowns of 180-foot tall trees causing them to topple. This is a very common sight especially on the north side of the mountain which is unsightly and among other things it endangered hikers on the mountains. We've got serious hazards out there. The blue gums themselves are unable to regenerate in these conditions, something never mentioned by critics of Recreation and Park. The preemption of the understory ivy and blackberry means that wildlife find little sustenance in this unkempt, chaotic, weedy situation. Among the charges the natural resources Division is responsible for is maintaining and encouraging wildlife diversity and numbers. There has been much false information and baseless statements in the media about the actions of the natural resources Division. A frequent statement is that removing certain plants because they are "nonnative" 90 to 95 percent of the nonnative plants are ignored by the natural resources Division for the reason that they are not addressing and don't pose a threat to the native biological community which comprises our natural heritage. The program targets those plants which are displacing native species of animals which have been here for hundreds of thousands of years and are public treasures. For accurate information about the state of the Tasmanian blue gum plantations on Mt. Davidson and in other parts of the city I recommend reading four articles I wrote for the West Side Observer, that's westsideobserver.com, in the September, November, and December 2015 issue and then November 2016 issues. Opponents were unsuccessful in attempting rebut anything said there. Please, if you cherish the trees and the wildlife in the city support city staff which has labored under difficult conditions and inadequate [unintelligible].

Rachel Kesel: Hi there. I met in a natural areas program while I was a student at San Francisco State and I struck up an internship under the guidance of staff there. I decided to make that my career path and I now work outside of the county but continue to live in the city of San Francisco. I eventually moved into a fulltime position with the Recreation and Park Department in what is now known as the natural resources Division and I worked there for five years. I feel like I can speak to the modesty of this plan and the core values that are in this plan and the way that they are widely accepted throughout the Bay Area region. I agree with Dawn that these core principles are programmatic and can guide work in a way that allows you to have a project level discussion and community input that can guide work that is site specific and I can see that in my years of working with the Department which included nearly five years as either a consultant in GIS and surveying, an intern and a staff member, that's ten years of experience, the first thing I was hired to do was actually a sustainable dog walking outreach project. I came to this program as a commercial dog walker, that was my job and they wanted me to come in and talk to my fellow dog walkers about how to take care of [unintelligible] because erosion there is so bad and critical and I spent two and a half years working on that project and as you know the conversations around this program are hot, they are heated, and no one wanted to take that work over when I left. I went to grad school and I got a degree at the University College London in conservation science and I applied that degree for five years with this program. These folks know what they're doing. They're leaders in this field. We should be proud to have this program and I support them 100 percent. I hope you as Linda said and join us on December 15th to support us at the joint Commission meeting.

Jonathan Meade: I'm part of a group of people who are out in the Bayview who are advocating for Palou-Phelps, one of the little green areas up there on the map, I hope it is. And I just wanted to let you guys know that this is a really beautiful, rather large, [unintelligible] hillside grassland, [unintelligible] we really think it's worth preserving and improving but that's going to take a lot of work and what it means is it's probably also going to take some money. So I just wanted to come by and say hello and let you guys know that we want to work with you guys [unintelligible]. We're going to need help from PROSAC and other groups to really address the issues that need to be looked at in order to really improve and preserve that area which is a really beautiful spot. See you around.

Linda D'Avirro: Is this an area, Palou-Phelps that needs to be acquired or is this already acquired?

Jonathan Meade: It's complicated. Some of the land I think is Recreation and Park, some is DPW and some is privately owned so to really make it happen and preserve the hillside in a really beautiful way this [unintelligible].

Linda D'Avirro: The reason I'm asking that is I've had someone approach me about a section of it that they're looking to have our group consider for acquisition so I'm wondering if that's part of this natural area. [simultaneous comments] So it is part of that natural area, okay, thank you.

Female Speaker: Yeah and it's on your acquisition roster already.

Chair: Just to remind the entire committee we did hear Palou-Phelps at least once during this chairship.

Anthony Cuadro: And your group is just for clarification is in support, right?

Jonathan Meade: [unintelligible]

Chair: Moving on, Robert Sutton.

Robert Sutton: I'm here as a citizen not as part of any group [unintelligible] but I just wanted to share some feedback because I probably spend as much time in these areas [unintelligible] as anyone that's working on some of these projects and probably about on average maybe five to ten hours a week for maybe the last fourteen years, running, cycling. So I compare Twin Peaks with Mt. Davidson with Glen Park. What I've seen is very disturbing for the last fourteen years in terms of the amount of trees that have been removed and what's wound up in its place. The trails—a lot of trails have closed that didn't use to be and the trails that are existing where there used to be a lot of trees there's a mass of poison oak pretty much everywhere now. So I think what's happened is the trees that were there didn't prevent some of the undergrowth which was not things that we necessarily want to have in the parks. So what I see and what I've seen on a regular basis is guys in white haz-mat suits spraying stuff in the parks and kids playing. I've seen a lot of trees cut down, massive piles of wood chippings and everything that gets hauled away. A lot of reduced trails and reduced access to nature and increased erosion in a lot of these areas

where they've taken these tree down because surface grass just does not cut it when you used to have trees with roots. So these things all concern me and it concerns me that it's getting funded with tax dollars. So it's nice to have an ideology I think the natural areas program was originally a good-intended program that's kind of run amuck. I think it should probably be reined in.

Anastasia Glikshtern: [unintelligible] On the question of cutting down trees there is a table [unintelligible] is actually a very dishonest presentation because [unintelligible] I live next to Mt. Davidson and the herbicides are used as was told all the time. I was told by [unintelligible]. Oh, by the way, I want to tell—Mt. Davidson [unintelligible]

Chair: Thank you. Carolyn Johnston.

Carolyn Johnston: The core value of this might be fine but cutting down trees is not fine. You can put in plenty of native plants in lots of places in the natural areas, in fact we [unintelligible]. And by the way if eucalyptus trees were in fact invasive don't you think they might have moved over to the part of Mt. Davidson [unintelligible]. And then I don't know how they're planning to water these gardens that they plan to put in in the middle of these remote areas of Mt. Davidson. There's a letter from an attorney pointing out the plan was devised [unintelligible] and apparently it was also [unintelligible] before there was any discussion of climate change either. And so there was no [unintelligible] so how are they going to come up with the water to irrigate these new native plants in these remote areas of Mt. Davidson. Are they going to run hoses up there? Water trucks? Whatever [unintelligible] they're going to cut down these trees then they're going to plant something and it's all going to die and then it's going to be a mess. Eucalyptus trees are drought tolerant and there's a California [unintelligible] that acknowledges that. They're extremely drought tolerant. They do well in a drought but instead what we're talking about is clear-cutting these areas and replacing them with plants that have to be watered and that are going to die in this day of drought and climate change there should not be any tree cuttings and [unintelligible].

Rupa Bose: I'm actually speaking for the San Francisco Parks Alliance and I completely agree that one of the wonderful things about our city is having these natural areas. Unfortunately it does set up a forced dichotomy because it gives the impression that what they're trying to do is to say either we have these natural areas or we sell them to developers or something. And I completely support having them. I would support acquiring extra land [unintelligible]. I thought that there were a lot of factual inaccuracies in some of the assumptions that have gone into this account. I won't address all of them in two minutes but just the one—[unintelligible] versus eucalyptus. The studies actually show that [unintelligible] and eucalyptus forests have equal amounts of biodiversity and eucalyptus is the world's largest flowering tree. It supports not just hawks and [unintelligible] but all kind of birds and animals. It supports honeybees, it support Monarch butterflies, [unintelligible], little brown creeper birds that are this big and [unintelligible] extremely biodiverse as long as you don't insist on defining biodiversity and only native biodiversity [unintelligible] underlying that concept.

Chair: Thank you. Lisa Dollar.

Lisa Dollar: I just want to say that [unintelligible] there's something about walking into [unintelligible] trees that just quiets me and it does this for many, many people. It touches the heart. Trees are living things. Underneath the ground they're all connected by the roots and they communicate to each other so when they're under threat they signal to each other. So that was the first thing. The greatest threat to little creatures that live in the forest are herbicides and the destruction of the habitat and this plan would do that. Herbicides are [unintelligible]. Our butterflies are dying. We really can't be adding poisons. Animals actually and trees [unintelligible] they thrive by letting their own wisdom come forth. The greatest and most vivid example is the area of Chernobyl. I don't know if any of you have seen the video but don't be frightened by the title is called The Radioactive Wolves of Chernobyl but it's actually about how the species have come back. Thought people can't live there—the guys that come in haz-mat suits, the scientists who do their tests and see what's going on they're astounded by what's happening there. The animals and the trees they have regenerated. Only people can't live there but animals can. And finally when we had whatever it was—the prairie dogs were removed because people thought it was a good idea to do that look what happened? There was a dust bowl. Nature has a system.

Chair: Is there any other public comment on this item? Being none, that item is closed. Thank you all for coming out. It was very beneficial and good to hear everybody's perspective on this item.

I'd like to move quickly to the next item, Item #8 new business. I don't want to spend too much time on this item, I think we've spent plenty of time on this. I will be moving this item up in the agenda perhaps in the January meeting. Anthony do you have something?

Anthony Cuadro: I wanted to perhaps add something. Twin Peaks, there was like a realignment of the Twin Peaks with a partnership with RPD and other city agencies and perhaps we could have someone come and speak about it.

Chair: Sure, I would ask you to email me that and I will add it to our conversation with RPD. Does anybody else have anything that is not on this agenda that you would like to see added to this. Okay, one thing I would like to just make you aware of, Mark Scheuer mentioned something to me when we were talking and I took it to heart that I think it's something that the committee needs to look at. Basically we're a sanctuary city and the reality is that in the next administration there may be funding cuts based on us being defunded at a Federal level. So I spoke to the General Manager about it and I would like to add both the Mayor's office on budget planning and Phil come and talk about what the implications might be to our parks and open spaces if in fact our Federal funding is cut. Phil made it sound to me and I guess Dawn could probably speak to this, basically that Recreation and Park will be one of the late impacts. But what Phil did say was that the general fund would be impacted because there's a lot of money that comes Federally to the general fund and we obviously—Recreation and Park feeds off of that fund.

So I asked once—we have no way of knowing what might happen in January or February but I'd like Phil to come with the Mayor's office and see to that at some point. Linda?

Linda D'Avirro: If I could add to that—because of the passage of Prop B there is the baseline that could pull the additional \$3 million. If it drops below a certain amount that is—it's \$200 million. But anyway if it drops at a certain amount you will not get that \$3 million addition so that is another factor.

Chair: Certainly and he mentioned that, he did mention that if the city's budget is impacted that it would trickle down to the \$3 million baseline that the Department got. So I think it's an important agenda item. I don't think it's anything we can address immediately but it is something I'd like to see on the calendar. Denis?

Denis Mosgofian: District 5. To that point I think what it would really help [unintelligible] because these impacts [unintelligible] in every Department and not just [unintelligible] because otherwise we're looking at Germany or Italy.

Chair: I think we all know this may impact us in different ways. It was important—I felt it was important [simultaneous comments]. I had Phil on the phone and I said you know what's your opinion of this, could you please give me some perspective and he was optimistic in the sense that immediately he didn't think it would be hugely impactful but he thought over time that it could really affect us and affect San Francisco as a whole. So I think it's great, thank you for bringing that up.

Are there any other agenda items that we need to add to the agenda? So I have one item I want to be heard that's not on the agenda, there's public comment. Tom would like to make a comment on the equity metrics and then I have one more thing to add and we'll get out of here.

[simultaneous comments]

Denis Mosgofian: I just got this—maybe a lot of you got it, we get a request from Parks Alliance to help fund such things as Bayview Park and I didn't know [unintelligible] I didn't know that Bayview Park received a tremendous amount of money from the State and other sources and that the State had actually come up with almost \$400 million to provide for parks in underserved areas. I was just struck by I didn't know, you heard about this, but the only reason I found out is because I got this solicitation [unintelligible] and I didn't even know that was a park that maybe should have been one of the parks listed as a priority park. In any case they've done a beautiful job apparently. I haven't been there yet but according to this. That's it.

Chair: That's absolutely a good point and I think Dawn, Denis raises a point that we don't really know—you guys are funding, the capital Division is funding but knowing that there are other funding sources that maybe just don't even get—we don't need to see it, it's not on our radar. But it's interesting to hear that the State is funding let's say parks in equity zones.

Dawn Kamalanathan: For other park properties, not for ours.

Chair: Right, but other [simultaneous comments].

Dawn Kamalanathan: [unintelligible] San Francisco is unusual in the number of jurisdictions I think that we have [unintelligible].

Chair: Yeah, I mean I think it would be again something—I don't know who exactly might present to us but parks that aren't RPD parks but are being funded by [unintelligible].

Dawn Kamalanathan: [unintelligible] You know, the same funding streams also fund some of our neighborhood park projects too and [unintelligible].

Chair: I think it would just be interesting to have that dialogue and have RPD here.

[simultaneous comments]

Denis Mosgofian: [unintelligible] that suggests the folks in that neighborhood raised about \$1.5 million.

Female Speaker: There's add-backs too!

[simultaneous comments]

Dawn Kamalanathan: I'd have to go look at their particular budget but I actually believe it's a pretty even [unintelligible]. I think right now there's a pretty even blend.

Female Speaker: Yes.

Dawn Kamalanathan: Or significant blend of general fund add-back dollars that are being [unintelligible].

Female Speaker: And when they submit it for a community opportunity fund request that's how it came out at that time.

Denis Mosgofian: Do they got community opportunity funds—

Female Speaker: No, they were granted. Or did we? I can't remember honestly but I do know at that time when we analyzed it there was a significant amount in terms of matching funds is what you have to do for COF. And it was add-backs and some community raising and also volunteer hours.

Denis Mosgofian: So was [unintelligible].

[simultaneous comments]

Male Speaker: It was on the list but not the first tier. [simultaneous comments]

Denis Mosgofian: [unintelligible] I have a concern that some areas are well-off enough to be able to raise this kind of money and in my own person life where I live there was nobody that

could ever raise this kind of money to improve the parks unless the public tax dollars were used and the [unintelligible] impressive but it also says that it's pay to play, in other words the city is not able to come up with that money so if they do it themselves then I'm just concerned about the other neighborhoods that can't do it.

Chair: One thing that I'll say to that—sorry [unintelligible]. Denis, one thing you know before you walked in as part of my Chair's Report I talked a little bit about the sister parks program and I think that this identifies an exact reason—not a reason necessarily but a mechanism for a park 94126 for example that might be looking for a park partner in an organized [unintelligible] who does not how to raise funds, who does know how to apply for community opportunity funds or challenge grants. So I think one way to combat that or at least address it is to say okay we have identified these parks in these certain areas that simply don't have the money in their community. Let's go try to help them fundraise, let's got try to help them organize, let's help them build [unintelligible] it wasn't to go and get your hands dirty and go clean and green. Plenty of us can go do that but it's those of us who have these developed friends of groups that can say hey wait a minute you're going about this wrong. There's money out there for you, we've just got to find it, we've got to figure out ways to raise it. So I do think there's mechanisms there and you've identified exactly one main reason why I think that has to be a focus. So it's a good point, well taken.

Denis Mosgofian: I think maybe part of it goes back to something—and Dawn has always said it's really not practical but I still think that [unintelligible]. They all did really good work and came up with it but it basically is going to serve six playgrounds in a major renovation and I'm thinking you know people don't have enough time in their lives when their kids are young to wait ten or fifteen years and it would be better to spend \$1 million and do fifteen that \$2.5 million and do six. I've said that before.

Chair: You have. It's a good point and again you know it's do you want fifteen \$1 million playground or do you want six \$2.5 million playgrounds and I guess it depends on what the community wants.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: I saw what your plans were for Lafayette playground, it was \$990,000.

Dawn Kamalanathan: That was just hard cost, that was not the full—and that was also mobilized in front of a [unintelligible].

Chair: I'm saying it [unintelligible].

Dawn Kamalanathan: [unintelligible] So to do the playground fully you guys kicked in, the friends kicked in funds and also the rest of the Lafayette project wore the cost [unintelligible]. Where when you just have a playground project the playground has to absorb all of it. So it's very difficult right now to do a straight-up playground project for \$1 million. [unintelligible] we had a \$1 million budget for Hyde-Turk and we successfully managed to get through the Mayor's Office another \$700,000—sorry that was for Macaulay, I'm getting them mixed up—to leverage

that budget because it wasn't enough even for this tiny park to be able to redo the full [unintelligible]. I just want to keep putting that fact out there that the days of being able to actually deliver a playground for \$1 million under all the city's mandates that exist and that also hit things like ADA and [unintelligible] access that might be triggered, those days are long past. It's just the cost of—it's not a scoping choice that we're deciding to do something extra fancy, it's just what it's turning out to cost. You know, the kind of playground that you see at Mission Playground so not even custom work.

Chair: Okay, so committee everybody good? Everybody is holding on? There's two public items. I'll give Tom two minutes on a non-agenda item.

Tom Borden: I'll try to keep this really short. I'll pass this out so I don't have to say exactly. But I want to speak about the equity metrics at the final [unintelligible] hearing for the equity metrics [unintelligible]. Before I ever start I'm going to read a statement from the Controller [unintelligible] from the Controller's Office reviewed the data and [unintelligible] Recreation and Park equity metrics [unintelligible]. That was it. You know, who's going to argue on the Commission [unintelligible] and sure enough I get a statement back about [unintelligible] but from Taylor the same day [unintelligible].

Chair: Okay and finally Anastasia [unintelligible].

Anastasia Glikshtern: [unintelligible]

Chair: Okay. We're to the last item here.

Ana Gee: District 6, sorry this is not on the topic but it's related. So it will be very helpful for either both for people that are commenting and making comments and from Recreation and Park that every time you refer to a research you actually give us an actual study so we can look it up, the name.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: Thank you Ana and I think that I would assume [unintelligible] that for example tree studies [unintelligible]. Any other comments or announcements? Okay, so hearing none—

Female Speaker: [unintelligible]

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: I think we all would like to know more detail. Okay, so before I wrap this up I just wanted to make a quick presentation to my good friend Linda D'Avirro. [simultaneous comments] We all know what it says. Linda, I will just tell you you're big shoes to fill and I feel like as Chair now, I've been Chair for about six months, it's a daunting job and I thought Les was a great Chair until I met you and I think you did an amazing job in the two years and I think that our committee feels that—three years, was it really three years?

Linda D'Avirro: Maybe I only did a good job for two years [laughs].

Chair: But in order to honor that before the year passes and we get onto our next year of business your Supervisor as well as every other Supervisor signed this certificate for you. So we'd like to thank you for your service as Chair of PROSAC. [applause]

Okay, any other public comments? Hearing none, this meeting is adjourned.

End of Document