

**Parks and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee Meeting
October 2, 2018**

Chair: Welcome to the October Parks and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee meeting. I will start with the roll call.

Elisa Laird-Metke: District 9.

Richard Rothman: District 1.

Anthony Cuadro: District 7.

Mark Scheuer: District 8.

Gisele Rainer: District 3.

Steven Currier: District 11.

Kenneth Maley: District 3.

Robert Brust: District 8.

Trevor McNeil: District 5.

Jane Weil: District 6.

Katherine Jones: District 5.

Cara Wong: District 7.

Nick Belloni: District 2.

Jordyn Aquino: District 4.

Julia Pfeifferberger: District 4.

Ken McGary: District 11.

Chair: Steffan Franz, District 2. Great, so it's a full meeting with a full agenda. I am going to keep my remarks fairly short. Did everybody receive a copy of last month's meeting minutes? Does anybody have any thoughts about these meeting minutes?

Nick Belloni: I move to accept the minutes.

Steven Currier: Second.

Chair: All in favor of accepting the minutes as is say aye?

All: Aye.

Chair: Opposed? Hearing none, this item is closed. Any public comment?

I'm going to keep my report brief because we do have three robust presentations. One thing that I would like to mention to you is that the next meeting in November will be falling on election day which relegates us to two choices—one, to move the meeting to Wednesday which would be the 7th of November or Tuesday the 13th of November. I've heard generally from people that the 13th seemed better because it keeps it with our Tuesdays. I would ask as members if you have any specific thoughts I would like to change this today so that we can get is scheduled.

Nick Belloni: Traditionally we've always gone to the day after.

Chair: That has been kind of standard although once or twice because of the way it fell we did shift to the following week so we have the option of either one. I'd be glad to take a vote if anyone wants to. Let's start with the 7th, all in favor of switching to this date? And to the 13th? [simultaneous comments] So it will be on the 13th.

So I have a short Chair's report I would like to run by you. At the end of the meeting I will actually raise the ever-popular 2019 calendar so that we can roughly go through that and start to discuss these potential moves.

The first thing I would like to speak of is I attended an event at Alta Plaza Park about now two weeks ago which was the reopening after extensive renovations most to their sprinklers or drainage issues, concrete issues. I speak about this because there wasn't a huge amount of money allocated to them either in the 2008 bond or in the 2012 bond. Supervisor add-back money, the Department contributed some money, DPW contributed some money. And the reason I tell you this is will all of the talk in the news of the Commission and Department being at adds it was very nice to see Commission Low, Commissioner Anderson, General Manager Phil Ginsburg, various Recreation and Park officials, all together at this public opening. There was nothing to be gained or lost other than to be at this event and they had about 150 people on a Sunday morning at 9:30 in the morning.

So in our city of people who aren't sometimes thankful to the park for what it is it was really nice to see the people of that area who really depend on that park. It was a great opening and I think the people that came out for that.

Other than that I don't have much to report. I did an event last night, just on a personal note, it was the Monterey Bay Aquarium's Packard testimonial dinner and the guest of honor, the featured speaker as it were, was Bill Gates. He spoke about how philanthropy is very easy to route when it's a great cause. He said but when people are involved, especially when you're trying to deal with the business, it's very easy to look at things like software and monetization but it's really hard to look at the oceans and monetization in that way even though they're so

important to us. So I wanted to mention that to you because I feel like parks are another one that without some sort of personal engagement—that's what he was talking about, he said if every one person took a dollar and said look, I want to fix my whatever it would get fixed in a minute. And so his thoughts towards the future I just want to echo that, for us it's like us doing this, right? You ask what you can do to help, you're doing it right now. And so I wanted to just honor that and say you know every little bit helps, every little move that we make towards better open space, towards our city being such a great green city. You know, I just wanted to say thank you to you guys for that, that service is a big part of that.

With that said, this Saturday there is a volunteer appreciation day. I'll let the Department speak about that a little bit but I believe that every PROSAC member is in fact invited to that.

Before I close the Chair's report I did want to give Ken Maley a minute to speak. I spoke on his behalf at the last meeting, I don't know if you read the minutes but I did read into the minutes your thoughts about the situation in Washington Square and so I just wanted to yield to him for a few minutes to talk about his perception of this situation.

Kenneth Maley: We've had a very tragic event in Washington Square Park in that 61-year-old Canary Island pine tree, ten trees, had to be removed due to the destruction of their root system by the contractor and the lack of oversight by the Department. It's a very tragic thing for our park because the trees are adjacent to the newly renovated playground and so now the playground is extremely exposed to sunlight and wind that these trees provided a windbreak and shadow. Friends of Washington Square and The Telegraph Hill Dwellers are cooperating with the City Attorney's Office because we believe that there's a liability issue here for the destruction of these trees, it was unnecessary, it could have been prevented. Friends of Washington Square [unintelligible] asked the Department to check the contractor's [unintelligible] root system which made the trees unstable and unsafe. We're now in the process of trying to work with the Department who in my view is trying to push forward trees that are really inappropriate for this space so we really have a very tragic event in our square. This was a major impact [unintelligible] acknowledged by the Department that the contractor and Public Works failed to oversee the work that was being done until it was too late but the Friends of Washington Square and Telegraph Hill Dwellers feel that the Department has some responsibility for it as well as so it's an ongoing situation with the City Attorney in terms of liability and the costs and the impact.

But the bigger issue is with the advent of the water conservation project that's scheduled for the end of this year and the beginning of next year can we really trust the Department to oversee what will be a major renovation of the water system and the sub-drainage system throughout the park? And so it's thrown the neighborhood into a very serious concern about the ability of the Department to manage such a major project given the way this particular even has been handled.

It will continue to unfold. We're meeting with the City Attorney and we're meeting with our District Supervisor about it and we're gathering as much information as we can about it and [unintelligible] with the Chair's permission some time in the next meeting or so [unintelligible] but it's a very tragic event for one of the most historic parks in San Francisco. It's one of the three original public squares set aside in 1850.

Chair: Thank you Ken. I did want to speak to one thing I'm not going to say in defense of the Department but this was raised last month and it was raised with the same type of feeling that there were concerns that echoed other past issues where we felt like the Department was focused maybe too big-picture on the overall project and missed something that cost the community money, time, and effort. I will say that Stacy was here at the last meeting and you can read in the long very not only did she want to really stress that the Department is taking this personally but they feel like there were mistakes made and they own it or try to own it. So I was kind of bummed that you weren't here at the last one to hear them say that. I know that's not a compromise to ten dead trees, none of us want that to be the case. So I just wanted to say in their defense that they are trying to address that and they made it public by saying that. Thank you.

One other thing I wanted to mention which I thought was amazing—in McLaren Park are one of our favorite [unintelligible], they did movie night produced by the Parks Alliance. They did Grease and it was [unintelligible] but it was at night in McLaren Park. Do you realize what that means? Hold on, let's check, do you know when the last event at night in McLaren Park?

Drew Becher: Over 23 years ago.

Chair: Like 1980-something I think is what I heard. What it speaks to and what I'll put out on the table to you is that A, McLaren Park has become a safer place I think. B, there is more understanding on the part of the Police Department and others that this is a huge open space that needs to be cultivated and that there was demand. Drew, how many people were at that event?

Drew Becher: Over 1000. 30 percent of them had never been to McLaren Park before.

Chair: I feel that is [unintelligible] movies nights I get 150, 200 people, it's a great event. To get 1000 in Jerry Garcia Amphitheater singing Grease songs is bananas. So I encourage especially as it relates to that particular park and this particular issue [unintelligible]. The fact that we as a community, as a committee could go out there and support these type of events. So Drew again thank you.

To that end at my park I had a little shindig too and we had a couple hundred people the same night which is awesome. Just use your parks people. Like that's how I'll close this. Take the time, it's very easy to produce a little thing, a pot luck, a cleaning and greening event. Take back the park every day.

That's the end of my report. Is there any public comment? Hearing none, this item is closed.

On new business do any committee members at this time have anything to add to the new business agenda item?

Steven Currier: District 11. So a couple weeks ago we did have our—speaking of McLaren Park—our McLaren Park collaborative with RPD, [unintelligible] was there talking about the ropes course. Dana Ketchum did the presentation and then we had three members from Outward Bound who [unintelligible] this project. And of course as you well know from last month and the

month before the seventy trees came up and I think Dana said to me afterwards she was highly embarrassed, she wished that RPD did not choose that route in taking down the trees. But it's done and the only thing they can do is manager.

There were a couple people there who wanted to change where the ropes course is going but Dana said to me along with Outward Bound they would welcome to be put on the agenda as soon as possible at PROSAC and she has gone, I think she's in Europe now, and she will be back for the November meeting.

Chair: So we can certainly look at that.

Kenneth Maley: District 3. I believe we discussed in the past about having a discussion or a presentation by the Port on their 30 percent cut.

Chair: We did at last month's meeting.

Kenneth Maley: Sorry. My second suggestion [unintelligible] but in the last presentation of the mega-bond that I attended here the majority of the funding was directed towards major improvement in recreation centers but there was not one single mention about forestry and maintenance [unintelligible] what I consider forestry and landscaping. At the most recent capital meeting of the Commission there was a presentation by the General Manager, a video of—and it was all rec centers, there was no one mention of any additional work being done and we continue to get from the Department we don't have enough money for tree maintenance or urban forestry is strapped. Where is the money for those projects and for those needs of our parks? I'm wondering if it's not time to consider separating recreation and park rather than having them combined under one Department.

Chair: That's an interesting thought. I would probably say that preso could be called infrastructure versus programming and to understand what the Department's thoughts are moving forward. I would say there are people that feel the same way you do and there's probably a lot of people that want to see more programming on the other side and I'm not saying one way right or wrong but I think that would be the way you'd present it is to say, you know, what's the focus? Infrastructure? There's huge amounts of money that we need to maintain our park system. There's a huge amount of money that we need to program it to maybe raise more revenue so I'd like to hear that.

Kenneth Maley: I just feel [unintelligible] take care of our trees. I just was on a park tour of three cities—four cities [unintelligible] and I've never seen more beautiful, we—maintained parks. Our parks look like Third World parks compared to Europe and many other major cities in the country.

Chair: Okay. Anybody else? So Tiffany just for housekeeping we should take popos off the new business because that will obviously be next month. Did we commit to one other already for next month? Is it the ROSE for Parks Alliance? There might be a combo Stacy was saying between RPD and you guys on the ROSE. Okay, we'll get to that one. Alemany Farms I'm still

into. Developmental impact fees I'm still. Okay. Anybody else? Any public comment? Hearing none, this item is closed.

So as I said Stacy could not make it tonight. La Monte' I believe has been briefed so I'm going to turn it over.

La Monte' Bishop: So this is from Stacy. The first thing she mentions is [unintelligible] said that there was a community open house on Sunday which was well attended by Sunnydale neighbors. They received a lot of feedback on the projects [unintelligible]. Here are the next updates.

Number one, the Juri Commons concept plan was approved. [unintelligible] out to bid. Expect to award contract later this year. [unintelligible] Golden Gate Heights. Alta Plaza [unintelligible]. Construction has begun at Willie Woo Woo Wong. Gene Friend we had a meeting last month, it went well. The project is now progressing under environmental review. Central SOMA is moving through the board process, CEQA appeal. [unintelligible]. India Basin is moving through the Board process. [unintelligible].

Richard Rothman: District 1. Two things—any news about swimming pools, Garfield, Rossi?

La Monte' Bishop: Garfield is being held open until October 22nd and [unintelligible] due to several delays looks like they won't be able to open Balboa until mid-December, I think that's the last I heard, and so they're just working very hard to get all of the trenching done, getting all the transformers and [unintelligible] installed and getting it energized.

Richard Rothman: And Rossi?

La Monte' Bishop: Rossi will happen sometime maybe last—probably in January or February possibly.

Richard Rothman: So that's after Garfield?

La Monte' Bishop: Yes. [unintelligible].

Richard Rothman: And another point, I live in District 1 and I was just driving here down Fulton Street and I know MTA but maybe you could tell if our friends at MTA why they have to close—why there's no parking along Fulton Street. It must start around, I don't know, 40th all the way down past 25th on the park side. We made suggestions to them that they could stage their busses either at [unintelligible] Ocean Beach and just call them up instead of taking away all that parking and then they're taking away all the parking up where Nick lives up on Balboa by George Washington High School. It's hard enough that they're coming into our neighborhood. Hardly is not as bad as Outside Lands but still [unintelligible] that they don't need to take away all that parking [unintelligible].

La Monte' Bishop: You said [unintelligible].

Richard Rothman: I don't know where it starts. It must start around 40th of 42nd and [unintelligible].

Nick Belloni: [unintelligible] people out quickly. Up by my house is the drop-off for Uber and Lyft for Hardly Strictly.

Richard Rothman: And it goes up to I know it went past 25th maybe up to I don't know, 20th or so.

Nick Belloni: Richard there's also a point with some of that parking being pulled was a concession for people that would camp there in their campers and they would stay all three days and the police can't remove them. The neighbors were getting scared, annoyed and really pissed off. So a concession was to pull the parking in that area for that reason.

Richard Rothman: [unintelligible] give them tickets.

Nick Belloni: You can't give them tickets if they're in the park.

Chair: Guys, sorry, this is not MTA.

Nick Belloni: Sorry, I know.

Chair: Can we stop this conversation please. Your point is well-taken, he understands what you're asking. Is there anybody else on the capital item? Okay, I have one quick one. A couple of stakeholders were interested in a capital update from the 2012 for McLaren Park, that there was some money allocated for improvements to the Jerry Garcia Amphitheater. There are two or three people that are trying to stage large scale concerts in that venue and they don't know when these capital improvements are going to happen.

La Monte' Bishop: There was a [unintelligible] assigned the other day so they will start energizing that project again soon.

Chair: Okay. I would love a report on that. Any other items for La Monte'? Hearing none, this item is closed. Public comment? Hearing none, this item is closed.

So Taylor, four years no Strategic Planning, four years. With an explanation point on the agenda item.

Taylor Emerson: Sarah [unintelligible] once told me exclamation points are only for twelve-year-old girls but I like to use them.

I was hoping this could be a real working session just like we do it in the office.

Chair: [unintelligible]

Taylor Emerson: I'm going to very quickly because I really want to hear what you guys have to say but I'd like to frame our discussion here with a reminder of the charter. It says going into number two every five years the Department shall prepare a Commissioner for the Commission's consideration [unintelligible] that establishes or reaffirms the mission, vision, goals and objects for the Department [unintelligible] and we shall submit it to PROSAC for you to comment which is what we are doing here today and what we're going to redo it every five years [unintelligible].

I did bring a few Strategic Plans. I can go get some later but our mission—can anyone recite it! San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department mission is to provide enriching recreational activities, maintain beautiful parks and reserve the environment for the well-being of everyone in our diverse community. That is what we—that's our touchstone, that's our guiding principle. We also have a vision [unintelligible] there's are five strategies. To inspire [unintelligible] public space, play, investment, stewardship, and [unintelligible].

Then there are objectives that kind of break those down and under that the initiatives.

So we talk about the mission, the vision, the [unintelligible] goals and objectives and [unintelligible] that part is the same for five years starting in fiscal year 17. So by that count we're only entering year three but actually this is our fourth year of the Strategic Plan. All right.

And then so we're here today to work on the initiatives. Actions and projects to achieve the [unintelligible]. Are you with me? You guys have seen this, I just wanted to show you. Normally they would take equity to the Commission in October but we did it early this year because we decided to have two meetings on the Strategic Plan, this one and next month. So I want to just frame [unintelligible] then repeat up fiscal year 46, thirty years.

So with that I want to actually open it up to discuss. Who here brought an initiative that they wanted to share, comment on an existing one or?

Chair: Can you tell by the look on my face? I have one.

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible] in terms of our strategies which we have to do so I did actually [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments]. So do you guys have a copy of our [unintelligible].

Chair: I don't think we saw them all.

Taylor Emerson: Okay.

Male Speaker: I'm kind of curious if every park has an opinion about the last set that we did?

Taylor Emerson: The last set of what?

Male Speaker: The Strategic Plan. We went through and created a Strategic Plan.

Chair: What are you talking about? Are you saying the Department's Strategic Plan that was adopted?

Male Speaker: Yeah, the one that we all worked on.

Chair: So basically—[simultaneous comments].

Taylor Emerson: You bring up a good point which is the charter [unintelligible] is supposed to be a five-year Strategic Plan but Phil [unintelligible] so each year we take a five-year look. So each year is an update we're calling it. So the mission, vision, goals, and objectives do not change in that first five-year period which we're not entering year-three but the initiatives, the things that support those goals do change, they get deleted, the world is different, you know, our priorities are informed, things happen, trees fall, trees die.

Male Speaker: But is there any thought to analyzing the current plan?

Taylor Emerson: Of course! It's reported in great detail in each Strategic Plan. The next year has a report of the prior year, so yeah. This is my life you guys are looking at here, this occupies three full-time months of mine. This is an opportunity for you guys to really provide feedback on what's there and what you feel like you might, you know, is missing that fits within the rubric of what is not changing—mission, vision, goals, strategies.

Chair: So I also Mark want to frame this for you. Before they did they because they didn't have one and they needed to do one and they were compelled to do that by Prop 8. Now they're saying we want to be ahead of the curve and I think that's the theme that Taylor is trying to say and that the General Manager was saying when he was here two months ago that now they don't have to write the story. The story is written. Now it's about improving the outcome, trying to finish the ending.

Taylor Emerson: Beautifully said.

Chair: Why she is here today is to let each one of us or as many of us have an opinion which surely we all do but at least this first wave to look at what they, what we were supportive or what elements that we were really strong about. Like for an example for you I know [unintelligible] but for me that sister park piece that's personal to me.

Taylor Emerson: Yeah! So that sister park—who remembers which one [unintelligible].\

Chair: I would say that I don't feel the amount of support that I felt in the initiative when it was presented to us by the Department. I don't feel that same level of support in terms of enabling that action, that it was great to put it in the plan but when the ideas have been brought it has seemed less that fully supported.

Taylor Emerson: So you want more support.

Chair: For the sister parks or friends of group.

Taylor Emerson: Okay. So the sister concept and the friends, right. [unintelligible]

Ana Gee: [unintelligible]

Chair: It's under play and it's 21A improved data collection.

Ana Gee: [unintelligible]

Chair: More data collection.

Ana Gee: More data, right on. That's my [unintelligible].

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible] So do you want to know how many people were there today? Call me tomorrow, I can tell you.

Chair: Unfortunately you can't tell us who they were exactly but you can tell us how many.

Taylor Emerson: But the technology is keeping up with our goals so there's definitely more accounting and more data in our future. On this idea of play [unintelligible] this is not your last opportunity, I'm going to be here next month and I can, you know, [unintelligible] I'm here for you and I have twenty minutes.

Chair: Well I think it's good because now we're all understanding what the ask from the Department is and it will give us a chance if you come back.

Taylor Emerson: It's an offer.

Chair: Sure, no, it's a great offer.

Taylor Emerson: It's an offer which you guys wanted to do.

Chair: Sure, so Jane.

Jane Weil: District 6. On strategy number one, objective number one, space?

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible] Place. [simultaneous comments]

Jane Weil: I mean, I don't exactly how you would word this but again the area where 90 percent of the growth in the city is happening is SOMA and we need more parks in SOMA. We have very few opportunities to get any space. And we know of one that is on the acquisition list which I would like to have pushed higher on the list.

Taylor Emerson: Okay acquisition to meet current and future demand.

Jane Weil: Right.

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible]

Chair: Under place, that would be objective 2.3D, identify additional projects for the installation of synthetic turf surfaces.

Taylor Emerson: Yeah!

Chair: [unintelligible] I have not seen a timed-use dog play area.

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible] and I heard it's actually working better than anyone thought it would.

Chair: I was a huge proponent with the General Manager and he said we'll get to it and that was seven years ago.

Taylor Emerson: Okay [unintelligible].

Chair: So basically just to explain what that is [unintelligible] is where there's generally a park that would be not off-leash but that during specific hours of the day many other cities will do just a very specific timeline, 7:00 to 9:00 in the morning, 5:00 to 7:00 in the evening where the majority of the people who are using the park are in fact dog owners.

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible] will say no dogs on the field and there's dogs on the field.

Chair: And again, timed-use is a great idea because it mixes it up and you can say to people listen, you can be here off-leash whenever you want during these hours.

Taylor Emerson: Timed use is [unintelligible].

Chair: [unintelligible]

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible] I'll follow up on that.

Jane Weil: District 6. In addition to acquiring whatever space we can in SOMA perhaps a look at reusing or using some of the existing spaces. For instance we do not have a dog park anywhere in central SOMA and we need one desperately. So I don't know where you put that but we evaluate the existing parks.

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible]

Jane Weil: I mean do you want specifics?

Taylor Emerson: This is perfect, this is good. I like this. [unintelligible].

Chair: I've got a list. Katherine.

Katherine Jones: District 5. And I haven't [unintelligible] so I might have missed it but under place is there—I'm not sure which one fits under perfectly but is there any discussion of continuing to coordinate [unintelligible] the joint use agreements with opening public school playgrounds?

Taylor Emerson: I forget where that's going on but yeah the [unintelligible] that's taken on its own life and they're growing it.

Chair: I've attended many [unintelligible].

Taylor Emerson: So more shared school yards is what you're saying.

Katherine Jones: Or just continuing to expand the program to include some sort of metric of schools. So I know it's sort of one by one by one and it's growing really fast.

Chair: But it's not under the Department, right?

Taylor Emerson: No, it's not.

Katherine Jones: But the opening. [simultaneous comments]

Taylor Emerson: Yeah, so is the program growing?

Male Speaker: Yes.

Taylor Emerson: That's what I thought, so

Katherine Jones: I thought that when it's like not open on the weekend for example we would contact San Francisco Recreation and Park like if the dates aren't open.

Male Speaker: It used to be parks and now it's just [unintelligible] now teachers get paid to open [unintelligible].

Chair: It used to be DPW. Mark Ferrell when he first launched it it was DPW. But it's great, I mean I think we all agree that any open space that's locked—

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible]

Chair: Okay, Nick.

Nick Belloni: 11D, the jurisdictional transfers of the Cal Trans underpasses. What's the status on that?

Taylor Emerson: I do not know what the status of that is. [unintelligible] I'll have all the status reports and the metrics and stuff next time. So I'll have a report on that. Good question.

Chair: Robert.

Robert Brust: District 8. Preserve and celebrate the [unintelligible] resources and you have [unintelligible] signage.

Taylor Emerson: Yes!

Robert Brust: How is that going?

Taylor Emerson: It's going good actually [laughs]. We have completed and exhaustive and [unintelligible] accurate inventory. [unintelligible]. It's not always about historical or natural or cultural. Like [unintelligible] so all the renovations [unintelligible].

Robert Brust: [unintelligible]

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible] That counts.

Robert Brust: That was put on there originally.

Taylor Emerson: Yes, in the 1800s, yes it counts.

Chair: We've got to keep you guys on track.

Taylor Emerson: I only have a few more minutes.

Chair: Giselle.

Gisele Rainer: District 3. So I just wanted to mention I'm not sure if that timed use is specifically limited to the park that you mentioned.

Chair: On no, right now they're saying they're piloting it potentially in one park but it is in the mindset of [unintelligible].

Taylor Emerson: I thought it was at West Portal and possibly and [unintelligible] an organized dog group there that wants to do more so I'm not sure. I'll report back.

Chair: It's definitely not Walter Haas because I go there a lot.

Taylor Emerson: Oh you do, okay.

Gisele Rainer: I would like just plant that seed that maybe we should consider it at other parks as well because there are other parks in District 3 particularly that I know that people would like that.

Taylor Emerson: Yeah. So it has to have an organized dog group that advocates for it and says okay, we want to like you know either sponsor [unintelligible].

Chair: I'd be glad to talk with you offline about it if there's specific parks and they need help forming a friends of group or whatever, I'm more than happy.

Gisele Rainer: And then I have one other—and I don't know if this is an appropriate place to mention this or not but in connection with the refurbishment of Washington Square Park one problem that I've noticed is a huge problem is pizza boxes because there are so many pizza parlors around North Beach that there's a pizza boxes all over Washington Square Park that never get stuck in trash cans because they don't fit.

Chair: Although I debate that this isn't the place for that particular discussion because it's so hyper-local I do agree that the Department's garbage cans are not wide enough to house pizza boxes. [simultaneous comments] I noticed in South Park when we went and did that walk-through I actually noticed there were like tons of trash because the receptacles were too small.

Taylor Emerson: I'll be back in another few weeks.

Gisele Rainer: Maybe we could get the pizza parlors to pay for the [unintelligible].

Chair: Moving on, Jordyn Aquino.

Jordyn Aquino: District 4. My first comment is related to Ana Gee's comment about the more data collection. Is part of inspire our team [unintelligible] I was wondering how that [unintelligible].

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible] is not fully mature and going every quarter we do it which is after each—the conclusion of each registration period. [unintelligible] and I just finally got into [unintelligible] and we had our first big meeting and it went, you know, okay. But we've got it, we've got the dashboards built and we've got people trying to help, everybody understands that this is a new tool that we're going to be using and [unintelligible].

Jordyn Aquino: And will that data ever be shared with us as a committee, especially the operations end?

Taylor Emerson: Sure [unintelligible] is on your list of topics, yeah we're happy to have them show you what we're working on at the yard [unintelligible]. The next unit we're looking at is the Park Rangers and we want to do permits but there's just still so much problem between with the new IT system [unintelligible] 311s and the dispatch and stuff [unintelligible].

Jordyn Aquino: And then my second to last comment is just related to this initiative or this objective which is I'd like to see it expanded. I know that PROSAC and other agencies like the Parks Alliance [unintelligible] stewardship but thinking about driving innovation and improving efficiency I think that we can improve [unintelligible].

Taylor Emerson: Say that just one more time, you want to see PROSAC part of?

Jordyn Aquino: [unintelligible]

Taylor Emerson: Yes, yes. Great.

Chair: I'm just going to piggyback actually on Jordyn's because we're on our team, one thing that I have noticed in my whatever I call them, unofficial interviewing of gardeners in different places because I do talk to a lot of gardeners. They do feel empowered now like they have a better voice. I felt like years ago we would talk to a gardener and they'd kind of just be like yeah, we just come here and we do what we do and now it feels like they're actually taking more ownership because they feel more like they're part of the team and less about just getting a paycheck and like [unintelligible] that vibe is much different now and I don't know how purposeful it is or whether it's part the candidates that you're getting or the people that you're elevating [unintelligible].

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible]

Chair: On the opposite side of that it is clear based on remarks that the Commissioners have made that they feel like they're somewhat less in the loop in certain situations, certainly with the mega-bond as Ken called it. Are you unaware of what I'm talking about?

Taylor Emerson: Are you talking about our Commissioners?

Chair: I'm talking about Commissioner Low.

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible]

Chair: Yeah, it was like a movie and so I've had some sideline comments with Commissioner Low and Commissioner Anderson and both of them feel like all of us are in the same game and that maybe we're not having the conversations that we need to have between the General Manager, PROSAC and the Commission. And so just more of those conversations. And to that end actually just from all of our perspective years ago we did an even where it was like a team building between us and RPD. So we went out, we cleaned a park. I don't know who attended that. None of you guys, huh? I didn't either but that's probably five or six years ago. Maybe it would be nice to do a yearly—

Taylor Emerson: I think that's an excellent idea.

Chair: And invite the Commission. Let the Commissioners come. I don't know if Mark Buell will be out there with us but I feel like Commissioner Low and Commissioner Anderson are both very willing to get involved.

Taylor Emerson: I think that's a great idea.

Chair: Moving on. Ken McGary.

Ken McGary: District 11 and I have a comment on [unintelligible] I'd just like to suggest adding somehow [unintelligible] youth programs are great but it's kind of oriented toward, you know, summer programs and school programs and I think there was a really large unmet need for families with young to kind of middle-aged children [unintelligible].

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible]

Ken McGary: [unintelligible]

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible] grants and recognition nationally for connecting children to nature and so I always point out it's just as therapeutic for adults as well [unintelligible]. We might have to [unintelligible].

Chair: If we can please just make them short. Steven? Richard?

Richard Rothman: District 1. In appendix A performance you don't have all the objectives listed there is that just because [unintelligible].

Taylor Emerson: That's last year's so I don't think [unintelligible] in fiscal year 17 this was created almost a year ago now.

Richard Rothman: So can we get an updated one?

Taylor Emerson: Of course, we're building towards it. First we're going to go to Commission and get it approved and then we'll print it and then you'll get copies but we're still at [unintelligible].

Richard Rothman: [unintelligible]

Taylor Emerson: What?

Richard Rothman: Can we see it before?

Taylor Emerson: Yeah, we're making it, we're writing it, we're doing it right now.

Richard Rothman: I don't know if you're the person to answer this and if not I'm sorry. The Board of Supervisors had passed an ordinance that there should be more statues of women. Is that going to affect Recreation and Park?

Taylor Emerson: I did read that today.

Chair: I never even heard that. That's awesome to hear, I like that.

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible]

Chair: I have one more, Ana Gee.

Ana Gee: District 6. You don't have to answer this right now but [unintelligible].

Taylor Emerson: It's true, yeah. It's really—yeah.

Ana Gee: [unintelligible]

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible]

Chair: So dog parks and nature in District 6.

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible] or if you had a chicken or something like that, that would be extra fun. Okay, so this is the process ahead. You guys are going to email any of the thoughts you have and I'm going to come back in November with a pretty firmish draft for you to respond to and you'll get it in advance and in between now and then [unintelligible].

Jane Weil: District 6. Is it too much to ask for you to send us a list of the Hope S.F. site.

Taylor Emerson: Sure, I'm happy to do that.

Jane Weil: Okay, because it's mentioned in [unintelligible] and I'd like to know what they are.

Taylor Emerson: Yes, yes. [unintelligible].

Anthony Cuadro: District 7. I just want to make a comment and it can be thrown out or whatever. The exercise we just did I feel like it being more useful if we got an update as we went through each one and we're updated about each one and then we could ask questions and throw things in as we go just as [unintelligible].

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible]

Anthony Cuadro: [unintelligible]

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible] Some of them are done, some of them may be just refined so there's room for—we always add some each year and there was a request to be more involved with those, the formulation of those so feel free to email me. Does everybody know my email address? Taylor.emerson@sfgov.org [unintelligible].

Male Speaker: Excuse, I'm sorry. I'm organizing the city's Armistice Centennial commemorations for this year so I have to leave but I did want to share one thing with you about Golden Gate Park that I found. The day after tomorrow a hundred years ago Michael de Young who was the owner of the Chronicle suggested a famous director Thomas [unintelligible] that people could come to Golden Gate Park and be filmed to send a message to their soldiers and

friends and the first headline was entire city aroused. [laughs] And subsequently there were other reports. But on the day of October the 6th 150,000 people came to Golden Gate Park and were filmed sending messages to their soldiers and the film was sent to France.

Taylor Emerson: What was the population of the city of the time? That must have been everybody. [simultaneous comments]

Chair: Sorry, before I close this item Taylor I wanted to thank you again, most of these members were not here during the Strategic Planning and I know there were many who were but I also know that one was kind of like it was a large-scale back and forth, it went on for a long time, like I think it felt like almost a year leading up to the Strategic Plan. So there was a lot of talk, feedback, talk. Feedback I think what the committee was in reading the agenda item again now it's much clearer now that you've made the presentation what your intention was but the reason I'm mentioning this now is she's opening the door to the next meeting where she'll be here again and we can now process this. So to Anthony's point now we have asked specifics about what want to know. We know what the scope that she's asking for is, now let's do our homework over the next month and come back with some good questions.

Taylor Emerson: I want to impress that between and the next month is better because it's just—we have to [unintelligible].

Steven Currier: District 11. That's why I'm not saying to you [unintelligible]. This is the first time I've ever seen this so I'm confused and I don't know what to say. I was going to say something about the dog parks in District 6 [unintelligible] play area in District 6 four blocks from AT&T Park but I have no idea.

Chair: Well now you can take it home and give it a read.

Steven Currier: This is an outline so this is not a conversation.

Chair: Right but we did this with the intention of supporting because that's their responsibility under Prop B that we're a part of this discussion and so this is them making us a part of the conversation.

Steven Currier: If Linda D'Avirro was here I'd had her whole file from when she was on PROSAC so if it's in there.

Chair: She was here. She was a huge part. In fact that document that you have is largely an interaction between Dennis Mosgofian, Linda D'Avirro, Taylor, the Department. [simultaneous comments] . I can also tell you the guy sitting behind you who was also very involved, feel free to have an offline discussion with Robert about his role that he played.

Taylor Emerson: And poke around our website. There's so much awesome information there including this edition and the two prior ones and if you haven't signed up for enews yet you get to know lots of events that way as well.

Jane Weil: District 6. I think that points up though that as we get new members perhaps we should have a small welcome packet.

Chair: We do. We give them a PROSAC folder. [simultaneous comments] So Tiffany can we at the end of this the members who did not get that PROSAC welcome packet I would certainly suggest that they get copies of that. I would also to that end say that whenever they renovate the Strategic Plan which we're an integral part of that all members of PROSAC get that document. So again, I can't ask you for that now but in two or three months. [simultaneous comments]. So is there any public comment on this item? Hearing none, this item is closed.

At the behest of Richard Rothman it's the zoo.

Joe Fitting: Hello. My name is Joe Fitting, I'm the deputy Director. I started with the park in 1979 as an education specialist. I've seen the park really transform in so many ways and one of the things I say to all of our board members, we have about a fifty-man board [unintelligible] for all volunteers I remind them this is a hundred-acre park, it's a hundred acre-garden, it's a hundred-acre classroom, it's a hundred-acre zoo. We're more than just a zoo.

[unintelligible] in 1932. The Department came into existence in 1929 so next year we'll be celebrating our 90th year. This year we'll have a million visitors, close to a million visitors, come to this park and guess how many of them are school groups? I don't know if you're aware of this but every San Francisco Unified School classroom gets free admission to the San Francisco Zoo and that's a lot of kids coming through the zoo during the school year.

This week is Fleet Week. Every military personnel shows up with a military badger gets in free to this park. So we do have a lot of free opportunities to the park and as you well know we're a part of the Recreation and Park system. We've been part of the Recreation and Park system since it's conception I presume. So it's really a special place [unintelligible] from 1989 to the present 40 million have gone through this park, easily. That's probably an underestimation. And you guys are talking about how to connect to nature—here it is. [unintelligible] but just to give you some sense this is the Pomeroy Center. Do you guys know what the Pomeroy Center is? Okay, this is the National Guard at the top of the hill, this is the high point. If we have a tsunami this is where we're going. This of course is the Oceanside Treatment Plant and this is the pump station. So all the western side of San Francisco waste system goes into this pump station, gets pushed along this enormous pipes into the West Side Ocean Treatment Plant.

I thought we were cursed. How many zoos have a waste treatment plant next to them? Actually it's going to turn into a blessing and I'll share that with you in a moment.

So what are our influences? We have a lot of influences. One of them is—[unintelligible]. So what you're looking at is the [unintelligible]. This is the pump station that I was referencing. This is Sloat Boulevard right here. This is the first intersection that's going to be impacted by this road closure. This southbound road will be closed they say in the first quarter of 2019. The north and southbound will be rerouted to what is now called the northbound lane. This [unintelligible] so we have an intersection here that's under redesign. This is Skyline and Sloat

which is under redesign and of course this is the intersection where this road system will [unintelligible]. They're going to redesign it. So how people get into the zoo is impacted too.

So what you're looking at now is the Ocean Beach Master Plan that was brought forward by SPUR and this is happening. In fact on Thursday all the stakeholders are coming to the San Francisco Zoo to learn about all the changes that are swirling around this park, and I mean swirling around. The road system is going away, access to this park is going to be greatly impacted. How we need to really start strategically planning on how we're going to get people back into the park. One of our plans is to reactivate [unintelligible] it comes right by the Mother's Building, that is an portal. The old what we call south gate is another portal. But where are the cars? The cars will no longer be able to get in and we're not going to be able to have an entrance and exit in one portal, we'll have to have capability and so we're looking at to redesigning and reformatting parking down this what we call Armory Road, create a new entrance into the park. So we'll have to bring people in right here, park them, and then get you to the park. So these are all really important considerations.

Richard Rothman: When is this supposed to happen?

Joe Fitting: It's coming like a ton of bricks.

Male Speaker: That change are you working at the Pomeroy Center on that?

Joe Fitting: The Pomeroy Center, yeah, they know that all this is under—they understand what's going on around them. We actually offer Pomeroy access [unintelligible] the old south gate and walk them in to a park so we routinely have Pomeroy programs coming into the park and what better place for these people to come and really reconnect to nature?

Male Speaker: So it's a parking lot, it's not going to be accessible where it currently stands together. Where will those cars go?

Joe Fitting: We're going to create a whole new parking bay over here and that's not the Pomeroy Center is literally right here, this is where the Pomeroy Center. We're going to bring them in to what we call our south gate and create a whole new development.

Male Speaker: So I guess my question is are you guys working with Pomeroy Center on traffic mitigation because it's going to go right in front of their doors which is now a street that's not usually traversed very often and they have a vulnerable crowd that goes in and out of there all day long.

Joe Fitting: There is a whole parking zone there so we won't impact that at all. And then have—it's not stuff we're controlling.

Male Speaker: I'm just curious if you guys are working together.

Joe Fitting: Yeah we work with Pomeroy Center. In fact we're bringing some more programs forward that [unintelligible]. That old entrance will be a portal right to them, they can just cross that street. We'll figure it out.

Richard Rothman: So will the current entrance on 48th and Sloat will that still be open?

Joe Fitting: Our intent is to hopefully open a new portal.

Richard Rothman: [unintelligible]

Joe Fitting: That has to be redesigned because it doesn't line up. The stop light does not line up with our entrance. [unintelligible] global influence have a huge impact and I say to you in all seriousness climate change is real, we have to start paying attention to it. Science matters, biodiversity is in real trouble because of climate change and [unintelligible] and the San Francisco Zoo has a responsibility to lead, to really influence those million visitors that come to the park. And how are we going to do it? Well, this is our mission, to connect people, to inspire caring and to [unintelligible]. So through this mission we will hopefully help stop some of those really global influences.

What I'm going to do is align our parks with the mission and if you look at that drawing you'll notice that half the park is actually [unintelligible] and half of it is still under development. The park was just a DPW park which is kind of old school, [unintelligible] and I think we've come a long ways. Tell me, when is the last time you've been to the park?

Male Speaker: Two weeks ago.

Joe Fitting: If you're been to the park you've seen a real transformation over the last five years. Our motto is fewer animals living larger. We can't do everything. We're going to try to connect our million guests to nature and inspire them to the biodiversity.

Male Speaker: The snow leopards are cute.

Joe Fitting: [unintelligible] So how do we do that? We have a framework plan. We are actually working on becoming a leader in the nature conversation [unintelligible] we're going to help achieve that goal. And the mission and the vision are pretty obvious but one of the imperatives, the really important ones I think is guest experiences. They have world-renown [unintelligible] and that program is to activate [unintelligible] in other words bring the best out of our animals and I think you're starting to see that through our lemur forest, our African Savannah. These are really engaging. The animals are really active, alert, and they're living long lives. I don't know if you're aware of it, one of our chimps is sixty-plus years old and that's an example of our commitment to wellness [unintelligible]. We have a unique opportunity. How many zoos really have their feet in the Pacific Ocean or in an ocean? Very few. So we're at the point of really having an important conversation about the other [unintelligible]. When Fleishhackers pool building was there it was a massive old building and it just kind of dominated that western outlook and when it kind of went away [unintelligible] and suddenly we realized we have an opportunity not only to [unintelligible] about the other two-thirds of the world.

[unintelligible] is really addressing the biodiversity issue and a lot of our [unintelligible] is based on bringing forward the biodiversity hotspot conversation. As you can see the coastal is the big pink one and that's really the future of the park, we're going to really try to bring that forward in a meaningful way. We have what we call a pop-up on the top of the sand dunes, you might have seen it, with some [unintelligible] and we're working with NOAA what they call an observation site so that you can go up there and kids can learn and look out into the ocean. There are three marine sanctuaries.

Male Speaker: What's NOAA?

Joe Fitting: Sorry. National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration. NOAA is really excited because they have a portal now into the ocean and there's nowhere else on the coast that gives them really a full access to monitoring and observing the three marine sanctuaries that are right off our coast. The biodiversity right off our coast is off the charts, that's why it's considered a biodiversity hotspot. 70 percent of the animals in there are endemic to it.

So this is one of those projects. This is taking the core, the heritage part of our park, an old building that was built in the 1930s, massive, cement monolith and we're going to connect it with another old space called the triple grotto and create a chimp sanctuary and here you can see the first phase of it. We've connected the two buildings with this aerial trail and this is the first day the chimps got into this aerial trail to go back and forth and you will walk under it. But they were so excited. This gave them a whole new vantage point. Being up is really kind of in their behavior and so they were really excited to be up there.

There's a page here that shows you where a long-term habitat [unintelligible] and there's multiple ones. You'll see on it specifically opening [unintelligible] portals and of course the Mother's building is mentioned in there too. Listen, we would love the Mother's building to come back to life. When we go to funders and donors and say here's the stuff we'd like to work on refurbishing old buildings like this is not high on their list. They're really interested in [unintelligible] animal habitats and that kind of connection. So it's a challenge but if it does come back to life we can use it in an interesting way. I would like it to do what it was initially designed to do is of course serve moms, that's why it's called the Mother's building.

Male Speaker: It was a gift shop when I was kid.

Joe Fitting: It was a gift shop. We would use it as a membership entrance that old portal would become a membership entrance. [unintelligible] because it's connected to the playground and it's a very dynamic and exciting part of the zoo and of course because it has such a history we can use it as the history of this whole area including the zoo.

So this is an exciting thing on the horizon here. We're going to create more open space for the public and for our animals and enlarge our very successful neighbor forest and [unintelligible]. Madagascar is one of those hotspots that really needs to be brought to full attention as much as we possibly can to this amazing place. So through the AAZA, that's the American Association of Zoos and Aquariums. It's a cooperation with zoos and aquariums to try to manage and maintain

whatever animal populations we can [unintelligible] so they've approached us and said we would love you to extend your lemur project to start breeding them. So that's part of the [unintelligible] start breeding lemurs and really start talking about Madagascar in a really important way.

What you're looking at here is the triple grotto where chimps are and this is where that aerial trail [unintelligible]. This is the Lemur Café. This is the main street right here. This is the boardwalk of the lemur forest so it's going to [unintelligible] use this space and this volume much more successfully.

You can see that's a little more detail of the project. That project is starting right now. We're meeting with the contractors, we're submitting drawings to [unintelligible] we're working with the architects to really make this a world class [unintelligible] challenge is to take old infrastructure and turn it into long-term successes. The Mother's building is really a challenge. Right now it's being arrested from further decay. This was just a cement pad poured on sand and [unintelligible] has suffered from multiple earthquakes it's experienced.

Richard Rothman: How many people know what's inside the Mother's building?

Chair: All of us.

Joe Fitting: What you're looking at here is our Penguin Island now and this is the Pachyderm building being built back in 1932. This is our coastal conservation initiative it's to bring polar bears back and [unintelligible] where they should be and that's right on the coast, right on the ocean [unintelligible] see the open ocean. It's a spectacular concept. What's really exciting is the relationship with this and when I say it's the relationship with this is we're working with the PUC now and I'm sure you're aware the PUC is working on a recycled water project and they're going to be pushing recycled water back up into the parks and they came at me years and years ago and said how much do you want? And I said I'll take it all because we will use it in really interesting ways. One of them is the polar bear I want to call it—

Male Speaker: Are we getting more polar bears?

Joe Fitting: If I can convince the Packards that we have the polar bear palace, the Packard Polar Bear Puffin Palace it would be possible.

Male Speaker: I would love that.

Joe Fitting: I forgot pinnipeds. Packard Polar Bear Pinniped Puffin Palace right on the coast there.

Male Speaker: It would be awesome!

Joe Fitting: It would be absolutely spectacular and we would use this recycled water—and this is another use of the recycled water. If you're familiar with the park we have an upper and lower lake, the upper lake the water starts there and drains into the lower lake. With the PUC we would convert that recycled water convert it to more of a wetlands activity and I think a couple

of you may know this but we have one of the first insect conservation actions going on with Dahlia the Damsel Fly. We're working with the Presidio and other groups to bring back insects [unintelligible]. There's no park in the greater Bay Area—almost in California, that talks about insects like we do. 92 percent of the animals on this planet are animals without backbones. It's really a great opportunity to have an important conversation about the animals of the future that will impact us in really big ways.

So here's a place to connect our kids to nature in really interesting ways. We're impacting them about land, we're going to be talking about oceans, we're going to be talking about water. [unintelligible] so keep your fingers crossed [unintelligible].

And upcoming events I just always—if you haven't been to the zoo on the weekends we have lots of fun activities going on, [unintelligible] kids have a great time. [unintelligible] You're really missing something, it's great fun. We have [unintelligible] we do all kinds of stuff for the animals, it's a lot of fun. Of course Zoo Lights is another one [unintelligible] and again as I said, hundred-acre park, hundred-acre garden, hundred-acre classroom. It's your hundred-acre zoo. Thank you.

Chair: I'm sure some of the members have questions. I wanted to start this one because Richard obviously is a champion for this and he is always, always talking about the zoo whether we're at PROSAC or not. I can be hanging with him and the zoo comes up. I say this because clearly his interest lies in the Mother's building to some extent but the zoo itself has made some impact on him. I speak to this because I'm a New Yorker and my local was the Bronx Zoo and I look at the money that the Bronx Zoo generates now—I don't know how many of you watch Saturday afternoon documentaries but it's the only time that I really get to shut down and I just watch that documentary over and over of this Bronx Zoo behind the scenes.

I heard some number in terms of the production of this show and it generates something in [unintelligible] revenue around \$65 million. So the reason I say this to you and the reason I'm mentioning it to the committee and Richard is there are certain ways you can get things done that maybe sidestep the Packard Platypus Patchwork that you're talking about. I think that you have to think outside the box and clearly the zoo is one of those great examples, one you're talking to us about the whole city needs to know, damnit the whole state needs to know about it. You have a million visitors a year you should have more, you should have people looking in from all over this country looking at that zoo. So I just want to start this dialog with that.

Nick Belloni: I appreciate you coming. As I told you before you and I talked and this is a resource of how good the zoo is to the city and to the parks. My first meeting here many years ago we talked about Sharp Park and it was—I came in and I was supposed to talk about Sharp Park and I was warned it was going to be ugly, about the frog and snake. And I decided to do research for that first meeting. The first thing I went to was Sharp Park. Second thing on my way home I was like maybe I'll talk to the zoo and I stopped in and met him and [unintelligible] actually it was not because it was a great educational that he gave me on the frog and snake that were there which completely helped me in the meeting that we had here when I had a wonderful woman, and this is funny, she said you know I said that we didn't need to pay \$60,000 for a biologist to walk in front of lawn mowers because of what you told me and this woman says to

the man about the guy with the lawn mowers and the snakes, they don't understand lawn mowers, they're wild animals. If it was a domesticated snake it would know but a wild animal wouldn't.

That was the comedy of it. But there was so much contention and so much problem with it that go actually helped me a lot deal with Lisa Wade who is our biologist here and stuff like that. I had information that she just sat there and was like [unintelligible] okay. Because we have this great resource which is our zoo and it's something the park has that we can utilize it as he did with me and I appreciated that so much. And it's something that it's nice to have them here, I've always been a fan as you know, you heard me joking about seeing it when I was kid and this and that. I would love—I'm happy you're here and I'm happy that you came tonight, thank you.

Joe Fitting: You may not know this but we're working with Yosemite National Park. They have come to us, the Federal Government, to work on a couple conservation actions to reestablish [unintelligible] in the valley floor and the red-legged frog and Yosemite Toad. So we've always had active conservation programs with big stuff but the building blocks of diversity, of biodiversity on this planet, is really the little stuff and so we have frogs, turtles, snakes, damsel fly projects.

Nick Belloni: And if I'm not mistaken you are the renown guy for those two?

Joe Fitting: I have a lot of understanding of them. It's been a love of mine to bring more herpafauna to the park. Zoos also concentrate on the mega-fauna, the big stuff, where the little stuff really is—the kids are really fascinated by the little stuff. That's where your understanding of nature starts and so we need to exploit that and again I just want to point out half the statues in the San Francisco Zoo are female.

Chair: Very nice. Anthony.

Anthony Cuadro: District 7. There's a lot of awesome plans on the paper here. What's the funding look like? Where's the funding coming from?

Joe Fitting: Well that's the real struggle. You've got to remember the zoological society was asked by the city to take over the day to day management and in 1994 they—each year they give us \$4 million to help with all the old stuff and you know it was Recreation and Park personnel and that transition to the [unintelligible] so we get \$4 million every year and that's it, only \$4 million. All the rest has to be raised by [unintelligible] and what we can get through philanthropy and foundations and stuff like that.

Chair: Can you give us a perspective on what that looks like in the file? Like you don't have to give us numbers.

Joe Fitting: \$26 million is what it takes to operate the park.

Chair: And how much comes in through philanthropy like in general?

Joe Fitting: I would say half of it walks through the door and so all the rest \$4 million--\$26 million is what, 10 percent is supported by the city and then the rest has to be raised through philanthropy and foundations and all that kind of stuff. It's a real challenge. We're not always—this mega-bond that you speak of, where are we in that?

Chair: You certainly just got some advocates on our side of the table.

Joe Fitting: And we have all this stuff swirling around us. It's a great opportunity. We can be a real leader—a leader in reconnecting the millions and millions of people who come to the park to the natural world. And again those coastal ocean connection is going to be huge because that is the—that is the conversation of the 21st century. [unintelligible] and working with the PUC we will become the poster child on how cities are solving real modern problems by using this recycled water in really interesting ways.

Chair: Just to echo what you're saying, again last night I spent a few hours with Bill Gates and Meg Wittman and that was in fact the theme obviously of what they're talking about, the theme of what the Packard Foundation is focused on. So just to back you up people who pay \$2500 to watch them talk that's exactly what they were talking about is the future is in the water, the food supplies, 100 percent are going to come from the ocean.

Joe Fitting: If any of you would like to come up and see our pop-up coastal center to really see the potential.

Chair: That would be super-cool.

Joe Fitting: I would love it. I mean because we are a sentinel, that's the word they use, sentinel site, NOAA wants us to help monitor. So we have a weather station out there that you can go and see which way the wind's blowing. We're monitoring the life that goes by and the air and the water. Kids are collecting sand out of the beach and they're looking at microscopes and guess what they see? Plastic!

Chair: We know that. Ana Gee.

Ana Gee: District 6. [unintelligible].

Joe Fitting: The Ocean Film Festival. We partnered with the Ocean Film Festival and we have three little clips that are really entertaining but really connected in interesting ways.

Ana Gee: And I have to say that every time we go we [unintelligible].

Joe Fitting: [unintelligible] So you actually go down to go underneath the giraffes you go over and we've embedded fossils in it.

Ana Gee: Correct and the little ones are like [unintelligible].

Chair: Thank you. So any other comments? Jordan.

Jordyn Aquino: District 4. I really enjoyed how the presentation just wasn't about what I thought it was going to be with the Mother's building. [unintelligible] Ocean Beach master plan and you know we're talking a lot today about Strategic Planning and how this aligns with the Department's goal of inspiring space and place and I think that's what the zoo provides to both children, families and everyone in San Francisco. But like with the advocacy that we see at this table today how does members of the community get involved with their interest in assisting in thinking out of the box.

Joe Fitting: [unintelligible]

Chair: Or as much we're a community advocacy group that can focus its attention on Supervisors for example. But I think in your case Jordyn is asking what other ways can we as a body or advocates advocate for you.

Joe Fitting: Send us an email. We're social media savvy so we get comment from the public all the time and really take them seriously and try and incorporate [unintelligible].

Jordyn Aquino: [unintelligible]

Joe Fitting: And of course through membership. Become a member and through the membership you have much more interface with the zoo and its operations. You'll meet the people who help make this place go on a much more intimate level. I'll be there on many membership events so you can come up and talk to me.

Richard Rothman: I want to say another way too is there's a joint Zoo Committee meeting because the animals are owned by Recreation and Park. I've been going to them for a number of years and I learn more about animals than I care to know about because I go there and talk about the Mother's building. But you can always come during public comment and say something. It's made up of three Recreation and Park Commissioners and some members from the Zoo Committee and it's the fastest meeting you'll ever attend, it's usually over in a half an hour or 40 minutes. They have public comment. They meet the third Thursday at 9:00 a.m. at City Hall, room 421. If you want to come for public comment just say you're part of this group and it's important that whatever you want to say. But it's a good forum to say something about the zoo.

Chair: I'm going to take one more question. Julia.

Julia Pfeifferberger: District 4. I have a two-part question. [unintelligible] but I'm in love with the zoo. We go several times a month [unintelligible]. That said, that is a marked difference from my perception of [unintelligible]. Growing up in San Francisco me and my crunchy granola friends had this perception of the zoo as being out of line with our philosophy. We thought of the zoo as a place that puts animals in cages and [unintelligible] like you were saying. But it wasn't like we didn't want to support [unintelligible] and so I'm really excited to hear that you guys are [unintelligible] conservation groups and all [unintelligible] stewardship and conservation and research. That's very much aligned with my philosophy [unintelligible]. So I just wanted to urge

you to put that out there when the time come [unintelligible] with the marketing to change the perception of the zoo to be more in line with San Francisco's values.

Chair: Before you ever answer that, that's it right there. Right them an email and say exactly that and say listen, I grew up here, I didn't think it was in line. Now as a parent I'm absolutely in line. I'm sure that will be really beneficial to them.

Joe Fitting: If you notice I'm very careful, I don't mention the word zoo very often, I call it a park and it is a hundred-acre park. One of the things the boss pushed and said Joe we need to bring the plant world into the conversation so we've been working really hard to bring the plant conversation in so we're a hundred-acre garden. We are a hundred-acre classroom and we're a hundred-acre zoo. We're more than a zoo! How's that.

Chair: Any other questions.

Julia Pfeiffenberger: I actually have a second comment. My second comment was that growing up in San Francisco in a working class family the zoo was [unintelligible] and so I wanted to ask you other than the few days that you set apart for free access are there any discussions around why [unintelligible] for working class families and any discussions around how that could be made more accessible for more San Franciscans?

Joe Fitting: Well if you do the comparisons and go to other places in San Francisco we're dirt cheap and becoming a member is the best avenue because it's kind of a [unintelligible] but the more you use it the cheaper it comes.

Julia Pfeiffenberger: I know the big cash outlet isn't accessible for all families.

Joe Fitting: A hundred bucks?

Chair: For a year. It's a hundred bucks for a year.

Joe Fitting: It's a little more than that but how much does it cost to go to the Academy.

Julia Pfeiffenberger: [unintelligible]

Chair: But I'll go back to one thing, when I was a kid—and I hate to sound like this and sound so old—but when I was kid and I went to the Bronx Zoo I think it was \$8 and we all thought it was outrageous. It's \$250 a year for the base-level membership.

Julia Pfeiffenberger: I'm hearing you Steffen but [unintelligible] doesn't make it right. I'm saying how [unintelligible] ways to make it more.

Joe Fitting: To have you guys go to the city and say give us more money, we can drop the price. I mean when you think about it \$4 million and you saw that half of the zoo is [unintelligible] and the only way we do it is who walks through the gate. So if we can drop costs [unintelligible] but there has been no change. It's \$4 million and it's been that since 1990.

No change, no change. And we're on nobody's list. Where are we in the mega-bond? We're not in the mega-bond.

Julia Pfeifferberger: It sounds like that's a big opportunity for us to kind of channel our community's energies towards supporting [unintelligible].

Joe Fitting: We are one of your parks.

Chair: Okay. Thank you. So Drew you got up pizza. I have to say when I first discovered the Parks Alliance and how the roles that we all play being Recreation and Park versus park partners I was not a hundred percent sold on the Parks Alliance maybe due to leadership, maybe due to structure, maybe just due to it being kind of the only game in town at that point. But the gentleman who's going to come up and present to us has changed my opinion of that and I think many of you have asked the question where's the Parks Alliance now? Where are these partners now?

So I'm going to turn the floor over to Drew who I think is making a difference in terms of this relationship. Welcome to PROSAC, thank you for waiting.

Drew Becher: I love partnerships. I love our partner PROSAC and I just have to say my first day on the job I came to PROSAC, that was my [unintelligible] and I had absolutely no idea who I was talking to or what I was talking about but I came here and [unintelligible].

What I want to do tonight is really take you through—I'm going to take you quickly through a high level of our Strategic Plan, the planning process, bring some light to it and what you have in your package here. I'm also going to run through overall our organization the way it's set up, the way we work, some high level of our programs, a recent acquisition and merger [unintelligible] and then what we're doing moving forward.

So for those of you that don't know the Parks Alliance has had many iterations and we've been around since 1972 when we were Friends of Recreation and Park. Friends of Recreation and Park [unintelligible] so I just put the Recreation and Park logo there and then the Neighborhood Parks Council was around, that's basically what the Friends of Recreation and Park morphed into over time and the Neighborhood Parks Council created the Park Partner program that we have today. And the San Francisco Parks Trust really grew out of the Conservatory of Flowers issue that happened in the mid 1990s when the Conservatory of Flowers blew down and a bunch of people stepped in and raised about \$30 million in order to rebuild it. We still to this day operate and [unintelligible] with the Recreation and Park Department.

So those entities came together in 2011 to create the San Francisco Parks Alliance as we know it today.

So the San Francisco Parks Alliance over the years we've created the partner program we currently have today. We have over partners in the program. We've rebuild the Conservatory of Flowers. We passed Prop B not too long ago. [unintelligible] blue-greenway and since the mid

1990s we've invested over \$100 million in San Francisco parks and public spaces, that's private funding, not public funding that we have leveraged.

We have a new mission at the Parks Alliance. No one could ever say our mission before, it was a paragraph. Our mission as the San Francisco Parks Alliance is to champion, transform, activate parks and public spaces throughout the city. That is short and to the point and this [unintelligible] we actually worked with the Department and a bunch of our partners on this and I think some people in the room [unintelligible]. Our values are equity, stewardship, partnership, initiative engagement and excellence. This is the lens that we look at, all that we do. So we have a short mission but when we take on projects they have to go with these six values and this is something that's new for us.

Our goals. Build brand and base. This is—I'm going to sort of read here on the way that these are working and basically this is starting here as our foundation for everything that we do. We have to create the culture [unintelligible] within our organization and [unintelligible]. It can't be always the General Manager of Recreation and Park creating [unintelligible] in order to make things happen. We also have to create that and we have to create that and we have to create that within our partner programs and we have to be okay with that [unintelligible] in many ways is good. Money goes to make green parks and green things so that's something we just have to be okay with.

Develop [unintelligible] spaces in highest need neighborhoods. This really is carefully targeting all of our resources and this doesn't mean that we're just going to be in some areas and not others. For example SOMA is a very park poor neighborhood. We build a park poor neighborhood and it should be a focus of us and it should be a focus of ours to raise funds and find green space in that neighborhood. The Richmond should be a focus of ours as well. More kids per capita live in the Richmond than any other neighborhood and that's why they're getting a playground and we're doing the playgrounds there as well but there are different ways to look at different neighborhoods through equity lenses and other pieces so it's the highest need neighborhood it's depending on what we're focusing on and what we'll be focusing on with our partners.

Developing funding and management for public spaces to complement city services. This is really [unintelligible] and maintaining our base, offering new ideas to assist communities and their local efforts to maintain the spaces they have created. This is very important. We are going to hear this as I go throughout this presentation. This effort will also [unintelligible] instead of being one park projects it's stepping back and using the Let's Play S.F. initiative as a model. It's easier for us to raise basically \$15 million for thirteen playgrounds than it is for us to raise money on a micro neighborhood level and making those programs and understanding those programs, who's out there raising money and let's combine efforts to make that happen. In New York we did this with the [unintelligible] program and the community gardens. [unintelligible] were basically falling down and we checked getting [unintelligible] this is how I know we did this and we raised about \$5 million to rebuild all the [unintelligible] in the community gardens, whether they're doing it \$10,000 here and \$15,000 there it was really successful and that's something we want to institute here in San Francisco.

Develop programs to activate public spaces citywide. This gets right to the point of movie night. It's not one size fits all, it is not build it and they will come anymore. These places need to be able to morph from volunteer efforts in the morning to soccer in the afternoon to movies in the evening and we need to be able to [unintelligible]. We also need to offer this programming in a box that people can and your organizations can use.

Establish an organization [unintelligible]. This is really getting to the heart of what we want to do and partnering with other organizations to bring best practices to this city. Understand what's going on, happening around the world and bringing that this organizations and others, being at SPUR, being at those things, being on committees, making sure that you all that love parks and open space are out there being a part of the message.

And then build a [unintelligible] organization. This is something that's big for us. A lot of what we do is we are the fiduciary for a lot of community groups and we need to be more proactive and [unintelligible].

So what we're doing is creating a complete public space ecosystem. We have our partner stewardship program. We just [unintelligible] and we have a public-wide and we've got to get city-wide public space initiative which we just received funding from the city to invest in the organization. It's really hard to see but if you look on your document here I just want to go through the way we're set up is we have a board. We actually have a 27-member board, we expanded it a little while ago to bring on our new board members. Our pro bono law firm which is for people on this committee that don't know this that is one of the big things we do bring to our partners is free basically full service law and insurance and it runs through Pillsbury.

The Conservatory of Flowers we have a whole development Department [unintelligible]. We just hired nine new people throughout the organization so we are basically fully staffed. We're looking for three other organizations. Our programming Department is now broken up in a different area. I'll get to that in a second. We have [unintelligible] which is really our capital Department now and urban planning Department and then we have our Director of Operations and our finance world and then the citywide public space [unintelligible] that we're working on with the city.

The program areas—this is new the way [unintelligible]. We have program and project managers and everyone has their own little silo. Now we have basically mayors of each of these areas. This is hard to see but we have the southeast area manager, the southwest area manager and the north area manager. [unintelligible] we're going to have the northeast and northwest area manager fiscal year 2020, this is proposed [unintelligible] form the city.

Some of our major projects that we have in program areas are street parks. This—we don't only work with the Department of Recreation and Park, we actually—this is through the Department of Public Works. This is an example we have [unintelligible] and Tunnel Top. This is some stats on this. These projects are anywhere from \$1 to \$300,000. There are a 136 street parks around the city. We have 23 that are fiscally sponsored but we're working with about 86 of those groups to actually move them into the fiscally sponsored world.

If you've seen any of these, these are amazing and this is basically a sub-open space system that's happening in the city and a lot happened on the southeast and southwest side of the city. [unintelligible] that we're working with the Department of Planning with. This is basically we go in and we test open space areas for plazas, we see if they work and then we recommend that they go into the capital plan for the city through Recreation and Park, DPW or OEWD and then they become real plazas or open spaces. So it's sort of that nimble, sort of quick easy sort of let's figure out if this is going to be used by the neighborhood. The best example of that was Playland at 43rd Street is one and we also have the Castro little area by the turnaround at Market and Castro Street, we have one on Valencia. We have a bunch of those projects.

Our partner programs we have over 200 partners in our partner program, a lot of them are these leftover spaces that were problem areas for the neighborhoods that people [unintelligible] come together and created these groups and they're our partners [unintelligible]. We have a lot of step projects going on. It's a huge program that we have at the Department of Public Works. This is just an example of some of our partners. Sutro Stores is one of our largest ones, they're also at—we have [unintelligible] they are actually our employees not so they can go out and recruit people to join that nonprofit and run that nonprofit. We give them access to all of our benefits and help them [unintelligible].

We are running two major capital programs. You've probably heard about Let's Play S.F. , it's basically a \$36 million program. We're raising \$15 million of that and that's what we're doing. We have about just over \$8 million raised of that program and then right here [unintelligible] is Golden Gate Tennis Center which is a \$26 million capital investment. We are actually going to work on this one, this is going to be a model that you guys might be interested in is we're going to look at financing projects to get them completed more quickly and we're going to use this as a model. As long as we have pledges and we know where the money is coming from and we have a pipeline in there we are setting up with our bank and financing and our financial world that we have, the possibilities because the city won't allow you to start a project unless you have all the money in the house, that we would actually be on that [unintelligible] so you would start the project sooner while you're still raising your money and the goal is to get the average six to ten years down to at least three or four years that we will be able to make that happen and this is going to be the pilot project that we will test that on.

The blue-greenway was in 2004 Gavin Newsom created the blue-greenway initiative. It's thirteen miles from AT&T to Candlestick Point. This is now sort of morphing from the big concept idea of all the projects actually have been okayed through the Planning Department and now we're really looking at connecting those open spaces back to the neighborhoods and now we're working with SPUR on understanding how we're going to manage these open spaces since only one piece of that thirteen miles, India Basin, is owned by Recreation and Park. The rest is either private developments, large popos or they are other private entities that are just adding open space there. So these is a big question of how this is going to be managed and operated. [unintelligible] you have to call someone else. How is that all going to work? That's something we're working on.

We are also updating the ROSE, the Recreation and Open Space Element. You're going to hear about this next month and I will not do it justice so you will hear about this all next month. This

is hugely important for us because this is approved by the Planning Commission and this is what everybody refers back to. This is what developers refer to when they look at documents so even though it's one of those bland sort of things that no one really looks at it's hugely important to the development world and specifically I think in your neighborhood they need to get it right so people are [unintelligible].

Chair: I'm going to stop you for one second. Again, many of these members were not here—PROSAC played a huge role in the ROSE. Many of our current members, past members, were on sub-committees. That document is what everybody roots back to. So for homework again in the future next month I believe Parks Alliance is going to come back and talk about their role in this but from our perspective this is something that we've seen a lot of and been a great part of, part of PROSAC's value virtue is to be on working groups for these types of documents.

Drew Becher: Our recent acquisition slash merger was Place Lab. Place Lab is a [unintelligible]. Some of their projects are living alleys [unintelligible] so of interesting financing ideas for maintenance. Their big current projects are Dolores Park, [unintelligible], also Eagle Plaza, Central SOMA, new Central SOMA park, that stuff is all through our Place Lab Division of the Parks Alliance now.

So really what we are doing as an organization is we've all heard about place making and place making everyone wants to do. No one wants to talk about place keeping, how do you maintain this place [unintelligible].

Chair: We do.

Drew Becher: This is something where we're really transitioning and we're really going to focus on because this is important. After people spend six to ten years going through our process, creating these spaces, basically it's drop the mic when the ribbon-cutting happens and then the whole community has to figure out how to maintain it and move it forward and we don't do a very good job as a city, as a Park Department, as Public Works in order of having this [unintelligible]. Basically it's like great, you did this now you need to maintain it into perpetuity.

I as the CEO of an organization that gives our a lot of community challenge grants I have to sign on a dotted line for every single one of these community groups five or ten years and we'll be maintaining your projects. I shudder at doing that every single time because I'm relying on really nothing in order to make that happen and it's coming back to bite us. We're being like [unintelligible] not maintaining this site, not maintaining that site. And we're like well—they're like well you signed an agreement to maintain it so we have to like quickly figure out how we're going to maintain this stuff.

So we need to go from a community [unintelligible] which is what we're creating now which is basically it's all up to you to maintain it to a community [unintelligible] and we've got to create this catchment system in order to allow these services to deliver to these community groups. Right now through the Department of Public Works we delivery with our Clean and Green Team we have every single weekend except for two out of the year so it's fifty weeks a year we do Clean and Green with the Department of Public Works but that's only fifty sites. We have 136

street parks plus we have another 200 partner projects plus community gardens that want these projects. We have a waiting list. Sometimes it takes us a year in order to get to the project, that's only one time that you get the services and the trucks and the shovels and the rakes and the extra hands to help. We need to fix that.

So what we're doing is [unintelligible] they are investing in the Parks Alliance not just in a financial and administrative role to make it easier for our partners with their finances but also the shared administration [unintelligible]. So we're looking at the shared administration that all of these [unintelligible] and all these other entities that are being created they all should have to have HR, they should all not have to have finance people, they all should not have to have all this other stuff. So we're basically creating all this infrastructure all over the place and it's being—a lot of the admin is being eaten up and what should be going out for public use. So that's what we're focused on is shared administration, how to delivery that service a lot better.

Cleaning and safety. This is basically workforce development, working with homeless. We're not even delivering this but creating programs like in other cities they have done, New York and Chicago specifically have really good model [unintelligible] that trains homeless people [unintelligible]. So that would be cleaning and safety.

Partnering with our community organizations such as Downtown Streets Team or Hunters Point Family in order [unintelligible]. Activation and programming, everybody wants to have things happen in their spaces. But we run into roadblocks all the time. Do you have insurance? Do you have the permits? Do you have all this other stuff? We would already—we want to create basically activation in a box, programming in a box, that if you want to have [unintelligible] it's already permitted, it's already insured, people have already done the background checks and it's ready to go. All you have to do is either raise money for it and pay for it or if you're part of a bigger program [unintelligible].

And then the project plan implementation this is a larger sort of do you want to do a larger project we'll help you through that project such as tapping [unintelligible]. And in a roundabout way if you want to create a financing district or a special financing district we would also take you through the process.

So that's where we're going as an organization and what we're doing. We are the San Francisco Parks Alliance! But we know parks are different in different neighborhoods and everybody in parks just as the zoo considers itself a park we consider streets parks, we consider a lot of things parks and open space. We love to partner with everyone. We love to partner with PROSAC and we are really bullish on our future and what we are about and really just loving working with the small subsets of PROSAC and moving this city forward in a way I think that we need to.

Chair: Let's keep it short and to the point my friends because we starting to get into tomorrow's meeting today. Ana Gee.

Ana Gee: District 6. [unintelligible].

Drew Becher: [unintelligible]

Ana Gee: My other question is what's the difference between your organization [unintelligible]?

Drew Becher: [unintelligible] Well, the difference would be we would look at those CBDs or GBDs we would look at them so they're all sanctioned by the city and there has been some thinking that [unintelligible] So if you sort of add up about \$250,000 in administrative costs, even make those go as separate organizations that's where our organization would step in and ask the question can we be of assistance there? We do not want anything to do with the local [unintelligible] we would just be looking at also offering services that the CBD could bundle so if you're buying Christmas lights or holiday lights there's seventeen other groups that want to do that as well. [unintelligible] and get a cheaper price and then give that to you. That's what we're sort of looking at and how we interact with those [unintelligible].

Chair: Nick Belloni.

Nick Belloni: District 2. Within all these services you said programming and everything how much does that cost the park group that wants it?

Drew Becher: We're right now in the midst of doing a business plan for that and that was the impetus behind these movie nights as well was to understand sort of the [unintelligible] and we didn't want any favors from anyone. We want to go through the process. We want to know how much this is going to cost. How much is this. How much is this overlay going to cost us on you know permitting, other things that are going to be required, all this stuff. We wanted to know the real [unintelligible] what that's going to cost. So this movie night was sort of a higher level sort of let us understand that and then we also have this coming—like in a couple weeks we have the [unintelligible] that's another one where we're been sort of tracking costs for that [unintelligible] understanding that and then building out the business on top of that.

Nick Belloni: Because it's more, you know, these things are going to start costing neighborhood groups and stuff and they're going to want to know how much that is if we push it to them because it is a good idea and it's good to have somebody else do it because that can be a pain to deal with all that.

Drew Becher: Yeah. I'm still thinking if we can get like you know if somebody like [unintelligible] we've done some quick scans like it's amazing how many people use the same DJ. Instead of us doing you know eighteen different contract with this person and then having to go through all this other stuff it's like okay why don't we just have you on you know [unintelligible].

Nick Belloni: Okay because that's going to be something going forward we're going to need to know to tell people if they want to use the services.

Drew Becher: Yeah.

Male Speaker: District 7. Just along that same thing is what's the cost structure that you guys charge to [unintelligible]?

Drew Becher: It depends on where you [unintelligible] and that's our current structure that we use. So you can enter the program at the 10,000 and below and I can give you a whole—it's actually on our website, you can [unintelligible] it's 90 percent of your revenue and nothing on the—nothing will [unintelligible]. So that's the core partner piece. We're actually looking at rethinking that whole structure as part of this program. I'm not particularly in love with the way that works and it doesn't pay for itself. The whole program, our partner program that we currently have that manages 200 partners cost us about \$1.2 million a year to delivery and with fees we bring in about \$600,000. So we've got a lot of groups that have a couple thousand dollars and we're talking you know it's like we get [unintelligible]. So that philanthropic side we've got to figure out how to cover.

Chair: Nick.

Nick Belloni: Just on that would like core partner—like you just explained, how many parks are on that and what are they?

Drew Becher: [unintelligible] which is the Conservatory of Flowers which is our core partner and it's not really—so we've got the Gardens for the Environment, the [unintelligible] Alemany Farm, we have Climate Action Now and I believe there's one more in there that are core partners. [unintelligible] and they didn't have anything set up how to do that so they became a joint employment partner with us, core partner, and they are not our employees and they operate the Alemany Farm.

Chair: Again. Just to visualize this here's the Alemany Farm a group of loose people who say we need somebody we can put on staff and have nothing in place to do that so in essence instead of paying somebody under the table and doing it kind of backwards he's offering, they're offering an infrastructure.

Nick Belloni: I think it's a good idea I was just trying to figure out how many you actually have.

[simultaneous comments]

Drew Becher: [unintelligible]

Nick Belloni: That's a good think and that's why I was trying to figure out what you had for other [unintelligible].

Drew Becher: [unintelligible]

Nick Belloni: I agree and that's why when you said that I was kind of like that sounds good and I just want to know how—you said it was like one park. It's like uh, you know. But the fact you have it built out actually gives a nice—

Drew Becher: It's basically what it is it's \$5000 for your first employee, it's \$2500 for every employee [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments].

Chair: Any other questions? So one thing I'll just chime in and we'll let Drew go. This is necessary for us. I think what he started with which maybe the headline got buried a little, we have to just expect and accept the idea that there is a public-private relationship that's going on, bigger and bigger. The only way that we're going to achieve positive open space. It's never easy to raise money bigger than all of that and I know myself and I deal with it all the time is having the infrastructure. You have plenty of people who are willing to be advocates. You have plenty of people that are willing to help raise money for Clean and Green but it's the infrastructure that's so important and RPD unfortunately isn't in the position to do what these guys are doing. They can say we own this property, we run this, we manage this but when it comes to these missing pieces it's never been easy to step up and say hey I want to do this and so now for these developing Districts you know. Again. Nine, ten, eleven, six! You're the districts of the future in this city in a lot of ways and to that end this relationship, his opening the door, Parks Alliance opening the door and saying drink it up, come to us. I did that friends of group preso in Hunter's Point and somebody said well you know this is great but like how do I start a friends of, we don't have any money, we can't do it. And somebody from Parks Alliance was there and said you don't need any money, you need the intention to raise money. You need the ability to go out and solicit people. They don't care if it's \$10. What they're saying is is there a future in this organization and can we become invested. So I'm not trying to do a commercial for you Drew, I'm trying to say it's a different Parks Alliance now and so for all of you as advocates this is your new best friend. Go with him! Be vocal. He and I sat at a movie night, [unintelligible] and Drew and I are talking strategy for the big picture of the park. So it's just much more reachable and I encourage you as members of this committee to reach out and go there and sit down and talk about some ideas that you have.

Steven Currier: District 11. You know, I hear what you're saying but in all my years of doing this when I had to deal with Isabelle Wade which you know it was like a wall there where you couldn't penetrate it and get anything done and she would never be on your side [unintelligible] and then when it became Parks Trust [unintelligible] and we couldn't get in the door.

Chair: Well no, no, listen to [unintelligible].

Steven Currier: I'm talking about experience! [simultaneous comments] District 11 don't know how to do this because they've been turned away so many times and so I have to be able to trust this so we can move on.

Chair: So to speak to that—I'll speak to it and say I joined a friends of group under the Neighborhood Parks Council and the San Francisco Parks Trust, Isabelle Wade. My president of that group was Lynn Newhouse Seagull who was a park Commissioners.

Steven Currier: Of course.

Chair: And it was a hundred percent against the idea of this merger and thought it would be bad for parks. I'm saying I am now the President and I spent years trying to solicit advocacy from the Parks Alliance and it was only now—if we were sitting here two years ago I would not be bullish on the Parks Alliance. I would not be as supportive and so I understand what you're saying and it is time to go locally and talk micro-locally at that level and convince people that they're –

Steven Currier: Can I give you a small?

Chair: Sure.

Steven Currier: Years and years ago RPD wanted to [unintelligible]. The kids were screaming for a skateboard park. Nobody in San Francisco wanted it and in Crocker-Amazon we had a group and I finally said I was at a Commission meeting, I think it was a Capital meeting, and I walked in and everybody knew I was coming and everybody knew what I was going to say that if you want to put it in Crocker-Amazon we're the further park away from anybody but you know what we've got the room, give it to us. And the one that argued with me who got there before I did was Isabelle Wade and she told me no you can't have it there, we're going to put it on Pier 23 or something. I was livid. We got the skateboarding facility but that's where we need to work I guess with you [unintelligible].

Drew Becher: I just want to say Isabelle Wade hasn't been involved in the organization for—

Steven Currier: No, no, I understand.

Drew Becher: [unintelligible]

Steven Currier: No, I understand.

Chair: Drew, again. In his defense your predecessor and I don't know how many people in this room dealt with Drew's predecessor there was a problem there. There was a disconnect with him and people who were advocates. He didn't want to talk to them, he didn't really connect with them. He came in at the last minute in projects and I see a lot of heads nodding because they know who I'm talking about. You're different. To that end I think this member's point is well-taken that if I didn't have a personal relationship with you I'd be asking where they hell is the Parks Alliance in this conversation but I know you and I know what you guys have been trying to do. So, again, I think Steven your point is well taken. Maybe a year from now you're be a huge advocate too because [unintelligible].

Drew Becher: I just want to be also clear, the Parks Alliance is not going to take sides on local park issues. This is something we're not doing and actually I've gotten from Aaron Peskin and others that's a very welcome thing that we are not doing that. Now, I cannot control all 200 groups [unintelligible] without taking sides but if it becomes [unintelligible] where it becomes a citywide issue yes, that's when we will start taking notice and [unintelligible] okay, this is an issue for us and this whole Strategic Plan about maintenance and what [unintelligible]. Maintenance is their number one issue. It's like who's going to help me maintain this thing and

we have got to start tackling this issue and it can't just be the weekend warriors that are doing that. That's not the answer to it. We've got to have something other than that and that's sort of our—this next two years, we're on a two-year, three-year Strategic Plan but two years is getting this web together or how are we going to maintain these public spaces that we all have dedicated umpteen million hours and decades to create. And some of them are falling into disrepair. I mean [unintelligible] it's a big issue and it's something that we've got to focus on. It's not just a Recreation and Park issue, it's a DPW issue, it's a court issue, it's a citywide issue.

Chair: That's another thing I'll mention is because it's not a city agency they're not held by all these it's not my fault, it's DPW, it's not DPW it's MTA, it's not MTA it's RPD. He doesn't have a bunch of initials to deal with, he basically can say all right let me bring all those people into the room as a different type of advocate not just a voice but somebody who had money, who has donors, who has support. It's an interesting paradigm for us and I think convening here and talking to us about this uniquely positions us in this situation to have his ear, to have that organization potentially behind us.

So Drew, awesome. You've got to come back and visit us again maybe in a couple months as this rolls out.

We have two more items. I'll make it short and sweet. Any announcements? Sorry, hang on. Any public comment on the Parks Alliance item? Hearing none, this item is closed. Richard?

Richard Rothman: District 1. Not all of you have seen the inside of the Mother's building so I'm trying to arrange to get [unintelligible] and when I do I'll invite all of the PROSAC members to come out and usually [unintelligible]. They're doing construction work right now so Recreation and Park doesn't want [unintelligible]. And the building is closed so I don't like to pester the zoo to open it up all the time because Joe has to come and stay with them. So hopefully [unintelligible] I know a lot of people don't like animals but I think the zoo is [unintelligible].

Chair: Any other announcements?

Ana Gee: District 6. [unintelligible]

Chair: Any other announcements? Yes, Jordyn.

Jordyn Aquino: [unintelligible]

Chair: Where is it?

Jordyn Aquino: It will be at the Sunset rec center on Octavia.

Chair: Thank you. Any others? Hearing no other announcements I'm going to close this item. Before I go to public comment we forgot to just touch base on the draft calendar which you should have in your packet. Katherine was kind enough to indicate Tiffany that December 3rd, not December 4th, of 2019 is Tuesday. So that should be changed. If you would, I don't need us

to vote on this now but I would like you to look at this so that next month we can actually vote on our calendar for 2019. As you can see here there are no real crucial dates that will conflict so I'd like you to just look at this and we'll either vote to adopt this or to make changes.

Okay, I have some public comment now. I have two cards. I will say both Jim and Jude thank you very much, I hope you've enjoyed the show. We'll start with Jim Haydn. You have two minutes.

Jim Hayden: I'm a longtime San Francisco resident, I live in District 2. Just a quick question on the Golden Gate Park golf clubhouse, you may know about it, it was built in 1951. It's been there for 70-odd years. It burned to the ground about three or four months ago, a homeless person or something like that. But anyway I've been playing on the course for 50 years and I was out there this weekend and I was very sad to see and I've heard bit and pieces of what the city is going to do about. You must have insurance and I hate to see nothing done for four or five years which is what I fear and I'd like to see it replaced very shortly. What are the plans, how much is it going to cost, what can you tell me about that?

Chair: I think that's a fair question. We actually had a presentation by the General Manager a day after that fire and his intention and I think what he made clear to the committee was that he was not going to let that happen, that he felt that was an important space that needed to be raised and some of the situation at least initially to make it usable. But I don't think that's a long term goal. Maybe the Department could speak to that. I can't answer your question directly.

Jim Hayden: They have a temporary structure there now which kind of gets by but are there plans replace [unintelligible].

Drew Becher: The city is self-insured so we don't have insurance. [unintelligible] The city has an insurance fund which is like there's a fund with police and fire and stuff like that so some money comes from your tax dollars [unintelligible].

Jim Hayden: Do you think it will be replaced in good time?

Drew Becher: Yes.

Chair: Phil talked about it two months ago but it was so fresh, there wasn't enough information, but I'd be glad to entertain an update and have the Department give us whether it's in the capital report or whether it's actually a presentation. Thank you. Jude?

Jude Deckenbach: [unintelligible] Jackson Park, that's over in the Potrero in District 10 [unintelligible]. However, since my job is to raise money specifically for my park project I felt it was a conflict of interest [unintelligible].

Chair: [unintelligible]

Jude Deckenbach: Long story short, we've worked at five years with Recreation and Park [unintelligible]. So we've worked with Recreation and Park, city agencies, community,

community of Jackson Park is a huge community of users because we have two of the only nine lit ball fields [unintelligible]. On Thursday we had over a hundred people there to see the plan we designed that's quite ambitious. It's very inspirational and long story short even though we raised a little over \$6 million we're not going to build that park unless we get bond money. Therefore we are rolling out a community outreach program to advocate for [unintelligible]. You might be receiving some of that [unintelligible].

Chair: Thank you very much. Continue. Good Luck. We're here to help [unintelligible]. Any comments, questions on this item? Any public comment? Hearing none, this item is closed. This meeting is adjourned, thank you very much.

End of Document