

**Park and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee Meeting  
June 6 , 2017**

**Chair:** Good evening, welcome to the June meeting of the Park and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee. We are going to get rolling tonight, we have two great items. So I would like to start by doing role.

**Richard Rothman:** District 1 and the first Vice Chair.

**Maya Rogers:** District 10, second Vice Chair.

**Mark Scheuer:** District 8.

**Jane Weil:** District 6.

**Wendy Aragon:** District 1.

**Elisa Laird-Metke:** District 9.

**Robert Brust:** District 8.

**Theresa Factora:** District 11.

**Kenneth Maley:** District 3.

**Jordyn Aquino:** District 4.

**Nick Belloni:** District 2.

**Chair:** Steffen Franz, District 2. Great, I would like to move quickly on to review of the minutes. I would hope that everybody has seen this past month's minutes. Can I get a motion?

**Nick Belloni:** Motion.

**Kenneth Maley:** Second.

**Chair:** All in favor?

**All:** Aye.

**Chair:** So moved. I have a short Chair's report. I would like a minute of your time. This past month has been fairly busy on the non-PROSAC meeting front but on the Recreation and Park front there's been a lot of development. So I will take a couple minutes to talk about first Item 1. Various member of PROSAC including members Brust, Gee, Maley, Rothman and myself went

on what I would call a tour of South Park arranged by Ken. We got to hear both good and bad about the project from the lead architect. The tour was very revealing as we heard some of the issues the project had and we were also taken aback by some of the items that were mentioned. These items range from problems in the planning phase all the way through to the final closeout of the project which we aren't actually sure has happened yet. Which seems odd since the park has been opened for almost two months.

Rather than having a long discussion about this now we'll work as park of Toks' presentation I would like to suggest forming a working group and that group will research and gather information to present their findings to the committee. Are there any member who would like to join? I would like to suggest that if we do want to do this that member Maley be the head and set the schedule for the meeting. I saw member Brust, Gee, Rothman, Maley. That's a pretty substantial working group right there so I would like to ask that group to if possible perhaps come and present to us in August so that gives you two months.

Item two: I attended a community meeting for the design of Francisco Park. This park for anybody who doesn't know is a 4.4 acre park located where the Francisco reservoir was on Bay and Mason Street. This community meeting had about fifty or sixty members and the public was well represented as well as the park. I saw park Commissioners and a couple Supervisors. So clearly this was important. There were a handful of people who came out in support of a full-sized soccer field with fencing and lighting. They basically have lobbied that group to do this and the Department and the architect were resound to putting in some sort of soccer area but what I heard from these people is that they wanted full fencing and high pressure sodium lighting and that seemed to be more than what they're willing to bear.

This project is about a year from breaking ground and since PROSAC was instrumental in RPD's acquisition of this space I would like to have them come back and do a presentation sometime in the next three or four months. Again, why I think this is important—this may be one of the first parks in the system that basically controls their own maintenance and so I would like to on onset understand the challenges that they are facing and what that might look like at year end or two years once the park it active. So I'd like them to come back maybe in September or October, we'll see how their plan is going. I would imagine that they have very strong Supervisorial support in the district and perhaps the Supervisor will come and speak to us about his thoughts about it.

Item 3: My second vice Chair Maya Rogers and I have been working on producing the first in a series of sister park events. We are doing this we doing this with members of Friend of Lafayette Park and Park 94124. This will be held at Hilltop Park and out hope is that basically our members will come out and talk about what it's like to set up and run a friends of group and find some individuals within the community who are willing and supportive to help us build Hilltop's Friends of.

Bigger than all that [unintelligible] who is obviously part of their strategic plan so we pretty have been guaranteed by the Department that they will help us presenting fliers and other things to help us with outreach. The reason I bring this to you know we'll know in July how it goes but I encourage certain members of this committee who have strong Friends of groups that maybe you

come to this event and it inspires you to go off and perhaps help an underserved park using the strength of your Friend of group. The new date we have is July 15<sup>th</sup> from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m. at Hilltop Park. We will have some interesting characters at that meeting, the architect who designed the park will be there. There will be a handful of other people. I would imagine our Supervisors would be there. I do encourage you if this is something you're interested in.

That concludes my Chair's report. I would like to thank any of the members who I saw out at some of the events.

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

Moving on to Item 4.

**Stacy Bradley:** I am the deputy director of the Park Planning unit. For those of you who I don't know yet I typically give the Capital and Planning update. Sometimes Dawn Kamalanathan comes in and gives it. Toks is here as well.

We've made a lot of progress on our bond projects. We have Glen Canyon just opened. Jane was there. Alamo Square a water conservation project that also had a PUC grant opened last week. We have Mountain Lake Park is opening this week which is very exciting. This is one that's taken us a long time and it will be fantastic to have that open again. We've got Moscone Rec going to start construction this summer [unintelligible] are also making a lot of process. We just had a Panhandle Playground community meeting. The Alice Chalmers one is scheduled for later this month and we have one as well for the McLaren Group Picnic and then for McLaren the bond project, the quick start projects, we have a trails meeting and a amphitheater meeting both coming up this month. And then another bond project that has another community meeting is Rossi. And we've got a couple of other openings—Noe Courts opened last week, last month, and the VMD we just opened up a new batting cage.

Then for our new parks we are looking at 11<sup>th</sup> and Natoma the acquisition of five parcels, it's half an acre, that's at 11<sup>th</sup> between Natoma and Minna. That should be at the Board on June 15<sup>th</sup> at Budget and Finance so it would be great if anybody wants to come and voice your support. Then also for 17<sup>th</sup> and Folsom that is opening this month as well. So our new parks are coming online slowly but surely. Also for 11<sup>th</sup> and Natoma when I brought it before you it was looking like we weren't going to be able to start construction it until 2024 so now we've renegotiated the deal a little bit and we should be able to start construction in 2021. So that's—it's beneficial to start three years early.

Then also for our Trust for Public Lands they had some great news for our city in that San Francisco is number three behind the Twin Cities who I think should have been listed as one and they also identified that almost 100 percent looking at how they look at things of San Franciscans are within a ten-minute walk to a park or open space or plaza.

I helped negotiate that deal so if you have any questions about how the maintenance is set up, how it's supposed to work you can ask me.

**Chair:** Thank you Stacy. Any questions?

**Robert Brust:** I'm intrigued by the Trust for Public Land report. That's exciting news and something that we were working—it takes into account all this stuff we were talking about for the last several months about equity and do we have enough parks, can everyone get to the parks. So I went on their website and they've got something called the Tool. Do you understand it?

**Stacy Bradley:** I understand some of it.

**Robert Brust:** They put a qualification to their 100 percent score.

**Stacy Bradley:** Yeah because I think it's like 99 point something over 5. So 99.6 or 99.7. Close enough that almost everybody.

**Robert Brust:** This is a half-mile, ten-minute walk to a park.

**Stacy Bradley:** Or an open space. So it's not—so it's you know it's also looking at plazas. So it's not saying that everybody is within a close walk to a park but within an open space or something that can provide that element of relief.

**Robert Brust:** I'm intrigued. Maybe we can get somebody in from the Trust for Public Land that can explain it to us.

**Chair:** I think you should bring that up under new business. I would also say that the Chair the preceded me in this committee was very interested in that tool. She spent a lot of time trying to understand it and I think Stacy probably had some conversations about it because it's presented as this kind of cool tool that you can use. It would be helpful to have somebody explain it.

**Kenneth Maley:** [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Tiffany, so Katherine does work for Trust for Public Land and so maybe rather than trying to do something externally we could just have her come and maybe give us five minutes if she has some insight.

Any other questions for Stacy?

**Toks Ajike:** I also wanted to mention that we're doing quite well with Let's Play projects. We had a really good engaging community meeting [unintelligible] well-attended so we're really excited about that project and as part of our equity zone Alice Chalmers that community meeting is coming up June 22<sup>nd</sup>.

**Kenneth Maley:** Is there an update on the Washington Square Playground renovation.

**Toks Ajike:** Yes. We're proceeding with the drawings for that. I think we'll be able to provide a much more definitive schedule as we're going along developing. I think it's going to take another four to five months.

**Ana Gee:** Any update on MaCaulay Park?

**Stacy Bradley:** MaCaulay and [unintelligible] are both moving along. [unintelligible]. I've seen progress and it should be wrapping up shortly. I think in the fall we should have something at the Commission.

**Jane Weil:** Robert and I were at the opening of the Glen Park rec center yesterday. It was very well-attended by every politician you can imagine, the Mayor was there, Scott Weiner was there. When you have time go by and see it. It's impressive. Converse I think so some of the reports we've heard about other projects that didn't go so well this one seems to have gone really well and the community is thrilled and it is important I think for us to go. We are recognized by staff and it's good that we go.

**Stacy Bradley:** That has a climbing wall, the first one in our system. If this goes well hopefully we'll be able to add more.

**Wendy Aragon:** [unintelligible]

**Stacy Bradley:** Well, we don't yet know what it's going to be. We'll start doing community—more engagement once we own it and we have somebody from the [unintelligible] to start the planning process. So hopefully that will be something that comes out of the community process but I do think those themes will be part of the process but I think that [unintelligible] Filipina's cultural district is also these are the things that this area should be [unintelligible].

**Robert Brust:** What parcel is this?

**Wendy Aragon:** 17<sup>th</sup> and Folsom.

**Stacy Bradley:** Yes and that name is coming out.

**Chair:** What's the name?

**Wendy Aragon:** I don't even know it. [simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Any other questions for Stacy? Any public comment? Being none, public comment is closed. This item is closed.

**Male Speaker:** [unintelligible] with the Operations Division of Recreation and Park and I'm on the project team working with MTA [unintelligible].

**Miriam Sorell:** [unintelligible] I'm with the SFMTA so we've been partnering closely with Recreation and Park on developing some [unintelligible]. Just as a refresher the executive director from the Mayor directed us to implement the immediate traffic calming improvements in the wake of the fatality on JFK Drive last June. Then the second phase to initiate a broader study of what we can do in the longer timeframe to traffic calm the park as well as consider traffic restrictions.

[unintelligible] I know the last time we came here there were some questions about what kind of data collection we were going to do and we've been waiting for our data collection results and we thought that we'd have them long before this PROSAC meeting but I just got them this morning so I did want to take a minute for that even though it's not in your packets. The main thing that we learned—we definitely saw speeding go down at the locations that we have before and after data for which is what we expect when we put in speed humps but unfortunately the level of detail we say the fluctuations day to day in terms of the traffic volume is such that looking at the before and after data we can't really see much in terms of whether those measure had any impact on other streets so basically we actually saw volumes go up on JFK between last September and May which is probably not attributable to the speed humps. They didn't attract new people to drive on JFK so it basically means that we don't have a really good way of saying that. We don't expect from other speed humps throughout the city that it would have an impact on moving traffic around but it was something we were interested to see of Golden Gate Park and in this case is not something we can say definitively statistical significance that the speed humps changed volumes on JFK.

What we've been working on since then is trying to think more broadly about what we can be doing in Golden Gate Park and rather than that immediate project we knew pretty clearly there would be some issues and we wanted to address them on the western half of JFK we wanted to look more broadly throughout the park so last December we had a community even where we got a lot of feedback from park stakeholders about specific locations that could be improved or desires that they saw in the park as well as looking at a lot of data about traffic volumes, speeds and existing collisions in Golden Gate Park over the past five years. Those combined led us to look into what additional more spot improvements we would be able to do as well as what kinds of things we should be thinking about for the longer terms.

So the map that you received in your packet has some of the things that we think we can actually get done in 2017 and the corridor things will be a little longer. I just want to walking through some of those spot improvements. There's a bunch of additional speed hump locations that we determine based on the data collection that did as well as some additional feedback we got about top locations where people had experienced speeding which we were mostly able to verify with traffic data. This is the number of speed hump locations. We also heard a lot from staff at Recreation and Park as well as members of the community about places where it's hard when you're walking through the park to get across the street because the way that the roads are in Golden Gate Park most of the places you're crossing is you're walking on a pedestrian path. It's not necessarily at an intersection, cars aren't expecting to stop for pedestrians so it's a little trickier than other parks of the city where there's a crossing every block.

So we identified a lot of locations we improved crosswalks and what we're trying to do in a lot of cases is put raised crosswalks which is basically like a speed hump with a crosswalk on top of it and what that does is it highlights the visibility of that crossing for drivers and increases yielding of drivers to pedestrians walking across the streets compared with those there will be a couple little things like maybe removing parking spaces in advance to improve the visibility for somebody driving to see that there's somebody trying to cross the street.

There's also something on the map if you look really closely it's called a speed table and basically that's a place where right now what we're doing is building a speed hump but we're building an extra big speed hump so that later we can make it a raised crosswalk. We're not allowed to mark crosswalks if there aren't curb ramps to make it an accessible crossing so there's some places where in the a future phase we can put in curb ramps and strike those as crosswalks but for now we'll just put in this speed table.

A few locations at intersections. What we're proposing is some improved turn and guidance which basically is like saying there's some big sweeping curbs where it's easy to make a turn at a fast pace and what we can do in the very short term is paint just a white stripe to show you should actually be turning at this angle not at this sweeping angle. So it's a fairly straightforward thing to do. In the future with additional funding we could look into actually changing the curbs at some of those locations but this is something we can do quickly. And then in a few locations we have some additional posts, there's some in front of McLaren Lodge and there's the opportunity to extend them there as well as to put some on one of the paths that crossed Crossover Drive West and that's just to slow vehicle traffic and in the case of McLaren Lodge to highlight the bike facility that's right there.

The yellow line on that map is corridor spot improvements is where there's the existing bike lane along JFK Drive. The bike lane we've heard both sides in terms of opinions on that but for the most part that we find that it's working pretty well, it's accomplishing what the goals of that project from 2012 were. But we could hear some really detailed comments from folks who ride that bike lane every day in terms of this is one location where cars almost always [unintelligible] deeper into the buffer so it blocks the roadway or here's a place where pedestrians are most likely to cross. So we're doing some pretty small changes in terms of adding no parking markings or increasingly the markings in the buffer there but they're fairly minor just to highlight those locations.

There's a few other things up there. We're adding a left turn phase at Crossover Drive and MLK which is one of the top bike collision locations in the city, I think it's among the top ten so by having a green arrow it will make it so that when cars are turning left is during a different time period from when bikes are going through.

On that map you'll see on 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue there's a little green stretch and we're proposing a pilot one-way conversion on that stretch. At this location we saw a collision pattern where cars are turning left to leave out on 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Bikes are continuing through and cars aren't expecting that and there's a collision pattern that happens there. One thing that we're going to try to do within the year is at a stop sign at that location but we also saw that in the Golden Gate Park Master Plan from 1998 there was the recommendation to make this a one-way street and doing

so would allow there to be room for a bike lane on both sides and then one-way into the park so people would still be able to get into the park here but they have to leave on 36<sup>th</sup> or on Transverse because this is something we can do just with paint we want to do it as a pilot and have the opportunity to look up what the impacts are. One of the components of the Mayor's directive was to look at traffic restrictions in the park. I'll talk a little bit more about that in a second but one opportunity here is to have the option of a fairly minor change that we can study, what the effect is, what the community response is because Golden Gate Park is such a regional destination that it's really hard in our outreach to get the attention of everybody who might care about it just by posting it. So that's an opportunity to address the collision pattern and improve bike access to the park as well as get the community feedback and monitor what the kinds of changes are.

Further into the future we have a handful of things that we're additionally going to be looking into. One of them I mentioned was [unintelligible] painted stripe. We're going to prioritizing from among those locations to see if there's some spots where we actually want to change the curb to make the actual park part bigger, more of a grassy area and change where the concrete curb it is to make those intersections tighter, square, and more predictable. We still need to prioritize, get cost estimates and see what kinds of funding sources we have as well as curb ramps that we might do at either those intersections of some of the mid-block crossing desire lines that we currently can't put a crosswalk in because we don't have the curb ramps. So those are some of the things we're looking at to improve the intersection safety and as well as provide these additional crossing locations.

That's something [unintelligible] funding immediately but it will be a little while until we can do those more physical infrastructure changes.

Another thing that we want to get into further detail studying is the traffic circulation and potential for additional biking facilities in the western half of the park and then the Mayor's directive and also what we heard from people at our meetings is a desire for there to be less commute traffic in Golden Gate Park. Recreation and Park is interested in ensuring that all kinds of people can get to park destinations, places people can visit, and a lot of people can get to the park to visit or if you're bringing stuff with you have a picnic. We want to make sure we still have the opportunity for folks to drive to the park but if people are driving through the park as part of their commute that is beneficial for the park itself.

We've been looking at what we might be able to do in the near term to address that kind of traffic and it's been pretty difficult because what we find when we look at the collective volumes is turning patterns at a bunch of intersections throughout the park and what we find is a lot of people need the north-south crossing routes to get across the park because it's such a big impact on the western half of the city and also the park doesn't have that many access points basically. It's like all the blocks in the Richmond only every so often is there an access point to the park. So addressing those north and south sides access points was not really an appropriate way to go in terms of reducing people using the park for commute traffic which means that we're really looking at MLK and JFK as opportunities to take that down but those are both major commute routes, they carry a lot of traffic. Obviously that's why we're interested in looking at them but it also means that a lot of analysis is needed before we can make any concrete proposals so we

want to keep looking at those, depending on what kinds of designs we come up with there are opportunities to potentially pair that with some kind of additional bicycle facility. Again, we'll be needing to look for funding to start that study process.

A couple of notes about Fulton because this is something that Richard asked me specifically and there are some access points to the park. These are not from our projects but from other work going on from the signals group at SFMTA so we're adding new signals at 28<sup>th</sup>, 33<sup>rd</sup>, 37<sup>th</sup>, making improves to the signal at 43<sup>rd</sup> including adding a left turn arrow which enable people to get from Fulton onto Chain of Lakes as well as increasing the size of the signal itself which is something that we found in this city makes people better able to see and therefore better able to comply. And then there's also going to be new pedestrian [unintelligible] at 30<sup>th</sup> and 36<sup>th</sup> where I think there's no pedestrian signal right now.

[unintelligible]

**Chair:** We have a few questions. I'll start with Nick Belloni then Mark Scheuer and Richard Rothman.

**Nick Belloni:** [unintelligible] The one-way is not really that good of an idea. One of the reasons is you've got two schools up on top on 30<sup>th</sup>, on the edge of 30<sup>th</sup>, you have Presidio and you have Washington. You're going to move all that traffic to other routes going up to the schools. Trust me there's a lot, I see it in the morning every morning. I live on 30<sup>th</sup> and Balboa. That is one. This is the first I've heard of this and I again live on 30<sup>th</sup> and Balboa [unintelligible]. That doesn't really make me happy. And I'm [unintelligible]. So these are already things that sound bad about that because that's a major, major change that will affect people going to school, people that try to cross northeast. When I have the concerts that go in Golden Gate Park [unintelligible] complaints I get not being able to cross north or south and those are not like when Sunday Streets is there two or three years ago they had that add to try to stop traffic at Chain of Lakes. That's was one of the biggest complaints I've heard in a long time. You can ask Dana how bad that was. You start clogging up the north-south crossing you're basically blocking anybody from the north to get to the south and that becomes a major issue. Then what are you doing? You're isolating a complete neighborhood from the rest of the city. That's not a good idea.

**Miriam Sorell:** In terms of the [unintelligible] compared with the spot improvements, the raised crosswalks and speed humps we're pretty much—we're pretty much ready to go. We want to have this upcoming opportunity to hear from the community but the 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be a little more work so this is what when we're starting to talk about it.

**Nick Belloni:** The stop sign idea is a great idea and I think I told you that when we started this whole thing the stop sign is a great idea and I think that's probably the best idea before that corridor is just put a stop sign there and enforce bicycles from stopping, that will stop the bicycles from going when the cars turn. I mean that's how [unintelligible].

**Miriam Sorell:** I think we have reached out to the [unintelligible] so we're follow up again.

**Toks Ajike:** So we started—we've just started outreach for the stakeholders with PROSAC [unintelligible].

**Miriam Sorell:** On Sunday we'll be requesting feedback on this idea so that's sort of where we're at. As I mentioned we choose 38<sup>th</sup> because of the closure patterns but also compared to the Chain of Lakes that actually has a through route across the park.

**Nick Belloni:** Oh yeah that's true but again you're talking about it's the schools that are the issue on that too.

**Mark Scheuer:** District 8. On the 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue are there stop signs on both the northwest and northeast corners of 30<sup>th</sup> and JFK?

**Miriam Sorell:** No.

**Mark Scheuer:** I think one should be put on the northeast corner because when you have bicycles coming downhill if they do a rolling stop someone making a left turn off of 30<sup>th</sup> onto JFK it's like asking for a disaster but if there was a stop sign there at least it would slow bicycles and also cars down at that intersection.

**Miriam Sorell:** The proposal would be for stop signs on all three approaches.

**Richard Rothman:** When I posted it next door the one comment I got was why 30<sup>th</sup> one-way and I just think if you do it I mean I agree with what Nick said cars will just go off on 30<sup>th</sup> or else they'll go down to Crossover and I think Crossover is more dangerous because you've got to go onto 25<sup>th</sup>. There's cause and effect so I don't know how much traffic is out there but it just seems people will want to turn and they'll either go 36<sup>th</sup> or go down further. Maybe on Fulton Street from 30<sup>th</sup> and 36<sup>th</sup> put a three-way light like you're going to do at 43<sup>rd</sup> so you have the traffic going the lights for north and south and east and west but have another light for left hand turns going west and south into the park. So there would be a dedicated left turn light on Fulton Street to go into the park. I appreciate about Fulton Street I still think there needs to be more done and thank you for looking into it about the crosswalks.

The other comment one of our neighbors had is on Chain of Lakes and JFK is to put crosswalks across JFK. There's no curb ramps there anyway.

**Miriam Sorell:** Yes, that's a location when in our next phase when we try to get money we will add crosswalks.

**Richard Rothman:** Finally, when you analyze the date you just got today can you send it out to us?

**Miriam Sorell:** Yes.

**Richard Rothman:** Was there any data on Fulton Street since you put up the speed humps in?

**Chair:** Anybody else? I have one, I'd like to pick up on Richard's question if that's okay. The last time you guys were here we actually asked you specifically, there was a very specific ask for data related to the changes. What you're saying to us now is you received that data today and it's inconclusive. So I have grave concerns and I think that they might as well in how much money might be spent without any kind of conclusive data. Do you feel like after these changes you're bringing to us are implemented will you be able to come back to us and say yeah I've actually noticed a decrease or we noticed that the median speed was down? I think what we're looking for is some sort of tangibles. I understand the Mayor wants to get this done.

**Miriam Sorell:** So the speed bump absolutely 100 percent the speed is down. The speed has dropped.

**Chair:** What about the accidents?

**Miriam Sorell:** So collision data takes about five years to get anything truly significant. So the only part that was inconclusive is about the volume. Like what we're seeing is that the day to day volumes or month to month volumes are such that there's so many other factors that go into whether somebody decides to drive on a certain day or month. One thing I think we definitely want to do is try to collect the data the same month but even year over year the economy and where jobs are located and all these things affect the volume. Another thing that we tried to look at for Fulton was there's some aggregated data provided by cell phone usage and the only thing that we saw in the couple months that we looked at was that congestion went down which again doesn't actually make any sense to be related to our speed humps.

**Nick Belloni:** There's a lot of construction going on Fulton.

**Miriam Sorell:** Do you know if that was MTA construction?

**Richard Rothman:** Public works.

**Chair:** I think we all want the same thing. We're all going for the same items. Maybe what would be helpful for us since specifically I know this particular presentation is important to certain members specific to those outside Sunset-Richmond District. Maybe you come back in a few months once you've had a chance to look and implement some of these changes because I think it does speak to other areas, it speak to McLaren, it speaks to other parks that need this attention that Golden Gate Park is getting. So I would just ask as we start to hear more about these changes that at some point whether it's the end of this year or early next year that you come back and visit us and say hey we've implemented this stuff, we've actually noticed some changes because of some of this stuff.

Let's go in order. Jordan, Wendy, Kim.

**Jordyn Aquino:** District 4. My first question is about the data. I wanted to know if the data that you're looking at is only specifically addressing traffic safety and traffic calming during commute hours or are you looking at the afternoons as well at the evenings?

**Miriam Sorell:** We do a 24-hour speed and volume count. So the vehicle volumes on a certain segment are taken for a 24-hour period. Typically we focus on Tuesday through Thursday. In the case of this project we've actually been trying to do Wednesday through Sunday because behavior in the park is so different on weekends. Unfortunately our contractor [unintelligible].

**Jordyn Aquino:** While I'm happy to hear that guys are working 24 hours in the park I would also recommend because you're specifically looking at MLK and JFK drive is over the weekdays there's so many things happening on the western side like the Beach Chalet soccer fields [unintelligible] survey responses if you looked at the type of recreation that's happening during the week. I go on Wednesday and the evening for my 6:00 to 10:00, it's always really crowded there, you don't only have families but you have soccer teams as well as Ubers dropping people off.

**Wendy Aragon:** District 1. So I'm looking at the Fulton changes and the new lights and pedestrian countdowns. How did you correspond that with what MUNI stops are more frequently used? I know I've almost been hit trying to cross Fulton on non-lights and I'm young and able-bodied. I'm not a senior or dragging little kids around with me and how the timing of these lights would impact that.

**Miriam Sorell:** I'm not on the signals group. That project was sort of an independent thing from the work that we've been doing. We've been looking at roads in the park. I know that our signals group is working at least with MUNI in terms of making those changes but I don't really know the details.

**Wendy Aragon:** I know that would be really interesting to have considering that in our neighborhood we have to cross those streets to get into the park and get the bus to go to work and I think that is actually really important.

**Kenneth Maley:** District 3. I don't know if this is a realistic question or not but I'm sure you'll tell me. Have you looked at more promotion on the MUNI lines to encourage more non-car visitors to the park? I mean you're got several major lines like the 5, the 31, the N Judah I think that traverse both north and south parallel to the park from downtown all the way to Ocean Beach and I'm wondering if more promotion on MUNI to encourage more non-car visitorship. I encounter a lot of visitors who constantly ask me or someone over here how do I get to Golden Gate Park and I'm wondering if we could consider maybe more of a promotion of public information on encouraging more MUNI traffic to the park. I don't see much advertising or promotion or marketing to take the bus to the park but I would think that maybe might be a possible assistant if not so much the interior part but at least maybe in terms of car traffic.

**Miriam Sorell:** I think that sounds good in theory but it's not my area of expertise.

**Chair:** Just to your point because I think that's an amazing, excellent idea. I mentioned it to Richard because of his relationship with the Supervisor which does actually reside in that District, perhaps she could [unintelligible] even in her own district as it relates to MTA.

**Kenneth Maley:** The information center at Powell and Market or any other opportunities. Even on your 30-day pass or 3-day pass mention a little blurb in it somewhere that says. You know, so many people want to go to the park not just locals but I think non-locals and international visitors.

**Chair:** I think it's an easy fix with the limited budget it could be something that could be implemented easily.

**Kenneth Maley:** And we produce a lot of material anyway.

**Chair:** Any other questions? I'm going to ask if there's any public comment on this item?

**Nancy Cross:** I'm not sure where I might fit in but I have in mind it's a park project that I would like to talk a little about that I think will have a safety and serve people that don't have a car to get out to Golden Gate Park but wait for a bus if there was a comfortable waiting place. Is this the time for me to mention that or does it fit better later?

**Chair:** I would say it fits better at the end. We have a session that's not listed on the agenda and you can certainly raise that then. Thank you very much.

All right, so we're going to move on to our next agenda item. This is Item 6. I would like to preface this item by saying that the person who is going to present it Tokes Sugeekay is somebody who I find to be a doer. Tokes is somebody who I find if I can't get somebody to answer a call or do something that the Department promised to do they send Toks. And so I will just start with that in saying welcome to PROSAC, thank you for attending.

Toks, I will tell you that we have asked for this presentation for quite a long time because it is very important item. I'm sure there will be a lot of question and answer. [unintelligible] Today is not that day. We are here for informational presentation and we look forward to hearing what you have to say.

**Toks Ajike:** Thanks everyone. I am a project manager with the Capital Division. I think I've been with the Capital District for about ten years, give or take. My background is as an architect. I went into more development in the last five or six years.

I'm going to try to keep the presentation relatively not too long so that I can really attend your questions because I know you have a lot of them for me today. In trying to sort of talk to you today I sort of tried to develop this framework or how we approach all our construction projects. There's sort of like three main bodies that sort of govern the way we deliver our projects on our team. [unintelligible] One is being proactive. Actually really planning ahead. The other one is collaboration and that means collaboration between us, the construction team, the project team, and our stakeholders. Last, but not least is the quality of work, that's very important, that sort of governs the way we approach our work on a daily basis. We instill this in the project managers that come to work for us. These are the values that we repeat when we start on construction projects and design projects.

So as part of that, the first thing I said was being proactive and you will see in the first sort of bullet point that I pointed out is what we do pre-construction before we actually start construction, in order to actually do the work you actually have to [unintelligible] to get there. And so putting bad data in it's going to be bad data that comes out. So that's why we take this very seriously. And some of our pre-construction work is actually very rigorous, this is between the project manager, the design team, and also our structural maintenance yard who are the ones that are sort of managing this project. [unintelligible] And also feedback from our public stakeholders also.

So the first thing that you see is having accurate sort of existing condition analysis and what I mean by that is when we start our projects we try to get surveys for the projects for accuracy to know the extent of the property line, to know what the elements are that are on the project site. [unintelligible] that's another one that's very important. The reason that is important is because one, it determines what we can actually put on the site and how we sort of approach the design so let's say we're putting up a new building, we want to make sure this building would be able to stand up for a long, long time and those parameters sort of determine how the foundation is designed, how robust the foundation system is for it to last long.

The other part that we do is also structural analysis and what I mean by that is getting a structural engineer to go into a building to actually do a structural analysis of the existing building and that determines how you approach the design for the project.

The other thing that we do prior to going out to send these projects out to bid is what I call structural reviews and specifications. What I'm saying here is that the [unintelligible] established during this review is very important, the choice of the products that we choose for the project, the materials, the requirements for substitution are all set during this period and it's important we carry that knowledge throughout the project.

The other thing that we do is also we have an independent peer review of our drawings before they actually go out to bid which is done by either another maybe an architect who is not involved in the team so that this independent fresh set of eyes is looking at the drawings and sometimes that person is looking at this project like as a contractor like is it actually doable the way you're asking. We've got a lot of really good feedback from this and the reason this is important is when we don't do enough of this analysis prior to going out and fixing our drawings is that when we start the construction the existing conditions are different and when the existing conditions are different it causes delays for the project. Delays transfers to more money for the project that should be going in the actual construction instead of fixing something. So that's why it's so important. It mitigates schedule and it mitigates cost.

The other portion of this is contractor evaluation. I know that this is something Steffen and I have talked about before in 2016 there was a new ordinance that was passed by the city that requires new contractors to be evaluated for all the projects. It's going to be done in phases whereby phase one sort of collects this basic some of information for the project like the contractor, the sub-contractors, sort of an objective way or looking at it. The phase two portion of this is that the city is consulting with a vendor that is going to be [unintelligible] it should be

done by January, 2018, and hopefully my understanding is actually that evaluation becomes public and we'll be able to go in there and evaluate and see what the evaluation of these contractors are. That's my understanding.

The other thing that is sort of important is we also look at contractor experience and expertise when it comes to some of these projects, especially specialized work. We're doing a project at Golden Gate Park, the Conservatory of Flowers where we're sort of [unintelligible] all around. This is really specialized work so no one can just come up the street and say I can do this work. We're putting documents together, we require that this kind of person has done this type of work—has worked on these projects.

Going into construction some of the things I do is also adopted as a city family is that we encourage [unintelligible] on a lot of our projects, that's sort of important for various reasons. One it's sort of conducted by a mutual facilitator that's not in the city family so it's someone that comes from the outside that the contractor and the city chooses from the list of certified facilitators that facilitates the project. We adopt a project charter, we adopt a resolution ladder to resolve disputes along the way so when disputes occur it raises the framework to resolve the disputes. In most cases that disputes come to me because it starts [unintelligible]. When it cannot be resolved at that level it comes to me at some point when they cannot resolve it. It helps us to minimize the managed risks. It promotes collaboration between the city team and the contractor because sometimes the [unintelligible] leads to bad projects just from experience. We develop strategies to solve the problems. It improves safety. It also schedules [unintelligible]. The Construction Institute actually put out some data out there that said projects [unintelligible] reduced cost by ten percent, even also reducing delivery time by quite a bit. So this is something we just started with the city about—I think this is the third year so you'll start to see that.

Quality control and quality assurance on the projects as I sort of talked about. We have an independent body that looks at for example we're pouring concrete, it's just not the [unintelligible] that's looking at this, an independent certified body comes out to actually take samples to make sure that the concrete has the strength that it was designed to.

We also have inspectors who are trained, DPW, who actually look at the projects who are doing ongoing inspections on a daily basis. The architects come out also to look at the work. So there's levels of quality control, quality assurance along the way. [unintelligible] is another way for us to assure that contractors are actually installing or putting together buildings or the sites the way that we've asked them to do, the sort of detailed, really specific submittals that they have to make to us. We have meetings on site to keep track of the progress or work. That's sort of important. If there's questions on the project along the way this is where we discuss it, we try to resolve it at that point.

Cost control and change order review this is another one that's sort of very dear to us as a team. We're very aggressive in the way we sort of review the changes that come during construction. As a team we [unintelligible] trying to mitigate costs for the project. We do construction schedule analysis. For example we have a project that starts, there is an issue, we work with a contractor to mitigate some scheduled delays, maybe we sequence their work around different areas while we resolve the issues on this side just to mitigate scheduled delays. We're checking

on them to ensure that they are leading all of their procurement dates for the project, for all the elements that are coming into the project we're checking, there's a check that we have to do to ascertain they're actually meeting those procurement dates and to the point where we're sometimes asking for a FedEx tracking number. I'd like to see it. Because they will tell you it's coming. We're actually we're very serious about that.

[unintelligible] is another one that's important. Steve, I know you and I we talked about that quite a bit on Lafayette. We developed a checklist that sort of provides before we actually start the closeout. [unintelligible] an inspection has to occur from the project team to ascertain that the work is actually being done before they can actually get that [unintelligible]. There's also a review that is done by our Structural Maintenance Yard, this is the team that's in Golden Gate Park [unintelligible] invite them to spent a day to tell us about the project. [unintelligible]

And also a close-out is another important one. Close-out [unintelligible] providing the warrantees, the owner's manuals [unintelligible] to ensure that the punch-list is done. We hold about five percent [unintelligible] holding about fifty grand to ensure that they come out and actually do the work and complete it. If they do not do it we use that money to fix the problem. [unintelligible].

Another thing just to wrap another thing I think sort of adds to this list I gave you is what do we do post-construction. We are developing a lesson learned sort of approach to this project such that the lessons we learned on a particular project sort of informs the next project that comes along. A good example is [unintelligible].

Also, products. The products that we're actually putting on some of the sites maybe [unintelligible] three, four, five years from now and when we see it happen that the particular product does not work that product [unintelligible] saying we do not want to specify this product. So those are some of the strategies that we are doing to improve our projects.

I'll be happy to answer any questions you have.

**Chair:** Thank you for the presentation. I'll start with the conversation about standards and quality amongst products that are purchased on behalf of [unintelligible]. Who does the initial analysis and who has the final signoff for those products? The reason I ask is because sometimes there seems to be a want in the design phase to appease the maintenance side and so Operations is brought into the conversation but who has the end-all, be-all. I think that's my first question. When it comes to choosing is it hardscape or DG or what's the component is that an Operations decision or a Capital decision?

**Toks Ajike:** That's a good question and a question that project managers take very seriously and it's also challenging sometimes. When it comes to the actual let's say the irrigation for a project for example we have project standards that we have that the [unintelligible]. So for example we use [unintelligible] they've worked well over time and two, the parts for them are much more readily available. There's good support for [unintelligible] product that we've seen over time so that's an example of how that is done.

But when it comes to like is it DG or is it Country for example in a lot of cases that is done through a community-driven process because I think there's more [unintelligible] versus something that is much more—

**Chair:** Let's take it off the design element and make it about something. So I'll give you one example. In Lafayette we have a building that was spec'd by Operations by the MSA or PSA who retired immediately upon opening the park to which the new PSA walked up and went what's that? And I know how much that building cost, it cost over \$100,000 out of a \$1 million fund. So ten percent went to this thing that was pointed to by operations saying we absolutely have to have this, is there a voice or reason in Capital that says do we really have to have this or could we use [unintelligible] or is it that Operations basically says we can't operate without a [unintelligible] and you guys have to [unintelligible].

**Toks Ajike:** Actually there is a [unintelligible] a long dialog sometimes such that sometimes when we can't solve it at our level I sort of raise it up between Denny Kern and maybe Phil or Dawn and say is this a policy, we're making a policy decision here for a site, not just for two years, forever. Is this something we want to do? So there is a long dialog on that.

**Chair:** So assuming that at a stalemate, you know [unintelligible] wants one thing, Operations wants something else, Capital looks at it and says guys you know what this is too much money, this shouldn't be. So there is you're saying at a high level of discussion between head of Capital and the Head of Operations and the project manager to determine whether this is viable.

**Toks Ajike:** Right.

**Chair:** Beautiful, that's an answer that I was looking for. Thank you. You said that phase one collects the data and then in effect when you talking about [unintelligible] work performance by contractors that you feel that this database will be open to the public?

**Toks Ajike:** I think so. That's still being discussed. I think so.

**Chair:** What we did hear was I'm a contractor, I have been graded for work performance a dozen times, what happens now?

**Toks Ajike:** So that's a good question. There is a task force that was put together by the Chapter 6 Departments which is MTA, Recreation and Park, DPW, who started thinking this through. Also with—also the City Attorney's Office because there has to be fairness around it because [unintelligible] can't just say that contractor did not do the work and that's a [unintelligible] it has to be defensible. And those details are still being worked out. I think I can come back to you at the end of the year and give you hopefully I'm thinking actually they will have some sort of framework of what that evaluation would look like.

**Chair:** I think it would be important for us to know what those standards are, to know what the Department and the other Departments might choose because again it would be helpful for us as a committee to know it's not just Recreation and Park, MTA won't work with them, DPW

won't work with them. Like if in fact this does become a situation where you can identify contractors it sets everyone up for a [unintelligible] situation.

**Toks Ajike:** And in order to get to this place as you're aware we are also engaging with the contracting community so that there's [unintelligible].

**Chair:** Sure. And again [unintelligible].

**Male Speaker:** What did you set up to evaluate this contractor stance, there's a working group?

**Chair:** Well, they're creating a database that will allow for them to put information.

**Toks Ajike:** Right. And then there's also a working group that's being put together.

**Male Speaker:** For all the different Departments.

**Toks Ajike:** Different Departments that are working on it.

**Male Speaker:** [unintelligible] these are all that spend money and hire contractors?

**Toks Ajike:** Yes, exactly. So DPW, Recreation and Park, MTA, the Airport and the Port.

**Chair:** I'd be interested to see what they talk about. Okay, I'm going to wrap this up really quick, I have two more quickies. The stakes—and there are some and we all know anybody who's been through an RFP or any design process I don't care if you renovated your house or whatever there's going to be small mistakes. For the sake of just keeping it logical to Recreation and Park Lafayette's renovation had a few mistakes, measurement mistakes, problems with certain paths not being where they should have been. The community asked me, they said you're the President of Friend of Lafayette Park, you're on PROSAC, what can you do? And my answer to them is the really simple answer, [unintelligible] the city which we know is never going to happen, we know that can't work.

So I know you talked about retention and I'll get to my thoughts in retention. Tell me what happens in the Department's process when you've identified a mistake whether it was due to the architect who designed it or the contractor who built it how do you mitigate that mistake? What is the process once the Capital Division to say it wasn't there, it was supposed to be here. The money to repour it [unintelligible]. I just want to understand.

**Toks Ajike:** And that's why this preconstruction portion of this that I gave you is important. We are taking much more seriously having peer reviews of the drawings by another body or another team that was not involved in the design that gives a fresh look on the design. Then if it's the contractor that made a mistake we issue a non-conforming installation document to him that tells him this has been installed wrong, he needs to fix it in let's say ten days or something. So that is part of the project documents whereby until it is resolved it's something that we carry along the way and if he doesn't fix it we can take it from the [unintelligible].

**Chair:** That bring us to my last one, the retention. So for everybody on this committee who is not aware of that term, retention is the money that's kept by the payor to basically make sure that the payee does their job. I find—and this is me speaking as an individual, as a member of this committee—that there are certain contractors [unintelligible] as throw-away money. In other words there are certain items that are on that list that are the punch list at the end and the Department is holding the retention money but the contractor may or may not want to do those items and so the reality is the community suffers the most—and Tokes correct me if I'm wrong—that last five or ten percent or the bells and whistles. They are the hey we're supposed to sod under this, hey we needed those finishing things that never showed up. So my concern is if you can identify a contractor who doesn't care about the retention, knows full well a \$1 million project that ah, 50, 100 grand—my concern is how do you spend that? How do you prioritize when you know that the retention is going to be left over, there is going to be some money left over of the things that didn't get done how does the Department define what those priorities are?

**Toks Ajike:** First of all the priority number one is to [unintelligible].

**Chair:** So that's where you start. You were supposed to [unintelligible], the contractor didn't do it, we have some money so we're going to use that.

**Toks Ajike:** Right. You're supposed to put [unintelligible].

**Chair:** So you will go ahead and hire another contractor to do work out of the retention.

**Toks Ajike:** Yes.

**Chair:** I think it's important for the committee to understand that the Department has a fix, right, that if the contractor doesn't live up then they have the ability to say no we're not giving you this balance of the money and we are going to direct that money to other things.

**Toks Ajike:** On a more interesting case, and this has happened to me maybe once or twice, whereby I notified the contractor that they need to fix it and when they refuse to fix it I also notify I write a subsequent letter saying that I'm going to contact their bonding company. That perks them up big time because without bonding they can't work so that really—they don't like when you contact their bonding company. The other thing that happens is actually once in a while I get letters from their bonding company asking how is this project going and I have to be truthful.

**Chair:** I think it's important and I just want to say thank you for being very transparent about these answers because I think I'm speaking it but I think that on the minds of some of these folks that have gone through large capital projects they understand these concerns. My main goal for talking about this is so that the next projects are better and it's very clear to me that the Capital Division wants that to be the case, they want to hear from stakeholders going not good, this was not a good experience for me, how do we learn from this to make it better for other people. I think you've been forthcoming with those answers. I also think that you're caught between what we would call a rock and a hard place because you're trying to make it work in the scope of what

you have to deal with. I would certainly say from my own perspective that I hope that the future is better. I think you've been particularly a project manager as a whole for the Capital Division have been put in a lot of compromised situations, you're the public relations people of projects which necessarily that isn't your job and I think that puts you in a hard position with the community, the community has really high expectations, they're let down when something doesn't go right and you guys become the scapegoat because you're the only face they know. And so I just wanted to say thank you for clarifying some of these things, it's certainly helpful to me. And I will say it's Ken, Robert, thank you.

**Kenneth Maley:** District 3. I'd like to address a couple of comments to the committee to my colleagues. Given the time situation and what I perceive that there is many more questions to ask you all have a contact sheet with email and phone numbers for each other and since the Chair has appointed a subcommittee to look at contracting issues the questions we can't get to today I would appreciate getting emails about them so that the committee will have your input into areas that we decide to look at and I'm confident that Tokes will be available to us to discuss some of those issues. So I'm going to try to limit my questions just to one or two but with the caveat or disclosure that I'm mostly concerned about this because my park, Washington Square Park, is about to enter a multimillion project. It's been described or an RFP put or we're in the free contract stages so we have great concerns particularly after some of the comments that I've gathered and other committee members have gathered in terms of some of the difficulties with contractors. So I'll save all the rest of that until we get together as a group but I do have one question, it's very easy for us to have a lot of input if you will about bad projects, bad contractors, things that go wrong, and I know the Department must issue a significant number of contracts. So is there a way to evaluate the number of bad experiences out of a total number that are good. In other words are we looking at ten percent of the contracting work goes askew or astray where maybe 50 percent of 70 or 80 percent in the scale of things go better than others?

**Toks Ajike:** Are you talking about the retention?

**Kenneth Maley:** No, in general which in my view involved the selection of the contractor, the quality of the six Departments skills in evaluating. I don't think it's all just in the contractor, I think in the evaluation process within the Department there's a skill set that needs to be looked at in who these people are who are evaluating these things and making these decisions because it's not just the contractor it's the Department problems as well. Does that make sense?

**Toks Ajike:** It makes sense. I've not done that analysis. [unintelligible] perhaps out of every ten [unintelligible] contractor.

**Kenneth Maley:** Well, I hear about Bowman. I saw them the other day, they were doing some work for DPW out on Potrero. They were a contractor at one of our colleague's parks, a contractor on the park that we just toured which was South Park. I have also hear from professionals who have worked with the company that described them as one who's major skill is how to scam the system. Now how does that contractor continue to get contracts that must have totaled from the different Departments in the millions of dollars but yet they're known to be their best skill is how to scam projects.

**Chair:** Ken, I'm going to take this because one thing I do know for sure is that he can't speak on anything that he's engaged with and they are working with Bowman right now so I don't think he can really—

**Kenneth Maley:** I'm not asking about Bowman, I'm using them as an example.

**Chair:** You just named them though.

**Kenneth Maley:** I know I did.

**Chair:** I don't think he can really answer to that.

**Kenneth Maley:** Tiffany can delete that if she likes.

**Chair:** If you wanted to say contractor in place of that name.

**Kenneth Maley:** I agree, I withdraw that specificity.

**Toks Ajike:** That's a very good question. Here's what I would say to that. All our projects, the bidding process it's a public one. The public bidding process it's phased on the lowest bid. This is a law by the State of California that the winning bidder has to be the lowest bid and one of the things I think the city is also looking at is a concept called best value and what that means is that when you evaluate a proposal that's put forth by a contractor perhaps maybe sixty percent of that evaluation is based on qualifications and then forty percent is on costs. I think that might help to mitigate whereby some people are good at mitigating good contracts. So that's one thing that the city is looking at. But I would just leave it at that.

**Kenneth Maley:** I'll say the rest for the committee.

**Richard Rothman:** District 1. [unintelligible] Since you're here, when we went to visit South Park the one thing that disturbed me is that there were no bathrooms there. I think all Recreation and Park facilities should have bathrooms so I really think that's important. You don't have to answer it but you know it should be there. And then the other thing is Monica said—I don't know if you're in her chain of command or not, she sent me an email about the Mother's Building. I won't go into detail but I hope you will look at it and maybe we can talk about it.

**Toks Ajike:** I'm just make a quick comment on whether or not there's a bathroom at South Park. The design process itself was a community driven design. So during the design process if there's [unintelligible] oh I want in addition to a park I want a restroom, it probably wouldn't happen and we probably didn't have money for it. So that's sort of the way it works. I know there are places where there used to be restrooms where there are restrooms now and that is also community driven.

**Stacy Bradley:** Just to follow up, that is also really an impact about the scope of the project. I think the money that it takes to put in a restroom it's really high so there isn't always money available for a restroom. Sometimes there is, sometimes there's not. So if it's not an identified need it's something that can come later but they are incredibly expensive.

**Robert Brust:** District 8. One quick question. About the retention, how often do you think that happens in your ten years or so in the Department, how often has the contractor just walked away from an additional project?

**Toks Ajike:** I think I've seen it maybe twice. Actually I was astounded it by it because the guy just sort of walked away and it was a relatively small project.

**Robert Brust:** What do they do, do they sent you a letter?

**Toks Ajike:** No, they just sort of didn't respond. They sort of just left. It was an elevator project they did. I think the amount was maybe \$16,000 and never heard from them. I told them to come out and fix it and they didn't respond to my calls so we went and took the money and fixed it.

**Chair:** Just one quick thing. I know with Lafayette that there were a handful of things that didn't get done on the punch list and that the contractor did in fact not complete those items and that the Department hired another contractor in this case as it were to finish the items that the original contractor did not finish. Would you not say that was walking away from the retention?

**Toks Ajike:** I think [unintelligible] came back to do was additional work that was not in the contract for Lafayette, the current design. So there were some scope items that were never part of the original bid. We wanted to finish the project with Bowman so that [unintelligible].

**Chair:** You did say a clean contract.

**Toks Ajike:** I don't mean it like that, no. I take that back. [laughs] A new contract.

**Robert Brust:** So they got the full amount of money? They pretty much said that they fulfilled their contractual obligations according to the specs?

**Toks Ajike:** Yes. So just to let you know that decision is not just make by me. So that decision is something that's [unintelligible] by the resident engineer [unintelligible] by the landscape architect. Also it's guided by the construction manager. So it's just not me saying oh you can walk away. They just don't walk away, that doesn't happen.

**Chair:** Ideally it's the project manager's ultimate responsibility to keep the contractor at the table and keep everybody happy with the outcome.

**Toks Ajike:** That is correct.

**Chair:** Okay. Theresa.

**Theresa Factora:** District 11. What percent of projects are we [unintelligible]?

**Toks Ajike:** I don't have that.

**Theresa Factora:** Is it written in every contract?

**Toks Ajike:** Yes, it is.

**Theresa Factora:** Would you say it's more than half? Would you say it's less than half?

**Toks Ajike:** It's less than half.

**Theresa Factora:** [unintelligible]

**Toks Ajike:** Yes, we use that all the time to get them to do work.

**Theresa Factora:** And also back to the contract evaluation, the database, I think contractors do tend to blame their subs so that should be related to their general contractor as well and maybe something to keep in mind.

**Toks Ajike:** Actually that's a very good observation because I have participated in a couple of conversations with the task force and it's now been determined how the general contractor's [unintelligible]. My take on it is that it's important to keep the general contractor sort of responsible for the subcontractor because I think when you remove that responsibility from him it's going to be excuses galore. Oh, the subcontractor did not do the work. It's his responsibility to make sure. [simultaneous comments] It should be their responsibility, that's my personal approach.

**Theresa Factora:** Is there a timeframe around the retention in the punch list?

**Toks Ajike:** Yes.

**Theresa Factora:** You were mentioning a park and it seems like those last little things get stretched out.

**Toks Ajike:** Right, that is correct. In most projects it's between about 45 to 60 days when they have to fix it, we try to hold them to that.

**Wendy Aragon:** I'm a general contractor so I know a little bit about everything on here. So one of the things I have a question about is we're evaluating contractor experience but also the person who has a peer review we saw what happened when DBI used peer review in the Millennium Tower and special inspections, geo-tech report, those things can be greatly delayed getting those special inspection reports back and that costs money and that costs time. The other thing too about with the restrooms how is that not like an ADA issue to not have accessible restrooms nearby a park even though it's a community-driven process?

**Toks Ajike:** Regarding the question of [unintelligible] inspections the resident engineers they do a good job of scheduling those so they need inspections, they are required to give us 48 hours

notice so we schedule those to come out. It's very rare that an issue would come out. I've seen it happen but usually we have a plan B to get somebody else to come forward to do that.

**Wendy Aragon:** So the peer review also like how you evaluate people to do peer review as well.

**Toks Ajike:** Right, right. So we use a wide variety of experts in the field, they could be architects, they could be construction managers who have done some of the work and we have a pool that we pool from and tap into so it's not just one particular person, we make sure there's diverse eyes looking at it.

**Wendy Aragon:** And then obviously the code issue about not having bathrooms. That just blows my mind. Isn't that like just from an ADA code standpoint not having restrooms.

**Toks Ajike:** Right, so you mean not having restrooms at parks?

**Wendy Aragon:** I would think that you would have to have it at a park per code.

**Toks Ajike:** I don't think so, it's not park of the code. If you do have a restroom you're required to make sure it's accessible.

**Wendy Aragon:** I just feel that like I don't know maybe because I work at [unintelligible].

**Toks Ajike:** That's the commercial code is sort of different from our park code.

[simultaneous comments]

**Toks Ajike:** I'll give you an example. We just finished Alamo Square. We put in an accessible restroom.

**Chair:** It didn't have an accessible restroom.

**Toks Ajike:** It did not, exactly. It had restrooms that were not accessible and we made sure that when we finish a project we added an accessible restroom. [unintelligible] but it was not on an accessible route so we put [unintelligible]. But in cases where there are new restrooms [unintelligible]. But buildings of course.

**Wendy Aragon:** That would just make sense to me in a space that's public access that you wouldn't have that as well.

**Toks Ajike:** I'm not making this up.

**Wendy Aragon:** Yeah, I know.

**Toks Ajike:** The reason I'm also saying that is also all our projects go through the Department of Building Inspection. They would catch this, oh Toks you do not have a restroom here.

**Chair:** [unintelligible] I'm sure between Stacy and Tokes they would know [unintelligible] but I agree with you.

**Wendy Aragon:** I was really shocked that's not a code issue.

**Chair:** That's not a part of it. So I'm going to move on to another question, Ana Gee.

**Ana Gee:** District 6. Thank you for bringing up the restroom issue and I want to talk a lot about that because [unintelligible] but I want to ask since District 6 seems to have a very slim budget of parks when you were talking about the [unintelligible] how much a percentage are they taking from the actual budget?

**Toks Ajike:** That's a good question.

**Ana Gee:** Is there an [unintelligible] going on about how many resolutions [unintelligible] when there are conflicts?

**Toks Ajike:** Good questions. So how much are we spending on partner? Depending on the body of the project it's usually between \$5000 to \$10,000 and what happens is the contractor pays for half of it and we pay for half of it. So if we're doing South Park if it's \$5000 will we pay \$2500 [unintelligible].

**Ana Gee:** [unintelligible]

**Toks Ajike:** That's a budget we've set and we've never sort of exceeded it on those projects. And then you had another question?

**Ana Gee:** [unintelligible]

**Toks Ajike:** So we just started this program going on two years now so we are sort of actually gathering that data. I think it's something I can come back and talk to you about. The DPW is actually managing that program. I can talk to them about that. But being I was just sort of attached to it, I've been in a lot of meetings or a lot of projects where there is partners and I'm, a proponent of that because it promotes collaboration, it promotes—actually it sets a framework to solve its own problems. So I'm a proponent for it.

**Ana Gee:** I want to make it clear, so that \$5000 is coming out of the Department?

**Toks Ajike:** That is correct. And I think I know what you're getting at. On projects there is an announcement out there on projects that use partnering there is also under the savings that is garnered from it. So for example past projects that we've worked on where there are no sort of partnering framework there are disputes on the project, how do those disputes get solved? And

where there are disputes causes delays in the project it also adds to cost. So if you have \$35,000 to solve, to set [unintelligible] you're paying like a hundred grand for delay on the project. So that's the way, that's the like the big picture on how we're looking at it. We think it's a good investment for projects that are complex.

**Chair:** You said this is new for you guys?

**Toks Ajike:** Yes.

**Chair:** Will you be able to provide us with some information at some point?

**Toks Ajike:** Yes.

**Chair:** Because I think again you've offered to come back and visit us maybe in six months.

**Toks Ajike:** Right.

**Chair:** I think some of this info—our working group will certainly have questions and I think it would be great to get you to come back and just talk about some of these things that are in process.

**Toks Ajike:** And I also referenced the Construction Institute analysis that was done that talks about the savings that comes from partnering projects.

**Chair:** Are there any other questions from the committee for Tokes? Okay, before I open it to public comment I want to thank you for coming, [applause] Is there any public comment?

**Kasey Asberry:** I'm Kasey Asberry from District 6 but my question doesn't pertain to District 6.

**Chair:** I'm sorry, you can't direction ask staff a question.

**Kasey Asberry:** Thank you for the clarification. So maybe this is a question for the working group, maybe it's something to take up later. In Mr. Ajike's presentation, very fine, very exhaustive, I wanted to see where—at what point in the projects the criteria for sustainability and resilience is set and where the primary checkpoints are throughout the project for sustainability and resilience measures throughout construction projects. And this is a risk management issue as well as a quality control and delivery issue.

**Chair:** I would certainly leave it to him if he wants to answer that. I would just say from our committee's standpoint in the preplanning phase, maybe even in the acquisition phase for us we're looking at those items are incredibly important to this committee whether that be maintenance, sustainability of products used, our goal—and I'm just speaking for the old committee that PROSAC was, now we have a bunch of new members who I assume are probably on the same mindset but for us we put up those little circles number one on our list was is this park going to live out its life longer [unintelligible]. And so I think certainly from

PROSAC's purview, probably at the Commission's purview, before these projects even get funded and start hitting the ground, before they get into the capital planning phase that discussion is going on, whether it's held to the high standard the project manager holds it to is a different question and I think that's what the question is.

**Kasey Asberry:** It's not only about products, it's also about things like [unintelligible] so it's a broad—

**Chair:** We certainly talk about when they wanted to acquire 900 Innes and we thought hey this site could be irreparably tainted, why would we buy it? Well, the Department had due diligence and be able to come back and say [unintelligible]. So again, those questions are being asked by the city, they are being asked by stakeholders in certain communities. Your question at a higher level is where's the Department step in and say this is a priority, this is on our checklist as knowing that this is—and maybe Stacy you could answer rather than Tokes because you're looking at it from the top down.

**Stacy Bradley:** Anything we do we try to incorporate that through all our projects and all the elements of sustainability we work with other agencies to make sure that we're following whatever guidance the city has set up. The PUC has a lot of different guidelines on making sure we're sustainable with storm water management, with making sure our water conservation which actually is a project that's really interested in Tokes is working on they have a few—Alamo Square was one of those projects where we were able to cut down water usage by I think an unbelievable amount and that was one of our biggest water wasting parks and that one project helped us solve that problem so I would say from the Department's point of view this is a very important value that the Department holds, being sustainable and looking at ways of being responsible stewards of our public space. We try to incorporate it as much as we can in every project.

**Toks Ajike:** I would quickly add to that, actually as a matter of policy for the city it's actually in the Building Code that projects that we're working on of a certain size meet some [unintelligible] requirements. For example we just finished Glen Canyon. That project was designed to what I'm calling was an elite goal which [unintelligible] energy and design. That's a criteria that we're [unintelligible] through the project into finishing.

**Stacy Bradley:** We're also working on [unintelligible] certification, trying to get parks that certified but also are garden staff and operations are going through this certification to make sure that they're looking at taking care of our parks as responsibly as possible and then that [unintelligible] help design.

**Chair:** I'll just jump in again and say that I was at Francisco Reservoir meeting and one of the big conversation they had was it is 100 percent self-sufficient [unintelligible]. So that was built into the design before they even [unintelligible]. I do recall that was a big selling point. [unintelligible]. And so it is in the design phase, it is in the discussion phase with acquisitions. I think you can hear from all of us that it's a high priority.

**Kasey Asberry:** But it's not on this structure and that's why I was trying to call out that I know it's a high value in the city, I know it's a high value and ethical calling amongst all of us and I was rather trying to say it should be highlighted as part of the structure of the work that we're all doing because it's a really—oftentimes it's a hidden value that we don't elevate it enough to show that we're investing in it.

**Toks Ajike:** I probably could have added a few more items in terms of what we're doing.

**Chair:** Is there any other public comment? Being none, this Item is closed. All right, let's quickly go on to new business agenda setting. I know there are some people that would like to speak on items not listed on the agenda. Who would like to talk about new business items? This is not open to public comment, this is committee only please. So that's five so just like two minutes for each. Let's go Wendy, Jane.

**Wendy Aragon:** So I know that both my Supervisor at my nominating orientation had asked a little bit about this and there's a lot of new members here that maybe we could get an update on equity analysis and metrics.

**Chair:** I would like to say that the Department probably owes that to us but I would say that I would assume we will see that a little later in the year rather than immediately following what was prior to you coming on this committee months and months of that discussion. I'm not saying it's not important, I'm saying that the committee did spend quite a bit of time on that item. I don't think the Department would have a problem coming back in October or November and talking about it.

**Mark Scheuer:** District 8. I would like to put on the agenda a presentation by Recreation and Park on the latest considerations for putting syringe disposal boxes in parks. There was sort of a big front page story in the Examiner about a month ago about this and Phil Ginsburg responded that we need to get some data before we do anything. But at any rate I would really like to get with Recreation and Park, what their attitude is towards this.

**Chair:** I definitely think there are members of this committee that would like to know more about that. I would put that on new business, I think it's something that we can aggressively [unintelligible] when the Department is ready to make a presentation on that. Trevor.

**Trevor McNeil:** District 5 is up in arms about the failure to secure a permit for a Summer of Love concert/gathering. Last Sunday was originally the date they had been hoping for and a few other things. It was in the news and people are coming to talk to me. Of course District 5 not only bordered Golden Gate Park but is home to the Haight-Ashbury. Again, maybe this has already been talked to but I think some kind of an update might be appropriate. It is time sensitive, this is the anniversary of the Summer of Love. [unintelligible] I think it would be interesting to retrospectively in the fall circle back on the process because a lot of people are saying a lot of negative things about the permitting process and I think hearing that or not. I'm still new to this committee and I'm not sure if that's our purview.

**Chair:** I would certainly say that it's not directly our purview because we are not the Recreation and Park Commission and do not actually uphold or deny permits. On the record I'll say that I've been involved in this situation for quite a while as have Nick, as have all the members of the Department. I don't think any one of us can bring this to the table and say yeah this is an injustice that's being done. I think there were ample opportunities for the person that you're talking about to have presented his case. Now his case has been presented, it was turned down by the Recreation and Park, he was given another opportunity by the Department but did not present [unintelligible].

Trevor McNeil: [unintelligible]

**Chair:** We can certainly talk about it offline. I would be glad to discuss the process.

**Stacy Bradley:** Can I make a comment on that? I think actually the Recreation and Park Commission might be really informative. You can see past full Commission meetings and you can just watch that part which might be—I was at one of them and there was a few but I think there might be something again on this month maybe. The Commission for that particular issue might be informative.

**Trevor McNeil:** And that's what I've been telling community members who've been coming to me because I know this is not the first time so what I'm trying to do is sort of think about well is there a way that we can make for the future even if individuals ask for the permit I almost feel like [unintelligible] there has to be something, it's been fifty years.

**Chair:** I'll speak to that. We've actually had presentations on permitting by the head of that Department. I believe that each one of us—and again I'm speaking as an individual on this committee—I believe that each one of us has a right to obtain a permit. But there are rules and rules to building a building, etc. So those rules actually apply to all of us and it doesn't matter who you are, who you know or how long you've been involved, if they set the rules to the process and you don't follow the rules by sending a hand-drawn stage plot and saying okay Department everybody else gives you CAD drawings that are in spec with bathrooms indicated and 40,000 are going to be here. To me that's a denial of a permit and again I'm not saying—everybody should be held to the same standard. Whether those standards should be revisited could be new business, whether we want to discuss our thoughts about the permitting process but I think that's a much longer discussion.

**Nick Belloni:** There are newer standards than what was in years past. The newer standards are a lot more stringent, a lot more on the safety to deal with situations that we've seen across the world in the past couple of days. These are things that we put in place ten years ago with Outside Lands and it's been a long haul to get to where we are. Unfortunately some people are still stuck at the old standards and think those are what they should use.

**Chair:** And again I think it's valuable for a District 5 representative to say my stakeholders in my District are concerned about this and I would like to hear what the Department thinks. I'm sure that can be conveyed back to the powers that be and we'll see if we can't have a dialog.

**Richard Rothman:** I would just say I live right near the Polo Fields and I think besides having the event in the park it's also how it affects the neighborhood and I worked with since I've been on PROSAC with Recreation and Park to see if would get more transportation and less [unintelligible] like Nick has. You know, so it's a two-way, it's not only having the event in the park but also how it affects the neighborhood when the event is on. [unintelligible] I've worked with him, try to get more busses to come and so if the permits aren't right and I trust Recreation and Park staff, that's what their job is and if they feel the neighborhood isn't going to protected of the park is not going to protected then there shouldn't be an event.

**Nick Belloni:** [unintelligible] and that is the neighborhood that you're affecting.

**Chair:** Again, I don't think this is our purview but I think we could take up a conversation about permitting. Anybody else for new business? Robert.

**Robert Brust:** This is sort of old business. You've got two items on trash.

**Chair:** I have [unintelligible] because we just talked about trying to make that item next month.

**Robert Brust:** Do you want to combine it with the overall trash that's been sitting there for six months, waste management plan? I wouldn't mind that.

**Chair:** I'm certainly willing to marry those two items.

**Robert Brust:** Marry them. If the Recreation and Park wants to do it because they're trying all these new things in Dolores Park which I think they might want to discuss. Like they're doing recycling in Golden Gate Park but they have this three phase recycling with Dolores Park.

**Chair:** I think it would be interesting for us as a committee to understand how they are trying to tackle the never-ending pile of garbage that your park has and it would be an insight to any of us in terms of what we go back to our communities, out neighborhoods with, how you guys are dealing with it. I think that is—you guys are setting the stage for some other large park.

**Robert Brust:** Yeah, I mean as much as they talk about trash and all the pictures they don't really get into the details and they're fascinating, they are!

**Chair:** Not that I would like to spend a whole PROSAC meeting on trash I do think that it is a viable conversation for us. Tiffany, we've taken from this equity metrics at some point in the future, [unintelligible], potentially some conversation about permitting directly or indirectly to the Summer of Love and then trash. Is there any other new business? Is there any public comment on this item? Hearing none.

We are now done with new business before I get to announcements I know that Jane Weil has something that she would like to present as an item not listed on the agenda. I also have two other comments that are items not listened on the agenda and then we'll go to announcements.

**Jane Weil:** For the new member especially but to bring everybody else up to date too on what's happening mid Market. I'm sorry to keep coming back to you all the time about District 6 and mid Market but just to give you an idea of what we call mid Market because it's a little bit confusing in the sense that it's sort of Tenderloin and sort of SOMA. It's really this area in the middle. SOMA is huge, it goes way over to Mission Bay and all those other places but we're really talking about mid Market and the lack of parks there. So despite the wonderful TBL statistic that there are parks within ten minutes of everyone we have lots of plazas, we have UN Plaza, we really basically have no green space. This is Victoria Manalo Draves Park which is a wonderful green park actually, it's lovely, but it's quite far from anybody that lives up here in the Tenderloin. So I just wanted to kind of give you the framework of what we're talking about.

Just now on June 1<sup>st</sup> the Mayor's Office of Housing has submitted a proposal to the Federal Government to acquire a piece of property right in that area, right at 7<sup>th</sup> and Mission. This is the 9<sup>th</sup> District Court at Mission and 7<sup>th</sup> and this is the surface parking lot next door. The Federal Government has made it surplus property. They opened it up for proposals, the proposals were due on June 1<sup>st</sup>. The city is not the only person putting in a proposal so it is not a slam dunk that they'll get it but what upset me as soon as I heard about it was the fact that their proposal included no open space.

These are open spaces that are only open to the residents. So they are proposing high to mid-rise building for ex-homeless people which is a very important endeavor and there are actually some Federal Government laws that make that the highest priority but they're not including any open space at all that's open to the public other than this little sidewalk right here which is actually going to make it worse because it's a dead-end sidewalk and we know what happens in District 6 when you have that.

So I right away went to the Mayor's Office of Housing because they had not brought Recreation and Park into the conversation at all and basically this the site map of that project. So if we can get it down here this is Stevenson Alley, this is kind of skewed from what we just looked at. There's Mission Street, there's Market, 7<sup>th</sup> is along here. The property we're talking about is 150 feet wide and so my proposal to them was that we cut this front part off, we make that into some kind of park. And I'll show you Paley Park as a wonderful example from New York. But that we made this opening to Mission Street a park open to the public and we move the housing which is very needed without argument even though we are clustering it more and more on the 6<sup>th</sup> Street corridor and I don't have to tell you how much evidence there is about how green spaces improves people's mental health.

So if we're making more housing for people that are ex-homeless and often have mental health issues I think it's incumbent on all of us to have a voice for open space as part of that. So I'm just throwing it out here it's a possibility that they won't even get the bid but it's very likely that they will and I think it's really important that we all talk to our Supervisors, that we write letters to the Mayor and newspaper because if we don't get the open space as part of their plan from the very beginning it's just not going to happen.

So I'd like to show you the last picture of Paley Park. This is a park in New York City that is on a very tiny 1/7<sup>th</sup> of an acre but it's all green. It's trees, green vines, it's like a green oasis in the

middle of the city and so many of the new members don't know there's a half-acre directly across the street from this project that we in the neighborhood wanted the Acquisition Fund to acquire and basically we were told there wasn't enough money. So they passed it up and didn't acquire it. So we still don't have any green space in this area. This is in some ways a really lucky opportunity that we might still be able to get that but it's going to take a lot of pressure because the housing advocates just want housing and their diagram if you look at it is housing right up to the sidewalk and an internal green space not open to the public.

So I just want to throw that out there so everybody knows about it, everybody can start talking about it. We need to make a fuss. Watch the newspaper because we won't know until the end of the month whether they in fact get the bid but it's likely they will.

**Chair:** Thank you Jane.

**Ancel Martinez:** At large. I just wanted to thank Jane for the presentation, succinct and to the point.

**Chair:** I am going to move on. I have other public comments before I go to announcements. Casey, was yours on a specific item?

**Kasey Asberry:** Yes.

**Chair:** I'll give you your two minutes. I have three people that want to make the same kind of statement to the committee.

**Kasey Asberry:** This is a letter from Friends of Boeddeker Park and I just wanted to read it into the record quickly and share the letter. Dear PROSAC Commissioners. This letter offers you our perspective as community stewards [unintelligible] status of Boeddeker Park. It's been two and a half year since the park reopened after a tremendous infusion of energy and major investments on the park of City and County of San Francisco, Trust for Public Land, St. Francis Foundation, the Boys and Girls Club, the Central YMCA and many other dedicated community based organizations. Friends of Boeddeker have been continuing our work to mobilize Tenderloin residents to make full use of our fresh, much needed and anticipated park. This is all paid off in an atmosphere of possibility and hope that by working together we can see profound positive changes in the health of our wider neighborhood. However, during Friends of Boeddeker meetings and other park events there is a growing sense that our community organizations need more support to keep up the momentum and safeguard this major investment. As a minimum we need Recreation and Park Department to rehire the weekend Supervisor staff position vacant for six months. Weekends are critical times in the park for residents and this period is understaffed and under-programmed we further need commitment from the Recreation and Park Department that more investments will be made weeklong and that we work together to figure out what they should be and how to implement them. We advocate that as a community we take a longer view as to the sustainability of this precious space. This summer we believe we're at an important crossroads. Soon all the other public green space in the Tenderloin will be under renovations putting even more pressure on Boeddeker to remain the beacon of health it has become. We request that this body add support to our efforts.

**Chair:** Thank you. Next speaker, Nancy Cross.

**Nancy Cross:** [unintelligible]

**Chair:** You have two minutes to make your comments so let's focus.

**Nancy Cross:** If I had a map there I could tell it faster. Could anybody make a map? Can you draw up a map?

[simultaneous comments]

**Nancy Cross:** This is the first presentation of this idea but I talked with other people about it and they're all enthusiastic. The 1100 block is a block with the biggest city shelter next door and there are about 300 people there and there's no park area in the vicinity. There are a number of big urns with single something growing in it but those urns take up sidewalk and the people that come out want free air in the block but they get to be a few station people in wheelchairs and then other people lying or sitting and smoking. A private employer or a store owner might be held liable for loitering but the city doesn't take seriously making the presence of the people in that neighborhood or open space seriously enough to do something constructive. I would say the first thing is get rid of those five or six huge urns in that block that block the free movement without having to be close to smokers. And I would like to see a strip park along that park and in the center a alleyway now up to Van Ness that can be a walkway. The big streets at the ends of this block are very heavy traffic and it's not a pleasant walk to get up to Van Ness but Van Ness is a common destination and needs for connection with busses, the 49 and 47. There's a 19 bus on Polk but it's roundabout and may serve some people well but it's extra long for other people to get down to near Market or the library and they often need to go there. We'd like to have a park, a green strip along there and then in the middle up to Van Ness there's going to be a new development on the lower side of that that kind of invades right now but we can have a little curve around maybe the south end, the green parklet, and then on Polk Street and then the middle of the block. We can make it a really pleasant place for people to have. We want benches out there and no smoking and make it really a joy and a green space for many hundreds of people in that vicinity that do not have a park within the vicinity and it's kind of rough trying to walk up the steep hills. Thank you.

[simultaneous comments]

**Chair:** Thank you for coming. I'm going to move on to our last item that is not listen on the agenda. Nick has brought some paperwork that I will share with you guys. We're giving these guys just the same as every other public speaker. We would potentially like if members of the community are interested in hearing a presentation after staff, that's the idea, but it is something they're coming to us as public asking us to just look at it.

**Nick Belloni:** I've got copies too.

**Nick Smith:** I'm an entrepreneur here in the city, doing business as a personal trainer and massage therapist for the past five years. I'm here in support of our new proposal to have a calisthenics extreme workout park built [unintelligible] the Recreation and Park Department. We have a few specific locations built into the proposal there towards the end but basically this is a really rapidly growing [unintelligible] sport. It's a passion of many and it's exploding in popularity throughout the world. [unintelligible] everything from pushups and pull-ups to handstands and more advanced [unintelligible]. We are looking to build a very small park, twenty by twenty meters, the size of a small children's playground and [unintelligible] is installed it's relatively low maintenance. The initial startup costs are very low. We're looking at probably \$60,000 at the high end for a very large park for all [unintelligible]. This is something that would be available to [unintelligible] to MUNI, BART, wherever we can actually find a plot for this. It will be open to everyone of all genders, ages, children, people with disabilities. There are only a few real athletic parks available in the city right now and they're aging or their functionality is really lacking. We want to get something very professional put in place that will be sustained for a great number of years and build a lot of tourism around it. A couple of goals is to create a clean, safe, classic street workout park. We are [unintelligible] who cannot afford gym memberships, those who [unintelligible] want to live a healthy lifestyle, enjoy the outdoors. We want to create a space for every level of fitness from the wheelchair bound members of the community all the way through [unintelligible]. We would also like to continue to hold community events for competitions that would influence a wide variety of people. Think of Venice Beach in Santa Monica with Muscle Beach down there, we have nothing of the sort here and you know how popular those beaches are [unintelligible] bring to the community. So we'd love to build something of that sort that the community [unintelligible]. We want to get things rolling as soon as we could.

**Chair:** Does anyone on the committee have questions? Mark.

**Mark Scheuer:** Years ago they set up these par courses where it had maybe ten or fifteen stations. Is that like those?

**Nick Smith:** Similar but it's one small thing that has pretty much all those things in an updated version so you don't have to be running from one thing to the next and the next and it's not a huge spread out thing over the course of a couple miles. It's just all those apparatus in one park.

**Mark Scheuer:** How many people could comfortably workout?

**Nick Smith:** Depending on the park size you could probably get I would say the higher end probably thirty to forty people depending on the size of the park.

**Wendy Aragon:** I talked to the District Supervisor and she actually proposed something similar near the Senior Center hoping it would become an adult playground. She's actually been a big advocate of that.

[simultaneous comments]

**Theresa Factora:** What went into the proposed locations? Is this just where you see there's space?

**Nick Smith:** Where there's open sunny spots in the city. Mission Bay is a new area that's being developed right now and I know Recreation and Park are going to be putting new parks in there and this could be a part of something that's being newly built. They just got done doing Alamo Square that would have been a prime location too but anywhere within Marina Green, we're thinking the fitness parks that are already there that are severely dated, maybe taking those out because they're really becoming unsafe to a certain extent because they have gravel on the floor, the parallel bars that are there if you look one is actually being uplifted from the ground and is shaky. It's not a safe park anymore. The one aspect that we need to figure out is the liability aspect of it. We have to figure out what the liability is now for those structures and would could tag on to that type of liability of [unintelligible].

**Robert Brust:** I was just thinking of Bob Pelasio who is charge of the [unintelligible] aspect so give me your card and I'll introduce you.

**Nick Smith:** Thank you.

**Chair:** I would also make sure that Stacy has your card. She has a copy of your proposal.

**Maya Rodgers:** District 10. [unintelligible] may be in your proposal but are you proposing that Recreation and Park build it or that Recreation and Park allow you to build it?

**Nick Smith:** Ideally if Recreation and Park would be built it that would be great but we were also into the fact [unintelligible] from Las Vegas, Phoenix, down in LA, different other groups in New York that all do what we do. We're just trying to build that space for us here and around the world. It's really an exploding sport and it's a great way for the community to get involved so we have that type of support from everywhere else and I'm sure the funding wouldn't be too severe an issue. [unintelligible]

**Maya Rodgers:** And then what would be your plan to maintain it?

**Nick Smith:** Really, this type of setup requires almost zero maintenance. It's concreted [unintelligible] similar to a playground flooring, so it's that soft rubber feel to it and then once those structures are in place they're all weather-proof for ten or fifteen years at a very minimum. There's no moving parts. There's no replacing structures unless somebody comes with a hacksaw nothing is going to happen to it.

[simultaneous comments]

**Nick Smith:** [unintelligible] is what our ideal brand would be for the park. They're internationally known I've got some links in the pdf that if you guys want me to send it to you via email I can send it to you, you can click on the links. I've got a couple short videos and things here that will give you a better insight as well.

**Chair:** Thank you. Richard has two announcements.

**Richard Rothman:** I can't go without mentioning the Mother's Building. I have a new webpage, richardrothman.net, and you can see photos of the murals and other WPA murals in the city. And the other is I've been working with Supervisor Fewer and Gary McCoy at Recreation and Park and we're interested in setting up a safe routes to parks modeled after the safe routes to schools. So if [unintelligible]. If anybody has any other parks you have my email address. Just email me because I found out that Recreation and Park is working with MTA but in different—not as a coordinated group or at least I didn't think so. So if we can get Recreation and Park and one part of the team it might be easier to deal with MTA. If we can get Recreation and Park onboard and coordinated then I figure we'll tackle MTA and get them onboard. So if you have dangerous intersections of routes to park and even in the parks email me and we'll put it on the list. What I want to do is just prioritize so that Recreation and Park speaks with one voice when we speak to SFMTA.

**Chair:** Thank you. Any other announcements? Okay, I have one. Our July meeting is July 11<sup>th</sup>. This was made on our calendar last year. The week before is a holiday week. Please make note that it is July 11<sup>th</sup>. We tend to have issues when we get to some of these summer months with attendance. Please, I can't stress to you enough, RSVP to Tiffany. We need to know if you're coming. I beg you especially in these lightly attended meetings where we may have a problem making quorum that you please RSVP. Any other comments. Hearing none, we are adjourned.

**End of Document**