

Park and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee Meeting September 11, 2018

Chair: Welcome to the September meeting of the Park and Recreation Open Space Advisory Committee. I'll start with roll call.

Richard Rothman: District 1.

Robert Brust: District 8.

Jane Weil: District 6.

Gisele Rainer: District 3.

Steven Currier: District 11.

Julia Pfeifferberger: District 4.

Ancel Martinez At large.

Elisa Laird-Metke: District 9.

Mark Scheuer: District 8.

Nick Belloni: District 2.

Jordyn Aquino: District 4.

Chair: Steffan Franz. District 2. Before we get into the review of the minutes I want to take a minute and introduce you to our newest PROSAC member, this is Julia and I'll give her just a couple minutes on the record to say what brought you here. We like to hear from PROSAC members of how they came to this place.

Julia Pfeifferberger: I am a long-time resident of San Francisco. My family immigrated here when I was three years old. I grew up here in the city attending San Francisco public schools and the University of California. I've been working in technology for the entirety of my career and I would love to find ways to get more involved in my local community and help improve San Francisco. I think that PROSAC is a great way to do it so I'm looking forward to learning from all of you and working with you all and hopefully improving San Francisco for all residents.

Chair: Welcome. So let's do the review of the minutes. Has everybody had a chance to take a look at the minutes? I know that one member had some concern whether that was in the action minutes or whether that was in the actual transcript.

Steven Currier: Under new business agenda setting we did have Tom Borden here who spoke actually in public comment but I made a request to put it on the agenda for staff to let us know why seven trees were cut down with no public comment and it's not reflected in the minutes and I would like it reflected in the minutes. I'm not necessarily concerned about having them on the agenda yet because they're coming to the McLaren Collaborative on the 18th so we can actually grill them there also and if I need any more I'll just bring it up again.

Chair: I think it's fair to say that although there was public comment Steven is saying that he wanted to make sure it was on the record that he was the one who actually mentioned that during the Chair's report.

Steven Currier: And a request for it to be on the agenda.

Chair: And requested for it to be on the new business. So we oddly don't need to add it to new business because that presentation is taking place for the McLaren Collaborative which was really what his end-game was. He just wants to make sure that if somebody were to come back and say how come nobody raised this at PROSAC he could say yes actually on the record I did raise this. So I think that's the clarification. If you go back to the transcript there is probably a mention that he makes of asking for that presentation.

Secretary: So it's in the transcript—so wouldn't that be in the minutes as well?

Steven Currier: Not everybody reads the transcript and actually I didn't even get the transcripts this time.

Chair: Again, we don't distribute the transcripts widely. The idea is that there is action.

Steven Currier: That's why I wanted the minutes.

Chair: Again, he's saying that not everybody reads the transcripts so he wants it in the action minutes.

Steven Currier: Or I could send you like a one-sentence blurb on it.

Secretary: Do you want that as part of the Chair's report?

Chair: I think that your comments were actually part of the Chair's report initially before we heard Tom in public comment.

Secretary: Specifically the transcripts are posted online after the minutes are approved and they're posted online along with the actual minutes and typically we don't put members comments in the action minutes because we've had quite a few times where people would be this is not what I said, this is not what I meant, and so the transcript is used with that.

Steven Currier: It was not in the Chair's report.

Secretary: In the transcript?

Steven Currier: Right.

Chair: I would just ask to take a look at it. I don't think he's saying that we can't ratify the minutes as-is, I think you're just saying you want to make sure that it's included.

So is there anybody else in terms of the August meeting minutes?

Steven Currier: With the corrections I move to approve the minutes.

Nick Belloni: I'll second.

Chair: All in favor of approving the minutes as-is say aye.

All: Aye.

Chair: Opposed? This has is approved. Thank you.

So I was going to reserve my Chair's report because there is a member who seems to be noticeably missing who actually was here last Tuesday, by his own admission he forgot that we moved the meeting. But Ken Maley reached out to me specifically with regards to Washington Square and an issue that he has been very vocal about both in the press, to the Department, to various Supervisors, with regard to ten trees basically being killed by a contractor under Recreation and Park's watch and I think what his concern was is that the Department may or may not have known about it but that this happened and I've heard from the Department itself that they are doing their best to rectify this. I think he wanted to put on record that he felt like there needed to be more communication in these types of situations. He worked very hard to see this renovation happen, he's been hand-in-hand with the Department and not to take his thunder or his ire because Ken is a man who has his own voice, he made it very clear to me that he was really, really upset and he didn't know if he could ever be calm in presenting what his feelings were about this.

So I'm just going to put it on the record that he was very disappointed and that has been in various letters to the community, to op-eds in various newspapers. I'm not going to ask the Department to respond on this. I think their response has actually been quite public about it but I feel like I would be amiss if I didn't put this on the record in his stead because he's not here to do it.

That's really all for the Chair's report although I know that two members would like a quick minute to give us a recap. Richard?

Richard Rothman: Last week we had a meeting about the wrap-up of the Outside Lands and since District 1 takes the brunt of it—although I think they diverted traffic to District 4—we still have the parking issue which I don't know can be solved but I think the sound issue can be solved. Apparently Supervisor Fewer told me the sound reached all the way into District 7 and

District 4. I found out that the contract is coming up for renewal probably at the November meeting but the sound—Recreation and Park for whatever reason doesn't need to get a permit through the Entertainment Commission, they have their own reporting system which basically means that the uniformed police cannot enforce the sound ordinance, only the Recreation and Park police can go out if you call. So I think this is something—I don't know if District 4 and 7 are going to have community meetings about this issue or about the impact. I think you should because the contract is going to come up for renewal and this is the time if we want to make changes to make changes.

Chair: Thank you Richard. Nick, you want to reply to that?

Nick Belloni: Just a quick reply. The meeting had a very vocal but small group of people that were highly against the concert. They were very annoyed with the sound and the parking and this and that. To Richard's point about the Entertainment Commission not issuing a permit that's actually in the charter, that's an issue with Recreation and Park, the only person that can oversee Recreation and Park lands and you'd never want to change that in the charter as we all know because we know what could happen at that point.

Chair: I don't want this to get into a dialogue. Steven.

Steven Currier: On Thursday's Chronicle there was an article about issues in parks, especially homes that are close to dry brush, fires that break out in San Francisco in light of the fires up north and east. The unfortunate thing in the article they didn't mention where the meeting was taking place but it was at the Police Academy in District 8 and I was going to go anyway because in the article they failed to mention other parks in the city that are susceptible to fires and burning down homes if they were out of control. It was very well-attended. Unfortunately they had 35 questions for the officials that were there and that was the Office of Emergency Services, the Fire Department, and I don't know if they even got to all the 35 questions but I was able to speak a little bit, not on behalf of PROSAC but I introduced myself as a PROSAC member and if anybody needed anything—if they couldn't get anything with Recreation and Park they could always contact us and speak at public comment. Sharon Bobrow was in the audience and we had a little dialogue and I told her to send me an email regarding her issue. She's going to speak in public comment today. I just wanted to let you know it was very well-attended. LaMonte' Bishop was there also.

Chair: Thank you. Do any other committee members have comments on the Chair's report? Any public comment? Hearing none, this item is closed.

Is there any new business other than Steven's brief mention which I think we'll revisit after the public comment about potentially adding an agenda item regarding private property backing up Recreation and Park and a policy related to either fires or liability? I have one I want to add. I'd asked Tiffany to start doing some research and potentially have planning and DBI come and give us a refresher on public-private open space, popos. So for those of you who were members early on in PROSAC time we had a really great presentation about the public-private open space and it's definitely a current and future item that we're going to need to take up and so I'd like to hear from DBI and the Buildings Department since they are pretty much controlling this, they're a

part of this. We're going to look into who would make sense to present and hear that as a presentation. So I would like to add that to a future agenda item.

Steven Currier: Would you be interested in inviting also DPW? We do have a partnership.

Chair: We do and I'm not saying that DPW wouldn't be a relevant voice at the table. I think the first step is to really understand and have everybody understand I made one phone call and I got a whole list, a very comprehensive, fairly nice formatted list that I feel needs to be more public and I think we need to come up with ways to disseminate that. Hearing from what their plan is in terms of how do you get the word out about all these great new spaces? Well, certainly if we look at the Transit Center it got a lot of press, right? All of us should be visiting that. I don't know how many of you have visited the new Transit Center, I have not but I would really like to go and I think that's a really good example of this concept but I feel like District 6 might have ten or twenty or thirty that are bought and paid for by our city and yet they're inaccessible and so I want to get to the root of accessibility for a public-private open space.

So I would like to see that as an agenda item starting with DBI and with planning because they're really at the head but I would like to certainly hear at some point from DPW.

Nick Belloni: Community gardens.

Chair: Oh yes, community gardens. I actually didn't want community gardens, I wanted Alemany Farm so I would like to add that as well if that's okay. Again, it could be down the road a little bit. I know our agendas towards the end of the year start to choke up a little bit, all the Department presentations, but I would like to hear from Alemany Farm before the end of the year.

Robert Brust: District 8. I had a thought in my head and I'm wondering if there is a whole presentation around this, the Department strategy on [unintelligible] could you develop that into a whole presentation? Is there a possibility of getting even half the money that we would need to develop the [unintelligible].

Stacy Bradley: [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments] I could do that later on this year.

Robert Brust: And can I phrase it so it's for the entire area?

Stacy Bradley: No. [unintelligible] It would be good to do all the [unintelligible] updates I think to give everybody an understanding where the impact fees are coming from, what they are, how they're allocated. We should probably do that with the Planning Department.

Chair: So can I proposed—I'm certainly willing if you want to make that an agenda item or as part of the new business, is that what you're proposing?

Robert Brust: Yes

Chair: Can they flesh it out first before we actually put it on the roster and then it turns out it's February of next year before everything is ready?

Robert Brust: Why can't it sit here?

Chair: You can put it there, fine.

Robert Brust: Thank you.

Chair: So Tiffany we'd like to also add—so now in addition to public-private open spaces, Alemany Farms, we're adding updating development impacts. Then keep me on-call to make sure these get on the agenda.

Any other new business? Any public comment? Hearing none, this item is closed.

So Capital planning, hi Stacy.

Stacy Bradley: A quick update. I actually have an update about Washington Square trees. We are also very sad about what happened and I think a lot of the information has been relatively public so I'm just going to give a quick update on where we are. The trees have been removed and we're working to replace them. There are ten trees and we plan to replace those trees. We're not positive what the species will be but we're working on figuring that out. This is our changing our [unintelligible]. We're enacting our tree protection standards which have been there [unintelligible] and so we're shifting our [unintelligible] to make sure this doesn't happen. We do see this as an anomaly. We have executed a very large number of projects and we have these same types of standards with all of our projects and we do take very good care and pay attention to what's happening and sometimes things happen. We are sad about this as well.

Chair: Before you move off of that I just want to echo. I think in this case the Department has actually been much more vocal than in certain cases. I know Jane brought to us that during the South Park renovation that there were some mistakes, there were some issues. Trees were sitting out dying in their boxes because the timing wasn't played out right. In this situation I think it is obviously on the Department to be in front of this. This is something that for any one of us who are park advocates as yourselves ten trees you feel it and I feel like it was—even though Ken was very verbal and very aggressive in some ways about what his position was that the Department kind of just stood up and said listen, we're not happy about this. We're going to figure out a way to fix it and I believe that's the way of a future partnership between the Commission and PROSAC. So I do applaud the way you guys have been handling it and I'm glad that you were forthcoming with it.

Richard Rothman: District 1. Were the trees all in one location?

Stacy Bradley: It was all in the playground construction.

Chair: So this is obviously something that we'll get to if it needs a presentation we'll get to it.

Stacy Bradley: I'm not going to give you an update on Let's Play S.F. because there is a great update [unintelligible]. Also, [unintelligible] on the bond we are out to bid and we're awarding the contract this month. With this bid there is only one more park that is not yet in bid or that has not yet been bid out or is currently in construction. So for our 2012 Parks bond we're doing really well and Rossi is the last one. Everything else has gone out and we've awarded the contracts. So we're very excited about where we are in executing the bond and we're also almost onto the 2008 [unintelligible].

Speaking of the bonds, for the 2019 bond we're working on the lifecycle assessment. So a quick update on that, we are almost done with the assessments, not quite but almost, and it will take another couple of months for them to input all of the data, to go back between the Department and them and make sure they caught everything and implemented everything. It is an incredibly robust database that will now have our information [unintelligible] but it is significantly better than Comet. The data that we can get it's just amazing. There's so much data that it's almost hard to figure out how to distill it to what we can use because it's so detailed. It gives us a lot of information about our facilities and it will allow us to look at facilities in different lenses. I'd like to give you guys a presentation on it sometime in the future once we get to the point where it's done and we're able to share the information. I think it will be really interesting and I think you'll like to see what the database looks like and the types of reports will be able to pull up with it.

Steven Currier: District 11. So through the grapevine of Mayor Breed's office I understand that she's going to kill this 2019 bond.

Stacy Bradley: Well, I don't know that yet, so.

Steven Currier: I just wondered what you guys know because she has other things that she wants done and so I'm concerned because if there's talk at City Hall that they're going to kill this and the Department wants us to get onboard and push this bond—

Stacy Bradley: So, you know, whatever happens will be aligned with the Mayor's Office and with the Capital Planning Committee. So right now we're in this state of us knowing that we're listed on 2019 for \$185 million and it is right now at this exact moment over the next four months or so the Capital Planning Committee is looking at that [unintelligible] is preparing the next ten-year capital plan. Is it likely [unintelligible] something is going to change but we don't yet know what that is and so until we know what that is we just are moving forward getting as much information as we can and preparing ourselves for whatever can happen. So that in January we'll have a better idea once the report is prepared and I'm sure we will have an idea before. So I don't know the answer except that we are working very hard to be as prepared as we can and this assessment is [unintelligible] what condition they're in so that whatever financing we get in the future we're able to use and help prioritize.

Chair: I'm going to chime in and echo what the General Manager said when he presented this to us, he said they serve at the hand of the Mayor. That in essence they will be aligned with whatever the Mayor's decision is and the reality is if that means pushing it back a year, so be it. I

don't think it's fair to ask Stacy to comment on what the potential—their intention is to go forward whether it's 180, whether it's 565, that's not the issue. The issue is they're preparing for a bond measure. If the Mayor says it's another year then so be it. If the Mayor says it's off the table for now then so be it. Obviously that can't be the reality of it but I don't think it's fair to ask or impart what City Hall is thinking. We're just here as a citizen's advisory committee.

Steven Currier: I'm not a pawn. I'm not a pawn.

Chair: I'm just saying, I appreciate that you say that and I appreciate we all have ears and we all have eyes and the reality is you can ask that question but I don't think that's an answerable question.

Steven Currier: I just put it out there.

Richard Rothman: District 1. Two questions. When is the Rossi bid going out and is the issue [unintelligible].

Stacy Bradley: At Rossi?

Richard Rothman: Well, at all the playgrounds. I mean this was Recreation and Park's—it was at Garfield and what was the other?

Stacy Bradley: Balboa. Everything that's needed. The PG&E, PUC upgrades is still a reality and we're addressing that as we can. Each project is different and so we're working with PG&E and PUC as early as we absolutely can so that we cannot be delayed.

Richard Rothman: Are they being reasonable?

Stacy Bradley: [laughs] I don't know. We're working well both the PUC and PG&E and we have a dedicated person at PUC to help us navigate this issue.

Richard Rothman: And Rossi, if you don't know--

Stacy Bradley: I don't know.

Richard Rothman: That's okay. Thank you.

Stacy Bradley: And then the last thing, Jane has been asking about the Open Space Acquisition Fund analysis which you have. It's actually just the first page. The other pages are just backup, previous years, you can throw those away. I actually have updated it a little bit since then. Tiffany has the latest one and she can mail it out. Basically all I did was get rid of 16-17 [unintelligible] so we have this year up top and then old ones below. There is a small change between 16-17 and the previous version and this version in the Francisco Reservoir [unintelligible] they lumped two years together, 15-16 and 16-17 all showed up in the 16-17 year and this one is not really much of a change, it just looks a little different when you compare them to previous years. But this is the Open Space Acquisition Fund.

Chair: Do you want to qualify for some of the new members?

Stacy Bradley: Sure. The Open Space Fund is a property tax set-aside, of that a small percentage is set aside every year for acquisition, [unintelligible] only to acquisition related expenses. So it grows every year. The first column deposits is the money that we get from this property tax set-aside.

So this year with is 18-19 we got \$3.2 million and so it's in bold because that's a casual [unintelligible]. And then the .6 hasn't happened yet so that's still not yet bold and then that's for Francisco Reservoir which we're paying out over twelve years. [unintelligible] and what we have set aside each year. So for the 11th Street property is we paid \$9.725 million last year and we'll be paying these reserves .275 for remediation in the future when we develop it.

Then we actually bought something that PROSAC and the Commission voted on which is [unintelligible] and we keep trying to guess when they're going to build and when we're going to buy it. So right now I have it sort of next year it's unlikely but [unintelligible].

And just also as another note this miscellaneous these are costs that aren't specifically linked to a purchase price so it looks funny if we spend money for [unintelligible] phase one and phase two but it didn't go towards the purchase price so we put it into this miscellaneous column where we can track the money that's going out without shifting what it looks like as a purchase price for each property.

So this past year we actually had a bonus I supposed you could say of \$1 million where we got \$700,000 for a lot of PROSAC's efforts of identifying [unintelligible] interest on the Acquisition Fund, monies that had been sitting there. So it was \$700,000 and the other one was a \$250,000 that was incorrectly put into the Acquisition Fund and should not have been. So accounting things. But the \$700,000 is a very exciting bonus.

Chair: Linda D'Avirro's ears are burning. Richard?

Richard Rothman: District 1. I noticed on the Commission's agenda a number of years that funds from the Open Space Committee either for maintenance or—

Stacy Bradley: So the Open Space Fund funds about a third of the Department, so the whole bucket of money that the Department has Open Space Fund, General Fund, and the bond, the Open Space Fund is a much larger bucket that pays for my salary and for a lot of stuff. The Acquisition Fund is the small, little thing that's dedicated just for acquisitions.

Richard Rothman: So then our jurisdiction or corner is just not the whole funding just the acquisition.

Stacy Bradley: Yes.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: Jane?

Jane Weil: District 6. Thank you Stacy. I just want on the record that the reason I'm so interested in this especially for the new members is there's a park in District 6, 1133 Mission that PROSAC endorsed in 2013 I believe and we didn't acquire it at that point because there wasn't enough money. But there is enough money now. It actually costs \$4.9 million which conveniently is the amount of money in the Acquisition Fund. So I would like to have the Department revisit acquiring it. District 6 as you know is the number one priority of the equity measure and the deficit of open space so I just want that on the record that basically the way it works as I understand it is the Department instructs the Department of Real Estate to negotiate the purchase. They had actually done that, they had an MOU to buy it which lapsed so we need to basically go back but the seller is still interested in selling it and we are very interested in having it. So I just want that on the record.

Chair: I would certainly think it's a conversation. Obviously that column where it says 11th Street properties \$9.7 million is something we have to identify as—it's a lot of money in that District although we do agree that is the most open space deficient District in the city and certainly you would find no fight from anybody at this table in trying to acquire more open space.

I also feel like the Department has to be a dialogue between the community and the Department in trying to find maybe a way to negotiate it, that it isn't [unintelligible] all this money at once or maybe give us a chance to let the Open Space Fund rebound rather than using every single dollar in it. So I think it's open for a dialogue. I would ask the Department potentially revisit it or at least have you guys talk offline and see what can be done to move towards that. As I recall it wasn't just about money, it was that the property wasn't ideal, it wasn't a huge space, it was a lot of money for the space, and so we can't just say that they didn't have the money for it, it wasn't like a beautiful sprawling green space. So again I don't object to it. I don't think there's a problem with looking at it again. There is exactly the amount of money you need or some semblance of it. Steven?

Steven Currier: District 11. So two months ago there was a presentation to this body from Supervisor Safai's Office regarding the Persia Triangle and when I met with him last week I told him—I actually mentioned to his office and to him that they needed to reach out to do a CEQA analysis at least on the surface of the land before it is brought to Recreation and Park and he said well we can just make the presentation and put it on the Acquisition list. I said you know there's one thing that I don't like to do is lose and I don't think that this body is going to vote for something that's going to spend millions of dollars cleaning up an old mechanic's site. So his office has actually gone to Jackie Spiers' office to basically fund the soil analysis and then do a letter citing one way or the other what the property looks like and then bring it back to us. So I told him, I said I need that before we can go forward. So I just wanted to mention that to you.

Stacy Bradley: Great, thank you. So just for clarification, you need a phase one [unintelligible].

Chair: And I think a phase one really—what the discussion I had was looped in on the original conversation with the Supervisor and I had said, you know, the Department unfortunately occasionally gets sold a bill of good for stuff that it needs a lot of work. Steven certainly agreed with that as did the Supervisor’s Office, maybe not the Supervisor himself but when we talked about what the phase one report was and that if they could come away with that at least we would know we’re not buying something that’s tainted.

Stacy Bradley: So phase one [unintelligible] if you need a phase two and a phase two is the actual analysis.

Chair: I would just be happy before we see any conversation and anything going on the Acquisition roster that at least we see a phase one knowing whether there needs to be a phase two. Anybody else? Anything else for Stacy? Thank you so much, this is awesome. I know that I’ve been on every Jane email about the Open Space Acquisition Fund numbers, I’m super glad that we could take a look at that. Is there any public comment? Hearing none, this item is closed.

Welcome Taylor, how are you?

Taylor Emerson: Very good. I’m Taylor Emerson, I’m here today to give you an update and have a discussion about the fiscal year 18, the year that we just concluded equity analysis and the metrics which is to say the analysis and the data that we have. Even more than that because equity is so much more than what the Recreation and Park Department is doing right now, it is the policy issue locally, nationally, and globally we are all trying to decide if everyone counts the same and I believe this is going to be a revolution in government.

I’m honored for the third time to be before you talking about this very vexing and complex subject.

I’ve come up with this great phrase, elevating equity. It’s not that it’s the only thing we’re going to hear about, it’s not more important than quality or what’s most in need, it’s just another criteria that we are now using to help prioritize and better serve people in need that we serve.

I just wanted to go over the metrics themselves but then broaden our conversation to be here to include not just the metrics, we’re not just measuring ourselves, we’re also doing [unintelligible] internally and externally and I want to share some of that with you and it’s not just us, it’s the Controller, it’s Human Rights Commission, the Mayor’s Office, and [unintelligible]. There’s lots of examples of work going on around the country and other parks and we’ll head to next year and then hopefully have a few minutes to [unintelligible] three very big items on the agenda today.

It’s always good to remember what we’re required to do. The Department shall develop a set of metrics to be used to establish a baseline, everybody was going to approve Proposition B and give us a bunch more money and they wanted to make sure using that first year as a baseline that we used it responsibly and used it equitably and so we were going to create a baseline to measure our services and resources in low income neighborhood and disadvantaged communities which means it’s more than low income, it’s more than being poor. It’s disadvantaged in all kinds of

way compared to the way we deliver services and resources to the city as a whole.

So that's our purpose, that's our exactly charter mandate and just as a reminder for you members our underlying data set is the [unintelligible] which is open data provided by a Division of the Cal EPA. It was updated in fiscal year 17 and we are still using the Cal Enviro screen although we've updated the population portions. And we even got so confident that we modified the methodology last year and we're sticking with it going forward. There are now ten characteristics of disadvantaged divided into [unintelligible] population which is health criteria as well as age and [unintelligible] for non-white which was a new element on fiscal year 17. And then socio economic factors, language isolation which is no one in the house speaks English over the age of fourteen or twelve I think, poverty factors, education and housing [unintelligible] which is how much of your income you pay for housing.

So those characteristics are equally weighted in our methodology and we measure them every census tract in San Francisco and compare it every other census tract in San Francisco so we're ranking in the census tracts for accumulation of these ten criteria and take which of the 20 percent most worst-off, most disadvantaged, the accumulated disadvantage from 80 to 100 percent is the line of our equity zone, the two darkest purples and you overlay that on the next page with a city map of our parks, then you can see along with me the imaginary lines on the map and we are able to then name the sites, the parks, the facilities, the programs, the other stuff happening in those parks that are inside equity zones. So the darker purple is the zone itself and then the light lavender is the five-minute buffer around the zone we call the whole thing the zones.

Here are the metrics I'll pass out. Does anyone want a copy of the map that has a list of the parks they're in. I'll pass this around, there's not enough for everyone but take one if you want.

So the equity metrics themselves—you can look on here or on the piece of paper that's going around. Now, this line on the map and the parks inside are the same as last year except that there's been two additions. We've added [unintelligible] and Shoreview, so there's two more parks in fiscal year 18 than there was in fiscal year 17 and a lot more people actually.

So say pretty much the same number of parks but higher population. So some of the other numbers have changed in access portion which is the number of park acreage.

SFPD incidents and safety is the next metric and it really changed a lot. [unintelligible] but yeah, overall this metric takes SFPD data and looks at all incidents that happened within 500 feet of a park which is about a block, [unintelligible] trying to measure a feeling of safety that there might be around the parks and of all the incidents that are in the city within 500 feet of a park 46 percent of them are around 20 percent of our population. [unintelligible] Overall, there's fewer crimes around parks but more and more of them are around equity zone parks.

Park evaluation scores, this is the average of our quarterly work [unintelligible] the Controller to evaluate every park and it's a good measure of maintenance and caretaking. So you can see there 82 percent for equity zone parks, 88.2 and 88.9 for citywide. So fairly nearly comparable.

Do you want me to keep going and reading these through and giving notes?

Chair: Sure.

Taylor Emerson: Capital investment continues to soar. So a lot of this is the [unintelligible] funds, the development fees that are being gathered and divested in areas of high growth which coincidentally turns out to be areas of equity zones. Has anybody seen this amazing piece of paper? I'm going to pass this around. This is a miniature of our equity zone map. This is a map from Planning that shows projected growth. Wow! They're really aligned. [unintelligible] especially if we're looking ahead about where we are developing and acquiring and [unintelligible] in those areas.

Volunteers are the next ones. We go from money investment to blood, sweat and tears. Voluntary Division does an incredible job of not only increasing the number of volunteer hours that they managed in our parks this year but allocating them more and more to parks in equity zones. Any questions?

And then the last one is recreational resources, access again. How of all the time that we provide structured recreation with a leader 38.7 percent is serving 20 percent of the people.

So overall we made a huge effort on scholarships this year to expand the number of locations we did outreach in and all of the expansion into equity zones about scholarships and it really shows. This year 68 percent of the people. Now, this isn't discretionary [unintelligible] if you live in Sea Cliff and you qualify you get a scholarship. But it does show that we're really trying to help who quality, get the word out.

And outdoor recreation is our nature metric [unintelligible]. Yes?

Mark Scheuer: District 8. In looking at the line percentage of capital investment for the equity zones it's 61 percent for 20 percent of the population. I'm wondering what the trend has been for say the last four or five years.

Taylor Emerson: Up, up. You see all the cranes out there? They're all building these multi-unit buildings and all of those have developer fees and that's a large part of what that is. The fees collected by Planning for Central SOMA or Market-Octavia, the area south, Eastern Neighborhoods. So these are fees that our forefathers building a nexus to and that we collect from developers and it's awesome. It's not just us, it's MUNI, Public Works, gets it too.

Jane Weil: The very last line, outdoor registration under eighteen. Does that mean literally there was 773 children in the equity zone that—this isn't all the Recreation and Park summer programs, this is—

Taylor Emerson: This is trying to capture kids in nature. It's missing the kids in nature phrasing. So this is just those programs that really have a center of—the primary function of them is to connect kids to nature so this is canoeing at Lake Merced, it is a couple weeks with

Randall at Mather—there's only 3000 or so slot but 773 of them were taken by kids whose home address is in an equity zone. We wish more kids could come.

Jane Weil: That seems very low to me. It seems like the equity zone kids are the ones who need it.

Taylor Emerson: Exactly, exactly.

Jane Weil: So that number seems totally reverse to me.

Ancel Martinez It probably doesn't include the sports programs too. So that would be a point.

Taylor Emerson: It doesn't include [unintelligible]. It's a narrow cut at our program but a very important one. There's such important evidence now about how time in nature not just for kids but for adults can be therapeutic.

Elisa Laird-Metke: District 9. So are the equity zones here the same ones as used for acquisition as applied to the existing parks or is it a different measure that used?

Taylor Emerson: It's a different measure that's used for acquisition, yes. It looks at density of use and [unintelligible].

[simultaneous comments]

Elisa Laird-Metke: [unintelligible] with is the recreation open space element of the General Plan for the high needs to determine the needs but now that we have the equity zones I imagine we would do both, we would look at both equity zones and what the ROSE says in the analysis. This high needs it's a little vague in the charter language and so [simultaneous comments].

Taylor Emerson: It really links up which is kind of what the graphics show. I'm feeling even more confident in our analysis as things progress and maybe we'll be able to see the overlay of growth there.

Chair: I remember that one of the questions we all kind of asked about was the police number of incidents and what defined an incident because we were concerned that parking tickets might define an incident so has that actually fleshed out into a process because here it doesn't really say.

Taylor Emerson: No, it has not. I have not made progress. In fact things have kind of regressed because the Police Department decided this year and so far the committee [unintelligible] has agreed with them that the incident data is now no longer public so it used to be open data but I had to practically file Sunshine to get it. I may not even have this in future years.

Chair: You know there's a few of us here who love to file Sunshine.

Taylor Emerson: [laughs] I'll know where to go.

Chair: If you're asking of this committee would we pry into that—because I do remember during that presentation not last year but the year before that actually was quite a question like how are we determining this data.

Taylor Emerson: How to find a [unintelligible] for safety around parks is very difficult. Look at crime data that just happens inside parks. You're missing a big part of it because a lot of times you start in the park and then end up at 18th and Church or they start at Dolores and 20th and end up inside the park. So that has been a real challenge and a lot of people are dissatisfied with what I've done so far. Maybe you guys have ideas about what else we could use. I'm open and listening and looking constantly.

Chair: I think as safety becomes more and more of a general city issue and it certainly is as it relates to parks it definitely plays a role and so just finding—

Taylor Emerson: We've thought about using graffiti or other vandalism as a metric. One of those [unintelligible] 311 because that can be so distorted by one person as Phil always says Alta Plaza has the most 311s.

So those are the equity metrics and I'm happy to answer more questions if there are any.

Internally we're doing a lot of work [unintelligible] I just want you to see that we are doing a lot of internal education and training around [unintelligible] around what equity is, we're trying to normalize the conversation. We've trained a hundred managers, directors, and deputies who got trained for a day by two national experts. 500 Recreation and Park employees watched this incredible documentary called *Race—the Power of Illusion* which I recommend to everyone here. And before this internal committee now where we opened it up to [unintelligible] 400 people at an all-staff meeting we did a ten-minute internal on equity and equity in the Department, 80 people signed up to learn more and from there we formed a committee called [unintelligible] Diversity, Inclusion Committee on Equity with 25 employees that are very hand-picked and represent all the classes and areas in our Department. And together they and we are going to do the next step which is write the Racial Equity Action Plan which our city has committed to doing. [unintelligible] Only a few Departments are done already—the Department of the Environment and City Planning are done and we're using those as guidelines and working with HRC to figure it out. So this will be in work for the next year.

We're also down at the bottom—I look at equity as a priority for citywide maintenance. So part of the \$15 million is deferred maintenance for things like erosion control or lighting or court resurfacing, [unintelligible] we're definitely elevating the site if in an equity zone it gets priority or [unintelligible].

We're including equity in project criteria for the bond which is that one page I sent around and we've formed a collaboration with HRC, the Department of Human Resources, and the Airport

too. [unintelligible] for some of the entry level classes. So internally we're doing a lot of work and there's much more to do.

Externally, really quick. We did an awesome man on the street project with a consulting firm this year in equity zones. [unintelligible]. We're starting to go more outward with this. We got almost 700 in-person surveys or digital surveys of people who living in equity zone and trying to understand what they like about their park, why they don't go to their park, what are some of the issues. It was great and there's much more to go into that which we'll do in fiscal year 19 but also we formed a partnership with the Unified School District which right there gets a standing ovation because they are very difficult partners to work with but we're tracking kids who are in this tennis learning center after school programs that's intensive physical, social, and academic sports and tracking them over time to show the value of some of our after school programming.

We did more scholarship outside. This is like applying our equity data and our learning so far to our work in a more forthright way. We elevated equity and deferred maintenance. We've prioritized volunteer resources in equity zone parks and are now using it in our bond element also.

I'll tell you really quickly about some of the citywide stuff. A lot of Department [unintelligible] on racial equity where we send people to do learning [unintelligible] where they teach about this ecosystem of government inequality, like an ecosystem of rules and regulations or policies and procedures that [unintelligible] and trying to disrupt those. The Controller was getting involved, the director is working [unintelligible] he's prioritized equity as one of the essential for our shared work, the Human Rights Commission of course. And Mayor Breed has talked about equity—you know, this is her from what I've learned her [unintelligible] and workforce development. So there is a lot of stuff happening in our city and lots of other Departments are working on it.

Nationwide other cities are doing this too. It's incredible! Stacy and I got to [unintelligible] 11th Street Bridge project that's in Washington D.C., one of the most inequitable cities in our country and it's a fascinating wholehearted [unintelligible] expansive development project that is trying to be truly equitable.

I wanted to say too the [unintelligible] there's a business school at Berkeley has [unintelligible] inclusive society which really takes just the academic part of this work. It's been interesting to follow their newsletter [unintelligible] this topic. They have an incredible newsletter that I always learn a lot in.

And Minneapolis always—for members here remember when Minneapolis-St. Paul is number one and two in the best [unintelligible] and it makes sense that they are way ahead of us and actually they put their money where their mouth is, they're actually going to pin themselves down to a formula that they are going to use. So instead of just elevating equity they've actually like put numbers to it, what much more they're going to give to equity zones citywide. Interesting work that we're following.

Stacy and I [unintelligible] we were like wow, what lessons could we learn about that project that could apply to our big project 900 Innes and sometimes we're thinking about this, we were there with the project manager Nicole and she goes yeah that would be great because every time I go out to the community and talk about this park everybody wants to talk about jobs. Right? And so it makes sense that if we go out to talk about this project that we should bring the small business advisory or economic development with us and have it more of a systemic the whole ecosystem idea approach.

Looking ahead I think there was this exact slide last year when I said the Controller was going to come do a project with us. They never showed up. They didn't do it. They were going to do it this year they say so this is all the same which is we're going to wait for them to tell us what to do and then we'll do it basically.

We're at the end. I hope that helps. It's a big topic. It's so much more than just the metrics, so much more and we're getting bigger.

Ana Gee: District 6. Thank you for the presentation. I'm very excited about [unintelligible] to allow more equity. My only questions is regarding the metrics and is there any way that you can apply the same metrics to specific neighborhoods within that equity zone?

Taylor Emerson: What would be an example of that?

Ana Gee: [unintelligible] and it's about 7500 use that single park so if we were to do these metrics to the Tenderloin-South of Market you would see that there's a big for acquisition [unintelligible].

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible]

Ana Gee: So is there any way that now that you are [unintelligible] by neighborhood?

Taylor Emerson: I've certainly heard this request before and I do not say yes or no. I want to just share the other side of that is that I sometimes get nervous thinking about well if I just [unintelligible] and count the parks and the people and the access, all that, in there and then do that for Chinatown and do it for SOMA I just wouldn't want a situation where again one neighborhood's equity gain is measured against—you know, I hope that all disadvantaged people count equally and are increased delivery to them, I want them to be equal instead of pitted against each other is one of my concerns. But I hear what you're saying, especially with the Tenderloin.

Ana Gee: Because the number that we have on the 20 percent does not look like [unintelligible].

Taylor Emerson: It's much closer to 50, 60 probably.

Ana Gee: [unintelligible]

Taylor Emerson: I did count the allocated bond funds towards [unintelligible] and Turk-Hyde in the Tenderloin so we did allocate the bond funds.

Ana Gee: [unintelligible]

Taylor Emerson: I know, I know.

Chair: What I am getting from this is a good point that again for Ana Gee who basically asked for this presentation, not that you wouldn't have given it but she's been adamant for a while to hear the Department's position on the metrics. But it wouldn't be unfair to maybe look at a working group or something once you might be able to specifically release—again, my District I'm not super—we [unintelligible] broken down within Pacific Heights but where—

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible] right, yeah.

Chair: But I think it would benefit SOMA, it would benefit the Tenderloin, it would benefit the Bayview. There are certain areas that would really benefit from that—

Taylor Emerson: Individualized—

Chair: Yeah, just your level of detail. Maybe that it's not even used in consideration. Of course Ana Gee would lobby well yes it should be but at least if you had that data it would really help you to quantify okay there's 7500 people using this one park, how do we mitigate that.

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible]

Ana Gee: [unintelligible]

Taylor Emerson: Oh, for a park, I see. Got you.

Chair: But again, I think it's a really—Ana Gee, thank you very much, that's a really good, well focused point. Robert?

Robert Brust: District 8. Just a suggestion. Going back to the actual metrics if you could maybe show some of those improvements and not-so-improvements. You don't even have to do them all year over year and you've been doing this now for what, three years?

Taylor Emerson: The printed copies were before I finish—so this slide is one of the slides missing and actually have [unintelligible] for this if you want it. So yeah we do have three years of data now and so I knew you were going to ask that Robert and that's why I did this three-year year over year analysis to show you.

Chair: In the packet actually it just doesn't say anything. It just says three years.

Taylor Emerson: Here it is.

Robert Brust: You weren't going to throw that up?

Taylor Emerson: No, I actually had it right here. This is all the metrics compared fiscal year 16 to fiscal year 18 color coded to see what's good, what's bad because up may not necessarily be better. These are the pilots. These are the ones we cherry picked to say look how good we are [unintelligible]. I wanted to remind you that we changed the methodology and the data [unintelligible] this isn't quite an apples to apples comparison so to speak. I'm not sure that the number of incidents [unintelligible] is relevant or is related to anything we do, I'm not sure so I don't want to take credit for this good work but some things are actually really improving. [unintelligible] we're not focused on this. We're not counting it and reporting it and so I think that intention it does get more attention and things do improve. It certainly happened for example in volunteers, right, it was very intentional that the volunteers that came in the door that weren't already allocated were sent to [unintelligible].

Robert Brust: They won't send any to Dolores Park anymore.

Taylor Emerson: No, Dolores Park is not [unintelligible] anymore. [laughs]

Robert Brust: You skipped over a couple of things and it would have been nice if we had the time but—that you are doing. I can't even remember them at this point.

Taylor Emerson: It's kind of messy, I know.

Robert Brust: That one. The developing equity priorities citywide, maintenance, so that—

Taylor Emerson: [unintelligible]

Robert Brust: You're going to track those in the coming years?

Taylor Emerson: We're not going to track them.

Robert Brust: No?

Taylor Emerson: No, we're not tracking.

Robert Brust: Just see how they come up? How much do you think they could separate into the pot? Do you have even a number yet?

Taylor Emerson: No, just the way we generally have that level of tracking in our internal work order system. So I can tell you how much money was spent on core servicing and I guess I could give you a list of courts that were resurfaced and I could count those up, you're right, I could. I could! Yeah.

Robert Brust: And then you mentioned briefly Minneapolis which when I did a Google search they popped right up.

Taylor Emerson: They were also sued by the NCAA. There are a lot of really good things about Minneapolis methodology.

Chair: Can we draft some Minneapolis park people?

Taylor Emerson: No, I am just as good.

Chair: I've seen three years of presentations about how great Minneapolis is. We've got to overcome this. If we want to get off the Minneapolis freight train we need to come in number one.

Taylor Emerson: We'll never be number one. The whole thing is rigged for people that have [unintelligible].

Chair: [unintelligible] So I'm telling you, draft Minneapolis park people.

Taylor Emerson: Are there any other questions on equity?

Chair: Any other comments from committee members? Any public comment? Hearing none, this item is closed.

Taylor Emerson: If anyone wants to work more on this with me or has other things to follow up or say or suggest please write to me. I'm going to think about what you said and how I could do it without [unintelligible]. I am very sympathetic to the Tenderloin and overall D6.

Chair: Any other comments, any other questions? Any public comment? Hearing none, this item is closed.

Taylor, thank you. Hi Lisa. It's good to see you. We're excited to hear this item.

Lisa Bransten: So Tiffany is working on [unintelligible] I want to be mindful of everybody's time. I know it's getting late. I guess I should first introduce myself. I'm Lisa Bransten. I'm the Director of Partnerships, we are partnered heavily with the Parks Alliance on this.

I guess I'll say [unintelligible] that we worked with a lot of you individually on these playgrounds. This is sort of a sprawling [unintelligible] pgs in ten Supervisorial Districts and so it's not really my intention to get down in the weeds of every single project but to give you guys actually the same overview that we gave to the Commission last month.

So just as a reminder and also for those of you who are new to PROSAC Let's Play S.F. is a project that came out of the 2012 park bond and the bond had a \$15.5 million allocation of funding for what we used to but no longer call failing playgrounds. It came with a mandate that a task force be convened to determine which playgrounds would qualify for that funding and so starting the partnership early [unintelligible] we convened a task force, there were two PROSAC members on the task force as well as some [unintelligible] we had one of our Greenagers, we had park professionals. It was a really wonderful task force. And after six months they decided

[unintelligible] criteria that they used to prioritize the playgrounds and those were presence of chromated copper arsenic wood in the playgrounds and there's eleven of the thirteen have the CCA wood. And then the other two criteria were [unintelligible]. So working from that mandate we again sat down with the Parks Alliance and said well \$15.5 million is not enough to [unintelligible] the thirteen playgrounds that the task force prioritized for [unintelligible]. So the Parks Alliance agreed to continue the partnership and raise private funding that would then allow us to renovate all thirteen playgrounds.

So that's the origins and I want to say overall—I think you have the presentation also. But that's the [unintelligible]. I'm going to skip around a little bit because one of the most exciting things is that the Commissions approved seven concept designs and it's actually next week, the week after? I can't remember when the whole Commission meets, that are going to approve the eight concept plans.

So I'm just going to as I say show you—I like to do this part because one of the great things about this project is like playgrounds are all about joy, whatever hard work it takes to get there at the end of the day these are injections of joy into neighborhoods that a lot of these sites are not great right now. So I'm just going to show you the pretty pictures of the concept plans of the ones that have been approved.

So this is Washington Square and I guess to reiterate like yes there was the issue of the trees in Washington Square and we're really sad about what happened to the trees. In terms of damage the contractors are paying to do the work on the trees to take them out and then to replace them so we will have trees there. And Washington Square should actually—the construction should be complete by the beginning of November.

This is Merced Heights playground and Merced Heights—the construction documents are complete and we're expecting [unintelligible] with construction starting early next year.

Sergeant MaCaulay playground we worked really hard with the community on this playground and we anticipate [unintelligible] in the fall and to break ground in early 2019.

And then this is Alice Chalmers playground and then I'm just going to take you through the McLaren Park picnic area and [unintelligible] playground. For all three of these we're expecting to bid these in the fall and begin construction in spring.

Then West Portal playground is the first Tier Two playground and this is the concept plan that was approved by Commission. I think they're at about 60 percent construction documents and this one because it's Tier Two and doesn't have all the bond funding we're actually working with the community on where we are with the funding [unintelligible].

And then the last one that I don't have a concept plan to show you but should be approved at September's full Commission is Jury Commons in District 9 which is a really sweet—I think that might be the smallest playground in the whole initiative. It's a tiny little pass-through and it's a really lovely design for the play area.

Chair: Did it just get approved?

Lisa Bransten: It was sent by the Capital Committee of Commission to full Commission which is—I think it's not next week but the week after that should be fully approved.

Nick Belloni: Just a stupid question. [unintelligible]

Lisa Bransten: It's like a nature play area also.

Female Speaker: [unintelligible] I see there's a slide and then many sticks. Can you tell me a little bit about how you envision this space will be used by children?

Lisa Bransten: This is one of my favorite designs, I think it's absolutely gorgeous. So you'll see there's like a net climbing structure. I mean I think this playground I don't know if you know this site in McLaren Park where it is, it's not far from the Jerry Garcia Amphitheater. There is a big picnic area that's going to get some renovation from another funding source but it all should be one project and I think the idea is—let me back up. One of the really lovely things about this is that the landscape architect used the existing topography to build it into the hill and it gets onto a big grassy area as well. I can't predict how children will use something but obviously this is going to be a lot of focus on climbing and sliding.

Stacy Bradley: They can climb on each of the logs and go under it and over it and up, they're all at direct angles and [unintelligible].

Lisa Bransten: And actually one thing that I didn't mention before that's part of the partnership with the Parks Alliance is that some of these playgrounds are designed—every project is its own unique project but some were designed by landscape architects from Public Works as we normally would do a fully publically funded project but because there's private funding in almost every single one of these playgrounds a lot of them are also designed by private landscape architects hired by the Parks Alliance and this one was designed by a landscape architecture firm called CMG that's also doing some other work in McLaren Park.

Female Speaker: Thank you.

Lisa Bransten: I sort of talked a little bit about the timing and it's hard to see but this is the overall schedule for Let's Play S.F. I'm really looking forward to the about the middle of next year when we will overwhelm with you playground [unintelligible]. It should be quite amazing because we've been at work on this initiative for a really long time and we know these projects take a long time to put together.

Chair: Well Lisa just to qualify for us we're talking about this time next year in 2019 four or five of these will be open.

Lisa Bransten: I would say six. Well, I mean it depends exactly what you mean by this time. Like within a month or two of a year from now we'll have [unintelligible] then we'll have five

more—West Portal is a little bit uncertain because of the funding but I think we'll get West Portal. So I would say we have six, with West Portal it will be seven.

Richard Rothman: So you just said that some of these have like Parks Alliance will hire their own architect and Public Works still manages the contract, so it's not a conflict with [unintelligible]. I mean do they mesh together? There's no conflict?

Lisa Bransten: There is no conflict.

Chair: There are many Recreation and Park projects where you can gift documents, you can gift landscape architecture services, in essence having somebody outside design while DPW or Public Works builds it, the Department oversees. So they do all the work in unison.

Lisa Bransten: And actually one of the really nice things that we wanted to put in place—this was one of the projects that I started on as we really began to develop the Partnerships Division of the Department and I would say that historically the relationship between the Department and private landscape architects got complicated because we never knew exactly how far into the project the landscape architect would stay engaged and would these do construction documents and would they be around to consult on construction. So I mean that way and the history of this initiative like even before [unintelligible] but one of the things that we set up which has worked so far really well is that we have very specifically engaged with the landscape architects to say these will be your rules and responsibilities all through to the ribbon cutting and I think it will prove to be a really good model for how we do these public-private partnerships moving forward.

Chair: I think that's a great expectation. I feel like—and again, I always bring up my own park because of my own experience—but Lafayette Park we raised some money from the community. Of that much of the work of designing it, the playground in particular, was a private landscape architect who was paid and the interaction was great. It would have been nice for him to—he was attached to the end but then as soon as it ended he was gone and it's not a bad thing, Jack Miller, but he wasn't engaged past the opening and there were things that broke, like things that were small design flaws that he could have been a part of and so I think it's great to like in advance say hey if we can identify this landscape architect who's going to be to the ribbon cutting, maybe even beyond, in case there's tweaks.

Lisa Bransten: I hope that they'll have some pride in these designs. And then just one last piece that we're very proud of, [unintelligible] community engagement today on these projects. Through these projects we've had like almost 2500 touches of the people. Now, some of that may be duplicate, one person might go to three community meetings but nonetheless it's really [unintelligible] reaching out to the community and say what do you want in a playground and then that's [unintelligible] focus groups, surveys. So that's a really nice piece of this project.

And then the one—we're maintaining enormous project progress on the private fundraising. We raises about \$8 million to date. I know I [unintelligible] in April that the over budget like sadly those construction projects in San Francisco has gone up a little bit beyond what we expected

and really that's—it's not due to that much more than the construction environment in the city of San Francisco.

So we have worked really hard both on the Department side and the Parks Alliance side to hold down costs as much as we can. That said we are about \$36 million for the overall initiative. We hope to bring in a little bit more public funding but the really lovely sort of recent news is that in July the Parks Alliance board voted to increase the private fundraising target from \$11 million to \$14.5 million. Then one of the increases you'll also see is in the initiative [unintelligible] we increased the reserve to just cushion ourselves to make sure that with the charter from the Parks Alliance, diligent work by everybody to contain costs and raise [unintelligible] we really do intend to get to all [unintelligible]. Thank you the Parks Alliance for stepping up.

This is the recently approved donor recognition plan for the initiative. So all thirteen playgrounds will have some arrangement and these are just three but the landscape architects or project managers can work on it however they work best but they'll have these cubes that celebrate like a moment in time when the city came together, the public sector and the private sector came together to build something for the next generation in San Francisco.

I think that's it. I'm happy to answer any questions.

Chair: Before I put it out for questions I'd like to call on Mark Scheuer because he was on the original Failing Playgrounds task force him and Anthony Cuadro and Mark I guess I would just ask you to give a minute or two of reference to you guys went out there, you looked at these failing playgrounds, you graded them. That's a lot more than any of us on PROSAC do physically going out to these sites. Now in listening to what Lisa is saying that in a year six of these playgrounds will be not only broken ground but finished. I mean give us a feeling of how that was to go out there and then see this huge amount of work.

Mark Scheuer: Well, it really kind of exciting and fun because all of us that went on the tours were all believers and to see that these pgs were going to be renovated was very exciting and the fact that the Parks Alliance has stepped up and increased the funding. The only thing I am concerned about though is you keep talking about the twelve or thirteen playgrounds in tier one or two. There were some playgrounds that did not make tier one or two and I guess I always want to make sure that those playgrounds are not forgotten.

Lisa Bransten: I don't think they are. My recollection is that the reason we ended on thirteen was that there was a pretty big drop-off between the thirteen and then number fourteen in terms of those metrics but there's no question that the Department is always looking at any of its sites and facilities that need to be renovated or refreshed. I mean certainly we're always looking at the park score data and all the different data that we get in. The equity metrics didn't exist when the task force met but that might be something.

Mark Scheuer: But we considered that.

Lisa Bransten: Absolutely, through those two other pieces of the puzzle there's no question. The other thing is the condition assessment that we're doing right now also didn't exist. We had

Comet but it wasn't as detailed as what we're going to get from Lifecycle. So I think hopefully we'll be able to inform the information, what happened from the [unintelligible] the last effort with this new information.

Mark Scheuer: In summary, it's very rewarding to have worked on that and then see this. So I'm very happy.

Lisa Bransten: Thank you. I'll just add that the task force process was quite amazing, the task force was really thoughtful and considerate. My favorite moment in the whole task force was when someone said wow it's really hard to pick. I don't know if you remember that.

Mark Scheuer: I do.

Lisa Bransten: These are the sorts of things we wrestle with internally all the time.

Chair: I think it's great to hear. Here we are five years later and he's worried about tier three, right, and you've just shown us hey we're going to put all these shiny new playgrounds out there and he's talking about number fourteen. Again, just to compare this for many of you who weren't on PROSAC we used to hear Dawn talking about bond planning where we would say okay these are these twelve named sites and we knew that there were four or six others that really needed money and so the reality for you as advocates this job is never going to be done. This phase of this job is just starting to get done but then all of us as community advocates know playgrounds are an important part of this whole process so for us it should be something that we revisit not just when it's great news like this but that we pick up this challenge, support the Parks Alliance's initiative as well and going to our Districts and saying hey I've been to this playground, it could use some help. Maybe you need to put it on the Department's radar so that in a few years we can be having this discussion about that playground.

Are there any more questions for Lisa? Ancel.

Ancel Martinez I'm curious in terms of the end-user here being the kids and what your observations or generalizations may lend to kids that play at playgrounds and in their development. I ask this because I'm familiar with I think it's Play Works which is in public schools, we know that PE programs are gutted so it's like okay we're willing to supplant the lack of public support with private or philanthropic resources. I'm interested in the public policy implications of the report.

Lisa Bransten: I didn't get too much into how we present this to donors but it's also policy work and that is like the three pillars of Let's Play S.F. that could be certainly applied more broadly to playgrounds are community, creativity, and wellness and the idea that behind those words is—and we have research to back this all up—but playgrounds create community. Like you build a playground that is well-used, you're going to go there and you're going to be with your neighbors and you're going to meet new neighbors. People make friends on playgrounds.

Creativity speaks to the enormous amount of research that helps the cognitive development that happens for children on a playground. We know that kids who get a chance to do free creative

play which is the kind of play, non-prescribed play, have better executive function. They are less likely to have ADHD. And then wellness really speaks to the importance of exercise for kids and there's no better way for young kids to get exercise than running, playing, sliding and doing the things kids do at playgrounds.

Ansel Martinez Thank you.

Chair: Any other questions? Any public comment? Hearing none, this item is closed. Thank you Lisa.

We have one more presentation. Welcome David, thank you for coming, thank you for sitting through some very engaging presentations.

David Beaupre: I'm a planner and project manager with the Port of San Francisco and I'm here tonight to talk about the Port of San Francisco parks system, how we participate in the general obligation bonds or how we have participated in 2008, 2012, and how we hope to continue to participate in the future and talk a little bit about the Port and the types of parks that we do deliver.

If you don't know, the Port is a trustee. The Port lands were transferred to the City of San Francisco in 1969 through the Burton Act. All of the lands that we own are managed by the Port but entrusted to the people of California and the reason for that is they were lands along the bay that needed to promote commerce, maritime, and uses that attract people to the waterfront and with that we have some restrictions on what we can do on our waterfront but one of our primary goals is to protect the natural resources and to do uses that attract people to the waterfront. So parks attract people to the waterfront.

What we can't do on our waterfront parks typically without going to get State legislation and support from the State Lands Commission who regulates these lands that are entrusted to us are active recreation that are municipal serving. So you won't see on Port lands soccer fields, basketball courts, and up until recently even children's playground they found is municipal serving.

But fortunately for us our Executive Director of the State Lands Commission has four little kids and she recognizes that when she comes to San Francisco her kids love to play on the waterfront and there seems to be some recent recognition that children's playgrounds actually do serve a regional use.

This talks about the types of open space we have. We have recreational boating. We have natural areas. We have elements of the Bay Trail. We have green spaces and plazas. This is Brannon Street wharf. We have piers that can be used for fishing or enjoying and we have what's called Cruise Terminal Plaza that's a major public open space delivered as part of the 2012 bond at Pier 27.

This shows the series of open spaces along the waterfront. The orange dots are open spaces that were delivered with the 2012 bond. The purple dots are projects delivered through the 2008 bonds and the green dots are other major waterfront open spaces that were delivered by the Port.

We essentially deliver our open spaces through three of four mechanisms of funding. One, Port capital. And what I failed to mention is that the Port is what's called an enterprise agency. We exist solely on the revenue we generate from our tenants. We don't take any of the General Fund money. So we've delivered significant open spaces on the waterfront using just Port capital from revenue we've generated and that also talks about the maintenance of our parks. We have used General Obligation bonds to deliver some of our parks like Cruise Terminal Plaza, Heron's Head Park entrance, Bay Trail link, all of the maintenance that happens doesn't come from General Fund, it's all from Port revenue.

And the other thing I can say proudly about our General Obligation bond projects is that we use that money to leverage resources that we have. As an example I've been the project manager and planner on four of these projects in the Blue-Greenway, my time for managing the project, going to community meetings, developing and getting all the entitlements is paid for by the Port, not the bonds. And we're trying to hold that bond money as much as we can for the capital investment required to build as much of the park as we can.

Just some examples of the types of open spaces that may not seem like an open space but it's a pier apron, unfortunately it's empty right now but if you go out there on any given day you'll see ten or twenty people jogging, walking, enjoying the waterfront fishing at the end. That's an open space that we have.

Justin Herman Plaza, massive civic events. The Embarcadero Promenade, some people may not see it but it's used for recreational purposes. When we were doing the planning for the 2008 bond with Recreation and Park our polling showed that on a weekly basis 170,000 San Franciscans would come down to the waterfront to recreate. Weekly basis, 170,000 residents. That's a lot of use. At a high level our open space policies that we follow are to deliver projects that have continuity, sequence, variety, connection and character. These slides show continuity as a continuous waterfront walkway, so it's the Bay Trail and the Blue-Greenway south of AT&T Park. Sequence it means if you're walking along the waterfront every five to seven minutes you come upon a major open space or activity. Variety means that we provide a variety of different open spaces whether it's a pier apron, a fishing pier, a plaza, an actual green park or an natural area. We provide a lot of opportunity and variety and when we're delivering these what we do is we work with Stacy and other Recreation and Park staff to say let's look at the area, let's look at the program of recreation that's in the area and if we're developing a new park let's not be duplicative of the program, either our program from park to park that are next to each other or programs that happen inward that are within Recreation and Park property. A great example of this is India Basin. You know, we have Heron's Head Park, a huge 22-acre natural area park. Rather than recreate that at India Basin we worked with Planning staff here to say what's the program that we can do that compliments and works with and fills the gap that's needed in Recreation and Park's program.

And then our open space attractions. We try to place significant open spaces and our significant investment in destinations along the waterfront. Fisherman's Wharf, one of the second largest destinations in all of California behind Disneyland.

Cruise Terminal, a huge destination for outgoing and incoming cruises but also in an area that has high needs for the city.

Obviously the Ferry Building, a lot of activity down that, the rehabilitation of that.

And the ballpark and then a lot of points south too. We're having development at Pier 70, Mission Rock, and further south and our partnership on India Basin.

More examples of our open space, Jefferson Street. This is the Bay Trail promenade from the 2008 bond project where we closed a gap in the Bay Trail. Here's Cruise Terminal Plaza, a brand new lawn and plaza area to greet visitors for cruises but also to provide an open space to the city. The symphony has moved its annual performances down here, an awesome place to see it on the waterfront. More shots of that. Here's what we call a warp, it's an area between two piers where we worked with a developer to help us deliver the open space on this. So developers will come in and pay for this. This was done by the Exploratorium as a part of their development where they created this intra-sink design that's supposed to represent barnacles and play elements for kids. That was delivered by both the Exploratorium and the Bay Ferry, a water emergency transit agency as part of their improvements to their facilities.

Pier 14. This was actually designed as a breakwater to support the ferry systems. We wanted to multi-benefit the project so we sought thirteen different grants from different granting agencies and created another public pier. Hopefully folks have been out there to enjoy the waterfront.

Rincon Park, this was a partnership with the former Redevelopment Agency as a part of the South Beach redevelopment area and this project was built by Redevelopment funds. The artwork was donated by Don Fischer. For the first five years of this project the Redevelopment agency paid for the funding and the maintenance, the artwork has an endowment that's paid for by the Doris and Donald Fischer Foundation.

Brannon Street Wharf. This was a \$20 million one-acre project funded by a combination of Port capital, about \$17 million. Within that \$17 million was a \$6 million gift from the Army Corp of Engineers, 2008 bonds paid for \$3 million of this. So again this is an example of how we leverage our resources. Those three long poles in the middle are tidal [unintelligible] the tides of the bay and how the tides work. These were developed in the 2008 and 2012 bonds recognizing sea level rise and how we can provide protection to city as the bay sea level rises and protects the infrastructure of the bay so we elevate the all.

Here's a development project we're all probably familiar with, Mission Rock. The Giants are our development partner as a part of this. 28 acres of development, mixed-use development, we'll be delivering 11 acres of open space with an expansion of China Basin Shoreline Park, a new town square, a wharf area, and some shared streets. All of this is being funded by the development, all

the maintenance and management is being funded by the development. Not a dime of public revenue going into it for the next 95 years.

Here's what that project is going to look like. Here's the square, you can see AT&T Park in the background. Here's a 2008 bond project called Bayview Gateway down along the Blue-Greenway. We took a dilapidated pier and wharf area, turned it into a gateway to the Bayview community. It includes a small skateboard park, an area for fisherman, a lot of natural gardens, an interpretive program that talks about the industrial and food history of Bayview. And in the background is a public art project the Port sponsored, worked with the Arts Commission, called Bayview Rise. So here's an example of how we were able to design an area for skaters to bring activity to an industrial area and even the week before it was opened it was extremely successful and continues to be today.

Heron's Head Park, the largest Port park. It's 19 acres when it was initially built by the Port as a part of the 2008 bond project. We expanded the park towards the community, added the dog run to keep the dogs out of our habitat area, a parking lot, a measure, native plantings, picnic areas, and opened that in about 2011. Heron's Head Park is a great example of a collaboration between the Port, the Recreation and Park, Recreation and Park helps us with the programmers, they run programs out there, they run Greenagers, we have the eco-center that was the city's first off-the-grid building. They used the eco-center as a park of the Greenagers program. And that just shows some of the natural areas, some of the volunteers we have that help support our park maintenance.

Pier 70 is another very large mixed-use project, it's the longest continually operating civilian shipyard in the country. It's a 70-acre site. Within the 70-acre site there's the [unintelligible] that has 11 acres of open space within 28 acres, up to 2200 homes, 1.4 million square feet of office building, about half a million square feet of commercial, retail and arts. You have the organ project that's the historic [unintelligible] that has about two acres of open space. And then our flagship open space in Pier 70 called Crane Co. Park which will eventually be a 10-acre park, the first phase is about 8 acres. 8 acres is being delivered through \$25 million of GO bonds including 2008 and 2012, we're aiming to have that project completed by the end of 2019. Very complex, very exciting project.

There was a very nice rendering but essentially here's The Ramp restaurant if you're familiar with the area, we are creating a new pocket beach for human-powered boaters, kayaks, canoes, standup paddleboards. Preservation of the historic shipbuilding craneway, restoration of the cranes, a building that can be used as a human-powered aquatic center, park restrooms, and a café to help activate the park. The large multi-use mixed green lawn and the Dogpatch area is just to the south here again. Part of the eastern neighborhoods where there's a huge demand and need for open space. Within the [unintelligible] project this is what the shoreline parks will look like, again extending the Blue-Greenway to and along the bay to connect Dog Patch to the Bayview.

Just to add to water recreation and water access we have a number of landings up and down the shoreline. This is Islais Creek right near Bayview Gateway. This is at Mission Creek. There are

landings at Pier 1 1/2, Pier 40, Pier 39, Aquatic Park, and potentially some in India Basin as that project moves forward.

And then future projects that we're thinking about for a future bond is Ferry Plaza behind the Ferry Building where Gandhi sits in the middle of it, there's a very old plaza area that's kind of under-utilized, it could be programmed more effectively. Warm Water Cove at the terminus of 24th Street on the east end of the city, near Dog Patch. Massive growth is happening in Dog Patch and the central waterfront. We have an opportunity to improve the existing park and expand it by 2.5 acres. And then there are a series of smaller pocket parks along the Blue-Greenway along Islais Creek.

With that, I'm available for any questions.

Richard Rothman: Richard Rothman, District 1. I have two questions. I don't know if you were working in the Port when the Ferry Building was changed over. There used to be a rock collection there which is up at Mariposa. There was also a large relief map and I hear it's in storage. Do you know where it is and are there any plans to bring it out of storage?

David Beaupre: We do have it in storage. It's down in the Bayview in one of our warehouses. It was stored because there was a commitment from an organization to help us restore it and maintain it. That organization no longer seems to exist. As of now there are no current plans to restore it and display it.

Richard Rothman: Is it in good condition? Have you seen it?

David Beaupre: I've never seen it. I've heard about it. It comes up time to time. What he is talking about is a scale relief map that was on the second level of the Ferry Building. It was made out of canvas. It was for a World's Fair back in the 40s or 30s.

Richard Rothman: I think the 30s. Do you think maybe one day people who are interested could arrange to see it?

David Beaupre: You could reach out to me. I'll leave a card and if you want to I'm sure we could arrange it.

Richard Rothman: My other question is that Ken Maley one of our board members that in the last two park bond measures there was I think \$20 million in there for the Port.

Chair: \$30 million.

Richard Rothman: \$30 million. And I was just surprised because the Port's a revenue enterprise agency and Recreation and Park we had a presentation here by Mr. Ginsburg a couple of meetings ago and he doesn't have enough money for all the projects he wants to do and I just don't think it's fair that an enterprise Department is taking money for a non-enterprise Department and I think the Port should be responsible for raising—you know, I've been to some

of the parks, Heron Park and seen the parks there and so I just don't think it's fair that the Port is taking Recreation and Park bond money.

David Beaupre: I appreciate your opinion on that. You know, the Port is providing open space and recreation opportunities to the residents of San Francisco and when we began the partnership back in 2008 what we found through the process was that the Port actually helped elevate the vote to the point where it would be successful. There was a lot of frustration about the expenditure of the 2000 bond and people recognize and appreciate the waterfront and while we are an enterprise agency we also have a \$2 billion capital deficit, aging infrastructure, we deliver a lot of open space through our partners as part of development projects and we deliver a lot of open space with our capital but we would never be able to deliver the amount and the quality of open space that we do without bond funds.

Richard Rothman: So you're going to ask money in the next bond?

David Beaupre: In 2008 we received \$33.5 million, in 2012 we received \$35 million and I believe the understanding between the agencies and the Capital Planning Committee is that the Port will continue to participate at that level.

Chair: I'd like to follow up on Richard's question and say what's the Port prepared to do in terms of selling this next bond to the voters? I heard what you said and I know how much the Port was a part of the dialogue. I've been here since 2008, I've seen the presentation in 2008 and in 2012. It's not to say that we're not—that any of us don't realize that you're contributing to the open space in the city. I think what Richard's point is this bond may need a little more help selling itself and to that end we require or ask that the Port be as much of a partner as they have been in the past and that just requires a little more push.

David Beaupre: I think the Port is right there ready and willing to do that. I think if you look at our track record or working with Recreation and Park and PROSAC and Parks Alliance have been the major fiscal sponsors we've been out there carrying out weight if not more I would say.

Chair: All right. Mark Scheuer.

Mark Scheuer: District 8. I hear periodically people concerned about the seawall crumbling and also the rising sea level and that wasn't mentioned once. I was curious how that's being addressed.

David Beaupre: So I did mention sea level rise and all the projects we do on the waterfront we're building them to accommodate sea level rise not only to protect the asset that we're building itself but to protect the city side of the land as well. So the Port participates and leads on the city's Sea Level Rise Coordinating Committee which includes a number of Directors. The seawall project which will be going to voters in November is a \$500 million bond we anticipate it being a \$2-5 billion project. We are anticipating Federal funding, State funding, City funding, and are looking even into seeking private funding and the priority on that project is to rebuild the seawall and make it seismically fit, the \$500 million anticipated to delivery some pilot projects and tests to make sure we can deliver it the best way and deliver projects that are in highest need

based on the criteria that's yet to be developed. You would imagine the Ferry Building with the number of people that travel in and out of there might be a high priority. Exploratorium where there's hundreds of thousands of kids down there on a weekly basis. And then there are other things like infrastructure, the BART tube and MUNI tube are aligned in the PUC's infrastructure so the Port is working with the Capital Planning committee, Federal, State and local representatives and working through a process where we want to get that \$500 million hopefully, spend it as quickly as we can, shore up what we can as quickly as we can in the highest need areas and continue to seek funding. The original seawall was built in 4 years and 21 seconds, the replacement might take 4 years and 10 seconds. Our hope is that it can be done quickly but it is urgently needed.

And the other things we're looking at is not just—our priority is to reinforce the seawall but there are great project precedences in Seattle where they just are finishing up their seawall rebuilding but they're creating multi-benefits out of it, habitat enhancements along their water's edge for wildlife and transportation enhancements along the waterfront at the same time. So that's the other thing that we'll be looking at criteria. How do we deliver a major infrastructure project that provides multiple benefits?

Jordyn Aquino: So I think one of the benefits of having this presentation is that this body didn't have a general understanding of why the Department was going to list the Port as part of preparation for the 2019 bond and so you mentioned that you see a capital committee and the Port is looking forward to the next parks bond. So how are the Departments evaluating that these are investments that should be made, what is the criteria?

David Beaupre: The Port really doesn't get involved in how Recreation and Park prioritizes its projects. We work collaboratively with them and the Capital Planning Committee and our elected delegates and how the Port looks at prioritizing it's project is we develop a criteria and if you look at the map of the projects we delivered one of them is equity, right? If you look at the first bond, \$22.5 million went to the southern waterfront and \$11 million went to the northern waterfront and that's because the northern waterfront is seeing the benefit of a lot of investment from private development and Port capital. We said we really want to get the Blue-Greenway going and the voters agreed and so we put two-thirds of that revenue into the southern waterfront to get those projects going and the 2012 bond it was more of an equal split but still more to the south, I think it was \$17 million, \$18 million on the south. So we look at a number of different things. What are the gaps in the open space system? How do we distribute the investment equitably across everything? Where are the gaps in Recreation and Park facilities and how can we help fill those gaps because most of the projects that we're working on today are brand new parks and so we have the capacity to delivery on the programs that when you go to rehabilitate an existing park the program generally stays the same. If you try to change it too much there tends to be a lot of pushback so we work with Recreation and Park's planning folks and say all right, we're doing the project down in the south, how do we do it?

And I'll just mention other partnerships that we have is on the India Basin project in order to move that project forward quickly the Port is taking out a huge liability, 9 acres of that land is coming to the Port to become the owners of it while we'll be entering into an MOU with Recreation and Park for the long-term maintenance and improvements of it. The reason why I

was running late is there was an item on our Commission that's like how is the Port protected from that? And we're saying this is a great community benefit, we will set up protections but it's a big chance for the Port but we work as a city family together to deliver what's best for the people.

Ana Gee: [unintelligible] As a resident of District 6, the Tenderloin, I can hear members actually utilize both open spaces because [unintelligible] the large amount of open space that we don't have. So we do realize the [unintelligible].

Chair: I appreciate that. I think that's great. That's good feedback for him to know. Any other comments?

Nick Belloni: What areas are you looking for if you do more bond stuff? Have you started the preliminary thinking of where you're going to put stuff?

David Beaupre: So three of the projects that rise to the top that we have been thinking about is the Ferry Plaza behind the Ferry Building.

Nick Belloni: You pointed those out. Those are the ones you were talking about then?

David Beaupre: Warm Water Park is another one where there's a huge opportunity to expand that park by 2.5 acres. Then there's a series of little breadcrumbs along the Blue-Greenway along Islais Creek. That's our preliminary thinking. I think there's also some opportunities up in Fisherman's Wharf too where we have some opportunities to improve.

Nick Belloni: I was thinking more near Pier 30 and 31 where some open places are going to be needed in that area with more density coming up.

David Beaupre: Yes. We have the Pier 27 cruise terminal which is right next to that too. That's a new 2-acre park.

Female Speaker: Where is Warm Water Cove?

David Beaupre: Warm Water Cove Park is on the eastern terminus of 23rd Street. It's just a block south of Dog Patch and a few blocks east. It's an existing industrial park we developed in the 70s as a mitigation to development we were doing at Pier 80. The [unintelligible] required us to build it. It was probably built before it's time. It's about 2 acres of land including a 1-acre easement from PG&E and as a part of a transaction on the Mission Bay project we received another few acres of land that are dedicated towards the park as an expansion. So essentially we have the Pier 70 project that's Crane Co. Park. [unintelligible] is doing the development of 8 acres along the shoreline. Potrero Power Station is being redeveloped. Essentially when Mission Bay is being developed and Mission Rock—so with Mission Rock, Mission Bay, Pier 70, Potrero Power Station, you'll be able to go entirely along the waterfront except for around our shipyard from Mission Creek down to Warm Water Cove Park and then as a part of that expansion we're going to make a connection directly over to Cesar Chavez Street which is just

two blocks further to the south, kick you our around our cargo facilities at Pier 80, put you on Illinois Street, go over to Islais Creek and then Cargo Way to Heron's Head Park in India Basin.

Female Speaker: So looking at this slide it's right over here basically.

David Beaupre: Just south of that white building.

Male Speaker: So the power plant is going to be repurposed?

David Beaupre: The power plant is closed. The Port owns a little bit of land along the shoreline but that's being privately developed. It was another item on our agenda today at the Commission where we are going to likely allow the developers of the power plant to build an open space on Port property along the shoreline. They're going to be responsible for maintaining it and managing it for the term of their 66 year lease and that way you can get again essentially there will be shoreline parks along all the way down to Islais Creek with the exception of our ship repair yard at Pier 70 and Pier 80.

Chair: Any other questions? Before we let you go I guess I would just ask that you take back to the Commission and just for your own thoughts we're supportive. I think as a body we over my time being on this committee we've always seen the Port and Recreation and Park kind of hand in hand through this bond process. Obviously this climate has changed a little bit and the needs of the city have changed a little bit and to some extent like you said in 2008 your focus was on the southern part of the city and that really benefitted because it's paying off, that's going to be a hotbed for the future. I ask or would say probably on behalf of the committee we would ask that an ongoing dialog with Recreation and Park in terms of the parks that you're delivering and the overall benefit, the consistency between a Recreation and Park property and the Port's properties, not that they have to look or feel the same but that the same intention goes in terms of building them and again I support the Department in some situations and I don't in others. In this particular one we're all in the same gang. Our goal is to deliver great open space and have great parks for our people and so again when you look at a piece of DG versus some green we need some green and I say that to you just the same as I'd say it to a developer for people. Like she's talking about, they needed a green space as much as they needed DG space so we'd just like to ask that you put focus on continuing to develop positive open space.

David Beaupre: Okay.

Richard Rothman: I disagree. The Port needs not—we need to look at the bond as an overall project mixing—not just setting money aside for the Port but having that in the mix with do we need more playgrounds in District 6 or we need more open space in District 11. So maybe not setting a fixed dollar amount but putting it all so everything's in the mix together and then we can prioritize instead of saying here's a separate amount of money, I almost feel like—

David Beaupre: So you want to give us more?

Richard Rothman: No, I'm just saying that we need to prioritize it in the whole mix because one thing I've learned being on here is the city receives their fair share and I feel like the Port

needs to be in the whole mix of everything instead of just saying here's a certain amount for the Port and seeing how the Port will fit in the overall mixed bond measure instead of carving out. That's my two cents.

Chair: Richard I appreciate what you're saying. I think the reality is that the Port is autonomous to Recreation and Park, they do not if they're on this bond have to answer to their want. If Recreation and Park says yeah you can build six parks in these three places giving them a part of the bond doesn't relegate them to being in that discussion. You can say it does but it doesn't.

Nick Belloni: As he explained, they do look at the overall system in the areas that they're putting in parks.

Chair: I'm not saying I don't agree with you, I'm saying they're not beholden under that deal to say okay Phil, Stacy, we'd love to know where you want us to spend our money because it's their money.

Nick Belloni: They also put out really nice looking pieces of parkland and I think that's where the autonomous of them—

Chair: Neither of these two things are up for debate. Whether they do good parks or whether Recreation and Park has oversight, those aren't discussions. He's just telling us thank you for the money, it was great that we have this money to build these open spaces, we'd like to continue to build open spaces if we're going to look for bond money. That's it.

David Beaupre: And we'll collaborate of course. We all want what's best for the city.

Chair: But you're not going to get him to say yeah, forget about it.

David Beaupre: Thank you. And I'm willing to come back to PROSAC whenever you need. I've been to many of these meetings in the past so happy to come back talk about our parks program more any time.

Chair: Thank you David. Is there any public comment on this item? Announcements really quickly, any members have announcements? I have some.

First one, Party in the Parks this weekend. Parks Alliance trying to raise money for playgrounds, go tell people please.

Alta Plaza Park in our District, District 2 is reopening, their fences are down, it's very pretty. Perhaps you've heard of it, it looks like a wedding cake. That party starts at 10:00 a.m. on September 23rd at Alta Plaza Park. If you haven't been there since they renovated it it's looking really good, the fences are down.

Lafayette Park has its 8th annual Fall Social, you're all invited. It's an awesome party in the park, about 200 of our friends will come out and share food and some acoustic music. If you haven't been to the Fall Social it's on September 28th 4:30 to 6:30.

Robert Brust: I got a plot at a community garden in Dearborn Park.

Chair: That's great. We'll all come visit your plot. Any other announcements? Hearing none, this item is closed.

I have one blue card. I want to disclaim that this person Sharon Barbaro who is about to speak under public comment her son is my employee so I'm putting that out on the table. He's also a good friend of mine. She's a friend of mine. But he is my employee and has been for ten years.

Sharon Bobrow: My husband and I live at 64 [unintelligible] Court in Diamond Heights and our backyard is Glen Canyon which is beautiful and a blessing. However, there is a huge cypress tree in Glen Canyon directly behind our house as well and eucalyptus trees next to our back fence. My strong opinion is that these trees need to be cut, trimmed, topped, because they are a fire and safety hazard. We lost our home in Napa in October during the Atlas Peak fire so I'm very concerned about fire danger and don't want to lose another home due to fire. We attended Supervisor Mendelsohn's meeting on this past Saturday with city officials concerning wildfire mitigation in Glen Canyon and I was glad to see so many people in attendance to reinforce that my concern is real, especially considering carelessness by people in the canyon that we have no control over the cigarette butts, fireworks, and nighttime parties, campfires, and homeless people. Plus it's very windy in the canyon which is another fire spreading concern. The trees were planted by our neighbor in the early 70s and are much closer to our house than the trees behind our neighbor's houses and I know they never should have been planted there in the first place. The issue of creating a defensible space seems to be very important and we do not have this barrier. Branches are hanging over onto our fence and the trees have been identified as being fire-loving trees. In fact, the first slide in the presentation on Saturday indicated that these trees are filled with oil and they explode and shoot sparks. The topography behind our house is very steep with dry brush which we were told spreads the fire fastest. So it seems it would be extremely difficult to fight a fire from the canyon behind our house. Plus there's a big dead tree lying behind the house and the canyon which was indicated during the meeting to be a fire hazard. Assistance Fire Chief Williams said that trees should be cut back. So we have had interactions with numerous people in the Recreation and Park Department including Brian DeWitt, Kelly Cornell and Dennis Kern. The last email we received was from Brian DeWitt on August 17th indicating that Dennis Kern would be in touch with me to address my concerns. I have not heard from him or anyone else. My husband emailed Kelly Cornell but we have not heard back from him either. My husband came to McLaren Lodge this summer and he mentioned that we were worried about the tree falling on our house because it's so big and unfortunately he failed to relay my concerns regarding fire. Brian asked Daniel Potter to evaluate the tree for safety and address any issues found. On August 2nd Daniel Potter indicated that he inspected the tree in question, he reported that the tree is in perfect health and in no risk of falling. It seems to me the tree has been pruned in the past, it's been thinned out and has no dead wood to speak of. This just doesn't seem to be the case to me as I see no evidence of prior pruning and there are in fact hanging dead branches. We were not home when Mr. Potter came by so I'm not certain he

evaluated the tree I'm concerned about. Bottom line is that I strongly feel we have a dangerous fire situation, that we need someone with fire risk assessment expertise to make an appointment to meet with us at our house when we are home to evaluate and discuss the situation. I will continue to work with the Recreation and Park Department but we would appreciate any assistance that PROSAC can provide for this evaluation to happen.

Chair: Thank you. So basically we can't undertake this as a conversation but I am a bit concerned and when I heard about this I think it is citywide that there are plenty of properties—anybody who lives near McLaren Park or Mountain Lake Park, I could go on and on, of parks that border private homes where does the responsibility lie? Does it lie on the homeowner who says this branch of the tree which is actually on Recreation and Park property is not leaning over my house and that I'm concerned that it might fall on my house. Who determines this control? Is this Recreation and Park or is this the homeowner?

In Ms. Bobrow's case the concern goes beyond that because there's a fire danger and again if this was a situation where it was clearly on Recreation and Park land Recreation and Park would be responsible under their tree assessment to say and many of us have seen Hort Science's presentation on tree assessments. Does it hurt people—does it hurt property? She's claiming that it would hurt property in that situation. There needs to be an immediate addressing of this concern because if it becomes a liability it's everyone's liability, it starts at Recreation and Park but it becomes the city's liability.

So I'm saying that I think this point is not only important for her personal perspective but as a body that Recreation and Park give us some policy on trees on your property, liability is not. Where do they take responsibility? Again, I think that this could be a presentation. I don't know who exactly from RPD would give that. I think it's a Denny question.

[simultaneous comments]

Robert Brust: They're notoriously bad with trees. They don't have enough people to take care of the trees. They know this. It's in their plan they want to hire more tree people.

Chair: How many million dollars did the city pay out to the woman who got hit by the branch?

Female Speaker: Wasn't it \$3 million?

Chair: Way more. It was \$14 million. How much tree remediation would \$14 million? Never mind giving that poor woman her life back. As far as I'm concerned this has to be a priority to the Department. I see it all the time, I see it in my park, I see branches that absolutely would kill somebody if it fell, absolutely. Again, I feel like what Ms. Barbaro is going through is a similar issue of if they don't see it and even if they do there isn't a lot of action.

Robert Brust: If you have a neighbor and they have this tree that's leaning into your house you ask them to fix it, they don't fix it, then you just eventually [unintelligible].

Chair: So here we are. In this situation forcing RPD's hand—

Robert Brust: Your Supervisor.

Male Speaker: We should make this an agenda item.

Chair: Yeah, I think so. So Steven go ahead.

Steven Currier: District 11. I met Sharon on Saturday as I prefaced at the beginning of the meeting. I suggested to her in an email of different people. When I write letters to anybody in the city I cc as many people as I possibly can, that's how I get things done because it keeps those people on their toes and what I've asked her to do is write a follow-up letter and cc a number of people and I would through the Chair to this organization would say I don't mind her cc'ing me and if there's nothing forthcoming I can bring it up under new business at the October meeting and we can go from there.

Chair: Again I would support that. I think that it is a citywide concern, it just so happens that I'm hearing about it from an individual.

Richard Rothman: It wasn't that long ago that Denny came and talked about this, maybe it was a couple years ago, but I remember.

Chair: It was a couple years ago. Here we've seen in Washington Square an actual play out of the worst-case scenario and here's somebody who's saying to us listen I feel this coming, how many more people don't have this voice or aren't willing to follow those channels to come to us and have us make it. So Mark I appreciate what you're saying. I think this should be an agenda item. I would say that if there's been no action that you speak with Steven before the next meeting and we try to at least put it on this new business.

I'm going to call this meeting adjourned. I'm going to New York in twelve hours. See you guys.

End of Document