

**PROSAC Meeting
February 2, 2016**

Chair: This is the meeting of the February Park and Rec Advisory Committee. First of all I'd like to thank you all for coming. We have a full agenda tonight so I'm going to try to hustle it along. I want to remind you that those of you that are seated near the speaker, Anthony and Jane, your voice gets picked up even in whispers so that if you don't want that on the transcript you should remain silent. Also, a reminder to all of you to identify yourself by name and district the first time through and afterwards at least your name because I notice the transcribers to understand later on that you're from a certain district. It's very important because otherwise I have to listen to the transcript again and identify the speakers.

For our guests we do have blue cards. This is a public meeting, it is recorded and records kept so if you do want to speak please avail yourself of one of these blue cards and the Secretary will call them in the order received. You will have two minutes to speak.

With that, as we normally do for the record please identify ourselves and our district, starting to my left.

Les Hilger: Les Hilger, District 1.

Robert Brust: Robert Brust, District 8.

Winnie Chu: Winnie Chu, District 7.

Anthony Cuadro: Anthony Cuadro, District 7.

Jane Weil: Jane Weil, District 6.

Linda Shaffer: Linda Shaffer, District 10.

Ancel Martinez: Ancel Martinez, at large.

Jordyn Aquino: Jordyn Aquino, District 4.

Heather Fuchs: Heather Fuchs, District 4.

Richard Rothman: Richard Rothman, District 1.

Sharon Eberhardt: Sharon Eberhardt, District 11.

Kim Hirschfield: Kim Hirschfield, District 3.

Steffen Franz: Steffen Franz, District 2.

Chair: Linda D'Avirro, District 11. Thank you. Our first agenda item is a review of the minutes and you should have a copy in front of you of the minutes. Is there a motion to approve. Second by Les. Okay, so that was a motion by Steffen, seconded by Les. All in favor?

All: Aye.

Chair: Anyone opposed? Thank you. Is there any public comment on the agenda before I close this item? Seeing none this item is closed, thank you. The third item is the Chair's report.

Tomorrow. Wednesday, February 3rd, at Palega I just want to remind all of you from 6:00 to 7:30 in the evening is the budget presentation which will be similar to tonight's presentation but if you haven't already invited your neighbors, your neighborhood and park groups, I really urge you to do that because that's our role as PROSAC members to bring them out and let the public know how their tax dollars are being spent and it's also an opportunity for them to ask questions.

Next Tuesday, February 9th, is the second and final meeting also from 6:00 to 7:30 and that's going to be at the Jean Friend Center at Mission and 6th.

Also a reminder that elections will take place in April. If you are interested in running in Chair, First Chair, Second Chair, this is the time to ask your fellow members to endorse you. We will have those elections during that meeting.

And finally the other announcement is the charter amendment has gone forward to the Board of Supervisors. I'm happy to report that the extension to the Open Space Fund is now in that legislation and will go out another fifteen years to 2046. I'm really happy that the working group took a part in that, thank you. Also of course our equity concerns were in there from probably the second meeting I think it was and our name is in there. One of our roles as PROSAC will be to ensure that those discussions that come up at our meetings go back and reflect this legislation that presumably when it passes because a lot of what is in here will be later on presented as the work plans and their priorities and so it's incumbent upon us to make sure that those priorities are being followed so that many of the parks and playgrounds are brought up to maintenance standards. It's really a great win on our side.

With that, does anyone have any comments or questions about the charter amendment? Yes, Linda Shaffer.

Linda Shaffer: Linda Shaffer, District 10. Can you just tell us really quickly how the Open Space extension made into the current version despite all the opposition and what anyone expects when it gets to the Board of Supervisors?

Chair: That I don't know. I haven't had a chance to talk with our Supervisor Avalos but there was negotiations with John Avalos and Mark Ferrell.

Linda Shaffer: Thank you.

Chair: Any other questions?

Robert Brust: So the final is online if you want to pull it up real quick, right?

Chair: Yes. It's legislation version 4. If you'd like I can send that following the meeting. Any other member comments. Is there any public comment?

May Wong: May from the Excelsior. Palega is at Felton and [unintelligible] Streets in the Portola and then secondly on Facebook I noticed that there are certain groups saying that because of Farrell's amendment that monies are going to the Natural Areas Project and that they are encouraging people to be against the amendment so I just wanted some clarification.

Chair: I have no comment on that. In fact we can ask during—there's set amounts that go to each one of these categories and I'm sure we'll cover some of that when the budget presentation is on. I know there's a couple that speak to that but I'm not aware of the context of what you're talking about so I can't even start to respond to that. Maybe in the future we can. Thank you, any other public comment? Being none, public comment is closed.

Next is Capital and Planning monthly update from Dawn.

Dawn Kamalanathan: Hello everyone. The Capital and Planning monthly update today is that Mission Dolores Park has opened [applause]. That took nine years and \$20 million. Are there any questions about that?

Robert Brust: District 8. I just want to say thank you very much. It really does look great. The bathrooms are first class, the benches, the picnic tables, they look nothing like what you thought a picnic table was supposed to look like. What, are they mahogany? So it's stunning. But it looks like a lot of things were left out especially around the edges, still waiting for more trash cans around that are supposed to be placed around the edges and they cobbled together some things out of plywood.

Dawn Kamalanathan: They're coming.

Robert Brust: And the 20th Street strip was just quickly cleaned up and covered because the contractor wasn't told to do anything else.

Dawn Kamalanathan: Well, is that side being planted though and they just needed to get it ready to have something for the opening that day.

Robert Brust: The gardener says that's what they're going to do for that day. This was like within 24 hours. Then they're going to pull it back and somebody is going to spray the whole thing with Insta-Lawn, hydroseed.

Dawn Kamalanathan: Thank you Robert. I'd really like to acknowledge the work of Jake Gilcrest and Carol Ruport. Carol was working for RJA actually as a private architect but she did

most of the design actually for the park, she led that when she was on BRAHA which is an architecture firm side and Jake Gilcrest who has been project managing this for several years and is probably more deeply relieved than any person on the planet that the project has successfully opened to the public so thank you very much.

Steffen Franz: District 2. Robert, just hang in baby. [unintelligible] But I will tell you from personal experience that the first day is the hardest.

Robert Brust: The conversations we had what was it, last month or the month before that when Denny came in.

Steffen Franz: Did that give you some clarity?

Robert Brust: It did.

Chair: We'll be doing the counterpoint next month.

Dawn Kamalanathan: Yes, I have agreed to do that, yes. The only other note I'd like to add is that for 17th and Folsom Park we are going to—our intent is to pursue a supplemental appropriation in the Board of Supervisors not for General Fund dollars but for surplus Eastern Neighborhoods impact fees and that will allow us because the two-year delay when the PUC was thinking about the cistern has really caused major cost differences, we lost our moment in the market to take advantage of a better market. So now we have like a \$700,000 overage deficit that we need to fix about \$200,000 of which is at alternates, so things that could conceivably be cut. But the good news is there is this surplus impact fee so we're just going for it and trying to fully fund the project because I think we've made that commitment to the community. This is the first big park to be built through Eastern Neighborhoods and it's important that we kind of move forward with that so please keep an eye out for that and we'll be working with the Mayor's Office and the Board of Supervisors to hopefully move that forward in the next few weeks.

Les Hilger: Les Hilger, District 1. That was my question, it's going to be a Supervisor-Mayor conversation?

Dawn Kamalanathan: Yeah, it actually should be a pretty minimal conversation between them. I think that everyone has acknowledged at this point the legitimacy of the ask, it's about timing and paperwork and there's always twenty other conversations going on that you don't want to interfere with or be the victim of so we're just trying to move that forward in as low-key a way as possible.

Jane Weil: District 6. What is the approximate timeline realistically?

Dawn Kamalanathan: Probably eight weeks.

Jane Weil: For the actual construction.

Dawn Kamalanathan: Oh, construction, we wanted to start in March but I can't really start until I have all the cash in hand. So we are ready to go and then once we're ready to go around a year for construction.

Chair: Will you be convening a meeting? We had talked about in the past having some of the Mission reps meet about 17th and Folsom in terms of the philosophy of the park.

Dawn Kamalanathan: The naming of the park or the philosophy of the park?

Chair: Apparently some four months ago or more you had asked me whether my—

Dawn Kamalanathan: That was about the naming. That was about naming the park, whether or not it's going to be called 17th and Folsom forever, just the address, or whether or not there will be a different name for the park.

Chair: Is it going to take place or not?

Dawn Kamalanathan: Actually, that was Sarah Madeline was the lead on that project. I just reached out to you guys as the liaison from the Department. So I can circle back with Sarah and ask her what the status is.

Chair: I also want to mention that one of the groups that has a website has been posting.

Dawn Kamalanathan: I'm sure.

Chair: The reason I mention the philosophy park is they have a different concept of what that park should be.

Dawn Kamalanathan: In terms of the design?

Chair: Well, whether it's open to the public or whether it's going to be a personal park for the folks that live there, we can talk about that offline.

Dawn Kamalanathan: That's a new thread, I have not heard of that before.

Chair: It's been online for a few months. I haven't looked at it lately so maybe it's changed.

Dawn Kamalanathan: All right, I can absolutely—

Chair: I just want to make sure it's a public park that's open to everyone.

Dawn Kamalanathan: Yes, that is our intention and it's also going to have an affordable housing development next to it that there's going to have a lot connectivity between that development and the park.

Chair: Thank you. Any other questions from the members for Dawn? I'll open it to public comment. Any public comment on this item? Being none, public comment is closed.

I was going to have Howard come up and change the agenda but I was asked not to because we had people that were preparing for the [unintelligible] Howard, agenda Item 7, and they'll have other comments. So we're going to move on to Item 5 as the agenda shows and that's Katie Petruccione to talk about the budget.

Katie Petrucione: Hi everybody, it's good to be here, good to see you all. So I am making my annual pilgrimage to talk about our budget planning for the next two fiscal years. So tonight I will start with the Mayor's outlook for the General Fund budget for the city as a whole, talk a little bit about the charter amendment and its impact on our budget now that we've started budget planning for fiscal year 16-17, give you an overview of our budget in the current fiscal year, talk about some proposed changes to the budget for the next two years and then have the opportunity for questions and answers.

So overall it's interesting. The Mayor's outlook for the General Fund over the next two years is actually a little mixed. They are projecting that revenue is going to continue to grow in the city, so about \$75 million worth of growth next year as well as the year after. But they are also projecting that the city's costs are going to grow more quickly than revenue and the primary driver of the expenditure growth is salary and fringe benefit costs.

City employees are scheduled to get a 3.25 percent cost of living adjustment on July 1st and then pension costs next year are going to be significantly more than the Mayor's Office had originally anticipated. There have been some changes to actuarials and then the city lost a lawsuit. Retirees filed a lawsuit against the city having to do with whether or not they could receive cost of living adjustments and the city lost so whereas the Mayor's Office had assumed not, the answer is yes retirees will be receiving cost of living on a regular basis.

So next year the Mayor's Office is projecting a shortfall of about \$100 million and cumulative two-year deficit of over \$240 million.

They issued budget instructions to Departments as they do. They've asked General Fund supported Departments to reduce General Fund support by 1.5 percent in each of the next two fiscal years and that those be ongoing reductions and then they issued a handful of policy instruction to reflect our strategic plan priorities in the budget, support development of a modern responsive, engaged government which is code for please be efficient in how you deliver services, minimize service impacts from any budget reductions and to pursue cross-departmental collaborations.

So as we all know there is this proposed charter amendment which has made it through the Rules committee. It's going to the full Board and then the expectation is that it will be placed on the June 7th ballot. Given the charter amendment the Mayor's Office has actually asked us to budget as if the charter amendment has passed for the next two fiscal years so as you all probably know by now the charter amendment creates a baseline for the Recreation and Park Department and then it grows that baseline is the current year General Fund subsidy which is \$64 million and

then the baseline grows by \$3 million a year for the next ten years so \$3 million next year, \$6 million the year after that and \$9 million the year after that. After that ten-year period our General Fund will either grow or contract based on the average growth in the General Fund for that year. So if the General Fund grows by 3.5 percent our General Fund support will grow by 3.5 percent.

However, with this baseline comes greater responsibility. So we now are going to be responsible for absorbing all cost increases and revenue changes in our budget. So if the PUC charges us \$4 million a year to deliver recycled water to Golden Gate Park we are solely responsible for eating that cost whereas in prior years that would have just been absorbed by the Mayor's Office within the larger General Fund. It's now all on us, we are on our own.

So what does that mean? It means that we are thinking about our budget in a very different way. Certainly about my staff and I are thinking about our budget balancing in a really different way and this table kind of runs through what those changes look like.

Before I start running through the table though I did just want to speak to the ballot measure and give you my take on it which is that the charter amendment really accomplishes two things for the Department . First and foremost it's going to provide us with some budget stability. We are no longer going to be subject to the changes in the economy and the in the city's General Fund budget. There were years where we were making \$5 million, \$7 million, \$12 million cuts from our General Fund budget in order to help the Mayor's Office balance the General Fund budget and those days are over. That's not to say that we won't have challenges absorbing cost increases because we may very well.

Chair: It's only for ten years?

Katie Petrucione: No, General Fund support will continue to grow after ten years.

Chair: But it's not fixed at that same point. Part of the way the legislation is written is it's only good until X date and then it's over to whatever.

Katie Petrucione: Right but our General Fund baseline continues to grow. So at the end of the ten-year period our General Fund baselines is going to be \$94 million.

Chair: It could be cut the following year.

Katie Petrucione: If the General Fund shrinks but let's be clear, the city's General Fund in the last twenty years has shrunk maybe a couple of times. By and large when you look at the city's General Fund as a whole it grows year after year. It may not grow by three or five percent but one percent, two percent. It is pretty unlikely that we are going to see an contraction in the General Fund that would then affect us. It's not impossible but it is unlikely.

So though even if the Mayor's Office were to say to us you're getting this much less in General Fund support we definitely are more masters of our own destiny given this charter amendment.

We have more control over our budget than we have ever had historically. So that is Thing One, stability.

Thing Two is that we have made a policy decision as a Department that we would like to maintain a General Fund capital budget of at least \$15 million a year. So on average we've got somewhere between \$5 million to \$7 million in General Fund capital from the Mayor's Office and the Capital Planning Committee. So that's a fairly substantial increase over what we're got in prior years and really if we can sustain that level of funding going forward it's going to help us make some progress in chipping away at our \$1 billion worth of deferred maintenance.

Dawn and I along with Denny are currently working on a project that would hopefully end up giving us some guidance about how to prioritize our deferred maintenance needs. We're going to really spend that money where we get the most bang for our buck and certainly we'll be talking to you guys about that process. We're still very much in early days but going forward.

So stability, capital funding, those are from my standpoint the two real benefits to the Department from the measure.

So to walk through this table—in prior years we've always balanced to a General Fund cut. This time we're actually balancing to a guaranteed baseline of General Fund support, \$67 million next year, \$70 million the year after. Right now in the city's budget system there is about \$58 million in General Fund support underpinning our budget, \$53 million the year after. So if you do the math there, you subtract 57.9 from 67.25 we have \$9.2 million in new General Fund that is available to us to invest in the budget and in the next year it's \$16.7 million. But as I've said, we have to absorb revenue corrections and all of our cost increases and so that's what follows. We have about \$1 million worth of revenue corrections where we were too aggressive in our revenue budget in the current fiscal year and we have to reduce the budget to more accurately reflect what we're actually earning.

Expenditure increases. As I said we've made a policy decision that we want to fund a \$15 million General Fund capital budget. Well, there's about a little less than \$7 million in the General Fund capital base budget right now and for next year. So to get to \$15 million we have to add \$8.7 million. In year two of the budget there's zero. There are no General Fund capital fund dollars in the base budget for year two so we have to add \$15.1 million of our available \$16.7 million in year two.

We want to budget a General Fund equipment budget at a little over a \$1 million. So to get there in year one it's \$250,000. Again, it's zero in the budget right now for year two so we have add \$1.1 million. We know that we're going to have to absorb work order increases where the cost of water or sewer or worker's compensation are going up. That's just a plug number right now. I really don't know what that number is, I hope it's not more than 350 but it could be. We're rolling out a new software application for our recreation registration and permitting that's going to cost an additional \$227,000 next year and going forward. And then we also know that employees are getting a 3.25 percent cost of living adjustment as I said and in the budget system permanent positions the 3.25 percent rolls through the system automatically, it just adds that to the budget but not for temporary salaries. We have many recreation program staff that folks who

are out there teaching yoga, delivering Tiny Tots, teaching ceramics classes, that are funded through temporary salary lines in our budget and so we need to add the 3.25 percent to that temporary salary budget or we're just going to lose that earning power when those folks get a 3.25 percent raise on July 1st.

So when you add the revenue corrections and the expenditure increases up and you subtract them from the \$9.2 million in year one and the \$16.7 million in year two we're actually in a deficit position. We end up being almost \$2 million deficit in year one and \$1.4 million in year two.

The good news is that we have earned income so we know that we're going to make more money next year as well as some growth in the Open Space Fund that will cover that deficit and allow us to make some enhancements, some investments in the budget over the next two fiscal years.

Richard Rothman: The figures are different on the chart.

Katie Petrucione: Sorry, I updated the chart. This is totally a work in progress so the numbers that are in your presentation are from a week ago and stuff continues to change. So these are the most up to date numbers. I'm more than happy to share the updated presentation with you.

So our budget in the current fiscal year is nearly \$180 million, \$147.7 million of that is operating, \$31 million is our capital budget in the current fiscal year and that's all sources—General Fund, [unintelligible] fee income, Open Space Fund, gifts and grants. And we have 933 budgeted and funded FTE this year.

As you know our budget is supported by a three-legged stool—Open Space Fund, earned income, and General Fund subsidy and savings. The Open Space Fund—man, we just continue to be so fortunate in having the Open Space Fund as a source for our budget. Property tax is an incredibly stable source of revenue and it also continues to grow in a pretty significant way and actually as you guys know there's some information later on that speaks to that.

Our General Fund subsidy you can see went up \$14 million this year versus last year. This is a pretty particularly strong year to baseline that General Fund subsidy. That's the highest amount in easily twenty years. And then prior year revenue and savings where we get to keep year over year growth and any savings in the General Fund and that will continue to be the case with the new charter.

Earned income. So you guys have seen this slide before and you know we generate significant revenue from our property and our assets—parking garages, concessions and citywide rentals, permits. [unintelligible] once was a very open source of income, no longer. Recreation program fees and then the Golf Fund, we generate revenue in the Marina.

And then the other category is a combination of gifts and grants, it includes revenue that we get from other City Departments for providing services to them. The library pays us to take care of the grounds around their buildings. The Public Utilities Commission pays us to do tree topping for them. So all of that is in the other category.

Earned revenue continues to grow. It drops off—these are actual figures and this shows that it actually dropped off a little bit in fiscal year 14-15 versus the prior year. That's a combination of a reduction to revenue from the stadium as well as a reduction in revenue in the marina. Really the growth that we've seen over the last five years or so is just the consequence of additional usage and enrollment. We have not raised fees in at least five years, we're just see additional use of our facilities and our programming.

So how do we spend our money? So about half of our budget supports park maintenance. We own about 12 percent of the land in the city and it takes some significant resources to take care of that land. We spend 25 percent of our budget on recreation and aquatics, 11 percent is our structural maintenance yard, carpenters, roofers, plumbers, taking care of our buildings and parks, 7 percent is administration which is me and my staff, IT, human resources, accounting, property management, Phil and his staff. Park safety, that's actually a slice of the pie that's been growing. That's up to 5 percent. In prior years it's been 2 or 3 percent. Marina and the zoo which is 1 percent of our budget and planning and volunteer programs which are two percent of the budget.

By far the single largest expenditure in the budget is salary and fringe benefits. That's staffing of course. Services of our Departments at 15 percent of our budget. We spend about \$25 million a year in work orders to Departments for repair of our vehicles, for City Attorney, workers compensation, sewer, water, light, heat and power. We have about 5 percent of the budget devoted to debt service and that is for the Marina Yacht Harbor where we borrowed money from the State of California to renovate the west harbor. And then we also as you all know issue lease revenue bonds against the Open Space Fund in 2006-2007 for neighborhood park renovations and we're repaying that. 5 percent of the budget for incidental supplies and equipment. 3 percent is the slice of the pie that goes to the San Francisco Zoological Society to help support them in running the zoo on our behalf. That slice for Harding Park is also 3 percent. And then 4 percent on services—garbage pickup, software licensing, etc.

So I always talk to you guys a little bit about the Open Space Fund and I was blown away when I did the math on what the growth in the Open Space Fund was over the last five years—21 percent. That is amazing. It's just remarkable. And then we're assuming the Controller's Office assumes pretty conservatively 3 percent growth a year going forward. So for the five-year period if you divide from 155 we get about 4.3 percent growth a year. So just as a point of comparison while revenue grew by 21 percent during that period costs grew by 15 percent. So again we're incredibly fortunate to be supported in part by the Open Space Fund.

The Controller's Office is assuming 7 percent growth next year in Open Space Fund and 4.5 percent the year after, 3 percent the years after that. Those are still pretty earlier estimates. They still have not got the second round of property tax payments which are due in April and we'll have much firmer numbers for growth in the Controller's nine-month report which comes out in April.

So similarly, how do we spend the Open Space Fund. Well, a little over 50 percent of Open Space covers salary and fringe benefits and that supports staff in doing park maintenance,

recreation stuff, natural areas stuff, urban forestry, volunteers and planning. You can see here again that service is associated with the least revenue bonds. Open space supports—20 percent of the fund goes to cover both Department and citywide overhead and then we have our charter mandated set-asides 5 percent for acquisition, 3 percent for contingency. We spend a little bit of money on capital out of the Open Space Fund every year and then an even smaller amount on material, supplies, equipment and services.

So what are we talking about in terms of changes for the next two fiscal years? So as you all know we completed our strategic plan and the Commission approved it this past summer and we are really committed to making sure that the investments that we make in the budget in the coming couple of years and really over the next five years are reflective of the strategic plan. And just to remind you, there are five strategies, each strategy has somewhere between three and four objectives. The first strategy is to inspire public space, the second inspire play, the third is to inspire investment, the fourth is to inspire stewardship and the fifth is to inspire team.

So it's still early days and as I said my numbers are changing every single day but right now I think that we're going to have some nice growth in earned income. The single largest item will be growth in revenue from parking garages and this primarily comes from Civic Center Garage. This is the second year in a row we're seeing some really nice growth there.

Leases and concessions. So admissions at the tea garden. This is another line item in my budget that every single year there is growth for us to capture in terms of actual revenue versus budget. Coit Tower elevator also there's some revenue growth there. Some growth from the Outside Lands concerts and facilities rentals. And then I think there should be at least a \$1 million in new revenue that we can comfortably capture in the Open Space Fund.

So how might we spend that money? So ideas that we are currently talking about as staff include adding a plumbing and electrician to the structural maintenance yard budget to maintain buildings, irrigation systems, lighting systems, etc. Funding to transport kids to programming outside their immediate neighborhoods. It used to be that our staff drove kids around. The city's risk manager to knock that off and so now we actually have to contract with a service and we have to pay for that. Materials and supplies for recreation programming—paint, upgrade class. We are going to fund some consulting services to guide the life cycle program, an investment in deferred maintenance. We are talking about adding an environmental planner for natural areas program and then enhancing funding for employee training and new employee recognition program.

So you guys are part of my budget outreach. Linda announced the two community meetings. You guys will have heard all of it so you don't need to come but if you can encourage friends and colleagues to attend that would really be fantastic. And then just a reminder of the timeline—I'm giving an update to our Commission on budget on Thursday and then they will consider the budget for approval and submission to the Mayor's Office on the 18th of February. The budget is due to the Mayor's Office this year on the 22nd and then the Mayor as always will submit his budget to the Board of Supervisors on June 1.

Chair: Thank you. Questions—Richard Rothman followed by Steffen and Anthony.

Richard Rothman: Richard Rothman, District 1. A couple things. One is I heard your presentation at the last Commission meeting but had to leave to go to another meeting and you know somebody who has worked for the city 26 years and been bumped around a couple times I think it would be good to put a reserve in because since you say we can't go back—I know we want to spend everything but my experience is to put a reserve in there. And the other thing in the strategic plan and object 1.4 about the historic and cultural resources it says one of the objects here is a reserve of 5 percent for cultural resources and you plan to set aside some money for cultural resources.

Katie Petrucione: That was actually specific reference to the money—so right now the Open Space Contingency Fund under our Commission policy half of the Open Space Contingency Fund is used every year for deferred maintenance work. What that initiative in the strategic plan refers to is that we would take 5 percent of what we're setting aside for deferred maintenance in the Open Space Fund every year and allocate that for work on cultural resources.

Richard Rothman: So how much is that?

Katie Petrucione: I believe that what's available for deferred maintenance this year is about \$675,000. I cannot do that math in my head.

Steffen Franz: Steffen Franz, District 2. You mentioned two major positives to us about the charter amendment. I think this body would like to know whether you think there are any negatives related to the charter amendment?

Katie Petrucione: Speaking only for myself.

Steffen Franz: That's all we're asking.

Katie Petrucione: I would wish that the Department had the opportunity to do the homework and analysis that we needed to do in order to understand what it would take to really work through our deferred maintenance backlog. We did not have the opportunity to do that. This all sort of came together before—and that's a project, right, to really do that analysis and so my concern is that while \$15 million a year in General Fund capital is fantastic and certainly better than what we would be getting otherwise it's maybe not really what the right number is and with this moving forward we will have missed the opportunity to identify the right number.

Steffen Franz: Aren't you chasing something that may or may not be a real number? Like I know you're a numbers person, I know that's important to you but I also understand that what you're saying is to try to understand what deferred maintenance is that is consistently adding to that pile can you really—I mean I appreciate your position but I also think it's like you're trying to tackle something that you don't even know where the ending is.

Katie Petrucione: I actually feel like with some—

Steffen Franz: You threw out a number like \$1 billion, is that a real number?

Katie Petrucione: Well, so one of the things that we would like to do over the next eighteen months or so is to actually do condition assessment, get a sense of basically to update Comet and that would give us a firmer idea in today's dollars of what the needs are and where the needs are. So I actually feel this is complicated and takes effort but I feel like this is a knowable number.

Steffen Franz: Okay. I have one other quick question. You mentioned for facility rentals you saw \$200,000 in growth.

Katie Petrucione: Yes.

Steffen Franz: I also so a line item that said for online reservations you expect \$233,000 a year on this new system.

Katie Petrucione: Yes.

Steffen Franz: Can you give us an idea of what facility rentals look like? I mean what is the percentage compared to what this online system might cost?

Katie Petrucione: The online system really is—the primary use, permits uses it, but the primary user of the system is actually recreation programs where they put all their programs in the system, people can enter in the system, it has point of sale, etc. The facility rentals which is really just a subsection—when I say facility rentals I mean where we're renting rec centers on the days that they're closed or gyms, it's really about buildings.

Steffen Franz: Not picnic rentals.

Katie Petrucione: Exactly, which are a different line item in the budget. The facility rentals I think were budgeted at 400 and I want to take it up to 600.

Steffan Franz: Thank you.

Anthony Cuadro: District 7. I know you said at the beginning that the Mayor has advised to put your budget around as if the charter amendment has passed but what work—or I'm sure you have—in case it doesn't.

Katie Petrucione: We don't really actually. So I suspect that what would happen is that we would agree with the Mayor's Office that we would live with the approved budget for fiscal year 16-17 and then during the budget process for 17-18 we would revert to norm, essentially. We do not have a contingency plan.

Les Hilger: Les Hilger, District 1. Katie, maybe I'm just a little late to the party but is the lifecycle project the same thing, the updating of the Comet?

Katie Petrucione: It is.

Les Hilger: And is that the same thing you have here budgeted in the annual capital budget submission for deferred maintenance consultant contracts?

Katie Petrucione: Correct.

Les Hilger: So is that the expected full amount that it's going to cost us for two years?

Katie Petruccione: Probably not, we don't know the answer to that question.

Les Hilger: It's too early?

Katie Petrucione: Exactly, yes.

Chair: Do you want us to do public comment or do you want to do your part?

Dawn Kamalanathan: Mine is shorter than Katie's so I can do it quickly and then you can ask questions. I brought printed copies of the handout that was distributed. So as Katie mentioned our policy goal is for fiscal years 17-18 to budget approximately a \$15 million General Fund capital program. That's on average about \$7 million more than we've been getting over the past few years so the General Fund capital program on average is somewhere between \$5 million to \$7 million depending on how good the year was. The past few years have been pretty good so we're probably getting another \$7-\$8 million more than we normally would with the measure passing.

Until we have completed the deferred maintenance planning project, the lifecycle project—this is the lifecycle of our assets and wanting to plan for the full lifecycle of an asset rather than just building it and walking away. Until that analysis is complete we're just trying to build off of known needs in deferred maintenance in kind of our existing expenditure patterns. So just on a high level as you look through this plan you'll see a number of oldies but goodies like the erosion line and Mather facilities and the general facilities maintenance in 88. There's also a few new categories that have been added and this includes—it says new under project code and it includes grass field rehabilitation, forestry, gateways and fencing, paving, etc. Those three categories that I think are of some interest to you guys I think one, the idea of creating a contingency reserve to Richard's very good point, this would function the same way that the bond program has a contingency and that's used for unforeseen programs. The contingency reserve would behave the same way, we would need to develop a policy about how the Commission would expend funds from there but we would create an ongoing contingency reserve because now that again we have to solve all our problems a Telegraph Hill landslide if \$4 million, right, some of the things that are most troubling often come with big price tags and you don't want to derail your whole program in one year because of that so we would try to build a little bit of a reserve for those types of issues.

We also have budgeted deferred maintenance consultant contracts over two years. That's for the Comet replacement and this is just a ballpark—the last time we built Comet it cost \$1 million

and that was ten years ago. It's a really open question, one of the main tasks for us over the next few months—probably over the next six months or so—is to kind of look around at the products that are out there now and see whether there's an existing comparable product or will we have to build something ourselves and then buy a database to put it in.

As a note for you guys is that the unusual thing about Comet is we were able to buy both the engineering services that gave us the data and the database to put the data in the same package. Many of the packages we see now are just the database to store the data and it's up to you to figure out how to populate it and so that's a very different kind of contract and approach that we'll need to figure out but that's why we have a fair amount of money there.

Lastly we have a category called bond neighborhood park improvements and this is again in the absence of a fully vetted deferred maintenance program we wanted to focus on using these funds for projects that had already been vetted, already identified as clear priorities, and I think as some of you might remember from the 2012 bond process there were a number of projects that got cut in terms of their scope during bond planning. So we ended at like George Christopher and Gillman playground only doing the playground when originally we had envisioned doing the whole park. So this is just a placeholder where we would figure out with the Commission and others how to use these funds to flesh out those existing bond projects that are being delivered right now as well as other partnership opportunities and the like.

Les Hilger: Is that kind of like a contingency fund or is it basically you know we're not going to be able to finish parks for the cost and so we have to?

Dawn Kamalanathan: We have to, this is stuff that wasn't even scoped as part of the bond project. So the Gillman park project is just the playground and the bathroom and this would be money to do the playfields and some of the other ancillary amenities, same thing at Christopher where we have a playground but there's a field we're not touching and a bunch of other properties where there's similar kind of issues. So this would allow us to do more full park renovations at some of those sites.

Then again usual stuff—court resurfacing. Again, these are all old categories. You can see the sub-total 1GAGFACP that is the funding code for the General Fund continuing projects fund and you can see about a \$15 million number which we'll round and figure out. And then you can see also our usual special funds expenditures, both the Marina Yacht Harbor money needs to be programmed every year, the Golf Fund needs to be programmed every year, as does the Open Space and these numbers are subject to change as Katie gets more up to date projections they'll be updated and loaded into the system accurately.

So this is our current two-year proposal.

Linda Shaffer: District 10. Playing fields replacement, is that the turf?

Dawn Kamalanathan: Turf play fields yes, synthetic turf program and continuing we have a number of fields there on our replacement cycle and so this moving ahead so right now we're working on Franklin, Garfield and Youngblood Coleman and then I think the one next in line is

Silver Terrace and then I forget what comes after that but we're just starting to get on a regular replacement cycle.

Maya Rodgers: Maya Rodgers, District 10. The community gardens budget, what is that money for?

Dawn Kamalanathan: It's for our community gardens program. So we have a number of community-run community gardens across the city and this is just the money to kind of deal with irrigation issues, forestry work, replacement of the garden beds, all of that is in a queue that's building every year of things people need fixed and this money chips away at that every year.

Chair: And this is different than Urban Ag?

Dawn Kamalanathan: Yes, this is different than the Urban Ag program, this goes directly just to the community garden.

Chair: I have a question, in terms of these are we going to see details of these as they come up? For example paving will you have some list of who's getting paved or what's getting paved?

Dawn Kamalanathan: Not for a long time.

Chair: What's not for a long time, five years, ten years?

Dawn Kamalanathan: I mean hopefully the lifecycle project that we would like to emerge in 24 months with some very clear recommendations and at least trade-offs for people to consider. In the interim these funds will be spent in the same way that either the General Fund Capital Program has been spent for the past few years which I think is a little bit more of the approach Steffen was describing which is problems come up and here's the money to deal with them but it's not proactively tackling issues so much as responding to needs that arise over the course of a year. So the Commission and the General Manager would be allocating these funds.

Chair: The reason I mention that is of course the annual Controller's Report came out. Plus now assuming the charter amendment passes in year four we'll be audited as to whether you met certain guidelines and if not money will be withheld. So that's my concern, is if your project for the lifecycle takes 24 months but then you identify whatever that cycle is but [unintelligible] anywhere where you can say yeah, we met our objective or we didn't.

Dawn Kamalanathan: We will be describing and categorizing the expenditures as they occur. So you will be—well, I can't say proactively how the money will be spent, at the end of every year you will absolutely be able to tell what the money was spent on. So there won't be—there will be a lot of transparency around that in the same way there is right now. You can run a report and look at what the capital projects or maintenance projects that were created and how money was spent at different parks and for different projects.

Chair: 24 months from now.

Dawn Kamalanathan: No, you can do it right now. Like you guys can start making your request every six months if you wanted but just how the money gets spent from the past six months because that's what the Capital Planning Committee does right now for the General Fund allocations is Brian Strong and his staff call Katie and I twice a year and say why haven't you spent your money? What are you spending your money on, we gave you General Fund money you should spend it. We provide them with a status update on how the funds have been spent. So you'll be able to say how money is being spent or not spent but I just can't outline for you this is the pipeline of projects that we'll be using these funds to address. Does that make sense?

Chair: Any other questions from members?

Linda Shaffer: Me again, Linda Shaffer. This is just a comment, I'm delighted to see a new line item for forestry and the hope might be that the maintenance cycle for our trees might be reduced from once every 100 years to once every 98.

Chair: Is there any public comment? Being none, public comment is closed. Thank you ladies.

Howard Levitt: My name is Howard Levin, I'm from the National Park Service. I recognize some faces here. I want to salute Katie and Dawn for giving a budget presentation. This is the meat and potatoes of how public agencies manage parks and I appreciate all of you hanging in there through this because this is really where it gets done. If it gets done in budget a lot of resourcing reflects how you manage your park. So I salute all of you.

I am a 39-year resident of San Francisco. I live in District 8. I've worked for the National Park here in San Francisco for nearly 30 years. I'm the Director of Communications and Partnerships. Before that I headed up for 18 years the education interpretive program within the National Park here in San Francisco.

So tonight I'm here to talk to you about what is in many ways a preview of coming attractions if you will. It's the least kept secret in the world that we are doing a dog management plan in our National Park area. It will also come as absolutely not surprise to you that this plan has engendered a tremendous amount of passion on all sides and I'm happy to see our good friends from Save our Recreation here and I know that there will be some questions and comments that they have.

So what I'd like to do is tell you a little bit about what we're doing in dog management and I will of course take questions afterwards but I'll be brief because your agenda is long and the evening is moving on.

Starting in 2002 almost fourteen years ago we began a process of planning for dog management. We'd had a structure for dog management in place at that time but around that time issues began to emerge and it became clear to us that as the population growth of San Francisco took off, as the popularity of the areas that comprise the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Ft. Point and Muir Woods, together they comprise what we sometimes call euphemistically call the Golden Gate National Parks. They became more and more popular and our visitation began to

rise to the point where last year we were the number one most heavily visit unit of the entire 409 unit National Park system. We had about eighteen million visitors last year and that includes Ft. Point, Muir Woods and Golden Gate National Recreation Area. This year the number are about the same. We were knocked off our pedestal by the Blueridge Parkway which had more visitors than we did last year but we're still right up there among the most heavily visited units of the National Park System.

People come to this park for about every imaginable form of recreation that you can think of. Dog walking, on-leash dog walking, off-leash, professional dog walking, bird watching, jogging, bicycling, beach combing. We could spend about three hours just tossing up recreational activities and they would all be occurring in the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

So our popularity is not a surprise. Why wouldn't it be? We have arguably, and I'll argue this, that we have probably the most varied of all the units of the National Park System. We have cultural resources, historic buildings, historic forests, we have for example more historic structures in this National Park than one entire region of the National Park Service, the Midwest Region. Which is kind of a stunning thing. This is a surprising fact. While we are in an urban area and we're proudly in an urban area and we do have the visitation and the range of recreation activities that we have we also have within this park more rare, threatened and endangered species that all but a handful of National Parks in the entire system. Which is surprising, in some ways it's a two-edged sword. When you have endangered and threatened species it means you have a surprisingly rich resource base but it also means that there are pressures on those resources.

The National Park Service exists for several reasons. We exist to protect treasured areas this country for future generations and that's a fundamental imbedded mandate that we have to protect resources for the future. But we also have a mandate to allow for the enjoyment of those resources in such a way that the resources aren't impaired but we have an enjoyment mandate. So it's a use mandate and a preservation mandate both. It's the duality of the National Park Service.

Now, city park agencies have similar mandates. Sometimes theirs will tend more towards one side or the other. Because I'm such a long-time resident of San Francisco I know that we're blessed in our city park system to have spectacular recreation centers, art centers, natural areas. San Francisco has it all so it's no surprise that the Trust for Public Lands when they talk about access to recreation San Francisco scores very high and we're part of that picture too because there's a National Park in this urban area, the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

So in 2002 we began a process to try to define and describe where and how can dogs continue to enjoy this park. By the way, we love dogs in the park, I'll tell you that right up front. We support dogs and our planning process began with the premise that dog walking is a healthy activity and so we want to figure out how we can encourage it in such a way as to protect resources and make sure that the full range of users—dog walkers certainly but other users as well—can continue to enjoy the parks.

So our initial attempt at defining this terrain and creating a rule for dog management within the park was to bring together stakeholders from various viewpoints including those who are recreation dog walkers, professional dog walkers, equestrians, hikers, joggers, advocates for children, advocates for seniors, advocates for people with disabilities, environmental organizations. We tried to bring the stakeholders together and said look, we believe that people of good will can develop a plan and we'd like to do it in a consensus fashion. The Park Service has one seat at the table but the table had about eighteen others around the table and so the group worked and by now I'm fast-forwarding to about 2006-2007, they met for about sixteen months this committee and they worked hard, they really did. They met in plenary session, they met in small committee session and unfortunately they could not achieve a consensus. They were very polarized. You had people over here saying you shouldn't have dogs. We have people over here saying dogs should have almost unlimited use of the park and it was just like this—it was discouraging really because a lot of us had hopes that there would be a consensus rule would develop based on stakeholder interest and it didn't happen and that was disappointing.

That left one avenue, literally the classic route that agencies go through when they make rules, they do a plan around the rule, they prepare a—they do scoping for that plan. They ask people what things should be covered in the plan, they create a draft document and they have public meetings and they take comments at those public meetings. Sometimes there's more than one draft and we actually went through two drafts. We went through a draft Environmental Impact Statement which finally was released in 2010, then we created a supplemental because there was some things that we needed to consider, for example 3700 new acres in San Mateo County that we hadn't considered—that wasn't in the park when we started our first plan. So we did a supplemental, that was released in late 2013 and we had comments up through February of 2014 so that ended almost two years ago the comment period. We received thousands upon thousands of comments on the plan. Again, from all sectors. There's a spectrum of belief out there and there's a spectrum of interest.

Not surprisingly a lot of the comments focused on certain areas that were particularly treasured by all—Crissy Field, Ocean Beach—I'm just mentioning the San Francisco areas as an example—Fort Mason. These are areas treasured by all users, not just one user group. And so we received the comments and so in agency rulemaking you produce a plan and an Environmental Impact Statement around that plan and then you produce at a certain point in time a proposed rule because a plan is just I'm looking for a big thick document, it's just—it's a written document. It's sort of inherently general and not entirely specific. However, you don't manage a park just on the plan, you manage it on the rule and so there's usually a rule that's developed that goes with the draft plan and that receives public comment and then comment on the draft plan and the draft rule—because the rule is sort of what can I do on the ground? Where will I be able to walk my dog? Where will I not be able to walk my dog? And what are the conditions that constitute appropriate dog walking? What's the behavior. What does my dog need to do in the park as well? That's what constitutes the rule, not the place.

So the plan and the rule, they're both commented upon and then those comments are bundled together and the agency considers the comments on both the plan and the specific rule and then it comes forth with a final environmental impact statement, a selected alternative and a final rule.

So where we are now we have completed a supplemental Environmental Impact Statement, a Supplemental Dog Plan, we will release—it's undergoing final review now in Washington, we can't tell you exactly when because we just don't know, we don't control their process of review out there in Washington, but we're hopeful that it will come out in a few weeks, the proposed rule for dog management. Again, that is sort of paired up with the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement because the proposed rule describes the preferred alternative within the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. What will the rule look like on the ground in that proposed alternative. And so we're going to release that shortly for comment and then we'll take those comments along with the comments that people have made, the thousands that we've got in the Supplemental Impact Statement and those will be considered all together in the development of the final report record of decision. There's some technicalities around the National Environmental Policy, but that will all bundle up and there will be a final plan, a final rule, a record of decision and then we will have a dog management plan for the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

So we're at the point now, it's an important point. There's a proposed rule that will be released that describes how will the preferred alternative in the Supplemental EIS what will it look like on the ground in the park. What will I be able to do, what won't I be able to do under what conditions.

So that will be distributed to our mailing list through other organizations. I know Save our Rec is going to help us get the word out on this and we will be looking for public input on the specifics, in this case specifically the proposed rule. So here's what it looks like on the ground, we want comments on that and then those comments together with comments on the SCIS will go forward towards a final decision. So that's where we are in the process and I wanted to just give you that. I know that there's a lot of interested questions and I would like to take questions. So this is a preview of coming attractions.

Les Hilger: Les Hilger, District 1. I'm not trying to pin you down to any specific date but could you give us a ballpark figure about when the rule will be published? It says fall, 2015, and I know we're past that point.

Howard Levitt: Exactly because if I had come to you a year ago I would have said Spring of 2015. I've been at this a long time and one of the things that is frustrating is I can't tell you because I don't know because I don't control the—we sat forward but—

Les Hilger: Will it happen before the EIS is published?

Howard Levitt: Well of course. I mean this process, this step is a prior step before that can occur.

Les Hilger: So as you pushed that first calendar date back all the other calendar dates can be expected to be pushed back.

Howard Levitt: To illustrate that point if you looked in our draft Environmental Impact Statement issued in 2010 you would have seen an estimated timeline that had this thing ending sometime in 2011, five years ago.

Chair: Steffen and then Richard Rothman.

Steffen Franz: Steffen Franz, District 2. I just have a couple quick questions. Obviously there are certain areas that you probably won't speak to but I'd like to at least ask. You said that GGNR recites the fact that dog people are—that there could be use within GGNRA. You didn't speak to the idea that there will be some off-leash areas.

Howard Levitt: Thank you. Yes, and two points that I want to make. Number one is in the National Park system the regulations that govern all National Parks in the country including ours now although we're operating under a different regiment at the moment, the rule that governs National Parks is where they're allowed at all and in most parks they are not they much be on a leash. There are some exceptions for hunting and parks that have traditionally had hunting but those are sort of one-offs. But by and large where dogs are permitted them must be on a leash and typically that's in parking lots, sometimes in campgrounds, never on trails. So the National rule is very draconian by comparison to what we're proposing.

When we decided to take on dog walking and create a rule around it the first thing we did is we went to the National office of the Park Service and said Golden Gate is unique, we inherited a history of dog use in this park. It makes sense for us to try to figure out where dogs can be in this park to much greater extent than the national regulation and we must be given a chance to see if we can find off-leash areas for dogs. We petitioned that and we were given permission to try to review our areas and see are there areas within the park where dogs can be off-leash. The supplemental plan and EIS went with it, identified seven areas in this park where dogs could be off-leash. So in San Francisco that includes Fort Mason, Crissy Field, two areas, Ocean Beach and Fort Funston two areas. So five of the seven areas were here in San Francisco for off-leash and some areas like Fort Funston and Crissy Field not only will there be major area for off-leash dog walking [unintelligible] area in the case of Crissy which is fenced within the dunes and the marsh will be available for on-leash dog walking.

So this is the most dog friendly park within the National Park system and we made the point that we're different and we should be a little bit different and so our plan reflects that. So that's the answer to your question.

Steffen Franz: I think that was a great answer and I appreciate that. I think everyone in this room appreciates it because I think clearly a lot of people just don't know what you guys are thinking and so for us this is very beneficial because we obviously speak to other stakeholders. I think that for a long time I followed this since its inception, I think other dog folks have and I think the big concern was that GGNRA was going to vanquish all dogs, all off-leash dogs and to hear you say that that's not the case.

Howard Levitt: Not the case.

Steffen Franz: That is obviously a positive coming out of this conversation. I also know you won't speak to it but I also feel like I have to raise it, I think our committee is concerned with the idea that if there is limitation on off-leash that we feel that it will impact significantly the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department and the current places that are off-leash. Is there a plan or some contingency from GGNRA at least looking at what could happen if—and again I know you're not saying it would—but if it did happen that it was vanquished, not more off-leash in GGNRA how would that impact the city's parks.

Howard Levitt: Yes, we don't have our head in the sand so to speak and we know we're contiguous to the city of San Francisco and other cities in Marin County and San Mateo County also. Yes, we know that there's potentially a displacement and we've been asked by particularly those who would love to have less restriction on dogs than more to try to characterize that. We attempted to do some surveying and we found that most people were reticent to talk to us and so we asked for example if there were restrictions on your use in this area would you stay here or would you go somewhere else and if so where would you go. Most people wouldn't tell us. So we attempted it and there was suspicion and we didn't get what we felt to be particularly solid information. So it's difficult to speculate. The question might be would for a certain user if they still access for example to use Fort Funston to the entire beach below the bluff and to much of the upland but less than they have now would that send them to Sloat and Stern Grove? We don't know but we did in the Environmental document we did characterize it as potentially moderate impact and we talk with our Recreation and Park folks all the time and as when these impacts would occur although it's all speculative whether they would we would look to problem solve this together.

Steffen Franz: With RPD you wouldn't just call it in and say okay now today it's happening and all of a sudden there's 200 percent use increase.

Howard Levitt: No, we work with Recreation and Park on all sorts of things and this issue is common. Of course it's a big issue with city parks too of course.

Richard Rothman: Richard Rothman, District 1. Well I see it a little different, I'm a volunteer over at Pt. Bonita Lighthouse every Monday and I think when I heard your boss saying you know to me I think if we took the name recreation out of just you know made it like Yosemite it should be—I can understand your reason, maybe there should be some policy but I think people need to see this area we have here as like you see any other National Park even though we're in a urban center and when people see the name Recreation in the title they think oh that's a free—and I think dogs should be in a certain area. I go to Fort Funston, I'm probably the only one there without a dog when I'm walking there and you know it seems like a perfect area and I know people we've got to protect our native plants but I don't know I just personally rather, we don't let dogs down in Pt. Bonita and people are very understanding. We tell them why and there are some that will give you a bad time but I think if people understand that certain areas we have animals and we have wildlife that we've got to—because that's the mission of the Park Service so I think to get out and to explain that the mission of the Park Service is to protect our natural resources and dogs need to be in certain areas. I think people need to understand that it's more than a recreational area but it's an area that we're fortunate to have, that the Army kept all of this open space for us and the Park Service took it over.

Howard Levitt: Thank you for volunteering at Pt. Bonita. If any of you haven't been out there you have this whole committee out there for a full moon walk to Pt. Bonita. Recreation is in our name and it's in our DNA, not just our name. This is a recreation Mecca but it's also a resource Mecca and so that's the interesting conundrum in managing a park like this and so it's figuring out how do we share uses in the right way and how do we protect resources in the right way and that's what we're trying to do and we feel that our proposal on which we're going to want comments on the rule around that we feel that it does that but we want your comments.

Chair: Any other members questions or comments? I'm going to open it up to public comment and for those of you who are giving public comment we are going to give you two minutes. I'll call your names in order. Please address your comments to the members not to our speaker. If the speaker chooses to reply that's his option however the process is that you make the comments to use at committee members. So if you need a card our secretary has them. First speaker is Sally Stevens.

Sally Stephens: I have a handout, I may not have enough, I'll hand it out after my two minutes. I'm with S.F. Dog, Sally Stevens, and I just wanted to explain that dogs have never been allowed off-leash on more than one percent of the totally GGNRA land so we have never asked for more than that, that's what we have now, what we've had since 1979. So when they talk about dogs being everywhere, no one has ever asked for that and what they're talking about doing is restricting by almost 90 percent of that one percent where you can go with your dog. The impact on city parks is not really handled well in the SCIS that you mentioned. The study that was done, it wasn't people were necessarily reluctant it was just extremely poorly done. The survey was poorly organized, people didn't understand what they were answering, that sort of thing. The guys are working together with the city, the professional dog walker permits, the city had a permit system that allowed a maximum of eight dogs per dog walker. Supervisor Weiner sponsored that and when the GGNRA started their own version of professional dog walker permits they choose six as the number and Supervisor Weiner and other city officials talked to them and said please do the same number and they refused to do so which has essentially given the professional dog walkers a financial incentive to move to city parks and we've seen that in a number of parks, at Stern Grove and especially McLaren Park there's been a huge increase in professional dog walker usage of those parks. The other thing is there is also the very infamous tsunami Friday which was in March, 2011, the Japanese earthquake. They closed Ocean Beach and Fort Funston entirely and at Stern Grove there was a ten-fold increase in dogs and dog walkers on that day so if people can't go there they will in fact move into city parks. And then just real briefly, the acreage that's being lost in off-leash according to the SCIS is about 107 acres and that doesn't include the miles of trails and beach that are being lost but just in acreage of what's currently off-leash which will no longer be off-leash in the GGNRA is actually greater than the total number of off-leash acres in city parks total combined. So it's a huge decrease in off-leash access and city parks are just much too small to handle the overflow.

Chair: Howard I have a quest on the off-leash, will that be converting to leashed or is there a general reduction?

Howard Levitt: It depends on the area. So it's hard to say, a lot of on-leash areas will remain on-leash. Some of the areas that are off-leash now will go to on-leash and some of those areas would go to no dogs. Again, there is a spectrum of desires among park users and I don't have to tell you this because the committee you sit on deals with city parks which have your own enormous set of conflicting sets of user groups, one wants this, one wants that. A city agency, a Federal agency, managing a park system does not have the luxury of putting on one set of lenses and looking at how use happens in a park. The first lens is what one of your Commissions said, we have to protect resources for the future but having said that they can also be enjoyed in various ways but everybody loves the same area. I know many of you have been out to Crissy Field and on any given day we've got tens of thousands of people enjoying that area in about—if there's 10,000 users there's probably 8,000 recreation uses of different activities and we have to figure out how to make that all work. We can't put on one user set of lenses, we don't have the luxury.

Chair: Our next public comment is Frank Triska.

Frank Triska: I have submitted comments over the years several times. Way back when we used to run our dogs at Fort Funston, at Ocean Beach and go to Crissy Beach. The process has been going on so long our dog is arthritic and can barely walk, she certainly doesn't run anymore. But we do in terms of finding a place to go we do heavily use Stern Grove, we use the park. I would like to say too that in terms of recreation it's not just the dogs which is part of it but when you really want to talk about a lot of recreation poor Golden Gate Park is beaten to death, it's not just the dogs, it's by all of the attractions that it has there. You can still do the bird watching, you can still do the jogging, you can still do all the things that you mentioned but yet it has a lot of other attractions so adding on people like me and others in Stern Grove and Golden Gate Park it just beats the poor park to death and I think that by and large Golden Gate National Recreation Area as long as you want to keep recreation in it you should be as accommodating as possible to a wide variety of activities including dog walking and it doesn't seem that way to me right now.

Chair: Again, please address your comments to the members. Our next speaker is Andrea Buffa.

Andrea Buffa: I work with a group called Save our Recreation. I live in the Glen Park Neighborhood and I'll tell you exactly what parks I will go to instead of Fort Funston and Ocean Beach, I'll go to Glen Park, I will go to Stern Grove although you all know probably there's been conflicts this past year with coyotes and dogs which will just increase if we have more folks with dogs going to Stern Grove. I'll go to Bernal Hill and I'll go to McLaren Park. Some of the parks that I think have already been impacted by some of the regulations that the National Park Service has already implemented. I'll say the last thing first which is I think you all should make sure that the impact on city parks is steadied before this is implemented. You shouldn't have to do it yourselves but so far the Federal government hasn't done it so I think you either need to do it yourselves or you need to stop the plan from being implemented until that's done. It has the impact on city parks that's going to be enormous, not just the dogs but the people. We go with the dogs so we're the ones that are going to be using our parks more than we ever have before. So my group has about 10,000 supporters, we're concerned about preserving recreation in the

Golden Gate National Recreation Area not just dog walking recreation but things like bonfires on Ocean Beach and bike riding and horseback riding, things that people have been doing there for the last forty years. I want to make sure you know which areas are going to be impacted in San Francisco, so some of the ones that have been mentioned—Fort Funston, Ocean Beach, Crissy Field, but there's also Fort Mason, Baker Beach, Fort Miley, and Lands End. Some of the areas, take Ocean Beach for example, two-thirds of Ocean Beach will now be no dogs so it's not like off-leash went to on-leash, it went to no dogs so those are the kinds of impacts that we're talking about and for somebody like me that has a knee injury I won't really want to go to Fort Funston anymore because I can't climb down a steep hill to the beach and I won't be able to deal with it so that's why I'll go to city parks. So once you get into all the intricacies you see that the impacts that we could have in the city parks. So again, the Board of Supervisors of San Francisco, San Mateo, and Marin are all on record as opposing this plan so I hope that you all get involved in making sure that we study the impact on city parks before we let this plan go forward. Thank you.

Chair: Next comment is Jeanne McKinney.

Jeanne McKinney: A few of you might know me, I was on PROSAC for quite a number of years and I was the chair. This particular issue is the one that really made me interested in politics, it's a big issue for me and I get kind of emotional when I talk about it. It's a huge issue for the city, we need to provide enough access for recreational activities in particular dog walking. I've been participating in this debate since I got my first dog in 1999. A lot of it has revolved around GGNRA but also the city parks, there's a shortage of space even just within the city parks and that was a battle that's been fought for decades over where you dogs can be off-leash and not. And so the GGNRA reducing the dog access it is going to have a big impact on our parks especially where there's already a shortage of space and I expect you'll see people walking their dogs in parks that are not intended to be off-leash. As members of PROSAC it's really your responsibility to look out for the city parks, the many diverse uses of the parks, and try to make sure that's being done in a fair and equitable way and that it's being fully evaluated. Part of the land—I don't know of the history of all the land for GGNRA but I know some of it I don't believe was owned by the Federal—at some point some of it I believe was owned by the city and was then handed over to the Federal government and this is an important lesson for all of you to see what happens when the city hands over some of its land to the Federal Government, you lose control, you lose the ability to make decisions that might be the best decision for the city. So I'm not going to reiterate all the points you're going to hear from different people. This debate has been going on for a long time. If you're new to it there's a lot of passion around it and there are reasons why.

Chair: Have some of those restrictions already gone into effect from what it was before this discussion took place in 2002?

Howard Levitt: There's been a couple of areas where we went and had special rule making applied. So for example at Fort Funston which in many ways started the ball rolling there's a colony of bank swallows that occupy twelve acres, maybe a little less than that, but the buffer around them would constitute about twelve acres of the overall acreage of Fort Funston and so to protect those—and again, one of the missions of the National Park Service and the city too

within areas that are natural—is to protect resources and so to protect those we proposed to prevent dogs and people from approaching. So we went through rule-making and set that aside as a bank swallow protection area. There's an area at Crissy Field near the Coast Guard station also set aside in this case for the western snowy plover and so we've had a couple of areas since the early days that have been where we've created restrictions for resource reasons. But this is both—the plan that we're putting forth and the goal we're hoping to accomplish is both protection of resources but also assuring a variety of uses and so those who want to have a dog free experience can have that in some of those prime areas that they want to have that experience.

Chair: Our final blue card is from Renee Pittin.

Renee Pittin: In the Recreation and Park presentation they said that they want to inspire play and want to inspire seniors to use the parks and I got a new dog a couple of weeks ago, a little sheltie, it was two years after my last dog passed away and my doctors at Kaiser would be thrilled to know that I've got a dog because I've been walking. I walked 11,300 feet yesterday and of course I went back to Fort Funston because Fort Funston that's where my heart is. It is disingenuous to say to put together every species that we want to save with dog walking because Fort Funston is not pristine wilderness. Fort Funston has Nike missiles underneath the parking lot, it has gun batteries and it has gun batteries on the sand because they fell off the cliffs. But I also saw because I just went back to Fort Funston the changes that the GGNRA is making and what they're doing is on the Sunset Trail there are now jagged rocks on both sides of the trail. You can't get off the trail and so if you're wish your dog and you feel threatened by either a person or a group or dogs that are too boisterous for your little sheltie you can't get off without possibly breaking your ankle or having your dog break its ankle. And this isn't the way to do it, this is no help and that's their plan, you know, dogs have to be on-leash on the paths and the paths are going to be confined and this is what they're doing is they put in this jagged rocks so that it's dangerous for seniors, it's dangerous for dogs, it's dangerous for anybody who wants to just enjoy the GGNRA and walk their dog.

Diane Malone: My name is Diana [unintelligible] and I think you made some really great points about the example on city parks and I think it's obvious to everybody [unintelligible]. I think there's another common sense rule of thought that goes with this—there's a lot of different levels to consider [unintelligible]. If you look at it at a very high level [unintelligible] and to some extent we've already got that, we've got places like Pt. Bonita where they are preserved for people without dogs and that's great. But we also have places like Fort Funston where we have awesome use for dogs and for dog walking off-leash. Let's look at that in balance and to the extent that it's not broken don't try to fix it with more rules and more restrictions that have the end result of causing other unforeseen negative impacts and ruin it for everybody.

Howard Levitt: Linda, would it be helpful for me to circulate the proposal for Fort Funston around to the committee members? Let me do that.

Chair: If you have that in a digital version.

Howard Levitt: It's in our supplemental plan. Some of you have seen it, I know that the folks from Save our Recreation have seen it. So let me explain what you're seeing. So the areas identified in yellow would be available for off-leash dog use. The areas that are outlined in blue would be on-leash dog use and so when the map gets to you you'll see that the entire beach below the cliff at Fort Funston would be available for off-leash dog walking. There would be an opportunity to go from the upper area to the lower or vice-a-versa off-lease and then the upper area has two major areas for off-leash. So I want you to look at this and understand that Fort Funston is a spectacular place to walk a dog but it's also a spectacular place for people who don't want to have a dog encounter. It's a stunning place with stunning views so this is our current proposed way forward to encourage dog use and again remember there is no other unit in the entire National Park System that permits dogs off-leash and so please look at this map, this is the proposal what's in front of you.

Chair: Les and then Steffen.

Female Speaker: What we're handing around has what the current status is at Fort Funston which is everything in red and then the second map is the one with their proposals so you see the difference what's red which is current off-leash and yellow is significant. [simultaneous comments]

Chair: Let's keep it down to one conversation. Thank you. I have Les, Steffen and Jordyn.

Les Hilger: Les Hilger, District 1. Sorry to go back to this rule thing but is there a specific site or a way to sign up so that I can be informed by your organization when you do issue the rule? We're busy in our lives, so.

Howard Levitt: Thank you. If you can provide me your email address we will send it to your in-box as soon as it's ready to go. That's the easiest way. And in fact I would love to get if one of you wouldn't mind handing me some I would love to get your email addresses and we appreciate you helping to spread the word.

Sharon Eberhardt: Just a point of clarification on this, what is this red area?

Sally Stephens: That's the current where you can be off-leash with your dog currently.

Chair: That's Sharon for the record.

Sharon Eberhardt: Sharon Eberhardt, District 1. [simultaneous comments]

Steffen Franz: So I'm going to maybe wrap this up by saying my park is Lafayette Park in District 2. We have a one-acre off-leash dog area which currently is fenced. I invite you to come as you said and see somewhere between 1000 and 2000 people a day, probably 50 percent of those are dog walkers, how this group of people that wants no dog experience versus the group of people that want a dog experience there is no policing, there is no official rules as it were. We know that the off-leash area is the off-leash area and we know that the on-leash area is the on-leash area but what you're seeing is the community able to for lack of a better term police itself

because these people have been coming to this park for years. Does this sound familiar? So for us it's passion I think—I'm a dog owner, I'm a dog advocate so I'm going to see it from the side of dog owners, dog advocates. But I also absolutely understand the position of the non dog owner who doesn't want to be run up on or doesn't want to have to deal with this concern. The issue as you is if we all can deal with each other, you even talked about how the EIR—just the whole process, I won't even say the EIR, but all of it has been contentious, polarizing. Well here we are in a city park where there is not Park Patrol, where there are posted rules that most people do not abide by, but there's no downside, right, there is nobody writing tickets, there is no actual action so it's condoned, it's accepted. I think what the problem is we're in a situation where there's only going to be more dogs. There are only going to be more people looking for more open space to bring their dogs to and what we're hearing is yes, well this huge area that we're so used to is going to get smaller. I would urge just come and see how people can basically police themselves and again I'm not proposing that, I know Golden Gate Park is different than every other National Park in the fact that you're even considering off-leash and I respect that I honor that. But I also know that there is a lot of passion within the dog community and I think it has to be seen to be able to understand how people deal with people in a civil manner when they have to see each other every single day and that more in a stroller who is thirty yards away from an oncoming Rottweiler, there is no fence, there is no wall, there is no Park Patrol, there is just two people saying hey get your dog out of here, hey I'm trying to walk here. So I guess I'm just saying to you there are ways that it's being handled without laws and rules and so I just as an advocate want to put that on the record to say Lafayette Park we're able to see this in real life and it's not perfect Howard, there are fistfights, right, there are people that go at each other but at the end of the day we're talking about thousands of people able to coexist within this very small area which will only get worse pending the outcome of this.

Howard Levitt: At the end of the day this plan is going to succeed or fail based on people's personal responsibility, how are they going to manage their dog, how are they going to behave themselves, are they going to follow the rules or not. So we're not going to have a ranger every five feet. We hope we don't have fistfights, we have them now sometimes. We've had some serious dog bites including some very serious ones very recently and we'd like to try to do what we can—we won't be able to prevent them 100 percent but our plan we're hopeful, we're optimists but realists too, we believe that when the rules are clear, when the areas are defined and when people get used to it and it is a change we believe that the future will be a whole lot brighter for the whole array of users in the park, that's our belief, that's what we bring to it. But we do bring a belief in dog walking as a healthy activity and a good thing and it was mentioned that for a number of people this is what gets them out, their dogs, it's what gets people moving and we want to be a place where people can come. The Fort Funston map that's making the rounds all those blue trails—the yellow ones are off-leash, the blue ones are on-leash. And so you can really enjoy Fort Funston with your dog in this spectacular area off-leash if you want to, on-leash if you want to and if you're one of those people who don't like dogs there's a place for you too at Fort Funston and that's the conundrum and that's why this plan has been so difficult.

Jordyn Aquino: Jordyn Aquino, District 4. I just wanted to say thank you so much for giving us this information about the dog management plan. As a dog owner myself I like to call Fort Funston Disneyland for my dog Max because of all that red off-leash area—so we rely on open space after working forty hours a week where can I take my dog out of my apartment if it's not

for the GGNRA? And this also includes living two blocks away from Ocean Beach where I take my dog every day once I get home from work.

My biggest issue here is today was my first time hearing about this dog management plan and I wanted to know how the GGNRA is making this information available to the public, whether it be providing a specific website or policing these areas. How is the public supposed to know that there is currently a plan pending about this dog management plan whether it be in the GGNRA areas?

Howard Levitt: We have an email list, we have a hard copy list, we have a website and in each phase of our plan it's been published there how you can get it. We put the draft plans in public libraries and fliers up in visitor centers. But obviously and you're a person who is in the know with parks you're telling me this is the first you've heard of it.

Jordyn Aquino: I was just appointed onto this committee.

Howard Levitt: But still, you have an interest in parks and the fact that you haven't heard it I'm concerned about that but please do let me know how we can get it to you directly.

Jordyn Aquino: I think my biggest concern is being someone who does this at these areas how can you make this information available to either dog advocates or just people that are interested in visiting these areas.

Howard Levitt: As I say, everything is put online. In the case of the proposed rule we'll send the entire rule to your inbox. There will be links to it, kind of like the dog plans which were voluminous—why were they voluminous? Because we did full environmental analysis of 22 areas. We did 22 mini Environment Impact Statements. This will be a much leaner document. First of all it only proposes a rule for the preferred alternative and it's going to be much leaner, I'm going to say it's going to be under 50 pages and so yeah please let us know how we can get it to you and then if you can share it on through your networks.

Jordyn Aquino: Is there any idea of posting this information in these areas? I know that you mentioned that it's on the website but—

Howard Levitt: We're going to put up what we call wind masters which you've seen these, they're called wind masters because they kind of pivot in the wind and you can place information on them so we're going to put information on how to access that plan at key destinations around the park, so that will be part of our outreach as well.

Jordyn Aquino: And then when would that be included?

Howard Levitt: When we release the proposal.

Chair: And public meetings?

Howard Levitt: Yes, thank you for that too. Yes, we'll have at least, more likely five public meetings, minimum one, probably two in San Francisco within the comment period.

Chair: Maya is next.

Maya Rodgers: Maya Rodgers, District 10. Just a comment, so obviously I'm in District 10 on the other side of the city and I'm a dog owner but I also have small children around so it's a polarization just in the home. One child is an animal person and one is not. But the idea is that I am totally sensitive to his fear of animals, you know, and I think that's a real consideration. Yes I know—I mean, like I said I have a dog so he's my companion, he jumps on the bed. You know, all the things that dogs do but I just feel like we have to find a medium, there has to be a place where people meet in the middle and there's compromise involved and yeah you have all this current off-leash space but it's a little give and a little bit of take, you know, and so I think people have to be considerate of that in order to move things forward or it gets stuck. It's been how many years?

Howard Levitt: Fourteen.

Maya Rodgers: Fourteen years. So I mean I think we can get stuck, you know, and we have to not do that.

Anthony Cuadro: Anthony Cuadro, District 7. I just kind of what Maya was just saying, I don't necessarily have an issue with the plan being a native San Franciscan and having a dog my entire life. I have an issue with the speed in which this has been implemented. Fourteen years—I mean we're not building the Bay Bridge here, this should be something that should have taken much less time and the longer it gets drawn out the more feelings and passions come out and the more new people get entered into the fray so I think that's partly what the issue is here. I mean we deal with city government, this Federal government, obviously it's whole different deck of cards but I think another issue would be communication. Like Jordan was saying there's so many people that have moved into the city and moved around the city in the last five, ten, fourteen years that I think that is a huge hurdle because once this gets posted whatever it is it's going to be news to the majority of people. So that will be an obstacle in and of itself. So I would encourage—I don't know how you reach someone that just moved a block away from Ocean Beach that is from Minnesota that doesn't know that this has been going on for fourteen years. But posting something like this—I don't know how you would disseminate but that is going to be a huge key to making whatever change happens.

Howard Levitt: And you're right, it's dragged on to the point where people have forgotten the early days. I haven't but most people have and yeah so it's like a first time for some people and so we are going to have wind masters but we have signage out there in the field for people to understand oh there's a proposed rule out there, here's how you get it, look at it, we want to hear from you. But yes and why did it take fourteen years? We put a lot of hope in this negotiated rule-making process and it unfortunately didn't achieve what it should. Interestingly enough one of the things it did achieve it was mentioned earlier the six dog professional dog limit that was one of the very things this group could agree upon, that six dogs was about as much as one person should handle effectively and that is the industry standard and actually just a little inside

baseball we did talk to Scott when he was proposing the eight-dog rule and we said Scott our plan is going to say six dogs because that's the industry standard around the country and if you think about how many can one person realistically manage and he said well I'm under great pressure to put eight so it went that we. And we've stuck with six from the beginning. It doesn't seem like it—it would seem somewhat logical to say six would be pretty good maximum.

Sharon Eberhardt: Sharon Eberhardt. I wasn't going to say anything because I love dogs. I don't have dogs, I have cats and they're much easier to manage than dogs.

Howard Levitt: That's the first time I've ever heard that.

Sharon Eberhardt: At least my two are. I kind of focused on what Maya said about—and I know a lot of people that are deathly afraid of dogs and I'm just wondering in these areas you've got a spot where people can walk their dogs on a leash and a spot where people can have their dogs off-leash, where are the places for people that don't want to interact with dogs?

Howard Levitt: Maybe when we break up I can show you on the map, where on that map for Fort Funston for example the areas that aren't marked in blue or yellow would be areas that people can go and have a non-dog experience.

Sharon Eberhardt: But do they have the trails they can use?

Howard Levitt: Yes. There's the main trail, the extension of the Sunset Trail for example, the short side extension. I can talk to you specifically but yes.

Sharon Eberhardt: Because that is a concern of mine because I've been out with friends who have dogs at Fort Funston and I know the dogs love it, they have a great time, but I also see little kids that are deathly afraid of the dogs and they come running around them where if they just see them coming down the pathway even if they're on a leash they're deathly afraid of them. A lot of adults are too. In Cayuga Park our park does not have a dog area but we do kind of look the other way when people bring their dogs in and let them off-leash. I have been out there when there are people that don't like dogs or are afraid of them and people let their dogs are afraid of them and people let their dogs jump up on them and they're not under control, they're not under voice control. They just let them run around and I think that gives dog a bad rap because their owners can't keep control of them, it reflects poorly on the dogs and I think that's where a lot of this fighting is coming between the dog people and non-dog people. I totally agree with you, six dogs is more than enough for a dog walker. I don't know how anybody can handle either big dogs and I have seen them with eight big dogs. Little dogs maybe but not big dogs.

Howard Levitt: My record viewing a commercial dog walker is 22 dogs at Fort Funston.

Sharon Eberhardt: I've seen people that have more than those dogs up at Alamo Square because they have a wonderful dog play area there and people just let the dogs run around and there are professional dog walkers up at Buena Vista Park, I've seen them have more than eight dogs.

Howard Levitt: It was mentioned that we do have a permit requirement for commercial dog walking and our limit is six dogs.

Chair: They have to wear a lanyard, do they not?

Howard Levitt: Yes, the dog walkers have to wear identification and the program has actually been very successful and again most of the commercial dog walking operations has got on board and many of them have told us they really appreciate this because it was tough for them when they were walking a more reasonable number were trying to deal with ones walking twelve, thirteen dogs.

Chair: Aren't your license fees twice as high as Rec and Parks' fees?

Howard Levitt: They're not double but they're more.

Chair: Any other questions or comments from our members for our guest because we do want to rap it up. Okay, we'll have to do public comment again. Please identify yourself.

Clarence Robinson: I'm more concerned that it doesn't seem like anybody else is. I'm more concerned with the maintenance of parks. I run some of the parks in Bayview and with McLaren Park as well and Crocker. So I just wanted to say that I'm not a dog person but it would seem that with the loss of that type of land the conversation that you might be having—because at a certain point you see the high rises coming up, we know the plans for Candlestick Park and there's going to be a point that we reach where we're at maximum capacity, not just for dogs but for people in general. But with that much loss of dog areas that conversation that we'd be having with Recreation and Park on the park side is no longer a five-year or a ten-year conversation down the line, it's like we've been talking about that problem now and being that McLaren Park one of the parks that I run is one of the main off-leash areas it's a big concern for me at least on the maintenance side of things and I think that's an important issue that this board or committee would have to think about as we support or don't support.

Chair: We've brought it up to your management and unfortunately it's not a discussion that they want to address. The problem is a lot of parks [unintelligible] the RPD side and we're very concerned because of the maintenance of issues. One of the suggestions was having a licensing fee that some money should be set aside, that's one of our suggestions, money should be set aside from the licensing fees to help defer some of the maintenance costs.

Clarence Robinson: I'm not for or against, I just want to know what the management plan is.

Jane Weil: Jane Weil, District 6. Has there been any discussion with Recreation and Park about creating more fenced-in dog areas where dogs can run around?

Steffen Franz: The simple answer to that is there is currently a moratorium on new off-leash dog areas in San Francisco. There was the Dog Advisory Committee that disbanded about twelve

years ago. They were who decided whether there would be off-leash areas. Currently because of the moratorium there are no new off-leash dog areas.

Jane Weil: Why was there a moratorium?

Steffen Franz: Sally you want to jump on this?

Sally Stephens: I don't honestly know. At the time the Dog Advisory Committee was disbanded Recreation and Park had said that they would do an internal study of where there would be more off-leash areas needed and where there were dog that might need more areas and that sort of thing but that study was never done and that was over ten years ago.

Jane Weil: So the moratorium was ten years old?

Steffen Franz: At least and the simple answer is it's not a discussion that RPD wants to have right now.

Chair: We do have one group in District 11 that is proposing [unintelligible] and apparently we were told at one of our meeting by Denny Kern as a matter of fact is that if the community gets together and decides and they can approach Ryan Komora who works in public relations and proposes a dog play area they'll take it under consideration so I'm not sure if they'll be successful but this is within the last three months that we were told this, which is news to us but I'm not sure that would be successful or not but there is a group that does want to go forward with that and it also came up in the Community Opportunity Fund two rounds, there was a particular park group that wanted an off-leash dog area and again that was a barrier because the moratorium was in effect and so apparently that viewpoint might be softening because that group again they were told to get enough people who represent the overall community, not just a portion of it and you all get together and come to some agreement and then go to Ryan Komora who was in public relations and you will all somehow get a solution.

Steffen Franz: Let's just go back to the question. Right now there are no plans for new off-leash dog areas within the RPD system. Communities are considering it, there's definitely been dialogue and I think Sally could say that people come to her, come to me. But again there has been no actual action related to new off-leash parks.

Jane Weil: I was asking because there's a park in our district where there is fact a group that wants Recreation and Park to fence a part off.

Chair: [unintelligible] I think the issue around that was controversy that will arise [unintelligible].

Steffan Franz: It's the same Catch 22 that they have to deal with. The reality is there's users that want to use a dog free experience, there are users that want a dog experience. Until we find a way for all of us to go live together it's going to be a challenge.

Jane Weil: I think echoing what Maya said the way that we all live together is we have a fenced-off area so that some people can outside that are and not be afraid. I have relatives that won't go to Fort Funston because they went once, they were jumped on by a pack of dogs and they will never go back there so it isn't fair really to say that some people can't go to Fort Funston because they're afraid of dogs. So we have to find areas for everyone.

Steffen Franz: Of course and I don't think that any person in this room, advocates for dogs, would say dogs are for all people all the time. Even as a dog owner I am in the same position as Maya, my dog acts out, I try to deal with it myself. The truth is that not every dog owner is that conscious. That's what we're dealing with and that's what they were dealing with on a much larger basis.

Chair: We're going to make this the last question.

Sharon Eberhardt: Sharon Eberhardt again. I think the big problem is in the smaller parks where you don't have enough room to make a fenced-off area. That's where the big problem is. Like with Cayuga Park we just have an understanding because we want eyes in our park and the dog people that come in early in the morning and walk their dogs keep people out of the park that shouldn't be in the park. [simultaneous comments] So we kind of look the other way as long as they behave themselves, the dogs are under control, pick up after their dogs and dispose of their waste.

[simultaneous comments]

Sharon Eberhardt: I'm saying that it's important to have people in the park using the park but they need to respect other people in the park too and they need to keep control of their animals so that they're not disturbing other people.

Steffen Franz: I agree!

Sharon Eberhardt: I think if your community can do that in a small park it's fine .
[simultaneous comments]

Steffen Franz: If you get two or three and then they take you in front of the judge and say we're going take that animal away from you because you're an unfit parent because you have numerous off-leash dog violations.

Sharon Eberhardt: I understand that before Park Patrol got a little bug in their little brains the community was getting along fine and we worked it all out. Even the director that we had at our clubhouse, our old clubhouse, didn't like dogs and the only request she had was to keep the dogs away from the kids. So the dogs were in the back of the park where they have a baseball field and that's where they were allowed to run off-leash but when there were kids around they had leashes on and everybody got along fine.

Howard Levitt: I know you're about to bring the gavel down but I just wanted to thank this committee because you're volunteering your time to do this, you don't have to be doing this but

you're doing it on behalf of Recreation and Park in San Francisco and as a San Franciscan I want to thank you for that.

Chair: Thank you for your time. We'll probably revisit this conversation again as soon as the final comes out.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: Are there any announcements? I see Richard Rothman.

Richard Rothman: Richard Rothman, District 1. Stacy, Bradley and myself put together a slide presentation about the Mother's Building and about the study we did and I'd be happy to come around to any community groups. You let me know when and put me on the calendar.

[simultaneous comments]

END OF DOCUMENT