

**Park and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee Meeting (PROSAC)
January 9, 2018**

Chair: Welcome to the January Park Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee at the McLaren Lodge Commissioner's Room. I have been a member of PROSAC for about eight years. We have been offered a few times to meet in this space but I don't think in my tenure we've ever met in this space. Clearly this space has a lot of history. For those of you who are park enthusiasts—we can see who's here, we can see the spirit that this building is made in. So I feel very blessed that we're here together today.

I would start with the roll call.

Elisa Laird-Metke: District 9.

Anthony Cuadro: District 7.

Jordyn Aquino: District 4.

Robert Brust: District 8.

Jane Weil: District 6.

Ana Gee: District 6.

Chuck McNeil: District 5.

Karen Wong: District 7.

Mark Scheuer: District 8.

Wendy Aragon: District 1.

Nick Belloni: District 2.

Chair: Steffen Franz, District 2. We do not have any minutes to review today which basically with the holiday Gary was working to get us our December minutes. We are caught up to December now but my hope would be February we'll approve December and January.

I have a very short report today. First of all I'd like to take a minutes, it seems like I do this now every other meeting, but I'd like to take a minute to dedicate this meeting to our Mayor Ed Lee. And why? For any of you who didn't know him or didn't have any engagement with him he was a huge champion of parks and I would say that knowing how much progress we've had prior to him being the Mayor and now with him as the Mayor. So he definitely if you call yourself a

lover of parks you would have to consider that we were lucky to have him as the Mayor and I would like to hope that whoever is elected in his place also has a soft spot for parks.

My second item is that I attended along with a few other PROSAC members the SFRPD-San Francisco Parks Alliance tree lighting event. For those of you who were not in attendance—I know a few of you were—it was an amazing event and it's an incredibly difficult event to put on. You cater to children, adults, and people fully in the Christmas spirit. I thought they did an amazing job and it was a very diverse audience. I saw a lot of kids. I saw a lot of people full generational families and I saw a lot of PROSAC members too. The reason I mention this here is because we haven't always been included the Department's list and I felt like they made a big point of making us VIPs and they did that. That was really important and I think we were recognized specifically PROSAC was recognized during conversations both with the Mayor and ex-Mayor Willie Brown in the Orchid room. I thought it was very nice and I'd like to go on record as saying that our ex-Mayor Willie Brown made the greatest comment I've ever heard as it relates to what we believe in. He said if you are running for anything—Supervisor, Mayor—the first question you need to ask is what's your position on parks. And I thought God if the PROSAC members were there and heard this, you know. It's very rare to hear us cherished like that.

So that was great to hear Phil, Parks Alliance and other notable park people recognizing PROSAC.

Mark Scheuer: I should add that two people, Phil Ginsburg and one of the park Commissioners specifically called out Steffen and his good work on PROSAC.

Chair: It was nice for all of us to be recognized. I've been on PROSAC when I didn't feel like we were recognized at all, like not even invited, not even on purpose or by accident. I made a stink about it and I felt like we got paid back this year and I hope for future PROSAC years we will feel that as well.

My third item is I met with Parks Alliance's new leadership team or some members of them—that's Amanda Montez who is the director of programs and Katie Strange who is the assistant director of planning. We're going to work to bring PROSAC a couple of items which I'll add in the agenda setting item but basically a couple of things that they've been working on which they've been waiting strategically to present to us. I mention this to you now in my report because our relationship with Parks Alliance—Parks Alliance as a whole has been kind of in flux and I think for many of you who have friends of groups or are looking for financial sponsorship, whatever, the Parks Alliance has kind of turned a corner for me in terms of their engagement, willingness to help develop new park groups. I just have heard a lot more of the right things from them over the past couple of months and so it's very encouraging to have them come to me off the record and say we'd like to start adding some agenda items, we'd like to be present at your meetings. So it wouldn't surprise me if I turned around and Drew the CEO of the Parks Alliance magically appears because they seem very connected to what we're doing. So for those of you who interested in what's going on I will add a couple of items and hopefully we'll hear from them in the next few months.

Finally, I just want to remind you we are going to do our elections for leadership again. I believe last year we did it in March and April. We'll see what the agenda looks like but it will either be March or April this year.

That concludes my report. Is there any public comment? Hearing none.

Ana Gee: District 6. I would like to take to you about having a connection with Parks Alliance and sister parks eventually.

Chair: Sure, they've very interested in that. I'm sure that we can have that dialog. Any other comments from the committee? Any comments from the public? This item is closed.

So we're going to skip quickly to our new business agenda setting item which as you can see has not been slimmed down to only items that are in fact really items we want to tackle. I think some of these will bear out over the course of the news few weeks and months.

I would like to firstly ask are there any items on this list that you feel should not be on this list after last months' discussion about this?

Male Speaker: The Twin Peaks an interagency project?

Chair: Still one that is there. I don't necessary know why. [simultaneous comments]

Male Speaker: Because it was Recreation and Park it was DPW, there was like a bunch of different agencies and they changed around Twin Peaks without really telling about it.

Male Speaker: They changed the roads. The roads have already been changed.

Nick Belloni: They changed the roads, they parking and everything.

Male Speaker: How you access everything. They've been getting a lot of complaints about it.

Nick Belloni: And it's been mugged and all sorts of stuff walking up there.

Chair: Right, so the question though is let's keep it but let's figure out who would be best to present on that item. That's what I'm really trying to do with these items is move them along. Is there somebody who can present? You certainly could make inquiries with Gary Bier, it's certainly something that you guys could take the lead on and figure out whether it's DPW or Recreation and Park.

Male Speaker: I know they still send the rangers up there.

Male Speaker: Feel free to email me and I know Beverly my colleague is working on that still.

Chair: Are there any other items that need discussion?

Female Speaker: I had mentioned to you after the meeting last month of maybe having a presentation about urban wildlife. Last month there was a coyote in Alamo Square Park so they're definitely everywhere. This park is notorious for having urban wildlife. But how that's managed because I guess the coyote was in the park for two hours.

Chair: So you're saying urban wildlife and how Recreation and Park's operational staff will deal with those things.

Nick Belloni: It would actually probably be the Natural Areas. They have a whole Division now that deals with that kind of thing.

Male Speaker: It would be Natural Areas but we sort of follow the lead [unintelligible].

Chair: It's certainly one that can go on that list.

Jane Weil: District 6. I don't know if this is the correct place for these but the equity metrics I think many of us have questions about it ongoing so I don't know if this is the right place for that or not.

Chair: The equity metrics as they related to the Recreation and Park Strategic Plan. So I think that's not something that necessarily has to be on a new business item. That's something that they understand they need to be presenting to us. I think Robert Brust is working on a formalized ask of the Department that will certainly be inclusive and I think there are enough members at this table that are interested in that subject to have it brought back.

Jane Weil: And then the second would be the still ongoing potential acquisition in mid-Market District 6. Again, I don't know if this is the right place for that.

Chair: It's certainly a place for it. If you want to mention it now or mention in items not listed on the agenda if there's something specific you want a presentation on. I know that we got to hear a half-baked where we're at in the Tenderloin conversation last month. It certainly would be in purview to ask for that again in a month or two. I would find it hard to say for any District as the Chair like District 6 every month District 6, right. But if you can say to me we'd like to hear something in April or May with the progress I'm certain we can make that an agenda item. Anybody else?

Before I turn this over for public comment I would like to add three potential items for the months March, April and May. Again, these are not confirmed, hard items but they are a request from the Parks Alliance. So that would be March for Let's Play S.F. April for—the Parks Alliance now has a strategic plan that they're working on and would like to have us vet it and hear about it. So April would be Parks Alliance Strategic Plan and May would be the Rose.

[simultaneous comments]

It's a testy document that went through PROSAC many times and had a lot of good input and a lot of talk, a lot of back and forth, and now Parks Alliance is taking a role in this and I think it would be good to hear from anybody but more of us talking.

Mark Scheuer: District 8. We talked about maybe having the Bicycle Coalition make a presentation.

Chair: Right and we weren't sure when that would be. Did you have a month I mind?

Mark Scheuer: I through we were going to do February because they wanted to—

Chair: Right, they want to time it out before. Okay. So do we know what—is that Healthy Saturday?

[simultaneous comments]

Nick Belloni: From my understanding that's not being dealt with until April.

Chair: No, I actually hear it was, it was February in front of the Commission.

Male Speaker: There is no date at the moment. We're still doing outreach on that. There is no timeline. Ideally they would like for it to happen before the end of the next reason this year in September but it's still up in the air.

Chair: I would propose that once that because a date on the calendar that we get it before. Okay, is there any other items for the new business agenda setting? Hearing. Any public comment? Hearing none, this item is closed.

For those of you who don't know Dawn had a beautiful baby. So some of us saw pictures. The baby's name is Iris.

Jordyn Aquino: I'll give you a quick update on some things that have happened in the Capital Division in the last month or upcoming. We went out to bid for Guy Place today. Washington Square Playground bids are coming in this week. Golden Gate Park tennis got its SEQUA clearance so we can go to the Recreation and Park Commission in February for the concept plan. We got Recreation and Park Commission approval of the Lifecycle contract so we can get going the first week of February with the assessments of the park properties that will really help with the bond planning process as well as [unintelligible]. Let's Play S.F. had meeting on McLaren, Panhandle, and Alice Chalmers in December and a lot of good feedback and so we're moving towards detailed design with all those. Garfield we submitted our detailed plans to DBI so we hope to go out to bid in April. Rossi is still in detailed design a little behind Garfield and Potrero Fields are going out to bid in February.

Are there any questions?

Chair: Thank you. Any public comment on this item? Hearing none, this item is closed. Because we've entered into the 1850s there were no video projectors when this building was built so [unintelligible].

Jordyn Harrison: So I'm going to cover two slightly separated but related topics. I'm going to start with the capital expenditure plan and then I'm also going to do an acquisition policy review and the reason for this is the first capital plan is a requirement of the charter that came into effect with Prop B 2016. And the acquisition policy we're going over because the Civil Grand Jury asked that PROSAC and the Commission look at that by January, 2018, [unintelligible] feedback on the existing acquisition policy.

So the capital expenditure plan I've outlined the language from the charter describing what [unintelligible] is included in this plan. [unintelligible] One thing to point out is that this is not the only place that we report on the capital projects that we have going on. We do gobac reports quarterly to a general obligation bond of the site committee that explains status of the general obligation bond funded projects and we also do regular reports to the Capital Planning Committee which is a citywide committee that deals with Capital projects as well as our monthly report to the Recreation and Park Commission and the ten-year annual capital plan that gets annually updated. So there are multiple plans out there that provide for accountability in capital projects for our Department.

In addition to laying out the contents that the charter [unintelligible] the Civil Grand Jury report asked that the Department do better about integrating our various plans. So we attempted to do that with this latest version of the plan.

Moving on, what we propose our capital plan [unintelligible] that I have included copies of in this presentation.

Male Speaker: Next time you have a table could you give us at least the table on one page?

Jordyn Harrison: I thought you all received these in a packet. I thought you would have all these.

Male Speaker: [unintelligible]

Jordyn Harrison: I'll explain what they are and Gary is running copies now. The three tables are the Strategic Plan initiatives that specifically apply to capital projects. So we plucked out from the whole Strategic Plan those that are being led by the Capital Plan Division or relates to capital projects and that's this first colorful table. There are the planned acquisitions and this is a requirement of the charter that we lay out the oppositions that we know in the five-year Strategic Plan. So this was the three planned acquisitions that we know are in the works which you are all familiar with—Schlage Lock; Potrero Central Park you may not remember was from six months ago that resulted from a development agreement arrangement with the Hope S.F. project over in Potrero Annex; and 11th and Natoma which I think probably you're all familiar with.

Then the third component of this plan is capital projects and that this really tiny one that is showing all of the ongoing [unintelligible]. So we have the Capital Division laying out what we're working on, roughly the schedule I think it is going to take. For those that are currently underway we have a status so in planning and design, in construction listed, then how far it's going to go over the course of the next two to three years. Then for the pipeline projects [unintelligible]. All of that is dependent upon when we finish the projects that we're working on right now.

So that is sort of a layout of [unintelligible] of the capital projects that are online.

Jane Weil: A quick question on the capital expenditures planned acquisitions. Francisco was paid off over like the next twelve years.

Jordyn Harrison: It's approved and we're already contracted to do the purchasing. I didn't put it on there but I guess it's a good point. It is a little bit gray but is still like a planned acquisition. We're in the process of doing the design as you probably know right now and so you're right it's a couple years down the road before it will be opened. I think we actually may be able to open before we pay for it, the whole thing.

Jane Weil: Is there anything else that falls in that category?

Chair: That would be my question, is there anything that should be on the list that isn't?

Jordyn Harrison: I don't think so, when we get into the acquisitions presentation I list all of our recent acquisitions where I have Francisco and we can spot check and see if there's anything that falls into this area.

So some things to point out in capital projects. Our Division's goal is to get through the 2012 bond projects for November 19 and we're focusing on the Let's Play S.F. projects first. There are a handful of other main projects as well as several other projects that come from multiple funding sources. We'll be hiring three new project managers, PM1s and one assistant PM early this year to help us see this through.

Nick Belloni: Is that more or replacements?

Jordyn Harrison: More. [unintelligible] I don't know if they're replacing Jake with another PM2. I don't know how they're arranging that.

Nick Belloni: [unintelligible] Are we adding more? Are we adding or are we losing?

Jordyn Harrison: I think we should at this point consider one a replacement. I think they may intend to replace Jake eventually but we don't have that in the works at the moment.

Chair: We just know that you guys have gone through a huge influx of PMs and that has led to projects that are in play getting new PMs and leaving other ones kind of like hey what happened to so and so. Knowing you're at a full complement or will soon will be.

Jordyn Harrison: I should also provide background. We'll be bringing this to the Recreation and Park Commission on the 18th and per the charter we will provide this capital plan along with the operations plan that Taylor presented to you in December and to the Recreation and Park Commission in December. We'll package them together and send them to the Board and if the Board does anything [unintelligible].

Also, the charter asks that we use equity metrics that we created to evaluate capital expenditures so this next slide has two factors related to our equity metrics. The top two were just a slice of the capital plan initiatives. Taylor is lot better at using which phrase to describe the hierarchy within the plan. It's just explaining that we are in the works on the initiatives that we defined as specifically addressing equity. I also pulled from Taylor's report an explanation of how we've done of [unintelligible] based on the equity zones from 2016 [unintelligible] the city as a whole and non-equity zones. [unintelligible]

The last slide is just four highlights that I plucked out of all the projects that we'll be working on for the next two years to see some of the big picture items that we'll be trying to achieve.

So that's the overview of the capital plan.

Chair: I think we should stop here for a minute if the members have any questions.

Jordyn Aquino: District 4. I'm looking at slide seven about the [unintelligible] equity zone. So the total is here. What is it based off of? Is it the construction of a new project?

Jordyn Harrison: So what was compiled were all of the various spending authorizations for capital projects. So that would include annual appropriations ordinance and I think grants accept and expend ordinances and the bond projects. The city gives Departments permission to spend money in various ways and so we compile those various sources, figured out the total amount of money in each of those projects and then mapped them relative to the equity zones so show the total per thousand in the zones. So the zones have like a physical bubble in a map that they can say there's this many thousand people who live there and this much money was spent in that bubble [unintelligible].

Jordyn Aquino: And the amount spent in non-equity zones is per one thousand as well?

Jordyn Harrison: Yes.

Male Speaker: I did not have time to make copies for everyone so there are a handful of these.

Chair: That's fine.

Jordyn Harrison: For the capital projects for the next two years we also provided a reference to Strategic Plan initiative or objective most relevant to capital plans.

Chair: Any other questions about this? Certainly you can study this. There's a lot of documentation. Gary, I would ask that you send this to us digitally. So what I would propose to you guys is that we'll circle back on this. If you have questions now, great. But this is going to cause more conversation so perhaps Jordyn will come back next month and any questions you have can be answered at that time.

Wendy Aragon: Just out of curiosity what's the plan for the Geneva Car Barn?

Jordyn Harrison: We're going to renovate it to make it seismically stable and it's going to have an arts performance space within it.

Chair: I've been in that space quite a bit and actually when I first joined PROSAC it was a dialog about who could find the money to renovate the building. Ten years of trying to find the money.

Gary: [unintelligible]

Chair: So if you're into it root for it at budget and finance.

Elisa Laird-Metke: District 9. I don't see urban agriculture on here and I wondered where that has a place. You made a presentation a few months ago and you were saying that was one of the top objectives for RPD so I was curious how it's falling into the acquisition.

Jordyn Harrison: In terms of acquisition there may be sites that are perfect for urban agriculture that have been identified that are on the roster that if there is momentum potentially they could rise to becoming acquired. In terms of the capital plan if there are specific projects that have urban agriculture related [unintelligible] and then the McLaren community garden are both active capital projects now. There may be others in the future, I don't remember. I think it's just those two right now.

Gary: [unintelligible]

Jordyn Harrison: Right. So our capital planning process get involved when we're doing major capital improvements to a community garden. The day to day is operations Division and so it's an operations plan.

Chair: But I think your question just to be clear is if this was a high priority of the Department then shouldn't we see this in planning mindset as opposed to saying well we know we're doing a slight renovation of so and so and there is a ten-plot garden.

Jordyn Harrison: I think that the Strategic Plan is where a topical type of subject area type of priority would be stated and so I don't actually have the Strategic Plan goals of the operations plan memorized so I don't know if it is in there and I would have to reread to see if we really identified community gardens as a priority for the Capital Division. But I think you're right, I think as a goal for the Department that would be the place to put it is in the Strategic Plan and then give the right Division within the Department responsibility to make that goal a reality.

Jordyn Aquino: And to add that community gardens and urban agriculture don't necessarily a hundred percent overlap, there's other kinds of urban agriculture.

Nick Belloni: District 2. What's this about the [unintelligible] boathouse and what does the Department think of this? That was supposed to be in the lease for the boathouse.

Jordyn Harrison: I don't know if that's the one where we're dealing with how we store the boats.

Nick Belloni: [unintelligible]

Jordyn Harrison: Well, we're definitely having the Capital Division assist with that assist with that aspect of that floaty thing that goes around underneath. That's definitely a capital project.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: You're zeroing into this one item. I appreciate what you're saying.

Nick Belloni: We're getting a lease that's [unintelligible] capital money, that's a question and that's where my question is going.

Chair: And the only person who would have the answer is Jordyn and she doesn't so let's just circle back to it.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: Moving on. Reaana.

Reanna Tong: District 9. Back to the equity analysis, these numbers at the bottom are they [unintelligible]?

Jordyn Harrison: Do you mean like are we aiming for a certain ratio?

Reanna Tong: Yes.

Jordyn Harrison: I don't think that we are. I think we're just aiming to make sure we're be equitable. This is really Taylor's area of expertise but when you read the charter language it doesn't provide us a lot of direction on how to decide what's equitable. It just says find some metrics and measure them. So that's sort of what we're doing. You probably remember in one of Taylor's table that [unintelligible] all the different metrics and how we're achieving them and this is the one that's most pertinent to Capital in that it relates to spending and so I think— actually, I take that back. Taylor does have a target in that table but I don't recall there being a target financially.

Chair: I think it is fair just to pick up on that. I think it's fair to say that because this is the implementation of the Strategic Plan is a year by year thing that it could be very beneficial to the Department to hear that as the committee we're interested in hearing more about how those numbers are being shuffled just to understand better if you're putting a number down in this slide about the equity metrics as they related to capital spending that it would be really important for us to know is that being based on a target goal, is there a specific ration? I think just as members of those communities want to understand it.

Jordyn Harrison: I think that she's reporting backwards so it's not that we plan to [unintelligible].

Chair: Understood. So I would just say that maybe by next year then they could actually look at this whole cycle and say okay well actually we did spend one and a half times the amount in this area. I think identifying that helps people who feel like the metrics aren't necessarily in their favor it kind of shows some evidence like hey actually we're not only conscious of this we're planning for it, it's part of our process.

Jordyn Harrison: I'll give that feedback to Taylor. It seems related to the previous topic of equity zone.

Chair: Anybody else on just this part of this presentation? Any public comment?

Okay, so now we're going to switch to the Acquisition Policy and before I let Jordyn go off to the races on that one. For those of you who have been PROSAC members for quite a while. The Acquisition Policy has been an ongoing topic I would say since I became a member of PROSAC.

There have been some really good acquisitions. There have been some okay acquisitions for lack of a better term. I don't want to say they're bad because I don't think any parkland is bad acquisitions right now. We're running out of space. But just please understand before she makes this presentation that Acquisition Policy is a work in progress and I know that certain people feel certain ways about what's being acquired and where but this isn't really the place to debate on a mainstream level aspects of the Acquisition Policy We can talk more about that in a separate so I ask that you let her make this presentation before we start talking about unfair acquisitions.

Jordyn Harrison: So my role is just to go over with you the content of the policy as it stands today [unintelligible] and the current state of affairs in terms of recent acquisitions and the [unintelligible].

So the current Acquisition Policy was created over time and most recently updated in 2011. On the second page I provide the three main goals of the policy which are to target properties in high need and/or open space deficient areas, leverage funding and acquire properties that encourage a variety of use. In addition to the policies within the Recreation and Park Acquisition Policy there are [unintelligible] within the Park Code that is similar to and has overlapping areas to the property Acquisition Policy. Those are on slide twelve and they explain that we focus on high needs areas as defined by the Rose, areas of [unintelligible] and significant natural areas.

So the next several slides explain how we get to the high needs areas based on the Rose. So this first slide here number thirteen those five bullet points are the factors that lead to that green map. The deeper the green the greater the need based on those five factors and then they are split out in subsequent slides in different colors. So you have density, income, youth density and senior density as well as the walkability maps which create the deficiency areas which are basically a ten-minute walk around parks [unintelligible].

Then they're all compiled together into the Rose [unintelligible] map. The high needs 2.0 is kind of how I see it is a equity zones. So that's provided here in slide eighteen which you're all familiar with Taylor's presentation. It gives us an opportunity to make the Acquisition Policy a living document by adding that as a factor that we consider when we look at different opportunities for acquisition. It's interesting if you eyeball it, there are some similarities between the high needs map but there are some specific differences as well because the factors are similar but not quite the same. What's nice about the equity zones is that it's an ongoing update. It uses new data regularly whereas the Rose map is static and it just stops when the Rose was adopted.

So that's kind of an overview of the policy guidance from the two main sources, RPD Acquisition Policy and the Park Code which is included in that Acquisition Policy. The policy is kind of a thirty-page document that we had published on our website and [unintelligible] so I apologize again. I think many of you may have seen it. If you like I can show you when I come back.

Chair: I would urge you all if you haven't read the Rose or at least skimmed the Rose. I have read it and it's a daunting document to read but I would encourage you if you want to be a part of this conversation that you have to read that document to understand what the policy is, to understand how limited or not the Department is in its acquisitions.

Nick Belloni: It was written in this room actually. We had a PROSAC working group work on it to write what is there. The thing about it is we did the best we could at the time with just having the Rose, not having the equity zone things. But one of the main things we did that was brought up was getting parks in areas that are park deficient. The Acquisition Policy before the one done is 2011 you couldn't buy parks that we own now it was so bad. You couldn't have bought anything with the policy we had beforehand. Each one of us took a park that we knew in our area and put it to the Acquisition Policy and guess what? We couldn't have bought any of them. And I mean I'm talking this little strip of land right here we call Golden Gate Park, no—wouldn't have bought that.

Chair: It was too restrictive of a policy.

Nick Belloni: I want to point that out when we talk about the newer policy. Things need to be changed always and it needed to be a living document. One of the things I wanted to put in there was we go back to it every five to ten years. That was nixed but it's something that I think we're going to be doing it looks like which is a good thing.

Trevor McNeil: District 5. So just for those of somewhat still new. So this was adopted in 2006?

Chair: It was adopted in 2011.

Nick Belloni: We got ourselves in there to give feedback and everywhere the old policy didn't even have that in there. So there's a lot that we added.

Chair: Just to be super clean, the 100 percent biggest ticket item when the Rose was put in front of us what was the number one thing as a body? I can remember number one on the list was high needs. There was nothing else but high needs. Everything else was kind of, sort of. Like is it Sunshine, is it near a public transportation. There were like all these secondary things, 100 percent high needs. And so that's what the Rose was shaped in but this equity metrics conversation didn't come around until much later in the dialog, five or six years later. So now what you're seeing is that they're really motivated. You can almost see that number one on their list is high needs and I think that's a testament to PROSAC's undying want for it to be about not just hey there's a park in the Marina that we'd like to acquire but there's a park and an open space area.

Nick Belloni: One thing I do remember, one of my guiding things I kept telling the Department was why should I buy a park in my District that I live in, District 1, when I'm surrounded by parks? When District 6, District 3, Chinatown area, need parks more than I do. I've grown up being around all these parks. These kids need that same thing and that was something that I pushed, I remember. I think Karen got so pissed at me one day and wanted to kick me out of here.

Chair: There's definitely a lot of process that went into this with the intention of looking at high needs neighborhoods, looking at park deficient areas and understanding what the needs were, whether the Department acted on that or not. Now we're seeing that they're kind of having to act on it five years later.

Trevor McNeil: I was looking at the map on page thirteen and I was interested about the recent acquisitions and how that's fitting into the goals of the Acquisition Policy.

Chair: Yeah and just to be clear there was a very weird time and certainly Jordyn can't really speak to this, I don't think you worked at the Department, but there was some shuffling of the Acquisition Policy at once point where there was some stuff that wasn't even on the Acquisition Policy and basically got acquired. That caused a huge issue amongst PROSAC members, it caused a huge issue with the Commission and it made them re-look at this whole topic as kind of like why set a policy if you're not going to follow it and why acquire space that isn't high needs because that's what we kind of made.

I should also say that the second priority under high needs while we're going through a kind of background of this was maintenance. So number one was high needs and number two was is there budget to maintenance this new acquisition. Those were the two real main criteria for us and we did feel at times that the Department saw an opportunity and they moved on it whether it fit those two protocols or not.

Trevor McNeil: Do they ask us ahead of time about an acquisition?

Chair: We have to be in the food chain. Whether they take our advice or not we basically— ideally the way the process would work is we would put something on the Acquisition Policy, on the roster, they would discuss it, we would talk about whether there are funding sources. Ideally it's up to the Department to decide does it fit all the characteristics. But certainly as PROSAC members we can identify properties and you could ask the District 6 member who spent a year going door to door going who will sell me a half a parcel.

Nick Belloni: Trevor, look at page 22 on the policy. There's a lot of checkmarks and one of the things I pointed out was if a park doesn't have those checkmarks it's going to be a hard sell to the Commission to say hey look we want to buy this property but it doesn't have anything— PROSAC and everybody doesn't have anything. There's no covering of the ass because I've got nothing here yet I want to buy this property. That's a problem.

Chair: Let's do this because we're getting ahead of ourselves now and we're right at where you in the presentation.

Jordyn Harrison: Yeah, you are, you're kind of doing the presentation.

So I walked through some of the goals that led to what would lead the Department to try to acquire property and so I was going to move into process. There's a flowchart here that explains how PROSAC or staff or someone outside the Department can initiate a consideration using an intake form that's on our website and that's a way to try to make it a little more open to the public to provide ideas. And then staff then takes that suggestion and uses the site information sheet and the property evaluation worksheet to try to have an apples to apples comparison of essential acquisitions. We bring our recommendation about whether it meets the goals which [unintelligible] explaining the priorities are integrate into this evaluation worksheet the deeper the green is the higher the priority addressing the high needs goal. And then the next one is about funding and maintenance. So if we can check those boxes and we provide that to PROSAC and then PROSAC says we disagree, we think it should be on the roster or we don't think it should be on the roster. And then we create the roster which turns green to purple and then we have exploding around there a list of all the properties that have been vetted through this system.

Chair: I'm again going to jump in and Ana Gee I know you have a comment. Is it specific to this conversation right here? Okay, so before we move on to this item one thing that you'll see in slide nineteen is that PROSAC's role in this is to provide feedback. It might be good feedback like hey we know some neighborhood groups in that area that would be really supportive of an acquisition or hey we don't think it's in a high needs neighborhood, maybe it shouldn't be on the roster.

So part of our responsibility it to take items, potential acquisitions, vet them and then potentially move them on and off the roster. That is within our scope. So again does that always happen? No. Do things just appear on the roster? Yes. It's just part of the process but it really does lay out right here one of you makes a recommendation, staff might say well lets go further along here and vet the recommendation before it ever comes back to PROSAC. At the same time you might

see something on there that just doesn't sit well with you as far as an acquisition before the Department does that you should be able to voice an opinion about that.

Jordyn Harrison: I would explain that purple table that's going around. I moved everything that we have acquired off of the roster so this is just properties identified that have not been acquired.

Chair: So those are on the roster but have not been acquired.

Jane Weil: Jordyn, so on this charter these are properties that have been evaluated but not acquired and then what are the colors?

Jordyn Harrison: The more color the higher it meets the goals and the deeper the color the more important the goal.

Male Speaker: [unintelligible]

Jordyn Harrison: Using the site information sheet and the language of the acquisition policy and of the Park Code staff makes an assessment about how well it meets the goal of serving high needs areas and of addressing open space deficiency. So if you look in the presentation slide 21 this is an unfilled site information sheet. We would have maps showing [simultaneous comments] [unintelligible]. It's in a moderate need area so you do an assessment based on all these questions that are being asked in order to make a call about how to check that box.

Katherine Jones: District 5. Just a quick question, when you're determining and putting properties through the Rose, sort of a determination of whether to acquire it, is it just for acquisitions and spending those funds or is it also for properties that you're sort of taking on from other agencies, like the under the highway properties?

Jordyn Harrison: We should be doing it for those as well. [unintelligible] I tried to update that too and I had a hard time finding every single acquisition but I found as many as I could to demonstrate the procedure.

Chair: I think your point is well-taken. There are certain things that are transfers that we should know about because I think one of the discussions that's gone on here is you get all this property for free, we want to know how you're going to maintain it or improve it and that does fall under our purview even if it's a free acquisition it still has a dollar value associated with it.

Jordyn Harrison: An example is the [unintelligible]. We negotiated there should be a contribution for maintenance funding from that development. If it's a mixed income development so they are taking in money either through an HOA or community finance district [unintelligible]. So we've asked for a slice of that to help maintain that. So that's the Department's policy. [unintelligible].

Chair: Yeah I mean another thing that they're talk about just to that point is if there's something that is valuable and if you look in some of the note sections if there's something valuable about the space like it comes with me, like a developer is willing to pay maintenance on it then they're very transparent with that information because it obviously helps when you're trying to make a determination like is this a good get. Well ordinarily this wouldn't be a good get but they're going to remediate the entire space. Like the Port with the blue-greenway oh they're going to remediate the entire space. Well, we'll take that then, that's worth it for us. So there's always going to be some underlying contingency behind just an acquisition.

Ana Gee: District 6. So the process for acquisition where it says public SSAI form is that the intake form?

Jordyn Harrison: Yes.

Ana Gee: Can you be more specific? Can like a group of members from my community come and fill out this intake form? Can a PROSAC member fill out this?

Jordyn Harrison: Yes. And that's how it's played out. We've had community members bring in.

Ana Gee: And how long does it take from step one to step two if all this information is filled out?

Jordyn Harrison: Probably a couple months. Then staff takes the suggestion and we go and we do this site information and the evaluation worksheet and we bring it to PROSAC and let you guys hear our opinion and weigh in on our opinion, make a decision about adding it to the roster.

Chair: Yeah I mean one thing that we were very successful in doing in this process which I think you guys should consider again is site visits. So if there is the possibility of an acquisition or you know a members that's like hey we're going to go visit this space that I would like to put forth as an acquisition possibility I think the more members that go and visit the better because you can talk from the perspective of I was there, I saw it. I particularly went when I was a young PROSAC member to 900 Innes Street. For those of you who are not aware of that, it's quite an interesting Sunday morning for me at 900 Innes about five years ago. I can say I was there before we turned that into a park space and I was pro-it because I didn't like what it looked like before. I guess my point again is you can't take a position if you don't go and check it out, right? So the best way to do that is to wait and see what they're putting on the table and then maybe as a group or maybe in small groups. The Department seems to be—yeah, small groups like four or five people, the Department seems to be willing to help us get a group to various spaces.

Anthony Cuadro: I have a question about a specific item that is on the acquisition roster but I don't know if this is the appropriate time to ask?

Chair: I would say that's what we're talking about.

Anthony Cuadro: I don't recall this being a part of the conversation when we approved this two or three years ago for Shlage Lock. I thought that the property was going to be given to the Department and we weren't paying to acquire it and/or there's maintenance being paid for by the developer.

Jordyn Harrison: There is maintenance but we're paying for it and—

Chair: We're buying the property but they are maintenancing the property. [simultaneous comments] .

Jordyn Harrison: You might be thinking of Potrero S.F. as an example where it's being given to us and they're also giving us maintenance funds, we're not paying for it. Shlage was probably [unintelligible] they negotiated this and part of the story that I was told is that as redevelopment ended that financing of that project just exploded and so the city was trying to scabble.

Nick Belloni: I remember the presentation I just don't remember the dollar amount affixed to it.

Male Speaker: We also received \$1.5 million for Shoreview, right?

Jordyn Harrison: We did, we received money for Shoreview to get to [unintelligible] and we're seeking grants to do even more.

Chair: Not to go too far down this round but his question is a good one. So in this particular case with Shlage Lock, right, that's a private developer that we're buying property from that is going to maintenance it as part of an agreement. One thing that we've wanted as a committee and I'm sure that you want as a Department is to have a seat at that table. What does that open space look like?

Jordyn Harrison: We do have a seat at the table.

Chair: Right so I think again that's a loop just so you know that we raised as a body a long time ago and said what do we have to do to bring you to that table. But here again this is a good example of us wanting to kind of know that you're involved in that plan.

Jordyn Harrison: Schlage was in ways a good precedent setting project because it laid the ground for Potrero and our goal advising on new parks, even ones that we may not acquire I think has brought us into the fold in various agencies to help advise them.

Chair: I would say that everybody at this table would feel a lot more confident that a developer willy nilly saying you know what would be great here? DG as far as your eyes can see. We'll get some granite. To have you at the table helps us feel like open space actually has trees and stuff.

Jane Weil: Another question about this color charter. As I understand it you're saying these are things that have been evaluated but not acquired. But there are two Shlage locks and the [unintelligible].

Jordyn Harrison: They haven't been acquired yet.

Jane Weil: I see, so they're on the list. [Simultaneous comments]

Jordyn Harrison: We're [unintelligible] so that's why they're on the recent acquisition list. But since we hadn't yet acquired them I didn't take them off of the roster. I think I had just two [unintelligible].

Jane Weil: So these should not be on the roster because they're already being acquired, right?

Jordyn Harrison: You're right.

Jane Weil: I just want to be clear. So these three have passed off this list onto this list, okay.

Chair: Any other questions about this item?

Jordyn Harrison: That was a good transition because now we're talking about the recent acquisitions. This map has acquisitions since 2007 that came about through a variety of way and they're all listed in the table below and as Jane was just pointing out we are planning to acquire Shlage Lock, Potrero [unintelligible]. Shlage we will acquire once they're built. So the developer is building them and then we would buy them. And the latest [unintelligible]. That should occur in the next two to three years and then the second part which is in the lower half they really couldn't make firm commitments so we're guessing four to six years at the earliest.

The Central Park for Potrero that park is actually the last phase of that development project so it's probably not going to occur for five years at least. And then 11th and Natoma we have signed an agreement to buy the property and it will probably happen this coming spring when the seller executes the contract by [unintelligible].

So I could go over the recent acquisitions if you want or provide some basic information around them.

Chair: Anybody want to touch on these recent acquisitions? You have any questions about these locations?

Robert Brust: District 8. The Potrero Central Park I have trouble remember which park that is. Is that in the project area that's being trans-visioned?

Jordyn Harrison: So if you go to Potrero Rec Center [unintelligible].

Chair: It's right in the middle of the redevelopment and they decided to have—it's basically a park in the middle.

Jordyn Harrison: So then I just provide an overview of how acquisitions are funded. The main source the city has is the Open Space Fund which is a property tax set-aside, five percent of that per the charter is put into the acquisition [unintelligible] it doesn't cover other costs like developing the park or maintaining the park. But there are way [unintelligible] we can use impact fees which is going to help us with the 11th and Natoma property, grants which we hope will help with Shlage so we may not have to use all our own money, [unintelligible] Potrero will be an example and gifts which occasionally occurs where people give us a park site like Fey House, that happened many years ago.

Currently we have about \$4 million and that is after having subtracted the money that we'll be spending on 11th and Natoma. So it's a set-aside, it isn't available [unintelligible].

We get about \$3 million annually, it's based on property taxes. So as property values rise that amount is higher and we have obligations [unintelligible] so that isn't one big lump sum. And as I explained before the Shlage Parks are timed to when they're built.

That next page is sort of a working fund balance spreadsheet that the Department is using to make sure we have cash on hand.

Ana Gee: District 6. [unintelligible]

Jordyn Harrison: It's part of the annual budget process. We have a line item where based on what the Controller anticipates the property tax revenues will be they estimate what the open space revenue will be for the next budget year and then 5 percent of that. So it's actually like a projected budget amount.

Ana Gee: Is this fiscal or regular year?

Jordyn Harrison: Fiscal year.

Ana Gee: So that will be next June, July?

Jordyn Harrison: Right. I don't know when it deposits. The way it works is that we get the amount up front based on the projections.

Ana Gee: Will we be able to see a different amount sometime?

Jordyn Harrison: Yeah, these are based on the assumed based on historic trends how much goes in each year.

Jane Weil: District 6. So 17-18 if four?

Jordyn Harrison: Right. So that is what is in our budget and that's because the 9.7 has been set aside for—and if that sale doesn't happen it goes back in.

Chair: Otherwise there would be 11-3.

Jane Weil: And then the next year 18-19 then is that 6.4?

Jordyn Harrison: Right, exactly. So that is assuming taking out 500,000 to pay for Francisco, putting in about \$3 million for that year's revenue.

Chair: Again just to look at the fund source on the fund balance this has always been a conversation, right? We knew when Francisco was acquired that it was going to bankrupt the Open Space Fund for a little while but we're already seeing once years later that it is starting to build itself back and in three or four years we'll be back up to a place where you could acquire something in that same kind of cost. Of course now we know Jane specifically know, the Department specifically knows, the value that we got on the acquisition of Francisco versus what they're paying for 11th and Natoma it's almost the same price when you see it written right there, 9.1 versus 10.2 it's like is it every going to be a better acquisition climate.

Jordyn Harrison: It's challenging. We're stuck with the same real estate market as everyone else is.

Chair: Are there any general questions from the committee on this subject matter? Like I said this is a very in depth subject matter. It took months, years, of conversation just to get where we're going here. If there are individuals on this committee that are interested in just talking amongst themselves and not caring what the Chair says—come on. If there are people interested in hearing more about this or diving further into this the first thing I'd suggest is reading the Rose, that sets the parameters for what the Acquisition Policy is. The second thing I would suggest is to have a conversation with Jordyn or later with Dawn or Stacy about how we got to here, how this city that just has barely any open space at least has a policy and a mechanism to bring budget to acquiring new open space. Those two things are really good. How we drive them is this committee's purview.

Jordyn Harrison: I'm going to be giving the same presentation basically to the Recreation and Park Commission and staff's recommendation getting back to the Civil Grand Jury report is that we continue to use the Acquisition Policy and the Park Code to guide this process to bring parks to the attention of the Commission and ultimately the Board for acquisition. So staff feels that it's a working process and our recommendation.

Ana Gee: District 6. I was just going to ask any other member that [unintelligible] especially the one in Francisco not here but we can talk outside about the whole process, that would be very helpful for our District.

Nick Belloni: Francisco is special.

Chair: Francisco is a hard one because it was basically a site that had an opportunity to either become a park or become developed and I think the Supervisor specifically and that's what all of us would say was the Supervisor himself in that District came to PROSAC and said you have a choice here, you can support this and that's great and we have this 4.2 acre open space or you cannot support and sure you'll have money in the Acquisition Fund but where will you find new parks to acquire. So I think the answer to you is it took a Supervisor actually coming to us to even get us to focus on that acquisition. Anything that you see above and beyond just putting in intake form that you actually have dialog with members both in—I would certainly talk to you about Francisco but I'm sure there are other members that could talk to you. One would be interesting would be like Noe Valley Town Square.

Nick Belloni: A Supervisor brought that too.

Chair: Oh no, the Supervisor paid for that. We unfortunately acquire it thinking that the community had the money to support it but then it turned out it was the Supervisor's add-back money that actually paid for it. There's a perfect example of we could put it on the acquisition roster if your Supervisor wants to kick in the build or the maintenance it might make it a much more easy acquisition.

Any other comments on this?

Jane Weil: When will you presenting this to the Commissions?

Jordyn Harrison: On the 18th.

Robert Brust: I'm not quite sure how long I've been on this committee but this is the most clear that anyone has explained the policy. We've got lots of explanation and people assume you know everything and this started at the beginning, went right to the end. It was great, thank you.

Chair: Gary, I would ask that all these documents be emailed to every member of the committee because I do know there are a lot of interested members that would love to be able to dive into this. Jordyn I would reiterate that was a really good presentation. Thank you.

Is there any public comment on this item? Being none, public comment is closed.

We're very excited to hear your presentation. Kenneth Maley who you know is who inspired this theme is absent, he is very ill, so he couldn't make it which is a bummer for us because he was kind of the impetus of your coming but I think you kind of know what we want to hear a little bit about.

Male Speaker: I'm flexible in how to talk about it and what you want to talk about. So I'll give you a brief overview maybe and you can steer the conversation and I don't mind if you interrupt.

So I'll start around 2004 and bring you up to present and like I said there's a lot here and I think you're probably are familiar with a lot of these issues already. So feel free to interrupt. So in

2004 the Controller's Office published an audit and it looked at construction practices of all the Chapter Six Departments in the city. There were twelve findings and twelve recommendations in the Department. All [unintelligible] committed to implementing all the recommendations. In short their recommendations said that—or the findings said that San Francisco doesn't do a good job of evaluating its construction project performance and it doesn't do it in a standard way and it doesn't take performance of [unintelligible] into account when awarded contracts. That's kind of the short version.

Fast forward a bit to 2016 when the Board and the Mayor changed the law to do a couple things and that's the first page that's in front of you which one it requires that we evaluate performance on jobs which sounds pretty straight-forward and simple but it's pretty complicated to actually pull off especially in the standard way because we're talking about one method of evaluation for all six construction Departments. So that's section 6.26 that's on the first page right in front of you. This is there for reference the paper in front of you so feel free to look at it but I don't need the presentation really. And then the section below is section 6.74 which allows for best value return. Pretty much until 2015 San Francisco was a low bid construction contract city. There's alternates means of delivering projects, design build and CMPC and all sorts of other ways to deliver a project and up until 2015 a Department would have to go through a Commission or to a Board to get specific permission to do a design build contract for a terminal at the airport for example. So as you can imagine [unintelligible] we had to go to the Board and get a law passed to do one project.

So 2015 the law changed to take that [unintelligible] down a level to the Department head and Commissions so now the head of the airport or Public Works of the Parks Department can look at a project and say we think it's appropriate that this be whatever—fill in the black—and get approval at a lower level. So it's a little bit more efficient and can be a shorter process.

And then a year later with section 6.74 which allows us to do best value. No one in the city to my knowledge, no Departments have done it yet. There's a possibility MTA might have just recently issued an RFP of some sort with the best value element but the whole point is that it's probably time for some [unintelligible] to start considering something other than price, minimum qualifications and delivering projects.

So I just want to start there because I think that you'll hear people use some of the phrases in here [unintelligible] so best value is the current method that is now an option that we can use for some projects. It's just there, it's an option. It doesn't change low bid contracting. It doesn't mean you have to use it. It's just there as a choice and the first part, section 626 is the requirement that Departments evaluate construction jobs and that's a requirement now. And so that's what we've been implementing and it's pretty straight-forward and common sense. We just established a system where it's going to be an online system where [unintelligible] contractors end [unintelligible] will be evaluated with some standard metrics and the point really is project delivery and delivering a project efficiently and tracking some basic things. It's not supposed to be a punitive system. It's not supposed to be a system that encourages finger-pointing. And all of that is really important in understanding why it's taken as long as it does. It would be a very straight-forward system if we just tried to raise the bar and change the law and said there are some black and white things that if this happens on the job ABC or D then the

contractor will not get [unintelligible] for a year or five years. We could have gone that route but no one in San Francisco as far as I can tell was interested in that route.

So the requirement is there's an evaluation. There is input from the contractors as well so they're commenting. It's not hidden from the contractors. This side of the table on a job were contractors and that side were city staff. There would be some give and take and back and forth and comments, not infinitely but opinions would be reflected of everyone and they're recorded in their website and I suspect that most of the time it will just stop there and it will just be the information that's recorded about the job.

Because we're recording information that applies to all construction projects for all six Departments this should be far more basic than the systems at each Department has set up to evaluate its own work. So Public Works for example can produce a million pie charts and graphs about any project about the close-out period and the change orders and very detailed information. That is not what we're trying to reproduce. So it's just some basic information.

The main teeth of the system comes six months or a year or two years down the road when a contractor who has performed poorly bids and the Department has concerns about the contractor's ability to perform a specific job and the idea is that now we have a better fair repository of information where if we wanted to we could make a decision to not award a particular contract to a particular contractor for a particular job. So it's not the same as debarment. It's just trying to kind of raise the bar from here to here.

Chair: So this is really good information for us. The thing that scares me a little bit in what you're saying is there's been this progress, these six Departments want to have more information but have yet to really figure out what they'll do with that information. In other words I like what you're saying, it makes people realize from a contractor perspective hey they're taking notes, these notes are going to be a part of a long-term file. But you said it's not meant to be punitive which means in essence there is now downside other than maybe they don't get another bid. They lose a bid in the future because of something they did at some point but you're not compelled. In other words there is not structure in place to say wait this guy has gotten a D every single project they're done, that's not a grounds for debarment.

Male Speaker: So it remains a grounds for debarment if a Department wanted to. That is in place now and was in place a year ago and was in place five years ago. The reality is that the city rarely debar contractors because that's a pretty serious penalty.

Chair: Could you give us an idea of what penalty might be between debarment somebody and writing some bad stuff in their folder?

Male Speaker: The risk is—

Chair: I don't mean to be a jerk about it, I'm trying to understand.

Male Speaker: I think most of you have a job or have had a job and we behave in certain ways thinking if I do this something bad might happen to me. And in generally with low bids

contracts what we're concerned about is some contractors and subcontracts are fine where they say we're going to perform and we give them the work and then they do it.

What we're concerned about is that sometimes and some persons have figured out that you can under-perform not like down here, just slightly. It's the equivalent of not coming to work just coming to work fifteen minutes late and leaving fifteen minutes early and just adding up and it's just seeing how far you can push the boundary before someone talks to you.

So the stick with the system is that there's a risk that you won't get the next job if there's poor performance. The idea is just to make people sit up a little bit straighter and pay attention a little bit more, not bid with [unintelligible]. It's trying to nudge behavior and it's also trying to solve a problem that is common now where the city knows a lot about contractors but it's all like water cooler information and oral history and there will be times when someone—a contractor is the apparent low bidder for a project and everyone around the table at the city is concerned that so and so is going to screw this up just like they did that job a year ago or two years ago and then they talk to the City Attorney, say can't we please, I don't want to work with this and the City Attorney says what do you have to show me. You talk to him and he talks to her and what are we going to do about it?

So this system part of the purpose is to force a couple things. One, you know we're not perfect on the city side either. We get feedback from contractors that [unintelligible].

Chair: And how they get paid.

Male Speaker: That's what I mean when I see it's not finger-pointing. It's just meant to acknowledge that we don't track our jobs now so we don't necessarily know what we're going to find so we have to do that in order to help document what the actual problems are and then act on them with some information instead of just the topic.

So that's how the system should work, that's the point.

Chair: I just want to give you guys context as to why this conversation has come up and why Ken was so vehement about trying to get this in front of us. Any of us would bid through renovations are aware that the Department's hands are tied in some ways as to who they bring in to do the work and also how those people—I think Nicholas said it kind of veiled but we know for example, I know for example in renovations that I've been part of that the specific contractor knew what the retention amount was and again for those of you who are new members a retention is the money that they Department will keep at the end of the project to make sure that the contractor does the job. What we're hearing and what we've heard all along is that certain contractors understand that the retention isn't enough money for them to do the real nuts and bolts and to turn the project back to the Department. The people who suffer in that mostly are the stakeholders because they're the super last little finishings, furnishings, and so to know what, to know that there are contractors that already know hey so the retention is \$200,000 I don't really care whether I get this money. In essence why this is so important to us is to find a way to head off or to I don't want to use the word punish, to identify these contractors so there can be some recourse eventually and then not continuing to get job after job and again I'm just trying to

understand what the mechanism—it sounds like there is now a mechanism in place and so that's a good sign. We're only hearing from one Department. There are other Departments that will present on this very topic as well in terms of their perspective.

Nick Belloni: My question is aimed at Recreation and Park side of this. Does the public have input because they're the ones that are getting the project at the end of the day, do they have input on what the subcontractor didn't do properly. There's a lot of friends of groups that put a lot of money into these projects. Is there a place where they have say in this?

Male Speaker: So the way this is going to be implemented is that we're building a website and it should be ready within five or six weeks and we're going to apply it to one or two projects per Department and we're going to see what we get. At the moment there is not a particular place for the public to comment but to the extent that any group from the public will be a participant in the actual construction progress of the job [unintelligible].

Nick Belloni: Recreation and Park tends to have more than DPW or MTA, more public oversight we'll call it, because they're the ones it's like you park, they put a lot of money into getting it done and there's a lot of things at the end that weren't down.

Male Speaker: To the extent that you think that the public could produce something that was reasonable there and fairly objective that could conceivably be input and stored in the system for a future decision.

Nick Belloni: That should be a component of it because the public is the final—hey here's your thing.

Chair: Again, listen to what he said. It has to be fair.

Nick Belloni: I know.

Chair: It can't just be like well those guys put up those fences and then nothing happened for all this time and then they tore down the fences.

Nick Belloni: No, I know that. But what I'm saying is the public should have a say somewhere.

Male Speaker: I hear you and we should keep talking.

Chair: Gary?

Gary: From the Department's side until there's a mechanism for that [unintelligible].

Chair: The only thing I'll add to that is that the Department is subjective because if it's a contractor that you have six other jobs with and you don't want to allow that information into the record because it hurts other jobs it's not such a good system. Again, the point is there should be some public repository for this information.

Male Speaker: What we've really tried to do is it's taken a really long time to do some very simple things and the reason for that is that what you're saying is kind of the obvious is not obvious to contractors. If they were here they would be unhappy.

[simultaneous comments]

Male Speaker: Even in just trying to figure out questions they are very frustrated because they think [unintelligible]. They don't agree whether or not it rained on a day. So take it to a whole other level when you're opening up comments to the entire public it sounds very scary speaking for them for a second but one of the things that we're trying to do is to separate the collection of information from thinking about how it's going to be used and so all you guys would have to think about is there a fair way you can record something, if there's a valid concern about a project in the neighborhood for whatever the issue is it doesn't hurt to report it because there's no promise that it's going to be used in a super good or a super bad way. We're trying to—and it's going to take years of cultural change at the Department level for management staff who are reluctant to record negative things.

Nick Belloni: That's why I want to put in if we're going to start this now or it's going to take years to make a culture change getting the public's input should be part of that culture.

Chair: I think everyone is in agreement Nick. The real question as PROSAC it's not really an issue because we all theoretically are appointed by our Supervisors which in essence bypasses the public comment. I'm more concerned about pure stakeholders who have no voice.

Nick Belloni: That's what I was getting at.

Wendy Aragon: I work for a general contractor so I know exactly what you're talking about. So the city Department don't have superintendents that would go oversee all those? Like one of our jobs if we were to just let the subcontractors have free reign and not have anybody to watch over them and go job to job like they would do whatever they want. So is there not a process of a superintendent that oversees like X amount of jobs?

Male Speaker: At the city level?

Wendy Aragon: Yes.

Male Speaker: The six Departments are all structured differently and we're talking about jobs from \$600,000 to a \$1 billion to it's the whole universe of jobs. What we're building is just the infrastructure to record impressions whether it's the impressions of a team of two people managing at \$900,000 park project or a team of ten people managing an emergency runway at SFO. We're just creating the place to put the information. It's up to the Departments to make sure it goes in there.

Wendy Aragon: I would make sense to me that [unintelligible] just like working in an officer you have to have somebody who is out in the field like watching all of this.

Chair: But for the opposite argument is if there was a city Department and I hate to throw that out there but if there was a city Department whose whole job was to do oversight of all of these jobs they'd probably save the city a bunch of money and in essence get [simultaneous comments].

Male Speaker: There are plenty of Department who think they're doing a good job now on oversight and on particular jobs. So what they would tell you if they were here is that we're doing fine.

Chair: We're doing fine expect that maybe there's room for improvement.

Male Speaker: This is tricky because we deal with projects that are probably the most visible.

Chair: That's why it was important for you guys to come first and talk about your perspective.

Male Speaker: It's different than building at SFO where it's a controlled environment.

Chair: Part of the issue here is it's six different Departments. Again, it's six different levels of oversight.

Wendy Aragon: It's just all internal but not like actually on the ground.

Chair: Again—

Male Speaker: But the opinions solicited will be from the ground-level people and it's going to be up to them hopefully to decide whether they're finger-pointers and they're just going to say I'm the best general contractor in the world and the city forces me to work with horrible subs and if after five years that continues it says something about the contractor every time you're making a mistake it's his fault.

Chair: And every time you use the same contractor it's the same problem that happens over and over.

Male Speaker: So it's going to take some time.

Robert Brust: So it's still early. Have we got any information yet? Have the Departments been submitting information for the past year?

Male Speaker: Departments I don't know if you know but they've been evaluating projects for years, many of us. It's just that they're on paper and they don't go anywhere.

[simultaneous comments]

Male Speaker: So yes and no. No, we're not going to start using this particular system with these particular questions with this particular workflow that includes the contractor and hopefully these particular consequences until [unintelligible].

Robert Brust: Besides just getting them blackballed—

Male Speaker: We're not going to say that.

Robert Brust: Debarred. It could serve as a warning to the contractors or impetus to do better.

Male Speaker: That's the plan.

Robert Brust: We haven't seen any tightening up at this point yet though.

Male Speaker: Well, that's part of the plan. The other part of the plan which is why I started where I did with talking about best value and this system is that we're also trying to attract more contractors and there are plenty of contractors who do not bid our job city work for lots of reasons. Traffic, it's hard to get to us. There's not that many people based here and they don't feel like they can compete with low bid contractors. So our theory is that there's generally we start off with a price that's here but you end up here so if there was a way to get that price or even lower with higher quality work and fewer headaches and less administration from a contractor who normally stays out of the pool then we're all better off. So that's part of the idea too is to add contractors to the pool.

Robert Brust: That sounds great. I'm amazed it's taken so long to get here.

Nick Belloni: All Departments are saying all of this with all the different contractors?

Male Speaker: You should ask everyone and you get very different answers.

Chair: We're going to have different presentations.

Nick Belloni: I just want to make sure everybody is seeing the same report, that's what I was getting at.

Male Speaker: Yes. That's why it's been so [unintelligible].

Chair: Any other member questions? Is there any public comment? I'm going to close this item. Thank you for your presentation. This is something that for me is really at the root of everything that we're all about. We can point at really great spaces and say that we want to acquire them, we can even use our friends of groups to help raise money but at the end of the day we're all married to city contractors that are under some low bid—maybe they have a reputation and we have no idea of how or what that means. I can just tell you and any of you who have been a part of these Recreation and Park projects when it's bad it's bad. And it affects you, it affects the things that you lobbied for years in community meetings to have, those things don't end up in

the park. And then you have a whole bunch of people who said wait you were my advocate, what happened? And what happened had nothing to do with you, it had to do with a business that goes on unfortunately between contractors in the city and city Departments. Why I think it's important to start shedding light on this is because—and I think Nick's point is well-taken—if we don't do this now then where are we going to be in five years or ten years? This clearly—they're going to clearly keep building stuff and clearly keep using the same pool and so I think the goal is to hear more about this, more transparency, more contractors, bigger pool, more of a downside to contractors that don't complete jobs or finish what they need to.

So I think this isn't going to be end of this conversation, it's really just the beginning. Again, I would urge you because it will bit you at some point to be vigilant where there is that project find out who the contractor is, find out who the Supe is of that job because that does help you in some way and maybe there is a public comment process by the end of it and you actually can put a voice and go you know what, this guy got a bad reputation who is really good, he was a great contractor and they did the work, that would be as helpful as a negative comment that says wow this was terrible, they spent a whole bunch of money they didn't need to which I'm sure they get plenty of.

So I think this is an ongoing conversation. I'm glad that we got the first taste of it. I think for the next few months we're going to hear more about best practices and also about best value. Thank you.

That item is closed.

Item 10, announcements?

Gary: I'll be sending this out in the morning. The Martin Luther King Jr. luncheon is this Friday at 11:00 at Minnie and Lovie. You're welcome to participate.

Chair: Be advised we may move out of this space again, we might move back to City Hall for next months. I can't tell you for sure whether that's happening or not. We are working on that. The goal would be if there isn't a long-term commitment like a one-year commitment to a space at City Hall then we'll come here because I'm not going to play. That's just crap. Either you give us a room and it's our room every first Tuesday of the month from 6:00 to 8:00 or it's not and then we'll move here.

Male Speaker: [unintelligible]

Chair: Another announcement that I'll make is that Gary as our acting secretary will no longer be our acting secretary. As of next month Christina will be back so anybody who want to thank Gary now go ahead, [applause]. Thank you Gary. Any other announcements? Hearing none this item is closed.

Any public comment on any items not listed on the agenda?

Amanda Marcus: I'm the Director of Programs for the San Francisco Parks Alliance and I've been there since April so I'm still relatively new but a big part of my plan is to be participating in all of your meetings, either myself or one of the members of our program team. Just to let you know we've had [unintelligible] speaking to our Strategic Plan in April. Hopefully that moves forward on your agenda as well. But I also want to let you know that in addition to myself our team as it stands we have two associate directors, one that works with Planning and project delivery, another associate director that works for partner experience. So all those partner groups that are those friends of groups across the city work with that individual as well as three area managers that are spread out one in the north, one in the southwest, and one in the southeast portion of the city. And we have one individual that runs through and manages all of the contract for the City and County of San Francisco that we have that are grants that we have for standardization for all our groups so that everybody stays on track and budget for all the major projects that we have. That's a little bit about the programs team and I'm sure you're going to be hearing a lot more about what the Parks Alliance does throughout the year so thank you for your ears, we appreciate it.

Chair: One other quick one. The NEM awards. For those of you who are not aware of what that is, Neighborhood Empowerment. This year in particular May Wong has been put up for a lifetime achievement award. If that's the only reason you go and support May that would be great. Certainly something that each one of us should aspire to. If you do good works in your parks that's probably one of the only ways that we'll get recognized for what we do. So it's good to attend. I've been to a few of them, they're at City Hall. The Mayor hosts it, it's a pretty cool thing to be a part of. It's on the 26th at 6:30 p.m. in the rotunda.

Any other comments?

Ana Gee: Are kids allowed?

Chair: Kids are absolutely encouraged? Anything else? Thank you, meeting is adjourned. Happy New Year.

End of Document