

**Parks and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee Meeting
January 8, 2019**

Chair: Welcome to the January, 2019, Parks and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee meeting. We'll start with the roll.

Richard Rothman: District 1.

Cally Wong: District 7.

Mark Scheuer: District 8.

Gisele Rainer: District 3.

Robert Brust: District 8.

Steve Currier: District 11.

Ken McGary: District 11.

Anthony Cuadro: District 7.

Jane Weil: District 6.

Kenneth Maley: District 3.

Wendy Aragon: District 1.

Elisa Laird-Metke: District 9.

Jordyn Aquino: District 4.

Julia Pfeiffenberger: District 4.

Chair: Steffan Franz, District 2. Did anybody have a chance to review the minutes?

Steve Currier: I have one comment on 3F. When I made the comment that I request a business card, I did not request that. What I said is what I think is that we need to have a more active presence in the community when people ask us questions in how they can get involved and that they can come to meetings. I understand, this is an advisory committee. I think you held me to the railroad tracks when I mentioned it, that we're not like the Rec and Park Commission, we're not the Planning Commission. I understand all that but I feel that if we give our time that we probably should have more clout within the city when somebody asks us questions because how are they going to get in contact with us or this organization to make public comment on advisory materials that go to Recreation and Park.

Chair: Before we go down this road, we've already discussed with the Department the need to have further conversation but the concept of having a business card for PROSAC is in the works. Whether it's going to happen immediately, it might take a month or two. There are some hoops we have to go through to clear it but that's a part of the discussion.

Steve Currier: I think that's fantastic because it gives a little bit more clout.

Chair: It's something we've wanted for a while. It's not something new to this committee. Linda as we've talked about tried to do it. She failed, unfortunately. It wasn't her fault. Unfortunately, it had all the charter language on one side that wasn't readable and one point and Nick Belloni pointed out they were glossy so you couldn't write your name on them. We're going to try to work through that. And in fact because that's not really an item on the agenda I think that's one of a handful of things that will help us to reconcile your comments.

Again, I want to stick to just the meeting minutes for right now. Does anybody else have any other changes or concerns?

Jordyn Aquino: Move to accept the minutes.

Mark Scheuer: Second.

Chair: All in favor of approving the December minutes?

All: Aye.

Chair: That's passed. I have a very simple Chair's report. I will first of all wish you a happy holiday and happy New Year. I know that it takes some of your time every month to come here and to sit on this committee. I feel like this next year there are going to be a lot of things happen, a lot of projects in a lot of Districts that have not necessarily seen support in the past and so I'm very hopeful for District 9, 10, 6 that this is your year, that you guys will some forward motion.

I also want to take into a couple of members, Trevor and Julia, had pointed out some things that may be helpful to us. One was kind of an online spreadsheet that would allow us to again to our events in there and the other members of PROSAC could see that and say oh I want to go to this event. Or just a more subtle way to communicate than sending it to Tiffany and having it sent out to [unintelligible].

So there are a few things that we're working on. Because we're outside of certain parameters it's difficult, we can't just open up a gmail account. Those are some logistical challenges.

Wendy Aragon: District 1. How would that work [unintelligible]?

Chair: Again, we wouldn't do committee business. We would absolutely be limited to—I think one thing that Julia had talked about was having everybody's contact info in a Google spread, somehow, that we would all access it because she couldn't find my number when she

was trying to say that she was sick. Again, I'm trying to make it a little easier for everybody to communicate.

As far as any other items in my Chair's report I thought the Department did another splendid job at their holiday party this year. It was nice for us to be honored. How many of you were at the tree lighting? I don't know if you noticed Recreation and Park made a point of making a PROSAC area, we had reserved seating for the first time. I thought it was a nice way to treat us with the respect as I feel like we've earned with them.

I don't have much else. This month will be kind of a standard meeting. Next meeting a standard meeting. In March we'll hold elections and there are—I don't know anybody else, I know my term is over. My Supervisor is going to appoint somebody to fill my seat until the election but then that day I will resign and so I want you all to start thinking about leadership. Obviously there is current leadership. If there is interest by other people I urge you to start thinking about that now and start thinking about what you're going to bring to the table moving forward. I feel like I've been a pretty good Chair and I think that you're in good hands with other members who are very interested and forward-thinking. I hope to see this committee continue to proceed.

That's the end of my report.

Richard Rothman: I just want to remind you that about half of us our terms expire in February so maybe Tiffany can you send out that list that you got from the clerk of who needs to apply and so you have to send your application to your Supervisor and then they send it to the clerk.

Chair: And obviously any of you who have a different Supervisor than the one that appointed you I think you need to have a conversation with that Supervisor and make sure that you're going to be reappointed.

Wendy Aragon: District 1. So something that I recently found out is that my term expired last February and nobody told me or my Supervisor so they're going to do it again this year but then I have to do it again next year.

Chair: I think each one of you should be responsible to what your term is and if you are termed out or if you haven't been reappointed after like she's saying you missed a year there then you should work to make sure that you are reappointed.

Jane Weil: My question is along the same lines. We have a set number of years even if we get reappointed?

Chair: Again, just for everybody's knowledge it's four two-year terms unless you were appointed in somebody else's unfinished term. So in my case I was appointed a year into an unfinished term so in effect I served a year and then I served four back to back terms.

Jane Weil: And then you're termed out.

Chair: Yes and really in essence there is no way unless I want to start soliciting other Supervisors or I don't even think that would work. But I think really I would say that it's four two-year terms.

Jane Weil: And we have to get reappointed every two years.

Richard Rothman: You have to put an application in. I was appointed in the middle of a term so I had to do the same thing and go back. When I started you just put an application in and didn't have to go to a hearing. Norman Yee was the one who started making when he was Chair of the Rules Committee making us come to the committee.

Chair: Again, if you haven't visited Rules since you were first appointed the likelihood is that you will have to do it again.

Any other comments on this item?

Steve Currier: Does anyone check?

Chair: Yes, especially incoming Supervisors who are looking to fill other positions. Anything else on this item? Any public comment? Hearing none, this item is closed.

Let's move on to our first presentation. Welcome to PROSAC.

Maia Small: My name is Maia Small [unintelligible]. So we understand that the Planning Department has come from time to time to this group and talked about our privately owned public open space and so we're happy to talk about it today.

So of the questions I understand was about some enforcement around it, an understanding of what's currently available, where the popos are that we have and I have a rather very small list of the popos that we have and some that we're expecting. So there's been some changes recently with all the development that's happened.

So I'm going to go through just a little bit of the basics of what popos and some of the considerations that we've had around them more recently. I'm happy to answer questions as we go through this, we can also have some questions at the end. My end doesn't get into enforcement, so.

Corey Teague: [unintelligible] a general overview of the enforcement process but I'm obviously happy to answer any questions you might have about the enforcement process.

Maia Small: Just so you know, I'm an architect by training and so design is more my side of things rather than [unintelligible] Planning Code though I certainly deal with a lot of that.

Every person living and working downtown should have access to a sizable, sunlit open space with convenient [unintelligible] maintained at no public expense. So as a lot of you probably know the popos process mostly came out of the Downtown Plan. There were open spaces before

that that were conditioned as part of project approval, so there are some that predate it. But a lot of it was around office developments and so we have popos requirements when you develop office space, hotel space, those are the primary ones, and it's usually a one foot per fifty square feet. So if you're developing 1000 square feet you're doing the 1:50 ratio. So you can do it onsite, there is also an ability to do it offsite. Most of our popos are onsite and most of them from that era are office plazas but there is a kind of list of different types that you can do. No more than 20 percent within that downtown area shall be indoor. So there are provisions to be able to do them in the Downtown Plan as indoor gallerias but the goal is to have open space, the goal is to have it open to the sky. It should be clearly visible and easily reached. We expanded a signage program which I'll show a couple slides later, and that sign needs to be at public level. It needs to be open when it's reasonable. So these are not open 24 hours, they're set more or less—a lot of them are sort of 9:00 to 6:00 but they really need to be kind of open with the adjacent hours of whatever businesses are participating. And seating and food service is encouraged, so they are specific requirements around how much you can take up but the intention is to have complementary uses that go along with that open space.

So it came out of the Downtown Plan from the 80s. So C3 is our downtown zoning and mostly it was around office space and those are some of the ratios so that even with the residential the C3R there is some requirement. But downtown was mostly where it was and that was really its origin.

I'm going to click through a few examples of what a lot of these spaces are like downtown. They're mostly used during daytime hours, a lot of them are lunchtime kind of uses, people in the buildings there coming down. They're a little more conventional in some ways, they have an art program that goes with it, there's often very large pieces of art, there are guidelines which describe what kinds of art and how the art can be done. It has to be permanent art. There are also ones on rooftops and some of them are tucked away a little bit, sometimes they'll be on a second level. It's not always exactly in your face at the sidewalk level. Sometimes they're in colonnades, some of these are successful, some of them maybe not. I think there is definitely the question about when it feels like it's public space and when it feels like it's part of the building or maybe even an entry into the lobby. So we've been reviewing some of these. That's actually one of the first things I did when I started at the Department about five years ago was to take a look from a design point of view and see what things were successful, how we could make some changes, especially when we began at the Central SOMA plan.

But we do have other examples, not just the office plaza, but we do allow for alley improvements as a way of satisfying popos in very specific circumstances. It has to be done well. We also have one on 2nd Street as an example of an indoor popos that's been relatively successful and I think it's improve the 222 2nd Street which is I think one of the most successful ones that's indoors. Indoor is really hard, it's not open space to the sky, so it has to have an elevated quality for people to feel like it's public. One thing I think they did really successfully in the 222 2nd is that they don't have their lobby as part of that space, that space is independent, it has beautiful art in it. The doors that you see, these monster doors, and the security guards actually go outside and invite people in rather than preventing people from coming in. But the fact that the lobby is separate means you don't feel like you have to belong to the building to go into it.

350 Mission Street not as successful I think. There's some big signage right behind the popos which makes it feel like you have to be participating in the building to be there. So we've learned from some of these small design things.

This is the signage requirement which was added I think in 2012 or 2013 and there is very specific requirements around the signs, how they're placed, they have to be visible, so you can't just be randomly creative about it. It's specific.

Steve Currier: How big are the signs?

Corey Teague: They're small.

Corey Teague: 20 inches tall by 16 inches wide.

Maia Small: And we really want the design of them to be the most evident. We want everyone to feel welcome in popos, we want it to feel natural, that you're part of the public realm, you're on a sidewalk, you're walking down the sidewalk and you feel like you can go into these spaces. There shouldn't be anything that is closed or you shouldn't have security guards hovering over your shoulder. It's not just some people feeling like they can go in, everybody should feel like they can go in. It's an interesting challenge to feel like that.

Chair: I championed bringing you guys here because I really feel there's somewhat of a disconnect. I keep hearing you say this is not what our expectation is. Part of the why I want to hear about enforcement is because I don't think that standard is being met across a large majority of these open spaces. I have heard from people randomly, they simply say no I go and the security guard says I have to buy a coffee here or I can't enter this particular area.

And so I like that you are pointing out ones that are successful but I think our concern is to cut right to the root yeah I know what your intention is, we all know what your intention is but we'd like to see the execution of it in a slightly different way.

Corey Teague: I think there's two issues there. I think when Maia speaks about something being successful she's referring to how it functions in its design and how it feels and operates as open space whereas it sounds like when you're talking about it's not successful because they are violating code and they're not allowing access or putting up barriers that may not be permitted and that's kind of a separate issue. It may be wonderfully design otherwise and could be of a successful open space if the access was granted and that's a separate enforcement issue and I'm happy to [unintelligible].

Chair: It's fine, I think you should finish your preso but I do want to be straight-forward that most of us have experienced that same feeling of kind of like hey you built it, it looks really cool, I just can't get to it. I don't even know it's there.

Maia Small: Well, not knowing it's there is a big problem and that's—okay, so part of this is the setup of the next layer of what's our next generation of popos going to be. So we need to solve the problems of the ones that we have which is less a design consideration, more an

enforcement situation. So that's one of the things we want to address. And the second is the next generation of them and how design can play a role in that to a certain level, we still can't completely control how people act like security guards and things like that and that goes back to enforcement. So it's always going to be paired together in that sense.

But I think there's been some self-criticism shall we say in the Planning Department of making sure that the rules have been set. We set them up for the best opportunity so one thing for example we started working on the Central SOMA plan. Now, Central SOMA has 20 million square feet of residential and office coming between 2nd and 6th and Townsend and close to Yerba Buena. So there's a lot of offices being proposed there. They have—we have included popos as a requirement for the Central SOMA plan, it would not have been a requirement because it's outside of downtown. So we wanted popos to be private, we wanted to try to fix some of these challenges like for example how do you make them accessible having them on a roof? Nobody knows they're there. Making sure that they would be at grade, connected to a public location so they're not through doors. So that was actually the number one policy change in the plan was to say that—now, there are some high rises in Central SOMA that have very small footprints, their sites are very small and so we made them do all their popos on the ground floor. So we said that the first 15 percent of their site basically had to be popos, they had a large popos requirement, they had to provide up to 15 percent of their site for the popos and anything beyond that, if that didn't meet their requirements then they could propose things like an indoor popos or on roof or something else.

As of this date we have eight key sites in Central SOMA and none of them are proposing them on rooftops, they're all at grade. We do have some indoor ones but when we have indoor ones we're requiring the same kind of level of absolute openness and transparency to the point where like the whole side of the wall [unintelligible].

So lack of public access is our number one concern and making sure that they're visible and connected. Sometimes even just a few stairs, you know, as soon as you get above the eye line then it feels like it becomes exclusive again and then I think you actually have more problems with security guards because as soon as it doesn't have eyes on the street, as soon as it's disconnected from the activity of the street then people can go and head into corners and then negative activity happens, right? So they're going to be more attentive and worried and [unintelligible].

So that was part of it. There's also, you know, the downtown plan was decades ago. We've had new changes and best practices around sustainability and greening. We wanted to make sure that was built more into it, different kinds of programming that we [unintelligible] different kinds of activities and uses and ways of making sure that we're maintaining those spaces so we want to try to build in some of the best practices and any program was a big feature of it too. I think just making it over the spaces is in many cases in a downtown environment not necessarily [unintelligible]. So incentivizing, creating way that people will have places to sit, have new activities, if there's different kinds of temporary things that happen. If someone really is a steward of that space, an active steward of that space.

So we looked around at other precedents, highlighting—some of them aren't necessarily public spaces but other places in which there were some really wonderful, almost too-crowded places that were almost overwhelmed with their popularity. We wanted to see how we could really build in the qualities of some of that, as much into the nature of design and the Central SOMA ones—there are two sort of major streams of popos we're having right now. There's Central SOMA ones at these key sites and they are very large and they have a danger of being kind of campus-ified, like you have a bunch of big office buildings and there's space between them and then everyone thinks that it's just a campus for the people who work in those office buildings so it's important to crack those open and make sure they're connected.

The second is we have a lot of hotel projects. Residential and offices become challenging for cost of all the things, construction and putting it together, and hotel became a really viable option for projects and hotels have popos but they often are really confusing because it looks like a hotel lobby, it may be very, very small. Those have been I think some of the biggest challenges for a sense of public activation because they're often tucked away. So those are the really specific design challenges, we're going to see how those come out but those are often the ones that end up on rooftops.

So we looked for different ways of how popos get connected to other natural networks and in Central SOMA we just did a map that has all the ground floors of all the major sites and all the park spaces and the sidewalks and the popos to see what that network really feels like and where the crossings are in the streets so you feel like there's sort of a natural way of moving through that reinforce each other rather than an isolated. And then as you probably know there's a website so that you can go and find them. We want them to be found by like just walking around the city and you can't help yourself, you run into them but there is of course a map of the ones and I'm constantly surprised by the ones that I've discovered that I didn't know where there.

This is a list on one page, it's the existing ones that we're monitoring and then also on the back side some ones that I'm aware of. It's a little anecdotal, ones that I see recently that are in the pipeline, the major ones. And a lot of those are central SOMA but there's also some more in the hotels.

Corey Teague: Again, our website if you just go to sffind.org and search popos you'll get this page and it's combined with [unintelligible] program so they're all on one page and we do have this interactive map where you can search for popos and public art and all of it [unintelligible]. You can't really read this here but it says get map data, so you can basically clip on that and it will take you to San Francisco's open data portal for as much data as we have we can make it available to the public and you can actually download the spreadsheet of all these—basically all the information that Maia just handed out and is maintained over time. So we do have all this information available for viewing on our website but also for download off the open data portal.

Maia Small: And these are all the ones that exist right now.

Chair: I just wanted to speak to that point. I've been on this committee a long time so we've had popos presentation years ago, obviously not as robust as it is not. The last one we had I think

it was about two years ago. This wasn't even launched yet and so I went to the website at the behest of whoever came and presented and said oh look at the website. It was crap and it wasn't mobile friendly and you want people walking around being able to go to it.

Maia Small: [unintelligible]

Chair: Right. But I will say that I went and I kind of tried to fail it. I tried to tweak on it and I'll put all different reports and all different stuff and so not you actually have that piece coming along a little bit. The web piece seems to be working well. There's no exposure. There's no way that an average person—you just said navigate to the Planning website and then kind of find popos somewhere in there and that's just not—a park is a park, you walk up on it, it's big, it's green, it's there. These are hard to find so again what you're doing here, this looks great. I went to the site, I flipped through a bunch of those. You're doing a great job in terms of that presence. I think that part of the concern is what's next, how do you make it better? How do you connect people to the site?

Female Speaker: [unintelligible] what if you had a short link as a requirement for the sign-in. [unintelligible].

Chair: We could go crazy. [unintelligible] Obviously in this city if you really took it to another level she's right, you could have one short link and take them to a world of public-private open space.

Female Speaker: Can you tell me what are the type of [unintelligible] in their design? [unintelligible].

Maia Small: It's office use and hotel use.

Female Speaker: Are there other ones?

Corey Teague: Technically any project, any new construction downtown essentially and some of the larger projects in downtown and some SOMA area but primarily its downtown. It's basically any new construction which most new construction downtown is office of hotel so de facto it's office.

Maia Small: But even residential has it.

Corey Teague: Even residential has that requirement or if you [unintelligible] more than 20 percent of the area, that's when it triggers essentially downtown. And then once you do that whatever you're building, new building or addition, there's going to be a certain amount of square footage, 100,000 square feet, and depending on what zoning District you're in there's a ratio for every so many square feet, whether 50 or 100 that you're adding you have to have a square foot of public. And then the [unintelligible] a lot of variety what kind of popos you do, right? It doesn't say in this zoning District or in this context you have to do a plaza or you have to do a [unintelligible] or a solarium or something. You have the option to be flexible but we also

view it [unintelligible]. There's a lot of criteria both in the Planning Code and in the General Plan to provide guidance about design [unintelligible].

Chair: What if I as a developer don't like what you've presented to me as my options for satisfying this concern? Can I give you—

Maia Small: [unintelligible] open options.

Chair: Can I give you money?

Male Speaker: You can't fee out of your popos.

Chair: You can't fee out of your popos. I'm sorry, I just want it on the record.

Male Speaker: You can't fee out of your popos.

Chair: That's good to know because I think it's a misconception that people think that they can buy their way out.

Maia Small: No. You can do it offsite so there have been times where people have looked at parcels—but it has to be within 900 feet.

Chair: But it's still open space, that's fine.

Maia Small: [unintelligible]

Chair: Okay, okay. All right—

Male Speaker: I was going to say generally the only time you can fee out of requirements and it's generally not every time is when we require you to do something in the public right of way. So for example where there used to be street trees which isn't in our code anymore but in Public Works or bicycle parking on the street if it's not feasible in your area we still want you to pay the fee so that MTA and Public Works or whoever actually works to install those features can still add them somewhere close by. In this situation the way it works is you're providing it on private property and you're maintaining it. If you pay us then we have to develop it in the public right of way [unintelligible]. So generally speaking the private stuff you can't fee out of.

Maia Small: And also when we were looking at Central SOMA there were a number of small projects which have very, very small popos and we were concerned about sort of little, funny—I mean there are things called snippets under the Downtown Plan and we have parklets which are not popos but we're used to small open space, that's not necessarily problematic bunch of small ones that are in front of front doors end up being like little forecourts that don't really get activated. So there was some conversation around these are a way that there could be—people could put a fee into a bigger pot and then we get something bigger that didn't end up in the plan mostly because of the logistic of trying to land which is so impossible so you might end up with a pot of money but it would be really hard to actually implement it, so.

Chair: I have a bunch of questions. Ancel. Hold on. Richard.

Richard Rothman: District 1. Before I had issues with my legs I used to walk around and I never saw any signs. They need to be bigger. You know, people should be able to see the signs. The signs to me looked fairly small. I think it should be a larger sign and I think the Chronicle ran a story a couple years ago about buildings not being accessible. So what's the penalty?

Chair: Let's let them get to enforcement because we haven't really heard what that is yet?

Richard Rothman: My question is so say Wells Fargo has where they're building on Market and they won't let people in there. So what is the Planning Department going to do?

Corey Teague: From an enforcement perspective with strictly speaking about popos usually the complaints that we get are related to access, they're not related to design or a bench that rusted out and haven't replaced it like they should. Most of our complaints are based on access. The challenge we face is that obviously we do have some popos that were kind of designed and approved a long time ago that are not ideal for access purposes that we would not likely approve today, at least not in those configurations. And also limiting access is usually not a situation where they had a sign that literally says like these people can't come in or we're only open for two hours a day. It's one-offs, someone says I went to access it and they told me no and usually what happens when we get those complaints we take those complaints in and we have more than one enforcement staff try to access popos at different times at different days and see if they're denied access. If they are then obviously we can take the next steps in talking to the property owner or manager about that.

The vast majority of times where that's in the complaint we don't have it show up again for our staff to go out there and creates a challenge because if someone builds a building without permits in their backyard that's tangible, that's easy. You did this, it doesn't meet the code, you have to take it down, that's how you fix the situation. In this kind of situation it's kind of a ephemeral on-off situation where maybe someone was denied access at this point but they're not actively in any kind of documentable way denying access so the best we can do is inform them and remind them that someone filed a complaint, you can't deny access, you have to be able to allow access during these times.

We've also got some complaints that people who don't like the fact that say for example at 1 Kearny where you have to go through the corridor and up the elevator and they have to help you go through that whole thing, that they require you to sign in, show ID. The code doesn't really specify those types of issues, it just says they have to give you access and especially post-911 I think we had a lot more spaces that were more concerned about who has access to their spaces and just wanting to have a sign-in and make sure they have logs of who actually comes. And so in those situations that's not a violation of the code. They're still allowing the access. For anything like that to change, if people were unhappy with that the code doesn't require longer hours of access or doesn't like the fact that it can require a sign-in that would require a code amendment.

But if someone is in violation, if someone—there's a documented violation of the Planning Code and this is the case for all Planning Code enforcement if we get to a point where it's a clear violation and we issue a notice of violation and then they're required to abate the violation within a certain timeframe. If they don't then penalties can ensue after that. People can appeal that notice of violation to the Board of Appeals if they want to. So there's a decent amount of due process there before you get to a point where you may actually be subject to any type of penalties but that's generally the process. We investigate it. If there is a violation we issue the notice of violation and we got through that process and something a lot of people don't understand about the Planning Code too and our enforcement apparatus is that it's specifically designed and actually states in the Planning Code that our enforcement program is purposely not designed to be punitive. So it's all about abating the violation. So that's why there's lot of due process, give you every chance to abate the violation and only then if you don't abate the violation do we start to charge fees and just from that point. There's not kind of like well there was a violation and you were violating the code for two years and that's really egregious, we're going to slap this fine on you just to penalize you for violating the code. We specifically can't do that under the code the way it's written right now.

Maia Small: I will also say that there are some ones that were [unintelligible] that are coming back to us for redesign.

Chair: That was another question.

Maia Small: There are a number, several on Market Street, some really big ones actually and some of them are on the cusp of being historic resources and so there's some concern around which landscapes they can fall into that category too but we really want to make sure that they come up to the standard of what we expect now for accessibility just from a design point of view and really making sure that they fit what we would accept in a design review.

Chair: Just to backend it, can you speak to the one that totally failed, the Intercontinental. How did that—can you speak to that? If you can't it's okay. They opened a popos that was never accessible, they—

Corey Teague: They had a popos. It was a hotel situation.

Chair: It was the 6th floor, right?

Corey Teague: It was technically available. It was hard to get to, there wasn't good signage. Ultimately they wanted to just not have it as a popos. Very long story short it was a very challenging situation and they worked very closely with the Supervisor at that time, Supervisor Kim, and legislation was passed in that situation to essentially allow a fee-out but that's only because they passed special legislation for that site. It wasn't a comprehensive legislation that allowed fee-outs.

Chair: I guess the reason I ask you is because of course it speaks to the future what happens if you find the same situation with somebody that you're granting right now, they pull back, they

don't use it, they don't want it to be a popos, do we have a means, a vehicle to take that back from them five years from now?

Corey Teague: I think there's two important things there. One, there are kind of evolutions of thought and design on various topics in the city. I don't think that popos—it's funny, because they are popos, the S is not plural but you always want to leave it off. So I don't think we would allow popos like that to be developed today. So that's the first things is, don't create that bad situation where it's completely disconnected, really bad, poor connections, poor signage. We obviously have signage requirements and so forth. So try to prevent that situation happening through design because obviously Maia made it pretty clear we really want these to be as successful as possible. I think sometimes in the past some of them were a little less scrutinized and it was just do you have it, it meets the code, okay. Good luck, I hope it works.

So that's the ideal situation but there's not been any discussion I'm aware of for any kind of broad buyout situation or fee-out because again it kind of defeats the whole purpose of the program. I don't think there was any big desire to do it for the Intercontinental. I think it just became obvious that even if we wanted that space to remain a popos it was never going to be a successful popos for a lot of reason and there was nowhere else to put it on the site. So there were literally not many options available for that situation but that's not something we would want to do again I'm sure.

Maia Small: And I can tell you because I see pretty much every major project that's happening. There's only one popos that I can think of that's not at grade and that is 555 Howard there's a rooftop popos, it's going to be a really spectacular building [unintelligible] easy in, easy up to the top [unintelligible]. Other than that they may be indoors, there are some indoor ones but they are at grade. I think that's been one of the really key aspects of it to make it really viable. You can't tuck these things away.

Ken McGary: District 11. We were talking about being able to find these things and I'm curious if you open a street map and Google map of course and all that if you [unintelligible] and also I'm curious what are the marketing campaigns or advertising or have you or do you plan to?

Corey Teague: Right around the time we updated the signage there was a lot—there was a big public press for that. There was a lot of project we're updating the signage and that's around the time we really started to track them more and want publically displayed it more and there were a lot of press reports at the time and there's been kind of another round of that in the last year or two.

Maia Small: [unintelligible] has been interested in that I think [unintelligible].

Corey Teague: Right. And like you said this has evolved. Our website has gotten better. The challenge with that especially in the public sector is that you have to have the capital and the staff to set up whatever you're going to set up but then you also have to have the long-term resources to maintain it both in terms of maintaining the technology and the infrastructure to maintain data, making sure that we also don't want to put it out there and have it somehow make it super-accessible and market it to everyone and be wrong, and be incorrect.

And so that's big undertaking. It sounds really simple but it's a lot of resources and a lot of effort and not that that's not important but we're limited in our resources so that those are good ideas. I'm sure they've been discussed at some level for a lot of different programs but that's the challenge we face.

Chair: I think the Chronicle three or four years ago was what triggering it to begin with.

Maia Small: He recently [unintelligible].

Chair: Clearly you know why we're interested, right? Because we deal with Recreation and Park who has this kind of sprawling, constantly do we get it, do we acquire it, do we build a new one? Do we have maintenance money to build the next thing and run it so now we have to look to other possibilities?

Maia Small: There are a number of challenges right now with public open spaces. Some of it is going into the plaza program now and there are other layers, ways in which things are beginning public space so it's a [unintelligible].

Chair: That's the word is vigilant because we all kind of feel and speaking to our Supervisors or whatever this is the future, we know what the future is. More development, more money being spent to build buildings. We want to ensure that there are green spaces, open spaces, along with those.

Maia Small: There's another I think interesting layer that has really come out of the South of Market work which is the midblock alley. The midblock alley requirement added a lot of open space [unintelligible] because there has been so much development that's happened, western SOMA, central SOMA, east SOMA, and in the southeast quadrant in general and in the Mission I think that the midblock alleys have actually—it will be interesting to see how that really works in the fabric of the city but I think there's a lot of opportunity. Even with programming, they're not just cut-throughs, they're actually public space.

Corey Teague: Just to let people know what Maia is talking about originally as part of the Eastern Neighborhoods Plan back in 2008 when that was adopted it rezoned a lot of SOMA. It basically required if you're a project on a big block and you take up a certain amount of frontage and you're double-frontage with streets so I'm thinking of the project at 900 Folsom Street they actually had three frontages, it runs on Folsom and 5th and then Clementina on the back and because of the requirements they had to basically create publically accessible midblock alley connecting Folsom and Clementina.

Maia Small: [unintelligible]

Corey Teague: The primary purpose of it is circulation because you have these super blocks in SOMA so that was the primary purpose but the secondary purpose is a benefit to our open space. 900 Folsom actually did townhome units that front directly on their midblock alley. So

we've got a lot of other projects that are coming down the pipeline that they've already been approved, they're not build yet or sill be [unintelligible] especially throughout SOMA.

Maia Small: And Transbay has a lot of open spaces with it as part of the development too. They have a lot of these midblock alleys as well. So there are—Transbay is going to be an interesting place for public space.

Ana Gee: District 6, the first question I have is related to enforcement and I heard you talking about changes for the code through legislation, is that correct? And if so is [unintelligible] where we can actually fine them for not complying?

Corey Teague: So right now as I mentioned the code is set up for basically all of the existence of the Planning Code enforcement procedures it's not punitive and there's limits to how much fees we can charged [unintelligible] on abatement. There are a lot of people in the city—Planning Commissioners, Supervisors, members of the public, staff, who the issue that's really been coming up in this round is repeat offenders as opposed to wanting to be punitive for just one-offs. But that's especially when you get into issues of like [unintelligible] and things like that.

The point there is there's lot of [unintelligible] talk right now for amending the code to update our enforcement procedures a little bit and what we have the legal authority to do to either deal with repeat offenders or to increase the penalties. There's still going to be legal challenges because of the requirements of due process so there's always going to be an issue and there's always going to be a situation except for really egregious type of events where the violation is found. The primary purpose is to stop the violation and there's no kind of fees. The real issue is are we going to in the future see something where you have a repeat offender situation where okay you were violating code whether through access or for popos somehow you're violating it, you stopped, but later you're violating again automatic fee of some sort, right. We don't have that now. I don't know if that will happen. There's nothing that's been specifically proposed but bottom line is that the Planning Code is the tool we have to use to implement all of this and that can be amended by Supervisors. And legislation can be forwarded by any Supervisor of the Mayor or individual Departments can start legislation. So there's a process there. There could be legislation to amend our enforcement procedures either comprehensively or specific to certain types of situations. So it's definitely a possibility it's just not anything that's right now specifically in the works.

Ana Gee: [unintelligible] I went to look at the map and I was happy to see two [unintelligible] I walk there at least twice a day on those two blocks [unintelligible]. I'm very happy that there's supposed to be open spaces because [unintelligible] and I'm saying this because when I was looking at the description [unintelligible].

Maia Small: That's always one of my kind of standards when I [unintelligible] and I imagine high school kids, like how welcome are little kids going to be, how welcome are like—it's not just like do you ever [unintelligible] it really has to be for everyone and I think those kinds of standards I'm imagining.

So when [unintelligible] these need to be neighborhood parks. We have to stop thinking of them as office plazas and so really thinking 24/7 on weekends, how are these really used by people that live there now that we have more of an opportunity to do that where downtown that was a challenge back in the 80s [unintelligible]. Now we really can make these [unintelligible].

Male Speaker: The distinction is that when this program was created was 85 downtown and the only people there from 9:00 to 6:00 primarily [unintelligible]. By and large the purpose of the program if you read the General Plan was primarily for all the people who can down there to work and needed to get out of the office and be able to take a break, have their lunch, do whatever. Of course it was open to people who lived in the area who were visiting as well but it wasn't—they weren't—the police at that time was not to design these plazas to be kind of like public open space in that sense, like a park. But as you said we're not in 1985 anymore. The context is very different and we're definitely looking at those spaces.

Maia Small: [unintelligible] in central SOMA are like residential neighborhoods as well as having other things in them. In the Central SOMA Plan we actually had an incentive to encourage playground, community gardens, dog parks, sport courts. I believe that was taken out at the very last minute and the incentive and the worry was that why should be incentivize these things, they should be doing them anyway. So we're going to try to get all of that, as much as we can but trying to sort of build it in so that you can have a little bit less space if you provide one of those things which usually [unintelligible] liability and responsibility and maintenance issue. But we sort of feel like those reason should be part of it.

Chair: Just to pick up on what Ana was saying too, she's in District 6, there's a lot of development going on in District 6 but her point was really well-taken. Recreation and Park is closing two playgrounds in her District to renovate them. Where can you offer her new open space for children to be able to play while those playgrounds are closed? And again I'm just throwing it to you so that maybe as things develop with Recreation and Park—because that's going to be my last question—my last question is how are you interfacing with RPD in terms of their experience of building versus in terms of what their next five to ten years of development is because I think there has to be some synergy between. But I'll leave that to you for the next time you come here. There's just too many questions.

Wendy Aragon: I have some equity questions. The first one is I notice this when I walk by these—the signs aren't fully accessible, they're no rail, there's not raised lettering which is actually law.

Maia Small: [unintelligible]

Wendy Aragon: [unintelligible]

Maia Small: Well, all I can say is there are more architects in the Planning Department now than there used to be and [unintelligible].

Wendy Aragon: The second thing is was the Transbay Terminal [unintelligible] because we all know that there is a lot of issue about them taking out benches. [unintelligible] and as 3rd Street gets developed are we looking at [unintelligible].

Maia Small: I will say that the art process is a little interesting. As far as I know we don't review the art which is a really good thing, we do not want to review the art. And I believe that it is picked by the developer. They often go to the Arts Commission but I don't think they get approved by Arts Commission either.

Male Speaker: They do.

Maia Small: Maybe I'm thinking of the ones in OCA that were former redevelopment and I'm not sure—

Male Speaker: That might be different.

Wendy Aragon: We just have such a vibrant city and to have art from Latino people and black people and I know that there's the galleria on Valencia or 16th where people [unintelligible] I think that's really important that we're focusing on that.

Maia Small: There has been some interest also in revising the fine arts guidelines which were developed quite a while ago as well and the difficulty is—because there's so many different types of art now I think that the complexity of what we define as art, plus just technology, there's just a lot of different options and it hasn't been updated in a long time. There's a lot of concern about updating it because they don't want things to end up being too temporary, like the digital and light are, all these other forms of textiles and things done seem as permanent as like a sculpture that's stuck there and I think there has to be some kind of conversation around finding that middle ground because we certainly want flexibility in that, we have to diversify.

Male Speaker: I think your question was about the Transbay subject to this. The short answer is no, not specifically because Transbay Terminal is in an area that's overseen by the Transbay Joint Powers. So it's a quasi-State agency like Redevelopment and so there's certain guidelines. There's some parts of the Planning Code that project follows, there's some parts that it's not subject to and [unintelligible] so it's not related under our purview of the Planning Department.

Female Speaker: [unintelligible]

Male Speaker: Good question. It's possible.

Female Speaker: I think there's a provision [unintelligible].

Male Speaker: Because some of them are linked to that.

Female Speaker: That makes it not an accessible public space for people.

Female Speaker: [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments]

Chair: We did see a presentation by the Arts Commission that talked about the inventory being way over what they could actually ever install. And so I think maybe a discussion because again I think they told us that they had hundreds of pieces that [unintelligible] and they had to stop actually taking people's gifts so it sounds natural to me that you guys could be like hey, can we get some art? Like maybe there's some cool Latino art in the storehouse. I don't know, I'm just throwing it out to you that if you put up walls it would be nice to put something on them especially if we owned it already.

Okay, let's keep going.

Female Speaker: If 3rd Street gets developed with offices [unintelligible].

Male Speaker: I mean 3rd Street, it depends on which part of 3rd Street you're talking about. If you're talking Mission Bay further down. So Mission Bay is completely within what was a redevelopment area that was [unintelligible] and Mission Bay is basically done. There's not really any [unintelligible]. That's really kind of it so there's not going to be much more other than what's going up right now, there's not really going to be much more new development. Once you get south of that and you start getting into like Dogpatch the popos requirements don't apply because you're really kind of getting out of more of the urban core, really large building area, that kind of density.

Originally popos were only required in the C3 District or downtown which is really kind of like the Market-Mission spine and then the traditional kind of north of Market Financial District downtown. Again, the Eastern Neighborhoods we had some officer districts kind of downtown adjacent where we also required some projects to be [unintelligible] is also subject to it but outside of that we don't have the popos requirement.

Maia Small: I will say that for like Pier 70, some of the really large development sites have what are [unintelligible] and they have agreements for getting their own zoning.

Male Speaker: Mission Rock.

Maia Small: Yeah, Mission Rock. They just have very large public spaces programs in which are basically meant to be equivalent to the popos requirements would be. So they're providing all this and residential, there's significant [unintelligible].

Chair: And obviously I mean I think it's a good question to ask but I also think eventually maybe it does have to move somewhat—you have to take what's working for you especially as that development continued down towards Bayview.

Female Speaker: [unintelligible] on Dropbox right now and there's requirements there and so [unintelligible].

Female Speaker: Hunters Point will be another one where [unintelligible].

Chair: We see all of that so we definitely are aware of what their promises are and what the execution is.

Maia Small: I mean it's really about how we can develop the areas to do the appropriate amount of open space. I think the question is whether it becomes privately maintained or is publically owned or the program [unintelligible] and there's a lot of concern and Recreation and Park [unintelligible].

Chair: Right and obviously they have [unintelligible] what we're trying to ensure as a citizen's advisory group [unintelligible] and we've had many presentations by private developers who were like yeah, we love putting plazas in. Plazas are not open spaces, they're DG. I mean I like the concept and I know what the rule says but it's not the same as a park. A green space is different than a DG space. Anyway, that's my—Anthony Cuadro.

Anthony Cuadro: My question was about Mission Bay also and specifically the Chase Center but that has to do with—it's not in your purview, I guess so—

Chair: Yeah, that's all Mission Bay.

Male Speaker: That's all through Mission Bay. Basically the popos requirement didn't apply and in Mission Bay has a whole master planned area and so they planned for certain open spaces that were open to the public that were owned by the public [unintelligible].

Jane Weil: District 6. So I represent central SOMA and we've had huge grave concerns about the popos just backing up a little bit what happened at the Intercontinental was looking at your mission statement what you say hopefully it will be a sunny, sunlit space. What happened at the Intercontinental is it was on the 6th floor, it was a wind tunnel, they literally tented it and had weddings in their popos which nobody could get to because you had to go through their lobby and the security made it very clear that you were not—you know, they wouldn't let you go through.

So ultimately a special legislation was passed to let them pay back which in a lot of ways I think was the ideal solution. It never should have happened but since it did happen—but we have several that are proposed in central SOMA now that I think are equally bad frankly and if a developer has his way he will put it in the placed that he least wants, so he'll put it in the back corner in the middle of three high rises which is shaded and windy and cold and won't be adequate open space. And so I've really pushed to have Recreation and Park have a seat at the table because if you asked all of us we want green that's got sun that is accessible from the street and visible from the street. That's a park. A tiled lobby even if it's open is not a park.

So we just have tremendous worries about a lot of the high rise proposals and in my mind it would be better to have them if they can't—if they don't have enough space to give us a proper park to have some way that they could fund and-or build offsite a proper park because we need open space in central SOMA and in my mind we're not getting it from the central SOMA plan. To let people put it on the roof is a total travesty. It's windy. Even if they put something

beautiful up there you go up there it may be one or two hours a day is usable and yet people are being allowed to do that in the plan So I just want to put that on the record that this all sounds great but in reality it's not. SomCan is doing a great job of coming to you with what they want in an ideal work but—

Maia Small: There aren't any popos on the roofs for any of the sites.

Jane Weil: Well, 5M has got them on the—

Maia Small: 5M is a whole other [unintelligible].

Jane Weil: But they managed to do that. I just want to be on record that we would love to have PROSAC and Recreation and Park have a voice in some of these and the real concern is wind and shadow and lack of sunlight and—

Maia Small: It's interesting the window—a lot of the big projects are going to through the wind studies right now and it seems like we're used to certain part of the city like Van Ness and Market having really high wind problems but South of Market and central SOMA it's really significant, it's more than I think some of the developers expected and they're having to do [unintelligible] and reshape buildings and the open space is part of that challenge but we have the same comfort criteria they have to pass as part of the code and there are exceptions in the central SOMA plan so it will be interesting. They're really kind of struggling with that to make sure that they meet those comfort criteria.

We also have—the other thing that applies in central SOMA are Europe design guidelines. So there are urban design guidelines that apply across various zoning districts in the city, mixed use district, downtown, commercial districts, and neighborhood commercial districts and they apply to all projects in the central SOMA plan everything that is not a [unintelligible]. But there is a section, the P section, the public realms section which really tries to get to some of these and there's seven guidelines and they get to things like having kind of character of the park should relate to neighborhood character, that you should have transportation built into the public realm thinking so that you support all public transportation methods and that you have comfort and different kinds of physical qualities and comfort space, sunlight, and shade in some cases too to make sure that there's a balance of those things as well as activities, activities that are perfect for the neighborhood.

So the urban design guidelines have just started applying this past year and they try to get to this in a rounder way, not a super specific way. So we've been working on design guidelines, [unintelligible] we're trying to find ways that we can help shape these things as we move forward and some of those conversations have been really helpful for us to have a better sense of what it feels like from a neighborhood point of view.

Chair: Hey Jane you know one thing I will say that I kind of heard them say is you can go to your brand new, spanking-new Supervisor who is looking to flex his legislative might and perhaps ask is there any [unintelligible] that says if you're building in central SOMA that maybe you take [unintelligible] rather than you know okay don't muck up what you have going away

but as we move forward in acquisition or development that there is money put aside for a viable [unintelligible] and maybe they put ten buildings together and put a lot of that money into one—

Maia Small: Or really tiny ones because I think [unintelligible].

Chair: Right, I'd rather see a 500 square foot than 500.

Maia Small: And the developers have a little bit of a challenge because these see these things as amenities to their buildings and so they have some investment in what they're doing and how they're doing it but obviously you have to be shaping that.

Corey Teague: And on that something similar in a lot of eastern neighborhoods mostly in the SOMA area in areas where we don't require popos we do still require certain uses like office, non-residential open space, it's not required to be open to the public if they make it open to the public they get some reductions and benefits but also because a lot of times it is like you know a 20 square foot [unintelligible] that's not going to function by itself we do allow [unintelligible] to fee out for those because they're not even required to be public to begin with and most of the projects are going to—very few projects in those areas based on their zoning and the requirements would actually result in a plaza or any kind of open that would really be worth it. So in those scenarios we do have a context where we do allow that kind of fee-out option but it is because the only thing that would be created there are just a bunch of little ones. There's like no chance [unintelligible]. There is some of that already happening on a slightly different context.

Chair: Can I ask you just a silly question, if they fee-out where does that money go?

Male Speaker: That's a good question, I'll have to look that up. I'm trying to remember.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: The acquisition fund is where it should go.

Male Speaker: I'm pretty sure that it's the same fund where our impact fees get divvied up and some of them go—X percentage goes into this bucket, Y percentage goes in that bucket and some of it goes into open space. I'm pretty sure eastern neighborhoods that open space, those fee-outs go into the same bucket that the portion of the impact fee for open space goes into.

Chair: and again it's only logical but of course if we don't say it then five years from we're going to realize that it didn't go there.

Male Speaker: Right because again we're going to have to take that money—we're basically saying we don't want you to building this little postage stamp ten times, [unintelligible] put that money to use and have one legitimate.

Chair: Or a private space that you can acquire and develop.

Male Speaker: That's what I mean.

Maia Small: And we looked at some of that and right now the land values have been too high and too challenging but right now there's a real cool-off and we're not going to see as many projects built as we say in the last three or four years. So you know I think there may be opportunities for that as things change. There's also—these are not ideal spaces but [unintelligible] Cal Trans says there are some sites that are going to be potentially available [unintelligible] as part of legislation at a State level and some of those will hopefully be in central SOMA. I think there's some real opportunities between 3rd and 6th, 3rd and 5th where there are some areas either under the freeway where you can imagine some kinds of sports, recreation, it's not a great space but it might be good for that. And then there's other green spaces which are possible. So we'll see.

Chair: Okay, Ancel?

Ancel Martinez: I know what snippet means but in this concept what is its definition?

Maia Small: [unintelligible]

Male Speaker: [unintelligible]

Maia Small: In the downtown plan under objective 10.1 there is a table that specifies this kind of detail and—

Male Speaker: A snippet is a small seating area.

Maia Small: Yeah, it's really small.

Ancel Martinez: [unintelligible]

Male Speaker: It could be anywhere. I mean I don't think it—it's basically just a small [unintelligible]. A plaza you think of a certain size. [simultaneous comments].

Jordyn Aquino: District 4. [unintelligible] all the questions that our committee has asked and I really want to pose the question to the Planning Department and [unintelligible] as a whole as how are we evaluating the existing popos that aren't meeting the needs of the public? So often we talk about failing playgrounds and what can you do [unintelligible]. I'm not sure if that's something that has been considered or explored but just listening to everyone's comment.

Male Speaker: I think part of the challenge there as we mentioned before is that when the program was created [unintelligible] they weren't designed or conceived as what we would consider a public park, right? They were conceived as like kind of a specific like daytime respite area.

Chair: Lunch, lunch.

Corey Teague: Or anytime, you know. Breaks, anything, before work, right after work. They weren't thought of and designed to be what we would consider a park or a public park, right? And so many of those spaces and even under the code as its written now in the downtown plan they're not conceived that way. Now our new planning efforts we have opportunities to think about this a little more differently and tackle those. It would be challenging to retroactively apply new criteria to the existing ones and maybe really challenging just because of the way they're designed to apply that but I don't know that we've taken any specific steps in looking at the older existing popos in that context instead of a lot of the work that was done I think around 2012, 2013, part of this effort with the signage was also just a revamping of the whole program, its visibility, also just reaching out to the property owner and property managers just as a reminder these are the requirements you need to bring them up to code as required and—but that was based again on their original requirements. Any program where we kind of re-imagine what these spaces are and re-imagine the programming would be a pretty significant undertaking. Not to say it couldn't be done but it's not something that could be done quickly or super easily just because they were created and conceived of and have existed as a separate type of space that a typical park.

Maia Small: And we believe sort of two mechanisms. One is that [unintelligible] and then it's an enforcement which doesn't—which means they have to rectify something but it doesn't necessarily mean they're redesigning something, right? And the other is that they bring a project to us, they want to renovate something, they want to add something, expand a use, do whatever, and those are really the opportunities and we do have a lot of those because one of the things that's happening is that as new office space is being built the [unintelligible] looks old and they have to reposition and rebrand themselves and so a lot of these downtown office buildings can't attract the tenants that they want without reconsidering their amenities inside the building, the quality of the materials inside the building but also a lot of the open space and so they really want to make—they're incentivized to redo these plazas and then they're coming to us and we've looked at a number of them on Market Street, up and down, and there have been a few—I think 101 California.

Chair: I was just going to mention 101 California is one of the best executed on a building that clearly predates the plan.

Maia Small: Embarcadero Center has some open space which is not part of the downtown plan. I'm not even sure if it's part of the—I'm not even sure it's part of the conditions of approval but there is some connection between that is public open space and it's a little bit ambiguous but we are like really encouraged in that as a process. That one also [unintelligible]. We were going to hit this next wave of brutalism is going to happen with our [unintelligible].

Chair: Just to piggyback on what you said I think it's a really good idea. I mean we look at members of this committee along with Recreation and Park and Parks Alliance and other city agencies that simply looked at playgrounds saying yeah these are failing, we have to find someone to fix them. Maybe in your case it's a task force, it's you guys yourself to begin with and just identifying ones that are just completely not serving any purpose maybe then you offer the developer—I mean again I know that's a lot of work for a lot of staff that you don't have but

I think for a point of like you did it, it's there, let's try to take something that's not functioning and make it better.

Maia Small: Well that's I think one of the challenges we have is regulating private ownership basically, things that are privately owned. Now they have a public component to them and so we're a little more at their whim as to what they want to decide to do something unless it doesn't meet the requirements anymore.

Chair: But again that's—

Male Speaker: That's why I'm saying it's challenging right now they are only legally required to meet what they were required to provide. If we start looking at it and saying now our concepts have changed and we think you should redesign this.

Chair: At your own expense on your own property.

Male Speaker: We can't come in and retroactively require that unless we have some kind of leverage. If they're coming in and they are redesigning it anyway as part of a retrofit or something then obviously we're going to have some say in how you're redesigning it but that's not that common and I think a lot of those spaces actually are spaces that were required before popos in the downtown plan so we have a lot of spaces as well where you don't really know the difference [unintelligible] but that's the limitation for us.

Maia Small: And there are some ones that aren't technically popos that seem like they should be, like the space [unintelligible] and mostly functions like popos but I don't know that [unintelligible].

Jane Weil: You can't, it's fenced off.

[simultaneous comments]

Maia Small: Mostly the public can get in there. I have a feeling though that they keep their eyes on people, so.

Chair: I'm sure 101 California keeps their eyes on people too.

Elisa Laird-Metke: District 9. So I was just looking at the renderings near the end of your presentation of the coming popos and they're beautiful but when I looked at them I was really struck by something, where are the ramps?

Maia Small: There are ramps here. This in fact one of the problems with this one is that—so this is the Flower Mart and the Flower Mart is the largest [unintelligible] in central SOMA, it's about 2.1 million square feet of office, it has a huge marketplace which is going to be a public marketplace. We'll have the Flower Mart back as a tenant which is a really significant PDR which is light industrial and they have the challenge that central SOMA is sinking. So if you look at one of those maps of like what's going up and what's going down as far as soil central SOMA

is in the yellow, it's going down in height. And so they have some mitigations that they have to do for climate change and for water filtration. So this has happened more recently but they actually are trying to elevate their popos by about three feet because of the potential flooding risks which is making an extra challenge so this all used to be at grade which was fabulous and now we have to find a way to design it slightly elevated. We actually think this is too much of an [unintelligible] the other side of it which I don't have the rendering for but the other side off of 5th Street is an extremely gradual ramp and that one works really well because they have the distance to be able to do it so it's enough of a ramp that you know it's a ramp, it's not like you're going to stumble on it, that's an ADA thing as well. But it's much more permeable, much more visually available and so the other side is the one that we're still struggling with and pushing them to see if they can make it more accessible. They definitely have ramps. The ramps are on the side and they have another staircase there but we'd like them to make this more. It sort of creates a barrier, a visual barrier that's a little more [unintelligible], I think there's actually a little more slope on the other side.

But I think you can get a sense of sort of they're trying to make these warm. They're trying to—it's a flower mart so they also want to make it with a lot of vegetation, more park-like, but it really is a challenge when you have 2 million square feet of office around it to make sure that it feels like it's still part of the neighborhood and not just embedded within. So we're still scrutinizing these.

Then I think the other one is really interesting, 498 Brannon Street which has got to be over 1 million square feet or maybe 1.5 million square feet of office, I think that may be the one you were alluding to, it's got three office buildings and it's got the former PUC land so that's actually going to be a part of the plaza program so there's a big chunk of it which will be publically owned and it's got a number of alleys that are connecting to it but that's a big challenge because of the scale of those buildings, how do you make that a sunny space, how do you make it feel really connected. I know our director was really concerned about making sure you could see it from the big streets.

Female Speaker: And you can't!

Maia Small: It's definitely challenging.

Female Speaker: Yeah.

Maia Small: And then also have an affordable housing site right next to it. We wanted there to be housing as part of the eyes and connection to that space to give it a better sense of diversity of just [unintelligible]. It's a challenging one but it is the biggest one that will be centralized.

Giselle Rainer: District 3. You mentioned earlier that there were some guidelines that were put forth and I'm just wondering who in your Department actually promulgates those guidelines and under what authority are they promulgated and to whom do they apply and who enforces them?

Maia Small: So the Urban Design Guidelines are built into the central SOMA plan, so they were developed by [unintelligible] the architects at the Department and those were passed by the Commission last year in April for—they apply many places in the city but they were also attached to the central SOMA plan itself. And so what happens is a project comes in and that location, it goes through a design review process and my staff or the architects look at the—and actually we have a couple landscape architects on staff as well who now specifically evaluate these spaces and they check—the guideline is they check the plan. They are making the determination as to whether they're meeting those guidelines. Eventually the Commission will be saying whether these guidelines have been met but the staff are making a recommendation about whether they've been met. If they don't meet them we actually have a way of documenting that. If they don't meet them they have to come back, revise the project until they meet them and then you can go forward to Commission. The Commission is actually the action that determines if they meet the guidelines but it's built into the plan so they have to do it as part of their [unintelligible].

Giselle Rainer: Does the developer look at the guidelines while they're developing their projects?

Maia Small: Yes. They're available on the website, we promote them and actually we have our design comments are all organized around the guidelines. So we have what's called a matrix for that particular guideline set and the guideline is listed on the left, we put comments in [unintelligible] to do X, Y, and Z to meet the guideline and they get a copy of that and they we do another column, we check it off, another column, until everything turns [unintelligible].

Giselle Rainer: And there's no requirement that you promulgate those for public comment or anything like a regulation?

Male Speaker: They were. There was a process [unintelligible] at the Planning Commission to adopt the design guidelines. So anytime the Planning Commission adopts new guidelines or policies there are hearings and a process there.

Giselle Rainer: So the Commission adopted those.

Male Speaker: The Commission adopted them, yes. So basically, obviously the Board of Supervisors has the authority to adopt legislation, so they basically create the law and the zoning. The Planning Commission though does have the authority to adopt guidelines and policies. Not the regulations. The regulations are a code, that's the Board of Supervisors. But within those regulations the Planning Commission can't adopt a guideline that's completely counter to [unintelligible]. You can't do an end around the Board of Supervisors but they can add more depth and more context to the requirements through additional policies or through additional design guidelines.

Chair: Does that answer your question? It was a good question. So any other committee members have any questions for these guys who we've run up and down the flagpole today? [simultaneous comments] Julia?

Julia Pfeifferberger: First of all thank you so much for an incredibly educational presentation. I'm new to the committee. This is incredibly helpful for me. From my perspective it feels like legislation around popos is one of the most kind of actual and productive way for us to actualize new public open space in the city as developments are going up. I was wanting to kind of gauge what is our level of interest as a Commission in putting together a working group to kind of formalize our ideas [unintelligible] about how these could be improved from a design perspective, from a compliance perspective. Do we want to kind of take this forward and document this wealth of idea that we discussed.

Chair: I would propose to you that because this is being presented to us kind of out of the kindness of the Planning Department's heart that anything that we would do is purely suggestive in nature, is purely advisory in nature, but I don't think that you would find—they wouldn't turn it away. I would support that. I would say to you that whether I'm sitting on this committee or not my vision, my feeling of this city requires Recreation and Park to carry a lot of the load but it requires these guys to carry a lot of the load and so it would be PROSAC's or at least a working group of PROSAC to take this up. Probably District 6 being well represented given their closeness but certainly if you wanted to take that on I would be willing to talk to you offline about how that might work and who might sit well on that working group. Would you guys appreciate a report from us just based on what you've told us?

Maia Small: Yeah.

Giselle Rainer: Just maybe consolidating our ideas.

Male Speaker: We get ideas from all kinds of people all the time and we take them all in for sure and I know we're talking about a topic area right here but I mean obviously individual projects have to go to the Planning Commission and they have those designs and make recommendations and plenty of people from the public speak to those issues so that's obviously available to any of you as individuals if you're interested but also as a committee.

Chair: I think Julia let's you and I talk about it. I think there certainly could be room for that. Richard.

Richard Rothman: Maybe there should be stronger—like a lien on the property if they don't open up or don't put a bigger sign there, that there's a lien.

Chair: Time out. This is a conversation you need to have with Sandy [unintelligible] because they're not going to be able to make that change. You can put it on the record but they're already telling you it needs to be through Supervisorial, Mayoral, Planning Commission, right? Because it's not going to be there [unintelligible]. I would love personally I'll just give you my personal—and we can close this item. I think you should have the power to revoke their [unintelligible]. I think you should be able to say you promised us this, we gave you plenty of time to act accordingly, you're not complying, you've been a multiple offender, you've developed numerous projects that unfortunately no one can use these public open spaces so we're going to revoke your C of O until you actually allow people access. I mean that's [unintelligible] that's not punitive, that's just saying you have to abide by what we let you build

based on the plans you presented. So again I'm all the way at one end. I think we need to get those spaces back. I think developers need to give us the money back if they're not going to let the public benefit from it and that money needs to go into the Open Space Fund so we can acquire new open space. That would make good sense. I'm not saying that you could do it and I'm not saying that there is any pathway to that yet but I think that's what Richard is trying to say is there should be some downside to somebody who just goes yeah [unintelligible] it's great and then never pays another attention to change [unintelligible] and she's told she has to buy a coffee to be able to sit at a table that you fought long and hard to make sure was open.

Female Speaker: [unintelligible]

Chair: I just had this conversation with somebody who tried to do a block party and got totally [unintelligible] she was like no, they turned me down. I think I'll just close this by saying you guys are a lot further along than I expected you to be in terms of this, that you are much more connected and engaged than last prior presentations. Our last chair was really frustrated. She particularly brought this topic five years ago and then started to do her own research where her phone was crashing. She was trying to physically go to these open spaces and she just lost it. She was like that's it, I'm done, I don't even want to be involved.

You guys came and gave me I feel I have some hope here and [unintelligible] so I want to thank you for giving us this presentation. Is there any public comment on this item? Hearing none, this item is closed.

Dana Ketcham: So I know that guys are after me and Toks talking about the capital plan which is really important so I want to keep this moving quickly. So we're here to talk about the overview of the partnership agreement between Outward Bound and us for a proposed ropes course at McLaren Park. This actually was approved by the Commission last December because we were supposed to see you first but you guys didn't have a quorum and the meeting didn't happen. But we want to still be here and tell you about our thoughts.

So a little background. We installed a rope course at Camp Mather and it was incredibly popular and we wanted to bring that here to the city so that residents had a similar opportunity. It's an educational opportunity, it's not a game. It's not going up and I want to go on Disneyland rides. It's an educational opportunity. It's a learning environment where you work in teamwork and you take risks and do things like that in a very structured environment.

The installation has a very low environmental impact you will see and we authorized it in December. Here's a picture of the ropes course at Camp Mather to give you an idea of what the impact looks like. It's a modest course, it's not a big fancy one and it's for purposes of providing educational-based programs provided primarily for students ages 12 and up through a licensed and cooperation agreement between us and Outward Bound. Outward Bound is going to do some of the programming and we have the opportunity to do the same programming. It's for five years, extended for four more years. Outward Bound is raising the money to install and maintain the ropes course.

It meets a number of our Strategic Plan's objectives. I know you know these off the top of your head so I'm going to not go over them but it falls right within them.

Outward Bound many of you probably have heard of it. It was formed in 2008 in the California version. It's to change lives, to challenge with discovery, they've served over 1000 students in San Francisco but that have very limited resources.

Student groups come from middle schools and high schools, Visitacion Valley, Lincoln, Lowell, Boys and Girl Club, [unintelligible], Larkin Street Youth Services.

They're going to provide education-based programs and there's going to be two things with us. One is they're going to provide for free programs for kids in our camps and programs. We don't have the staff to do it. Our kids are going to get a chance to do it. And then we also have trained staff that works up at Mather who will be able to do programs of our own on the course. The course will be scheduled in advanced on a semi-annual basis. Their education program is going to be open to students, non-profit groups and professionals offered Monday through Friday, 9:00 to 3:00, one class a day, three Saturdays. The other Saturday will be a free program for the community where members of the community can go online and sign up and do it for free. 95 percent is going to be youth and education programs, 15 to 20 kids. The RPD programs they're going to hold field trips for our summer camp kids, so if you're in a summer camp program you can have one day where you can come over. [unintelligible] a certain number of after-school opportunities.

We can offer our own programs, so we're going to have our own container of equipment because you need equipment to be able to use it and be able to reach it because it's way up high so people don't do stupid stuff. So there's two containers holding our stuff.

So we spent a lot of time looking at the location in McLaren Park and making sure we found the right location and making sure the community was happy with the location. Capital planning staff had gone with Outward Bound because they've been doing a lot of the McLaren Park studies and had felt they found a good place but the community wasn't 100 percent sure it was right so we actually went back and revisited to make sure we found the place we choose takes advantage of the natural beauty, it has a beautiful view, it doesn't interfere with other users including quiet recreation, we want to keep that. It's not a natural resource area because it couldn't go there. It has a nearby restroom and there's public transportation right there.

It meets with the McLaren Park vision plan.

So where is it? It's the wild overlook area which is you come up from Visitacion Valley and over Mansell from the east it's right on that corner. It's where that wild overlook tower is which is kind of this abandoned tower that's kind of a creepy, gnarly area. They are not going to be using the tower but they actually are going to be activating this space which is a good thing. There's some plantings in there that need love and attention. Everyone is very excited about taking this area that is underutilized. It has a lot of picnic tables there, probably 20. We're going to have to move some around because we can't have the kids falling onto concrete picnic tables. And also they don't like them too close because then the kids sit on them instead of standing.

Here's the view from Mansell looking, it's going to be set in these trees and then over the top of the trees it's just amazing views for the kids.

We did a lot of outreach. We met with lots of folks, we worked out a lot of details and I'll be happy to give more info to people who want it. We had a community meeting in September. We had some questions that came up. We went and we studied alternative sites. You can see them over there. We went out. We looked at them. We valued them. Jackie who is sitting here did all the work on that, she's amazing. We had a second community meeting onsite on October 22nd, even more people came. People became happy with this location. We talked about what picnic tables were going to go and the containers. And so this is where the course is going to be. There's a number of design features for those of you who are liking these things, you'll never find me on these because I hate heights. But you get to do all sorts of things up high and you really challenge yourself. The Outward Bound aren't here but it's really about learning and testing yourself. Someone might have seen a news story about it, there was a teacher talking about Visitacion Valley talking about how this really helps transform kids' lives.

This is where the poles are going to get placed. So they were well thought through. And then there's the down-lows, more of my liking, where you do things close to the ground. And that's their placement around a circle just outside the natural area. It's supported by community supporters.

We are super excited about this opportunity to have this cooperation and partnership agreement with Outward Bound. We think it's going to serve the kids and families and help create a healthy activation at McLaren Park without too much impact.

Steve Currier: District 11. We worked together on this. I am really excited as I testified at Recreation and Park but I do have a couple of questions that Ken was so great in sending out a message of tonight's meeting to the McLaren Park Collaborative and we had a couple of questions and one of them was the concern about the storage facility and I know that we've been going back and forth on that where they could be placed so they could be placed on Mansell or they could be place in the inner area. Have you worked that out yet?

Dana Ketcham: At this point they're going to be on Mansell. We are going to try to get them painted so they look really attractive. I was over at—there's that park they kind of created out of the schoolyard in the Sunset. Have any of you been there? It has these beautiful containers that were painted by artists and really inspirational. So I think we don't want just some big ugly container, we want to make it something that actually people will be whoa, this is cool. I can even [unintelligible] working with some artists it cuts down [unintelligible].

Steve Currier: I think we talked about that and I would like to get back to this person just to say and make it sort of [unintelligible].

Dana Ketcham: [unintelligible] This is where at this point people think is the best. We have to put the posts in but the containers can move around. We looked at a lot of different spots.

Steve Currier: So the other question I have too is you talked about Outward Bound outreach to Visitacion Valley Middle School and International. Are you going to—is Recreation and Park or Outward Bound going to do more outreach to some of the schools in the Excelsior and in Bayview-Hunters Point?

Dana Ketcham: Absolutely and that's why Visitacion Valley was one of the schools that really right down the street they're super excited and part of their fundraising is to pay for those. You know, it's not free. They make them pay a little bit just because it's part of the philosophy and they make sure they're dedicated to doing it but they do tend to have the funding because it's really modest but it's very low-cost and absolutely. That's why we're excited to have it at McLaren Park. There is a ropes course up in Fort Miley which is Federal Land here in the north part of the city but this is meant to be really a people's park experience.

Steve Currier: So my last question, I want to say that when we were on the site visit and where this ropes course is going to be actually has the best views of the East Bay and the south part of the city. It's absolutely extraordinary. So I think that's the best place.

Dana Ketcham: It's amazing for kids. I've seen events we've done where we've gotten kids out to Ocean Beach who didn't even know there was an ocean in San Francisco. It's a similar sort of thing and I just think it's a great experience. It's one of those—I feel really good about achieving this this year, so does Jackie. It's really a great thing and thank you to Stacy too who did all the planning for us. We feel really good about it.

Steve Currier: So my last question is there was a lot of concern that I saw in response to Ken's outreach just the last few days but there was a lot of concern about [unintelligible] tower and can that be opened up at some point? Can there be some functions there when the ropes course is open? What are we going to do with that?

Dana Ketcham: I don't have an answer. I wish I did. It's got a lot of very complicated issues, everything from paint to safety.

Steve Currier: We were there on the site visit. There were a bunch of kids that were drinking.

Dana Ketcham: I think everyone hopes that by having the ropes course—my favorite sign is the sign we put at Crocker after we redid the soccer fields and it said a busy part is a safe park. So we have to have that balance between recreation. But that tower it's just so easy to hide behind it but with those guys around I think it's really—and then taking the planters I've always hated them. They're not really well taken care of. So they've come in to kind of help with that, so that makes me super-excited too.

Steve Currier: Thank you.

Giselle Rainer: Will Outward Bound be contributing to any cost of insurance or will the city be self-insuring?

Dana Ketcham: They have insurance. While the city is self-insured for their own activities they provide insurance for that, for their own—they have to give us insurance. It's been reviewed by the risk managers. I didn't get into the details but so people can't climb up it you have to have a really high ladder to even get to it which is in the storage container and then there's these pegs that they have to be put in to be able to climb the poles. So you'd have to want to climb a telephone pole basically and there are telephone poles there already.

Giselle Rainer: And will there be a waiver?

Dana Ketcham: Yes.

Ken McGary: District 11. That's for your presentation. I just have a few questions about the issue of nonprofit groups. So I'm kind of curious about the funding or charges. You mentioned that neighborhood people can come in for free, would that also be true for groups? Nonprofit groups?

Dana Ketcham: It's a sliding scale. There is a fee for nonprofit groups, it depends on how much—basically their ability to pay but I think it's about 25 or 30 bucks a person so it's not free. And even at the lowest level there's some cost just because commitment but it's intended to be low cost and we will have our own programs there where we have our close scholarship program.

Ken McGary: But for the local users that would be free?

Dana Ketcham: The users on Saturday if you wanted to sign up for the program on Saturday it's free. And if you're a kid and you want to sign up for the Recreation and Park program and you meet our scholarship it's also free or it's a tiered fee.

Ken McGary: Another question. You mentioned the five-year term. So what are the criteria?

Dana Ketcham: Is it being used well, is the public having good access. Is the community happy with it? Ideally we want to give you five years is the chance to kind of see if we can get this up and going, is it really working well and then tack on another three years if it is working well. And that's kind of our typical, three to five.

Ken McGary: Last question, this is for kids 12 and older so is there any plans here or adjacent or somewhere around for kids younger than 12 that want to climb in a tree?

Dana Ketcham: This is not a tree house. This is an educational experience. So climbing trees we don't encourage because the branches are always falling. We don't have anything currently. We have a lot of playgrounds. We're putting up a beautiful new playground in McLaren Park that actually has a very—have you seen the plans for it? That has such a natural feel to it, it feels like you're climbing in nature for kids those ages and that's what playgrounds are.

Ken McGary: No, but I would encourage you to think about this. Some place they can climb on a log or get—

Dana Ketcham: Well, the down-low element, the part I thought was interesting, right, that might be good for younger kids. I think that's a good idea.

Richard Rothman: Yes, District 1. I have a District 1 question since I haven't seen you since our last community meeting.

Chair: Is this about the ropes course?

Richard Rothman: It's not.

Chair: She has office hours. You can't put it on the record, we're talking about an agenda item.

Anthony Cuadro: District 7. The restroom you mentioned, where in relation to the ropes course is that restroom?

Dana Ketchum: It's across the street.

Anthony Cuadro: And is capable to facilitate restrooms for 20 kids at a time?

Dana Ketcham: Absolutely. I mean we have a six-court tennis court over there as well so we're not worried about that.

Elisa Laird-Metke: I'm pretty familiar with Mansell but I can't remember that block. Is there a well-marked crosswalk there? Because Mansell is very dangerous.

Dana Ketcham: It's a big crosswalk at the top of Visitacion Valley, there's like a bus stop right there as you come up the hill and then of course that whole area has been redone to make it slower. It is fast but it's—we also looked real close at an area down near the Jerry Garcia parking lot which also has a restroom which was sort of interesting to us but it's a big off-leash dog area and we just felt like we couldn't take these kids out in a natural environment, ask them to climb and then deal with six dogs off-leash at the same time. It was just going to be too much. And this has the view too which that we didn't. But that had a closer restroom to it.

Chair: Any other questions for Dana? Hearing none, this item is closed. Thank you Dana. It's time for Stacy and Toks.

Toks Ajike: Good evening. Toks Ajike with the Capital Planning group. This is my first presentation to the group.

Chair: First Toks welcome as the new director of Capital Planning. It's great to have you here.

Toks Ajike: Thank you. My presentation today is related to our expenditure plan. As part of Prop B as you're aware we're required to provide you an expenditure plan for the next two years.

The plan is to provide guidance for us in the development and renovation of [unintelligible] capital assets, acquisition policy and how we make investments using the equity lens. This is also supposed to provide clear linkages between our strategic, operational, and capital plans.

First, the capital expenditure plan it covers two fiscal years. [unintelligible] plan that was presented to the Commission in December and it runs on a two-year cycle consistent with the city plan also. The plan is comprised of three tables which is in your package which you have. In summary what I can tell you is that currently right now we are working on over \$380 million worth of capital improvements as of today. So that comprises of multiple sources. A good portion of that is bond funds which you're aware of, grants. There are some general funds that are also part of that. There's about 49 projects in planning and design. There's about 17 in construction at various levels. So this is a busy time for us. Part of that also is the fact that we are at the last phase of implementing our 2012 bond [unintelligible].

This is sort of highlights for our equity related improvements. I'm happy to inform you that this body was very supportive of our next wave efforts and I'm happy to inform you today that at the Commission this month we will be awarded contracts for the implementation of four of those projects. December was super busy for us. We have all those projects in the community within our sort of budgets. This is a partnership that you're aware with the San Francisco Parks Alliance which is raising about \$14.5 million by 2020. Our focus right now is the tier 1, implementing that and shifting to tier 2.

In the southeast quadrant section we've commenced remediation [unintelligible]. We are working with Hope S.F. and Sunnydale for an MOU [unintelligible]. We want to continue to sort of maximize active recreation and maintenance in collaboration with OCII, Treasure Island, and [unintelligible].

Here are other initiatives that we're working on outside of [unintelligible]. The Francisco reservoir which is one of our new acquisitions is actually in the last phases of design. This project will probably be in the implementation phase later this spring. We're excited about that. A good portion of that fund is coming from private dollars. Only a small portion of actually [unintelligible]. This issue has been out there for over a decade now. We're actually sort of getting some [unintelligible] on that. [unintelligible] and how our staff actually [unintelligible] making maintenance investments.

We're collaborating with [unintelligible] staff on revamping our project standards which we have not done in a couple years. It needs to be sort of refreshed. [unintelligible] essentially what it is we hope to design a building whereby it is not—it only creates—it does not use more energy than it creates. It creates actually energy inside and the energy that's used has got to be less than that.

The Ocean Beach master plan which you've heard about, it creates a train from Sloat to Skyline.

This is sort of the summary for our acquisitions since 2011. As you're aware we have completed three projects [unintelligible] 17th and Folsom, the [unintelligible] is another one that we are proud of. The Noe Valley Town Square which opened about a year and a half ago. We are

currently in design on the Shoreview Park. Francisco reservoir which I just talked about and 900 Innes which we are in the phase of [unintelligible] that will be open to the public later this spring.

This is some of a few highlights on the next few slides of some of the projects we're proud of. Washington Square opened this past Saturday. That is the first project that's coming out of the Let's Play program, we're excited about that. Civic Center, if you have not been to Civic Center you'll see the improvements and the activation at the site, the synergy between the playgrounds and the kiosk that we just finished [unintelligible] in terms of transforming that space. It's safer, you can bring families and kids there. I had friends from out of town [unintelligible]. Alta Plaza is part of our water conservation program. At this particular site we're saving close to 50 percent water savings.

These are highlights from some of our other equity zones. Margaret Hayward, this is one of our biggest projects out of the 2012 bond, it's a combination of [unintelligible]. That project started in December and should be finished by 2020. Sergeant MaCaulay I talked about, we'll start construction in the spring [unintelligible]. Alice Chalmers we're starting construction later this spring also.

This is a project that are under construction right now. We're moving to the last phase [unintelligible]. Potrero Hill is also in construction right now [unintelligible].

Prop B. This is an important mechanism to address our deferred maintenance [unintelligible]. We're replacing fencing where needed, irrigation is another asset that we [unintelligible].

Our Lifecycle analysis. We will be coming back to you. We're currently in [unintelligible] conditions assessment that we contracted with a firm out of the East Coast [unintelligible] all of our assets into a database. The intention is hopefully it will help us inform on planning and also guide our deferred maintenance investments. It is over 54 million square feet [unintelligible] assets that we're assessing. That effort to assess is done. We gradually migrating that data into the database now. We're validating it with staff and then we will be coming back to you later this spring. We've very excited about this.

Chair: Do you feel like it will be available to us?

Toks Ajike: Yes.

Chair: I know this has been years and years in process.

Toks Ajike: It's going to be available. We hope to come back to you later this spring for a presentation and a presentation to the Commission also. We're excited as to what this database will do. We want to be able to make data driver decisions moving from a more reactive way to sort of [unintelligible].

Chair: Your predecessor actually said in this room that the Department didn't even know what it potentially in deferred maintenance they didn't even have a number, they couldn't even assess a number.

Toks Ajike: That's true.

Chair: And that's a huge challenge to a city that's [unintelligible] problems when you don't even know what that number is [unintelligible] present a number and say okay, it will be \$200 million but at least we know what the number is.

Toks Ajike: We're going to be able to also cost that data in a very specific manner and what I mean by that is we can for example say what are the conditions of all the courts [unintelligible] what is the facility index of those courts [unintelligible].

This is my last slide and an important one. Since we put together the report today and yesterday we were [unintelligible] sort of high level highlights. The draft plan anticipates about \$255 million for the parks bond in 2020. In addition to that [unintelligible]. Right now we're taking comments. The actual report itself is also available online. I can send it to Tiffany or you so you can see it and read it from now until I believe March. [unintelligible] on some of the successes of the last two bonds that we will have in combination of neighborhood park projects and programs. That's important for various reasons. [unintelligible] to actually make specific investments. [unintelligible] the actual conditions assessment, the seismic condition of the site, multi-use sites [unintelligible].

So that ends my presentation. I'll take questions.

Chair: I have one quick one and then I'll take everybody's name for questions. What you just said to us, \$255 million is a far cry from the General Manager's half a billion dollars [unintelligible] that we helped support. Our concern I think and I'll speak for the body but I think each individual will have similar concerns is the Department and specifically the General Manager talked about five specific projects all in the neighborhood of \$50 million each which basically just took all the money from this proposed bond. His idea or maybe it was Mayor Farrell's idea during that time was to say let's ask the citizens for all this money now so we can start building, so that we can take advantage of maybe better pricing in 2020 dollars than 2028 dollars but neither of those two things are going to happen and what it sounds to us or at least to me like is there are some dedicated projects that the Department wants to get done but we would like to hope that neighborhood parks—it says that you will divvy that money up a little bit more. There are a whole lot of people and I'll speak for District 10 and 11 who felt like in the last bond—and I know you weren't in this role—but in the last bond they were promised some things where people said just wait until the next one. Well now we clearly know that the next one isn't necessarily going to sate all the needs. What is the Department's position on how do we stop-gag this problem. Where do we start looking for additional funding?

Toks Ajike: [unintelligible] There's going to be some tough conversation that we sort of think through as a body and also stakeholders making tradeoffs is an important strategy that we sort of have to rethink, relook at these projects. No one is going to be able to—no problem is

going to probably be able to get everything they want. We have to [unintelligible]. The needs are always more than the resources we have, it's an existential sort of problem we have [unintelligible]. I can't sit here today and say I have a magic answer for that. We're going to deliberate with this body. We're going to deliberate with the Commission. We're going to deliberate with the various Supervisors [unintelligible].

Richard Rothman: District 1. In your attachment A under 4.2 about Master Plan for the Ocean Beach Trail is that going to affect the zoo property?

Toks Ajike: We are working very closely with the zoo. I'm going to ask Stacy [unintelligible].

Stacy Bradley: The initial plan will not affect the zoo. The initial [unintelligible] will be along the [unintelligible] southbound lanes and we're working really closely with Public Works to try to figure out how to actually abandon the southbound lanes and deliver a project there so that we can do our fully funded project. Our project is running into funding issues but ours is funded so we're hopeful that we can have that project happen so that we're able to implement the trail. But the long-term Ocean Beach master plan does [unintelligible] implementing the PUC's project that will structurally support the Lake Merced tunnel will impact the zoo's access through closing the Great Highway south of Sloat and we're working with the PUC. The PUC has just initiated this is a project with the city and they're figuring out exactly what that means. Public Works is likely going to be the main liaison that coordinates amongst city agencies [unintelligible] the zoo and we'll work together to figure out how the zoo will be impacted.

Richard Rothman: [unintelligible]

Stacy Bradley: We're hoping to do the first trail project in the next two years.

Richard Rothman: I have more questions about the Mother's Building. Historical buildings in general you know I was in the Beach Chalet before they fixed it up. It was in terrible condition. Coit Tower took a ballot measure to get Recreation and Park in gear and the Mother's Building I don't think it should be all private funding. I raised about half a million dollars and I think Recreation and Park and the zoo should come up with a funding plan. We have a plan how to fix it and I just—the building is owned by the city and I'm having an issue with the zoo of whether there should be free admission and I don't know who to talk to at Recreation and Park on what Recreation and Park's policy is on this issue admission and access to the building. I don't know who to talk to but I think the zoo—the Recreation and Park needs to work with the zoo and come up with a funding plan. I don't expect them all [unintelligible] but I think we need to take care of our historical buildings and not let them go get [unintelligible]. Maybe I'm talking to the wrong people but I feel kind of frustrated that I think there should be more cooperation from Recreation and Park. After all, they're the landlords there. So we need to exert some control of the property.

Steve Currier: District 11. So your answer to the bond that we may not get everything that we ask for was also told to us back in 2000 when I worked on the parks bond then. And then in the following years we've always been told you may not get everything you ask for. We were

lucky in 2000 because Crocker Amazon got one of the first playgrounds rebuilt on the corner of Geneva and Moscow and I just got an email today and I wasn't privy to some of the emails because they had my email address wrong but the deferred maintenance now after 20 years is incredible, it's absolutely incredible. So I think that our role if this bond does get on the ballot and we're to sell it I think I'm going to have a hard time selling it to constituents in District 9, 10, and 11 by saying well we may not get everything we want and I think the answer that we need to propose is something different than that and maybe even be more specific on what gets funded.

Toks Ajike: I can answer that as I sort of sit here. There's a couple of strategies that we're thinking about. We are thinking about also leveraging some of the impact fees monies for this project. For example Gene Friend which is in the central SOMA will [unintelligible]. There's some grants that we're looking at, Prop 68 is another strategy [unintelligible]. All of those things to help [unintelligible]. I'll tell you this, this project usually is not—it's a very sort of iterative process [unintelligible].

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: Toks can you speak to—because I think this is the undertone of everybody's questions, it sounds like you're starting to think outside of just the standard box that exists which is here is bond funding, here is a project that we need to fund. Are there commitments on the Department's side to look at [unintelligible]? Because you're saying and I think we're all hearing there's philanthropic, potentially people donating, you might be able to get matched funding. There are a lot of those type of things. What about—again, I'll go back to Margaret Hayward. Didn't the Y contribute millions of dollars for that?

Toks Ajike: I'm not sure about the Y.

Stacy Bradley: No, I don't think so.

Toks Ajike: There was a contribution from Sacred Heart for the fields.

Chair: Is it millions of dollars?

Toks Ajike: No, it's about \$1.2 I believe.

Chair: In a \$24 million property.

Toks Ajike: Yeah and also about \$7 million [unintelligible].

Steve Currier: Well I thought the Boys and Girls Club were also in that too, Sacred Heart and the Boys and Girls Club.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: So in essence \$8 million plus on a \$24 million project but that's a lot more comfortable than saying it's \$24 million out of the bond.

Stacy Bradley: And same with Garfield, the exact same thing happened.

Chair: So I mean that's something—there's an answer for you just to say if there are philanthropic or grants or any other community-driven funding the Department is willing to hear that as opposed to maybe in the old days there was not a whole lot of that conversation.

Steve Currier: Thank you so much for that because we do have in District 11 a couple of organizations that are in the billions [unintelligible]. We could tap into that. Their endowment is huge and thank you for bringing that up because I would actually most definitely approach that.

Chair: I also heard folks talk about the Supervisors and clearly we know with add-backs, Supervisors have a million here, a million there to play with, so maybe there's some money there. Again, I just saw the look on your face, there's a lot more openness than when I first started serving on this committee, we started talking about trying to collaborate with a public-private idea. Now it seems like that's the whole new way that a lot of these things will get funded.

Stacy Bradley: Or a scope needs to be reduced which could happen if we are unable to close gaps outside of city dollars.

Chair: But you've got to have a good way to say that. I think that's what the committee is asking for. You want us to go out and sell these bonds then you'd better come up with fancy language that speaks to well we've got to slim the project down a little bit but if you can find some money to support it some other way, like some clean way to talk to people about it that doesn't sound you don't have the money, I don't know, you know here's a hat. See what happens.

Trevor McNeil: District 5. I was just curious about citywide parks, this is really future planning, this is not part of any current bonds. I was curious about is that very different than we're going to fix the gold clubhouse, we're going to fix [unintelligible], we're going to fix the dog park area. What's the different between a named project and Golden Gate Park in general?

Stacy Bradley: It's more of a distinction in how things are—the buckets of funding. So what we did for 2012 was we had a bucket for Golden Gate Park, a bucket for Lake Merced and a bucket for McLaren Park which that allowed us to do more robust planning after the bond was passed and then we were able to deliver projects with that same funding source but without it being—

Trevor McNeil: It's not like a unified bond.

Stacy Bradley: Right, it's just not being restricted before going to the [unintelligible]. It's hard to do everything in advance of [unintelligible].

Anthony Cuadro: District 7. So you mentioned Kezar and Kezar being on a separate bond which is an interesting way to collect more funding for a named project. Are there any other facilities or places that can be identified that can latch onto another bond funding source to get you to the number, has that been explored?

Toks Ajike: Yes. We are exploring it [unintelligible]. Kezar sort of make sense because it's one of our highly used sites and [unintelligible].

Anthony Cuadro: Since it's going to be a part of that particular bond will that restrict what you can or cannot do with that facility?

Toks Ajike: No. [unintelligible]

Chair: Just to piggyback on that question because that's a really good question, do you make decisions or would you make decisions based on if let's say somebody said okay we're going to give you the money but it has to be spent for a certain aspect of the project, in other words could they like with a gift in kind for example as a friends of group my donor could give a restricted donation that goes specific to a project, for example a donation for [unintelligible]. In this case let's say a big donor, let's say somebody taps a big donor for some project, could they restrict where that money was spent or how that money was spent around any—but hey, I want it to be a fountain of me and I'll give you all this money to renovate the rest of the park but these has to be a fountain of me. Can that happen?

Stacy Bradley: People can offer to give gifts with strings attached and the Department can weigh those offers and say yes that works within our Department's world view or no it does not. So we can say thank you, no thank you.

Chair: You can say thank you, no thank you. That's all I'm asking. You're willing to hear any funding source whatsoever, right?

Stacy Bradley: I would assume so.

Chair: I would love to give you some things to sell on behalf so that you can take that money and go build a park, you'd be willing to hear anything, right? It's just up to you whether you decide to take that money.

Stacy Bradley: It has to fit with our program.

Toks Ajike: It has to fit with our mission.

Chair: The General Manager already told [unintelligible] if there was a possibility to raise that kind of money he'd like that, \$100 million. It does sound like you guys have a frickin mountain to climb here because again Phil came here four months ago and was very optimistic and thought—he pointed at a bunch of stuff and got us kind of fired up to go back to our districts and say hey you've got to do this, go to our Supervisors, hey we've got to be supportive and not

it's kind of a much more reduced amount which I think is much more palatable to San Franciscans I think.

Stacy Bradley: Which is really part of it. It has to pass.

Chair: Anybody else?

Richard Rothman: Maybe like somebody—you know, there's so much money in this city. I'm sorry I was frustrated when I talked before but maybe somehow get these big tech people saying that they'll donate so much [unintelligible] somehow like a public-private partnership like if we pass the bond measure they'll donate so much money either in kind of whatever so I know park bonds have always passed but maybe somehow to leverage the park bond money because we have all this—I just read in the paper the average San Francisco—you know, San Francisco is becoming—which I'm afraid of—is becoming a city for the wealthy or the real poor. The average income in the city went up from \$74,000 to \$93,000 so you know there's money in the city so maybe we need to be creative in trying to leverage some of this private funds.

Chair: Not to be argumentative but I remember two members, Jane Weil and Toby Levy, go door to door at South Park, their front yard, asking big companies can you give \$1000, can you give \$2000? And the F'ed them off, every single one of them told no, go blow. We pay our taxes, go fix the park. Is that correct?

Jane Weil: It was with me, yes it is correct.

Chair: I'm trying to show you a point where the money was there, they were planning to develop the park and all they needed was some money from the community. The community was like sorry, we're busy. [unintelligible] I was the one who said go find money wherever money is found.

Jane Weil: I was just going to ask, you said earlier that you would hopefully tomorrow get to Tiffany the proposed—

Toks Ajike: [unintelligible]

Jane Weil: So I would just like that, thank you.

Chair: Robert Brust.

Robert Brust: That is the city's capital plan you're going to send to everybody?

Toks Ajike: Yes.

Robert Brust: You're recommending that we take advantage of their comment period?

Toks Ajike: Yes.

Robert Brust: What is the full name of that Commission again?

Toks Ajike: It's the Capital Planning Commission, CBC. They actually have a website.
[simultaneous comments]

Richard Rothman: By the time it gets to the committee it's already decided. It's made up of all the Department heads and—

Chair: But it's the comment period right now.

Richard Rothman: You know, I just got the feeling like everything was all set before I walked in the room, you know and they had—Naomi Kelly runs the meeting. I just felt it was a waste of time because if you want to make changes you've got to get it done before you walk into that room.

Jane Weil: But you can submit written comments.

Richard Rothman: Yeah you can but I mean you need to talk to the staff person and because it's all set by the time it gets to the room. It's all the Department heads in the city.

Anthony Cuadro: I just wanted to ask, you said there was four projects that went last month?

Toks Ajike: Yes.

Anthony Cuadro: What were they?

Toks Ajike: [unintelligible]

Chair: Anybody else on the committee have questions for Toks?

Toks Ajike: I'd like to look at this from a different lens also. The last time Phil came here he spoke about our needs and there was a number out there, it was big number. This plan appears to be looking at this in a very incremental way, we're [unintelligible] in another eight years 200. So I still want to look at this. I'm optimistic that we can be creative and do something with this potential for the bond issuance. [unintelligible] for example if you're only going to get 160 which is what we had before the last two bonds which did not put into account the escalation of [unintelligible] the size of the bond was not changed in ten years but now we're at 255 [unintelligible].

Chair: So you mentioned two numbers. Just to be clear \$300 million but \$45 was for Port, is that what's going on?

Toks Ajike: Actually no.

Chair: Any money going to Port.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: 255 is the amount of the bond.

Male Speaker: Plus the 50 for Kezar.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: But does the Port get anything out of it?

Toks Ajike: So right now the Port is not in the 2020 bond but at the capital meeting the Port is probably going to ask for some amount for deferred maintenance, it's not a huge amount but my understanding is it's in the \$10 million range.

Richard Rothman: So where are they going to come, the Bond Committee meeting?

Toks Ajike: Yes.

Chair: Richard is going. Does anybody else have any questions for Toks? No other questions? Excellent. Toks, thank you for the presentation. Stacy do you have anything for the capital update?

Stacy Bradley: I don't think so. I feel like this kind of covered everything.

Chair: I like it, all right.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: Before we move on here is there any public comment on this item? Hearing none, this item is closed. Item 8, any new business that is not on this list? I see Robert Brust. Yes Robert.

Robert Brust: Just a few. I have a general comment, understanding the role and responsibilities was that in December?

Chair: That was added in—when did we miss our meeting, November? So it was added in December.

Robert Brust: I'd like that one.

Chair: We're going to try to bring that one up sooner than later.

Robert Brust: And impact fees.

Chair: That's next month, thank you.

Robert Brust: And an update on develop and impact fees, I think that was put on—

Chair: That's a Stacy question. We were waiting until she was ready.

Robert Brust: And I think it's sort of the other side of the coin and we've just been talking about it.

Chair: Sure. And again I think it should stay on there. It's definitely one that we want to hear.

Robert Brust: And a new suggestion that came up, you mentioned the Francisco Reservoir and I'm really excited about that project. It's such a partnership with the neighbors and the community the Recreation and Park Department. I want to see how it's going, if they think they've progressed enough where they can sort of talk about it.

Chair: I think the first question is did they [unintelligible].

Toks Ajike: [unintelligible]

Chair: I think there were almost five from the last one I saw, \$5 million.

Stacy Bradley: Very close.

Chair: And I think if they give to \$6 million they would get matching and if they were to raise how much before that that was [unintelligible]?

Stacy Bradley: They gets them very close to what they need to start.

Chair: That's amazing. That's just what you want to hear, right. We bought it now—

Robert Brust: So can we put it on and then just ask and see if they're ready to talk?

Chair: Yeah, I don't know that they are but certainly we can do that. Tiffany, did you hear that? So Francisco Reservoir at some point just maybe [unintelligible]. So we'll just see who is best to present that whether it's a [unintelligible]. Trevor?

Trevor McNeil: [unintelligible]

Chair: This is 8, new business.

Trevor McNeil: District 5. Some District 5 residents were concerned about some security cameras put up around the lake over here and I'm just wondering especially in lieu of the presentation we had about gathering more data is that something—I mean I'm happy to like just bark up Recreation and Park's tree but I was wondering if any other members were interested in having clarification on security camera use in parks presentation.

Chair: I don't know that that's a capital question.

Trevor McNeil: I'm sorry, I thought this was new business in general.

Chair: It is, I'm just trying to think about who we would ask that question.

Toks Ajike: I think public affairs.

Trevor McNeil: I'd just be interested to hear. I mean I'm happy to do it offline but if other members are interested especially as we'll talking about counting the number of people that come into our parks and that kind of thing [unintelligible].

Chair: Sure. I mean I'm more than happy to throw it on there and see. Richard.

Richard Rothman: When are we going to talk about the PSAs?

Chair: It's on here. It's next month. It's the last item.

[simultaneous comments]

Female Speaker: [unintelligible] to talk about issues of accessibility as far as economics go, you and I have [unintelligible] and Gene Friend. Another person I've heard is [unintelligible] so how the Recreation and Park could do better at making things more accessible.

Chair: So you're saying equity in programs?

Female Speaker: Yes.

Male Speaker: I'd say programming and permitting.

Female Speaker: Yes.

Male Speaker: Because I've heard from some people in my district having permit issues for baseball fields.

Chair: Is that around equity though?

Female Speaker: Cost.

Male Speaker: And going to more corporate things.

Chair: [unintelligible]

Tiffany Lin-Wilson: I believe it is Shauna Bogetz right now.

Chair: Because I feel like [unintelligible]. So programming and permitting as it relates to equity, okay. Anybody else? New business item? Hearing none, this item is closed. Any public comment on this item?

So announcements, I guess you're—I just want to go to Ana Gee because she wants to ask a question that is not an item listed on the agenda. So let's just go to that.

Ana Gee: District 6. [unintelligible]

Chair: That's a really interesting question.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: Richard?

Richard Rothman: Yes, District 1. I just wanted to say what I mentioned last time, my photo show is at the main library on the 6th floor and even if you saw my photos before the librarian there Suzanne Goldstein did an excellent job of describing the building and talking about women artists and the important role that the Mother's Building played in the women's movement that I've been finding out since I started this project. So it will be there until March 15th so it's worth seeing.

Chair: I have just one more and I'll close on it. I don't know what's actually going on in terms of vandalism in our parks and I say this because my park in particular Lafayette had within the scope of a month I think we had a shooting in the park, a shooting outside the park—this is like a year or two ago. Alta Plaza Park they burned the donor's circle, they destroyed brand new playground equipment in this neighborhood that you wouldn't necessarily get that. I mean I saw the pictures, somebody set a bonfire on their donor circle just to disrupt. Recently, like two weeks ago. So again, I don't need this to be an agenda item, I really just want it on the record to say that part of this—their friends of group said to me how do you manage this, how do you go to your bit committee that represents all of the districts, what do you do? So I guess I'm going to put it to all of you, it kind of falls back to us whether that's neighborhood watch, whether that's being in communication with your local police. I know in certain cases you have great relationships with your local police. I think that it's important for us as stewards, again. Here's a park group that serves a ton of people, that doesn't have a very big organized group, doesn't have a big voice in the city but has worked to raise money, to make their park their own and now they're being hit by random vandalism. So I just want you to start thinking as a committee about how we might address this, whether that again is just coming up with some sort of a way to as a neighborhood group do watches. I mean I'd be interested from Dubois and Dolores, these are parks that have had notorious problems before with vandalism.

Steve Currier: And Crocker.

Chair: Crocker, McLaren Park, I just think it would be helpful for us as a group to kind of come together on some best practices around protecting this area when Recreation and Park clearly—how many Rangers, 50-something? They can't protect every park. So again I'm just throwing it out to you as a group to start thinking about maybe how we might be able to—

Steve Currier: If you want to bring this up in an agenda I have a couple of great ideas.

Chair: Let's think about it. This meeting has gone on way too long. I just want you to think about it.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: All right, I mean I'll add it. It's going to get to the end of the list, but.

Female Speaker: Do they know who it was?

Chair: No, they don't unfortunately. The police are advised and Recreation and Park actually our Supervisor asked Recreation and Park and the police step up patrols and they haven't caught anybody and there's still these random acts, literally like park terrorism. They're not getting anything from it, they're just destroying it just for fun, just to do it.

Female Speaker: But it's at night I assume.

Chair: It's at night and it's again it's blatant vandalism and there's nothing to win or lose just to burn something to the ground.

This was a good meeting guys, Thank you so much. It's really excellent. I will call this meeting adjourned. Thank you.

End of Document