

**PROSAC Meeting
October 6, 2015**

David Pilpel: Public comment?

Chair: Yes, sir.

David Pilpel: Just a suggestion, since you do formal written resolution and that takes all your time to sort through I think it would be great if you followed that up with a letter from the Chair to Phil and the Commission passing the resolution, saying that it passed and that you would like a response in writing so that they have to say yes we got it and we're implementing it or we're doing this other thing. You can have formal communication in addition to the informal and I would encourage you to have a process in place to do that.

Chair: Thank you, that's a very good suggestion. Thank you. Okay, any other public comment? Seeing none, that item is closed. Thank you. The next item is the Capital Planning [unintelligible].

Dawn Kamalanathan: So what's been going on in the Department over the past month? I think one piece of news is the introduction of [unintelligible] that basically puts a baseline around the fiscal year 2015-16 budget and also add another \$3 million on top of that every year. The term of the measure is fifteen years and I'm sure the Parks Alliance has more information on the details of this. [unintelligible] it's on the thirty-day hold at the Board of Supervisors right now [unintelligible] So I wanted to let you guys know.

I think other interesting things that are going on is we went on a very nice hardhat of Joe DiMaggio Playground today with the Mayor and Supervisor Julie Christianson and [unintelligible] and Phil Ginsburg and basically the Friends of Joe D. and it looks pretty spectacular. You know, there's always [unintelligible] and you look at the TV bubble diagrams and you're okay I've got it and then you go there and you see the 3D vision completely realized and it just really looks fantastic and I'm very excited. This was a nine-year project. I'm very excited about it and it was personally satisfying to walk around the site with actually the group of people who have been there with us the whole way through litigation, SEQUA [unintelligible] you name it we did it and I've very, very excited about that. So that project is actually going to open on November 14th and I encourage you guys to come out and if you'd like to attend please do, I'd love to see you there.

Other happenings, we bid on 17th and Folsom, got bids back for that project. They were over-budget, we're actually going to need to go back to Eastern Neighborhoods Citizens Advisory Committee to ask for some additional funding to deliver that project and we're analyzing numbers but I think it might be as high as—it's going to be in the range of \$400,000 to \$700,000 and a lot of this escalation is directly attributable to our two-year hiatus while the PUC decided to think about putting a cistern in and then deciding not to

do it. So now we're seeing that cost escalation, that problem and right now in terms of available funding sources the impact piece is really the [unintelligible]. So we will be re-approaching to ask for those additional funds. We also intend to go to the Market-Octavia to request funding for the Buchanan Street Mall because there's problems to that fund as well and so we will hope to ask for additional funds for the Buchanan Street Mall and Margaret Hayward from Market-Octavia just to make those projects better. Buchanan Street Mall for those of you who don't know is actually kind of in bad of this building if you just went back on Fulton and it is a sad little spot right now. Buchanan Street Mall is a series of parcels that are divided up into streets actually with kind of dilapidated play equipment scattered across and there's an activation project right that Trust for Public Land and the Exploratorium are working on that we're very excited about so it would be great if we could take the energy and the community organizing that's happened as part of that activation project and channel that into a visioning process and maybe a [unintelligible] so that's very exciting.

Margaret Hayward, we are working on that project, it's been kind of behind these things. As some of you are aware we have a fairly complex tenant arrangement there including that the 911 Center is on Margaret Hayward and so we've been taking our time to try to figure out what their needs are and have a collaborative discussion about what they need from the future, what the park needs, etc. So all those things are actually kind of chugging along as they should be. We've had launch design meetings for the Garfield Pool project. We've hired a joint venture between Tom Elliot Fish and Paulette Taggart who are both excellent architects and we're pretty excited about what we'll be able to accomplish with them on that project and so we hope that the community design process will start for Garfield Pool sometime in the next six to ten weeks.

On other news in terms of staffing I am hiring for a project manager two, we're doing interviews this month. And then we also hope to hire two PM1s behind it so that there's been a little backlog building that we do have to start a bunch of projects in January including the 2012 bond projects and get going on McLaren and some of the things in Golden Gate Park that we've been wanting to do but haven't been able to tackle yet.

My finance officer resigned which has put me in a state of some panic but we're working on the recruitment to replay my finance officer. In the meantime I'm kind of exploring basically renting finance staff from the Controller's Office to kind of help us get over this hump. Also, our outreach coordinator is out through mid-November and so it's a little different. [unintelligible] Because our goal is to again have all the major neighborhood park projects from the 2012 bond complete by November 2018 when we're supposed to go back for another geo bond before voters.

So I think those things are all exciting. The last thing I'll note which has been brought up both inside the Department through the strategic plan and now through the revenue measure process and also through GOBOT and the other capital advisory committees that oversee our bond program, it's really time to replace Comet this year. For those of you who remember what Comet is, in 2007 we spent \$1 million as a Department to buy Comet which is basically a massive database that is an asset inventory for the

Department and it has all of our buildings in it and almost all of our properties. It's been instrumental, we use it all the time, we've used it now to plan two bonds and we've also used it for every time that people call me and they say hey I'm thinking about can we do a friends project, can we do X playground or redo X park and that was our first stop in looking at what the issues are at that site so I think it's paid for itself many times over but 2007 is a long time ago in the world of construction estimates right now and I think we've also made a tremendous amount of progress between the completion of the 2000 bond, 2008, 2012. So it's a good time as we begin to think about both developing of the Department's first every deferred maintenance plan which is by the way the same thing, pretty much the same homework you would do to do the next bond and so this is like—I do not want to underestimate for you the massiveness of this as an undertaking in terms of the amount of staff time it will take inside the Department that we're also going to see outside consulting resources but I think it is super valuable and will hopefully yield dividends for another ten years once we decide to do it and we also have support from the Controller's Office, the Mayor's Office, everyone agrees that it's time so as that project gets off the ground I'll be happy to come back to you guys and talk to you a little bit and depending on how bored you want to get listening to me talk about data architecture, TMA and whatever new products we might be looking at I'd be happy to do that.

Chair: What's the date that you're looking at?

Dawn Kamalanathan: For starting it? I would at least like to have the RFP written and published in this fiscal year to select the product. I don't know that we'll have the product selected but at least have a very clear scope of work which has actually been the challenging thing for us. When we think about lessons learned from Comet and actually the whole city in the way that government does IT there's a kind of wacky sense that you can buy something off the shelf and it will stop all your problems when really you have to spend to make it an worthwhile incredible investment up front really deciding what you want to accomplish and what the business practices are that will support that and then you can find a product to plug into it but it's so much more around the system you build around the product than the product itself and that was one of the things that I think we saw very clearly in the Comet impact which was the project management module that went with Comet is that the amount of staff time that was required to really keep that system running—we were never going, even with more money, it's not even about the money, it's just about the bandwidth and the repetitiveness of the task, what you can ask one person to do and there's no grad students who will lose their summer to population that particular database and so we're hoping for something better, easier to maintain but that really requires on our side really thinking through the business process piece.

So again, the RFP I would like a clear scope of work for what we're going to do for developing the overall plan. I'd like us to have a clear scope of work and hopefully RFP drafted to seek out the product that we can use and I think also [unintelligible] doesn't exist anymore as it used to and I think they're probably actually be a need for two different types of teams—one around the database itself and another one to hire the

engineers to go out and look at the cost estimators—engineers, architects to go out and look at some of the times and kind of make the mast list of what's wrong at each one and what condition they're in.

But I think it would be a good topic for me to come back at some point and putting aside like the [unintelligible] and just talking about what I think the components of the deferred maintenance plan are and how that works and what lifecycles are and how I think it works for the Recreation and Park Department and what some of our challenges our around breaking a very big problem down into smaller manageable, analyzable chunks.

Chair: Do you think January or February would be too soon?

Dawn Kamalanathan: I mean I can actually talk about what a deferred maintenance plan would look like in theory, I can do that. January would be fine.

Chair: Do we have any questions? I see Patricia and then I see Jane.

Patricia Delgado: District 9. With regard to 17th and Folsom the costs are going up but it's also a flood zone. Are higher costs related to repairing the flood zone issues?

Dawn Kamalanathan: No, that's now what it's being driven by. There is going to be a cistern at 17th and Folsom that will be under the lawn and it will be used to capture rainwater and do some basic irrigation tasks but for a lot of different reasons around the sizing and the cost of how big a cistern it's not going to be enough to really absorb the impact of the flood basis. That was what the PUC was supposed to do.

Patricia Delgado: There's also a stream that comes down from Twin Peaks. We've also got the housing that's going up next door.

Dawn Kamalanathan: That is actually out to—if they haven't selected a contractor already I know that they put the RFP out for a housing developer and have received applications and are reviewing them but I don't know if they've made a contract award yet. So that is well underway.

Jane Weil: District 6. Anything you can update us on about acquisitions?

Dawn Kamalanathan: You and I in our last chat we talked about there's two major property areas, one is a smaller property that's about 6000 square feet at the address is 1133 Mission, the Knight of the Red Branch property. [unintelligible] That property have sent them a letter of interest and so that negotiation is continuing to percolate along. The other property which is at 11th and Natoma we are—the initial parcels we were interested in was about 13,000 square feet and we started a conversation with the owner and he's actually indicated that there's another adjacent 7000 square feet that he also might be interested in selling us so we could get a 20,000 park and that's like a real park, you're getting close to real neighborhood park size and so when I think about just to give you some idea is like Cabrillo and Fulton they're about 30,000 square feet, 17th

and Folsom is in that same ballpark so that's like real neighborhood park size. And so we're exploring that offer with him basically and in negotiations/discussion with him to see—and it looks we have some legs underneath that. So I'm excited about that. We'll of course bring those properties back to PROSAC for your feedback and conversation. I think one of the things and I don't know if you guys [unintelligible] we have a little bit of a cash flow problem in that we actually have if you look at the next seventeen years of open space acquisition fund revenue we certainly have the dollars we need to buy this but in terms of this year we don't have the money so one of the things I'm asking the Controller's Office and Mayor's budget office is if I can issue a commercial paper to do some debt basically knowing—[unintelligible] the future income from the Open Space Fund to pay off that debt to allow us to act on both of these properties right now and that problem is further compounded, that's just to get these two problems. And then we're actually kind of wiped. Then we have another problem with is okay so that was one neighborhood park, size one batch of 30,000 square feet for open space in SOMA. Now if we wanted to do another one and then we wanted to do a rec center we have like a real cash flow problem. So I'm happy to talk about that in more detail but we are making progress on both those properties. I think C.C. Bradley is briefing the Supervisors [unintelligible] on Friday of these choices.

Toby Levy: District 6. How are we doing with our survey analysis needs on D6 and D10?

Dawn Kamalanathan: Good and I think we will have a product for you by January that we can really take around on a dog and pony show or road show. We've started to look at existing service levels [unintelligible] and also look at some of our capacity issues. I think one of the challenges is you have to in some respect it might be an easier place for us to start to rather than drawing a bunch of circles and making comparison about one neighborhood circle's versus another neighborhood's needs we talk a little bit about the fact that look if we look at the rec centers in these areas what can we say about their existing capacity? And I think that many of them are actually at capacity or approaching that so then if you say other well you've got this one serving this many people and then you add this many more what does that mean for the number of new rec centers. And in particular I focus on that question because I feel like everything else is pretty easy to program tennis courts, playgrounds, etc, you can decide once you find a 30,000 square foot space, a 20,000 square foot space, what you want to put there but finding spaces like Gene Friend that are big enough to accommodate a rec center that's a lift, that's going to require some real thinking and strategy on our part.

But I think we are making progress on it and we've actually gotten good collaboration from City Planning right now on that same topic. We've agreed to lock ourselves in a room for three hours, the two teams, and just put up all our maps and draw as many planner circles as we like and kind of ask different questions and pose different scenarios about how we could provide open space in D6 and also the idea of using that as a model for the southeast as well and then I think the trickiest thing is actually trying [unintelligible]. But focusing right now on SOMA and then the southeast. [unintelligible]

Toby Levy: So just as a sidebar you don't need me to go testify in front of the Planning Commission to make sure they do this? I have talked to [unintelligible].

Dawn Kamalanathan: I don't think this is the thing we need to [unintelligible, traffic noise] and I think that is the more important thing is that we need to build relationships and we've holding that and working on that too, build our own relationships with the CACs but I do think that as you're a member of the citizen's advisory committee and as you're looking at open space impact fees I think you might want to actually hear what Recreation and Park staff have to say in terms of making recommendations about what the whole context is for open space and all our different funding strengths and what we hear from the neighbors. And that's information that city Planning staff while informed on any other topics are unable to provide that kind of context but I think it's helpful if you want the CACs to make good decisions.

Chair: Any other questions? Do we have any public comment on Item 3? Being none, public comment is closed. Thank you Dawn. Item 4, Cabrillo playground, update on the playground hours [unintelligible].

Richard Rothman: District 1. Apparently the Friends of Cabrillo playground were if you count Boeddeker Park we're the third to apply under Scott Weiner's legislation to change the park hours and we followed all the rules. It's going to take at least another sixty days to go to the Commission and we started in the summer so it's taken over six months but I learned that people really care about parks. We had over fifty people at our first meeting and people are passionate about their playgrounds and so we decided we had one meeting where we talked out the issues and we decided to have two hours—one for summer and winter hours. And so we voted 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., that's the winter and then the summer will be 7:00 to 9:00 and some people wanted it to 10:00 but Zach Taylor who's our P.S. manager as probably have a fourth of the city I learned some interesting things, even though a park might say 6:00 to 10:00 under the new ordinance if somebody is in the park after 10:00 theoretically they can stay in the park until midnight unless you go and get the rules changed.

And the other thing is that the custodians might close the bathroom facilities, especially at playgrounds, before they close the gate so the bathrooms could close and the playground could still stay open which bothered me because I don't want to see Dawn redoing work again. So these were some of the things that I learned and troubled me. And the other thing is Cabrillo playground we're very—it started before I moved back here—are a very active group of citizens who care but what about the other playgrounds that don't have citizen groups, are they going to be vandalized or who will look out for them?

So I just wanted to tell and I asked Linda to put this on the agenda we had our second meeting so I didn't know what the outcome was going to be but I guess we'll find out in January when we go to the Commission but I wanted the members of the committee to be aware of these issues that I learned about and personally I think there should be some changes in this law between what park and playground but according to Scott

Weiner parks and playgrounds are all the same. If anybody has any questions I'll be happy to answer.

Chair: Thank you. Any questions or comments from members? I think Richard you bring up a very good point though. From my standpoint I think what's disturbing from what you just said was that even though the park closes at 10:00 if somebody is in there they can stick around until midnight and that's after the staff goes home because I believe most of the staff leaves around 10:00.

Richard Rothman: Our playground we only have staff from 3:30 to 6:30. So we only have a rec director from 3:30.

Chair: It may be something that we want to take up as other parks start to see results [unintelligible].

Richard Rothman: And I'll be happy or I have the head of Friends of the park talk to anybody who's going to be going through this process.

Chair: So it takes about three or four months?

Richard Rothman: Oh no, at least six months.

Chair: Robert?

Robert Brust: Can you clarify something for me Richard. You say you're going to be able to get the hours changed on the playground?

Richard Rothman: It has to go to—I shouldn't say—we're proposing the hours to be changed, not it has to go the Recreation and Park Commission, I guess their Operations sub-committee and then to the full Commission.

Robert Brust: So it would be an exception?

Richard Rothman: Right. And there was some opposition so I don't know if the people who weren't happy with the vote are going to come to the Commission meeting.

Robert Brust: Thank you.

Chair: Any other comments or questions? Any public comment? Being none, public comment is closed. Our next item is discussion of a sister park [unintelligible] actually my name is on it because I did the PowerPoint but it's really a joint discussion with Parks Alliance and the members and staff. So Mr. Pilpel [unintelligible] and really this is just a thought-process because we haven't really talked about it but I know that Steve Swaggart from Parks Alliance has had some ideas of [unintelligible] and we had some thoughts so that's really what this is about is just brainstorming. So go ahead and forward the first slide. And Steve do you want to comment as we go along?

Steve Schweigerdt : Do you want to present your ideas first or should I?

Chair: Is it different from mine?

Steve Schweigerdt: Let me introduce myself. I'm Steve Schweigerdt with the Parks Alliance. I run the park partner and all the stewardship programs and so our scope is actually a little bit bigger than just Recreation and Park parks and we've done some planning around creative volunteer programs and creating mentorship programs where we have groups that have completed renovation or more experienced groups helping some of the groups either in their area or a group that has a similar type of project helping them out and it's been pretty information to date. Linda actually came out to Friends of Youngblood Coleman quite a few times and helped them to develop and application for the Community Opportunity Fund grant which we got this August. It's that kind of thing where we could have experienced people helping others and really our big vision for the volunteer system and program is that every green space, every open space in San Francisco has an active stewardship group that has ownership of it in some form. That's our big vision.

There's uncounted green spaces throughout the city. We have currently a hundred park partner groups that are fiscally sponsored with the Parks Alliance. We have a 120 street parks that are on DPW property and then there's a lot of other types of properties out there too where this could be really helpful and they're in all different phases where some are starting from a vacant lot like Tunnel Top Park on top of a CalTrain tunnel where we've got a grant we're going to be turning that into a new little park this year.

So there's a lot of opportunities and we're excited to partner with PROSAC and anyone else that can help out because there's many other Friends of groups that aren't fiscally sponsored like Friends of Duboce, they're separate organizations. So what we need to figure out is how can we all get together, share data, know who is working on different places so that if there is someone that comes in who wants to join a group we can refer them over so I think we've got some goals for creating maybe a database, maps or where the green spaces are and then a network where individuals or groups can interact and share their needs, other groups that can fill those needs can help out and I think that would be a great benefit to the park and all the other open spaces as well.

So that's the summary of what I've been thinking. So what do you guys think now?

Steffan Franz: Hi Steve. District 2. I'm very interested in this, I saw it as a line item in the strategic plan when Phil presented it and I saw an opportunity for PROSAC who really interfaces between the Supervisor and the stakeholders and has relationships with Parks Alliance and with the Department to find ways that we could help people who needed support and I think to clarify my idea and I think maybe all of our ideas it's less about work days and getting your hands dirty because I think any of us could do that, isolate a park and say okay this park really needs help, they don't have a steward. We can go in there and help. But I think where our purpose might be served better is

organizationally, speaking with people, because as Steve says some of us have had experiences with renovations or modifications to the parks where we've put in for a Community Opportunity Fund grants or we've dealt with the Department for two, three, four, five years of a project and have better insight than an individual who is just starting from square one.

So I think Steve coming up with a formalized approach to it, in other words okay I'm the President of Friends of Lafayette Park, my group is willing in any way, shape or form, be identified as a group that's been through a renovation, is willing to help others. What will you as Parks Alliance provide for us to have the dialogue or at least to announce—and I think many of us have been through it, how do we say hey we're available, our group is available to speak?

One idea that I heard quite a bit was town halls where instead of it being identified as one sister park you had a group of people, maybe it's Friends of Lafayette and friend or whatever and [unintelligible] and PHRA and we all say listen if you're interested in XYZ we'll all come and give our time and speak to these people and say hey we've done this already.

So I think what I would get to is you're giving us a good synopsis of what the vision is, what would be the next steps from Parks Alliance's perspective and how would PROSAC play a role?

Steve Schweigerdt: So town halls could be a way to do that but I think we've got a communication system with all of the organizations that we have contact with and we could set up town halls or a forum where groups could announce that hey I've got resources and can help people out. I think we could most benefit PROSAC is helping to widen the tent a little bit more and you've got connections to other groups. So I think really building that into a database that is a communication tool would probably be the first step that I would like to pursue.

Steffan Franz: I think that a way to have—you guys have a hundred groups under your umbrella, if you could identify 37 of those groups and say okay these are people that have opted into wanting to help you would then have a very clear path to say okay well these 20 groups really need help, here are these 37 that could help and then try to put them together that way. I just think getting stymied in the logistics of it as we all know that becomes challenging, it's just a clear path to my group wants to be supportive, if that means [unintelligible] and meeting people or inviting them to our cleaning and greeting, some way to kind of break the ice and come up with a format or formula to actually allow this to happen [unintelligible] without structure and just with people's want to help others.

Chair: Nick and then Mark.

Nick Belloni: Have you guys thought of say a web-based—and I hate to say [unintelligible]—but a next-door type web-based communications system forum type for

San Francisco sister parks or something, make it a forum group so that people can connect with others so that the president of any of these organizations can get an email straight from going hey look we've got this park over here, you know, this park needs some help, can you guys get somebody to help them? Kind of a strategic web-based forum on that? I mean it's a little hard to run I understand, it could be a pain to set up but it's definitely a way to do it with a quick response time versus putting it in a forum or something where you have that every probably six months or even once a year where you could get everybody together where this would be something that could be done in real time.

Steve Schweigerdt: I think that's an excellent idea. We have tried to get a forum going between all the park partners and it's challenging to get people to sign up for another thing to join in but I think there's simpler tools that we might be able to use to activate this, it's a more specific task for somebody.

Maya Rodgers: District 10. I was just thinking about this when we first started and being a new parks group and not knowing anyone and being mindful that—I understand that people use lots of the platforms to talk to one another and that kind of thing but really we're in parks because we want to meet people face to face and so the idea being that we want—I know for me it would have been helpful for someone to say okay here's a list of two park groups in your area that have already been operating and this is this person, that person, like a specific email and not like the group email that you usually get and just thinking about trying to make it more personable.

Steffan Franz: I just wanted to follow up. One area that I think could really help and I think is speaks to both Nick and Maya's point is a web-based resource that's more like best practices, pointing people to various links, who do I need to talk to for this. Again, a resource that is static not something that needs to be updated all the time nor does it need the Parks Alliance or RPD or anyone else but it's kind of like you're successful in social media today because you create community which fills a need for people. This is one of those things that if it's set up more as a community-driven thing like hey my community can help with these areas, your community is in need of this help, instead of it being a long-term dialogue where it has to go to you and it has to go to somebody else and you appoint a new person that's the head of the sister parks and they have to be in the dialogue I think the goal is it's hard for any of us to get out into the parks. I love your idea but I think I could have stood in Lafayette for years waiting for somebody to tell me who the right person to talk to was. There's a level of proactively within our group, everyone who is on this body was proactive in getting here and staying here. I think that people lose interest if they don't find a plan, if they don't find a button, if they can't connect with the right person right away.

So maybe one suggestion I would make on behalf of PROSAC would be build a nice online community with best practices, with the right people to contact. Just hey, I can't go to your park today nor really answer this specific question but you should ask the City Attorney, here's the link for that. That's a Capital project, you should speak to Dawn she's the head of the Capital Division. I mean as simple as that because to be quite

honest when we started our renovation I didn't know who anybody was and like you said I spent a lot of time researching the right people to talk to, never mind actually having an intro to them or an email address or an easy way to get to them. So maybe that could be a good suggestion in terms of just a starting place. Sister parks dot.com here's a bunch of resources, share them on Facebook, share them with your friends, share them with the people who need it, then maybe it gets some momentum itself and then you can actually start to put a system in a place to connect people.

Chair: All of us have had projects. I see Linda's hand up. I wanted to get some input from other views. Linda, you had your hand up?

Linda Shaffer: I was just going to follow up on this idea and tie back into Maya's plea. Maya started and is still pretty much Parks 94124 and it's the pre-pre-stage that also needs to be there so if we're going to have something called Sister Parks dot.com that has to come up on Google so that somebody who wants to start a parks group and is saying okay how do I do this they can put something into Google or the search engine of choice and there would be all this information including how to start a park support group.

Ancel Martinez: At large. I have a couple questions and a comment. Going back to the PowerPoint, in terms of what generalizations would you make in terms of the scope and scale of existing sister park groups in the city?

Steve Schweigerdt: We don't have any where there's formal relationships between different groups.

Ancel Martinez: So Friends of Dolores Park—I mean how many?

Chair: You mean friends groups [simultaneous comments].

Steve Schweigerdt: There's probably about a hundred all together not including—with the Parks Alliance groups plus all the other ones that are not affiliated with us.

Ancel Martinez: And are they ad hoc? Are they kind of volunteer groups but are they 501c3s I mean, I'm just trying to get my head around it. I know there's going to be varying degrees but again, does anybody—

Steve Schweigerdt: We about sixty that are on Recreation and Park property that are fiscally sponsored so they use our 501c3 status. There's a few that are their own nonprofits like Friend of Duboce Park but I'd say the rest of them are probably just unincorporated or work with their neighborhood association.

Ancel Martinez: So how many people, do you have an idea in terms of how large that is? Of the hundred plus groups you've identified that are friends of a park how many people is that?

Steve Schweigerdt: I mean the leadership probably has maybe three or four people in each group so you've got three or four hundred there plus when they have events they bring in people around the community.

Ancel Martinez: Could you skip ahead a couple slides because I have a question.

Chair: This is stuff I put together based on the sister city concepts and I did some research to see if there was anything related to park groups and the only ones I found were with the National Parks but they're national. There's really nothing out there that I could see but there were some concepts that I picked up and some of this goes into a slightly different version of what you two were talking about because my take on it is there's a lot of green space—and you mentioned some new ones now that you're putting together plus the ones that are being developed by other Departments and then of course the ones that are being developed by developers. There's all these green spaces and then the concerns I have is how do we identify the ones that needing some TLC, the rundown ones? We could start with like the ones that are Recreation and Park parks and they have park groups and can we help them in that way with our expertise and your expertise can we reach mainly to those groups and find out who are the community leaders, is anyone interested in having a park group formed because they're the same groups that never get a COF grant put in. I mean you and I had this conversation [unintelligible] but there's parks that never get the funding or don't have the community knowledge or whatever the reason is they're the ones that are not being addressed and my take is I want every park that Recreation and Park owns to be up to a C at least and then we can go out to be the largess and help all the other green spaces that are out there. But that's kind of where I was coming from is we have to identify—

Ancel Martinez: Do you want to just run through the whole thing because I don't think everyone has seen this.

Chair: We could. [simultaneous comments] Basically it's a collaboration, we talked about this, I don't want to do this but if you go on to the next one we kind of beat this one to death. I just came up with some things, you know, exchanging information and this is just kind of everybody knows this kind of stuff but the number one on long-term is for me restoring unfunded or blighted parks and I think as a PROSAC members that's kind of where my heart is and creating stewardship but also bringing all parks and their assets to the same level. Did you have a question on that?

Ancel Martinez: Couldn't the area service managers provide input into which parks needs help and which ones are up and running?

Dawn Kamalanathan: If you want to ask that question on the record, sure. [laughs]

Ancel Martinez: If we're trying to find out which parks are needy.

Dawn Kamalanathan: Parks or the park groups? [simultaneous comments]

Steffan Franz: Ideally each PSA could identify like while these are chugging along this one really needs help. [simultaneous comments].

Dawn Kamalanathan: Depending on what question you could also ask the park service area manager that and you could also look at perhaps the Controller's Office data, look at that also as well to see what's in the bottom ten percent of the Department in terms of maintenance because depending on your strategy of whether you want to touch each district or each area or you really just want to focus on the ones that are lowest performing those are slightly different sets of parks and so that data set is also available to you.

Steffan Franz: So Steve it's clear because I think that's a great idea is if you were just to identify today twenty across the city or thirty across the city that area really the bottom and let—you already hear from a lot of the [unintelligible] there would be interest within each of our separate groups then we could identify them and get something going immediately, like a relationship going between X and Y as opposed to us having to spend time searching them out and then having to Google who to talk to.

Steve Schweigerdt: I think a great first step for me is that we've developed a list with the volunteer Department of as many Friends of groups as we know and who the contact people are and if we could share that list with you guys and maybe you should all be on the list also because you represent an area and you could help us fill in any blanks and then once we've got that list solidified we could then start figuring out who are the groups that want to help others out or who is starting that could use some help. But that would be a great place for us to start.

Patricia Delgado: I just wanted to say that it's going to be an interesting process to go through and I think what we need to do is find out from the area Supervisors what parks need help and then two, find out if any of those parks have groups and if they do then you might want to do a network of the next door thing because I know that there's a little sidewalk park on Bryant and 23rd and they do a call. We're going to clean, please come help if you've got the time and then at least you've got some [unintelligible] people respond and so that it's not a cold call that people are going to be put off by. I'm asking for help and then once that—or contact them and say we've got a sister park program that you might be interested in and make that introduction so that at least it's sort of step by step rather than blank wall and how do I get to the other side.

Steve Schweigerdt: This could be a partnership too where you know we've got a little bit more authority saying that we're working with PROSAC as a partner, that would be awesome too.

Patricia Delgado: But we also have a lot of park groups that change hands over the years. I'm sort of the last of the old guard and Ninos Unidos and nobody has come up so I work of watch like a hawk and if something happens I'll run across the street and attack my gardener and he's very good but he's going to retire in October so—

Chair: But that brings up a point and Robert I want you to go ahead but one of the points that raises is once you aren't there then that park becomes an enigma and maybe no one is going to take care of it because then you see it go down the hill. I don't even think I addressed that.

Steffan Franz: Well you do because you say [unintelligible] and the reality is we're all getting old and we're going to term out and there's going to have to be another generation of people that pick up this.

Chair: Okay, Robert go ahead.

Richard Rothman: My quick question is do we want to concentrate just on the Recreation and Park Department property or do we want to bring in some of the DPW open spaces at this time?

Robert Brust: I can answer that question since no else wants to answer. Lately I've been spending a lot of time working on what we call the staircases and Delores Heights and there's about seven of them, most of them are DPW, some they've accepted and they're actually taking care of them, some aren't and we have for about almost a year now been having first Saturday cleanups and it's very still early stages and some of them have got a group of neighbors around the park that are coalescing around it and they consider themselves the stewards of that space and others don't. We still haven't identified everybody yet but we're starting to. And I think that's sort of what you have in mind, right?

Steve Schweigerdt: Yes. We would love to have this be available for everyone, we don't necessarily need to start that way, we can focus first on Recreation and Park properties and try to get this going and expand it once we have a model. So we do a pilot with only 223 parks in that system.

[simultaneous comments]

Male Speaker: They ask here if we could go forward a couple slides I think next.

Chair: This goes back and there's the resources, the controllers [unintelligible] I didn't think of the PSAs but that's a good one. And then to me the first thing you have to do is you have to find out something about the community. I mean what are the demographics, who are the people that are there. If we were actually going to get something—we don't know anything about the community I think from someone's standpoint you have to really find out what is going on in this community and maybe we don't have that information, who are the people that use the park in this case and are there some projects planned, maybe, maybe not, and then identify some of the problems and challenges and so on and so forth.

Male Speaker: My sense is that there's an ask here and so I'd like in terms of public policy try to crystallize what the ask is and it seems like there's a desire to start and run a campaign. When I say a campaign it means build a constituency, reach out, reach people, come up with an action plan and implement some change that would improve the parks. So we start with people in the community. That's what I mean like a campaign so in the words of the folks that offered this report what is the central ask here that PROSAC can do in the short term.

Chair: I think something has already been brought to the table. This was really to surface ideas but I think what we're talking about is maybe some sort of inventory to start with. That's maybe the first thing is an inventory of who or what is—where we're starting.

Steve Schweigerdt: I think my desire really would be to focus on people and groups around parks and start forming connections. I think if we try and inventory that's a huge task and—

Chair: I mean inventory parks, I'm sorry I should have been more clear. Like who do you have, who are the PSAs, get those connections.

Steve Schweigerdt: So that database, building on that would be the first step. So the ask for individual PROSAC members would be to look through that database and we would identify parks that don't have a steward or we don't know who they are and if you know of a group or a person that is actually taking care of that space we would be interested to get that person's contact info in there so we can go to the network that way.

Tom Valtin: District 9. I'm perhaps being dense but what I hear is developing a constituency for individual parks but where is the sister park come in, if it doesn't get attention can turn to another park, has advocates and utilize those resources?

Steffan Franz: I think the initial concept when it was laid out by Phil was to say [unintelligible] don't reach the length that they need to, Parks Alliance is really great at what they do but there really needs to be hands on the ground, most notably people who already kind of experienced some of these pieces and are able to just impart, not maybe make financial contributions, maybe not even physically—expertise, consultation, direction, best practices, community. [simultaneous comments] Let's just pose just to answer your question if I knew Maya back then and I had just come through my renovation there are plenty of things I could have said to her, look out for this, talk to your Supervisor about that, before they finished the job make sure that the retention is going to be on the table, [unintelligible]. I mean I could put a hundred things on the table today that I couldn't before that renovation so in essence I think the idea is to put that on the table.

Chair: Okay, I have two hands and then we're going to close.

Toby Levy: I'm the curmudgeon in the room. District 6. I think this is a great idea but I think everybody has got their plate full. Parks Alliance certainly does and I think you have to be careful that what time you spend is spend judiciously and we don't start building another organization to have volunteers work on another organization to do this because we are volunteers so I think a database is great but I think we've got a lot to do besides having an overlay organization to great some more emails for giving us volunteers more things to volunteer for.

Richard Rothman: District 1. Just one suggestion. When I was looking up to find the West Portal group I found it but the lady I called moved to San Mateo so maybe you might want to update your database. She was very helpful.

Chair: Do you have any final thoughts? Where do we want to go from here?

Steve Schweigerdt: I'll share that list with you and if that's something you can share amongst yourselves and we could build on that, that would be great. I take Toby's point very well also because we were trying to start this as a mentorship program where we were relying more on individuals and most of the people that we asked were just too busy so we realized that everybody is stretched for time and we'll try to make this as minimally time intrusive as possible.

Chair: Do we have any public comment?

Nan White: I was just going to say in a real practical way the things he was just talking about I did some pro bono design work for getting some things done at our park and I could have had—if I had known who the person was that did the vegetable garden over by Kezar that would have made it really easy for me to just call somebody up and say that's [unintelligible] and just keep going and getting that information. I didn't know where to go to get that, that would have been really easy had there been a specific place. It does sound like a really useful thing.

Chair: Is there any other public comment on this item? Being none, public comment is closed. We have now our 2016 maintenance initiative to discuss and Mr. Pilpel would you—what it is is a legislation document.

David Pilpel: There are copies out.

Chair: There are copies. And this is also Parks Alliance [unintelligible] discussion. Because the time is running out for us as a civic body to comment this is the opportunity we have to [unintelligible] Sunshine rules and discuss what maybe we would like to see. [unintelligible] Ancel.

Ancel Martinez: One is the full charter amendment, the other is the [unintelligible]. [simultaneous comments]

Matt O’Grady: I’m the CEO of the San Francisco Parks Alliance. I’m going to lead this off with a few high-level comments and then hand it off to the true expert in the room here, Rachel Norton our director of policy and communications. So to give you some context and could I have [unintelligible]. If I had the power in me I would nominate Rachel for a Pulitzer Prize for this chart because this really captures the whole thing. In 2000 voters approved a charter amendment that tweaked the Open Space Fund, created PROSAC and the specific language in that charter amendment mandated that the increase in the Open Space Fund allocation to the Recreation and Park Department was to be in addition to, not instead of the then-current funding of general fund funding for the Department. Well, look at what happened.

So that chart maps out what should have happened if just using the base measurement of the Department at the time had 2.1 percent of the general fund. If it still had 2.1 percent of the general fund now it would be getting \$89 million a year but instead what has happened with every economic downturn the Department has been cut disproportionately, you could even say it’s been eviscerated and then in the next upturn it didn’t quite catch back up and so with each downturn we get further behind.

In our analysis it really came to the fore for us that what’s driving this is that San Francisco is both a city and county. So when we have a economic downturn we carry the human services obligations of a county so homeless shelters and San Francisco General and all those kinds of responsibilities they come to the fore. And we’re a city so we have police and fire and all that stuff. That comes to a fore too. When you’re facing massive cuts are you going to lay off a gardener or are you going to lay off a nurse? Are you going to close a clubhouse or a firehouse? Those choices are pretty stark to make at the time but what happens is we keep on deferring the maintenance and deferring the investment in our park system further and further and this is the hole that we dug ourselves into.

Now look on the other side. We’ve been working on this for about a year and a half and we have made great progress in that Mark Ferrell has introduced legislation for another charter amendment that would both stabilize and then gradually grown the level of funding from the general fund to the Department over the next ten years and then for another five years beyond that it’s harder to predict. It doesn’t get us everything that we think is needed but it’s also really hard for us to articulate exactly what is needed for the Department because we don’t know for sure but this would be a really big step in the right direction.

I think I’ll turn it over to Rachel at this point to go into the specifics of how we got here and what this looks like.

Rachel: You’ll remember I was here a couple months ago with Supervisor Ferrell talking about our initial idea for this legislation and you might recall that the proposal that we brought to him was a big increase in the actual open space [unintelligible]. That proposal would have generated—out original proposal was to try to generate an additional \$45 to \$45 million a year in general fund support for the Department. As all

legislation does it went through the sausage making process and what you have before you is a significantly different proposal but one that does I think stabilize the Department's budget over the remaining life of the Open Space Fund. You can see in this chart that this is the flip side of the original one these bars in green and what the Department is currently getting in general fund support, remember Departments [unintelligible] three major components—earned revenue, Open Space Fund property tax set aside, and general fund support. So this green is the general fund support. The dotted bars are what the Department would get in general fund support under Ferrell's proposal and the gray bars are just there for reference to show you if you simply increased what the Department got this past year in general fund support by 2.5% a year which is a pretty conservative estimate of what the cost of government might be on an annual basis it may actually be a little bit too low but it basically shows you that you are getting more than it would cost to run the Department in large part over the next fifteen years. So that is all very positive. Essentially what this is, it's not an increase to the Open Space Fund, the Open Space Fund set-aside would remain unchanged at the tax equivalent of 2.5 cents for every \$100 valuation but what would happen is that the level of general fund support that the Department got in this current fiscal year, 15-16, would get locked in and then would be increased \$3 million a year for the next ten years. So each year that we'd get an additional \$3 million that they got the previous year and then for the final five years the general fund allocation would go up or down based on the growth in the city budget. So again, these dotted lines essentially approximate what that looks like.

The other significant we think improvement in the legislation is much clearer planning requirements. All of us are familiar with the fact that the original Prop C required the Department to do a strategic plan every five years to do an annual operational plan, a capital plan and for a number of reasons that really did not happen and so the Department has just started—just finished its first strategic plan in I think the past ten years, so it's the first one in ten years or so that they had done.

This amendment now brings in—this charter amendment brings in the Controller's Office to actually come in and certify that the Department is doing the planning and also look at the current strategic plan audit the Department's progress on its current strategic plan and say these are the things that they did in fact accomplish that they said they were going to accomplish, these are the things that maybe they still need to accomplish that they fell short on or weren't able to accomplish.

So we think that is a significant improvement over the existing Prop C language. I think it will give all of us as park advocates a tool to really with the Department and hold them accountable for continuing to make the investments that we all know are needed in the park system.

I want to say you know Dawn was talking earlier about a deferred maintenance plan. That's the kind of thing that we're talking about is really giving the Department a little bit more breathing room and ability to get their arms around what is the size and scope of the problem here. We all know that there's a problem but it has been very, very difficult

for the Department and for advocates to actually put a number on what is the size of the problem and because if you can't do that you also can't come up with a really good plan to figure out how to address it, right. So we feel very good about the planning requirements in here.

The other items of note in this amendment it does not extend the life of the Open Space Plan. I know I've talked to a couple members of PROSAC already about this issue and I'm sure that you guys may want to have more of a discussion about that tonight. It also has a provision where if the city budget—if the city is facing a projected budget deficit of \$200 million the Controller can pull back the additional allocation. So we'll keep what we have and wherever we are in this trajectory of increased funding but in a really bad year we could stay flat and lose that increase and not actually get it back. There's no provision for paying it back. So those are areas that we're less thrilled with but negotiations being negotiations you know you don't always get everything.

So I think those are really the high points and the key bullet points of the legislation. We also have done our own version of the legislative digest that tries to highlight here's what's new, here's summarizing what's different. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Matt O'Grady: Before you go to questions there's one other point to add to what you just outlined Rachel and it's a bit arcane and on the subtle side but it actually is pretty significant and Phil Ginsburg was really able to highlight this for me. One of the current maneuvers that happens with the Department budget every year and one of the ways in which the city has been able to get away with these cuts has been when the Department has earned revenue that exceeds its budget. They have been able to use that basically as an excuse to cut the general fund support the next year because they don't get to necessarily keep all their earned revenue. This charter amendment would change that and would lock in what they earn they keep. When you combine that with the fact that there can be no cuts to the baseline of general fund support it means this big dips that you've seen in the downturns cannot happen and that's a significant stabilization of the revenue stream.

[simultaneous comments]

Chair: We're going to go Steffan, Les, Richard, Nick, Robert.

Steffan Franz: So I think the one area that is going to come up amongst PROSAC and an area that we want to be supportive of is I think two-fold. One, this money if and when this happens and there is more [unintelligible] what will the oversight look like on that because pumping more money into a stable but sometimes challenged Department I guess who is going to be the definer? You guys are going to work awfully hard to go out and increase this. Supervisor Ferrell is going to do the same thing. [unintelligible] hey by the way we got you an extra \$3 this year what do you guys want to do with it and more importantly the what do you guys want to do with it part because that's the part that we would feel like we should play a role in, that if we're going to help push this legislation, if we're going to help get [unintelligible] through a voter action then we would

like to know what are the oversights on the money coming in and where would the Department propose spending additional revenue. We already saw Katie's presentation, we know what the deficits are, [unintelligible] who are going to be the people that actually administrate this?

Rachel: The whole value to having a strategic plan is that you say in these five years these are the key strategic initiatives that we want to accomplish and they've done a pretty good job in my personal opinion of saying here are the key initiatives that we want to accomplish over the next five years. Then what you have that flows from that is an operational plan which you are doing annually and those objectives in that strategic plan should be represented in a much more detailed and actionable way in the annual operational plan. So it's kind of on the Department to do the plans and make them good. It's on us as advocates to comment on those plans, to monitor them, to make sure they're happening, to give input about things that we think should be in there that aren't or things that shouldn't be in there that are. And then at the end of the day it's the Controller's job to say yes they did the plans and here's how far they actually got on the plans. So it's a collective responsibility, there's nothing in—the one thing I will say, the one little sort of stick in here is that if the Department does not do the required planning as dictated by the charter the Board of Supervisors can hold back a portion of their allocation until the planning is done. So you know I mean hopefully that—we never get to that point, the Department would never want to get there, we would not want people to be deprived of their funding for that but there needed to be something in there to say we really have to do it this time but make no mistake, it's still incumbent on all of us to monitor, to oversee and to give input. We don't get a pass here, it's not like it's just going to happen without us paying attention.

Steffan Franz: Right because I mean again I read the legislation, there isn't really—it isn't really defined within the legislation other than there is a potential audit by the Controller's Department.

Rachel: They also have to have an allocation in every budget to fund a position or strategic planning, there has to be a line item in the budget saying this is how much money we are putting towards strategic planning which we think is important because you can mandate all the planning you want but what happened was it was never funded because the Department had other priorities that they were trying to fulfill and if you don't fund it, it doesn't happen, it just sort of get tacked on to so somebody else's job responsibilities. But now there is actually a stream of funding dictated by the charter that has to go towards maintaining this kind of planning requirement.

Matt O'Grady: I'd like to add to that. PROSAC was established by that legislation in 2000 and you read the language from Measure C in 2000 and you can see there was a clear link between the planning requirements that were imposed on the Department at the time and the reason from having PROSAC which was to be the key voice for we the people to weigh in on that planning. Well, the planning didn't happen and so that undermined the value of having PROSAC. With this upgraded planning requirement and the teeth that are added to it particularly the operations planning which needs to happen

in between the strategic planning and the budget that's a vehicle where they're actually going to look at okay what did they actually try to do next year and for PROSAC in particular and the Parks Alliance to weigh in on what the priorities ought to be for the next year the key opportunity for resident input into setting the priorities for the Department and how the money gets allocated. The legislation also requires the Department to then report back out after the fact that was our operating plan last year, what did we actually get done. And that's an oversight mechanism but again empowers PROSAC and empowers the people to really have a voice in all this. This is where I really think we have done about as good a job as we could expect to do in nailing this oversight and accountability component that we wanted to achieve.

Les Hilger: I'm in danger of asking a similar question but I think I was concerned that I didn't see enough accountability to really addressing the deferred maintenance, the depth of deferred maintenance that we have going on and I'm inclined to think that most people don't want to do someone else's homework and they'll just move on. And so I think I'm hearing that we're still the ones that need to hold the Department accountable while we're viewing their plans to ensure that they are addressed their deferred maintenance with this money instead of doing something else with it.

Rachel: I think that's a good point but what I also think is I'm hearing really encouraging things from the Department about addressing the deferred maintenance and maybe people in this room would disagree with me. My personal opinion is that it's not that the Department is like that's boring, we don't want to do that. It's like it actually didn't have the money. They were trying to keep all the plates spinning at the same time so I think that now that they are looking forward to a little—let's be honest, this is a little bit more money, it's not a lot more money but now that they at least can say okay we know that our Open Space Fund allocation is safe because we're not going to have to backfill when we lose general fund, we know what our general fund allocation is going to be. This frees them up to actually really do that planning which I have heard from every member of the senior leadership team in the Department that they really want to do. That said, I actually think it wouldn't be such a bad idea to have the Commission then pass a policy this is what we're going to do, here's how we're going to start to chip away at that deferred maintenance now that we have additional monies coming in. I think that actually is something that we will be I think advocating for as they starting that deferred maintenance plan. But they have to get their hands about the size of it because Dawn if I put you on the spot do you know what the total bill is? You don't really know right?

Dawn Kamalanathan: In 2007 it was \$1.7 billion and that's part of the challenge is that we have some of this planning and it's guided the delivery of now \$300 million in geo-bond program and what's different right now is those programs were very much focused on the end of the lifecycle of an asset. When you think about a deferred maintenance plan a full deferred maintenance plan is not just focused on replacement but really thinking about what the investments are you can make along the way and ask when to extend its useful life or preserve the useful life that came with the warranty when you opened it out of the box, right. So I think that's the missing piece of the equation. It's not that the Department is starting from scratch when thinking about this

question but that we now have to we've done it once and now we have to think about it again at a deeper level. I do think that in addition to PROSAC hearing about this one of the I think successes of the organizing around the revenue measure has been to bring real awareness in City Hall about the need for this plan. And again it's not just PROSAC, I saw the Budget Director and she was just like when do you think you'll get it done? To Rachel's point I think one of the things to understand as well is that our true constraint has been somewhat of an invisible one, it's not even about money, it's been about having the analytical bandwidth and having a deep enough bench at the Department and I think one of the things you've seen at the Department over the past ten years that I've been there is that you've gone from a place where there was one planner for the whole thing, slowly building capacity and I think that's the next step for me and we're talking actively with the budget offices about what that position might look like that can spend a year working on this fulltime. So that is what it's going to take and everyone is doing something else right now. I think in terms of the accountability piece Recreation and Park also really supports that and I think we'll be in a place of being able to maybe also make some suggestions for you guys as we have in the past for our other things around what's some good best practices and accountability practices might be in terms of guiding the implementation of expenditure of these funds.

I went back and looked at the past few years of general fund capital expenditures and part of the [unintelligible] is we have this \$3 million in city revenue and then we also are capturing a pretty good year in terms of general fund capital budget. Now, most of that good year—meaning that we are kind of on the like \$8-\$10 million more than average that what we would have got in past years. Now a lot of that money right now is add backs. So if we use that money we can use that money that we've captured in a much more strategic way but it's going to be pushing back on some other forces as well and that's something that I think you guys need to keep in mind that the extra money has gone to add backs. If you want it to start being used for deferred maintenance that's going to require a clear articulation of a policy statement about what it needs to go to and also again Commission policy, Board action, whatever, to kind of make sure those funds are expended in that way. But it's not anything different than what we've done already through our criteria processes for the geo-bonds, when we've gone through the revenue—that predates most of you now—but the revenue bond prioritization exercise. I think again you're not starting from scratch, there's a lot of work to be built on here but there's a good opportunity to move the ball forward if we think about our capital program and capital deferred maintenance, whatever, in a much more holistic way that we've been able to achieve.

Richard Ivanhoe: District 5. I've got my comment and then comments from Dennis Moscofian who is the other D5 rep who is not here. So my comment is that when Supervisor Ferrell first approached us with he didn't have anything written, it was just a general concept and the concept was to find a funding mechanism for operations and maintenance and really what I see in here is that yes this does increase funding for the Department but the only thing it actually mandates is to plan so that's [unintelligible]. And this may take a few minutes but [unintelligible]. It's probably easier to read [unintelligible].

I want to share my concerns I have about the Parks Alliance/Supervisor Ferrell's proposed set-aside which I support in general but won't without specific priority spend [unintelligible]. I believe the set-aside which would bring in a minimum of \$35-\$40 million per year for many years could most readily become a slush fund for the Department heads. While there's no easy way to predict how the money should be spent over the life of the set-aside there need to be agreed-upon priorities which can be monitored and enforced where to spend. The money raised should be spent in the most neglected areas of the city and [unintelligible] parks and playgrounds until some level of parity has been reached throughout the city. Playground, more than \$15.5 million is spent on the few playgrounds earmarked to date [unintelligible] up to 24 additional failing playgrounds. So it should be written into the legislation the principle that a top priority of the set-aside money must be spent to continually upgrade and maintain all playgrounds.

Trees. A top priority written into the legislation must be to spend a certain amount annually [unintelligible] fifteen-year tree care cycle from the current 102-year cycle. Denny Kerns [unintelligible] to reach the fifteen-year tree care cycle is a good measure of how much to spend annually.

Acquisition. A specific amount from the increased set-aside be set aside for acquisition of open space, particularly in areas like D6 and D11.

Facilities Maintenance. There must be specific language making facility maintenance a top priority of the additional set-aside money in lieu of the historic practice of deliberately allowing facilities to deteriorate which then justifies a geo-bond to [unintelligible] throw-away culture at work then use tax dollars to build brick and mortar and continue to avoid higher [unintelligible]. Thanks for listening, Dennis.

Richard Rothman: District 1. I like the changes but maybe this is a question for Phil but if this passes with the increase in revenue will this have less pressure on Recreation and Park to have outside income so there won't be as prioritization or less or will it be—can they cut back on some of these outside revenue sources or are they still going to have to depend on it if this bond passes? [simultaneous comments]

Rachel: So the revenue model, the model that we put together for the previous iteration of this proposal and this one here absolutely depends on them continuing to be able to generate earned revenue. It's just not—there's no way particularly with this much smaller amount of money that we're talking about that the Department can achieve any of the goals that we're all talking about without continuing to generate our revenue.

Richard Rothman: Will it need more or the present rate?

Rachel: That's really a policy decision for Phil and the Commission I mean I think our concern about he earned revenue was particularly that it had become the single largest source of revenue for the Department and we thought that was a clear indication that

the city was being derelict in its duty to fund parks so I think we'll have to look then when this really wraps up. I mean next year we're only talking about \$3 million, it's not a significant change in the balance but over maybe five, six, seven years from now when it has ramped up a little bit more then let's look at the balance of what they're bringing in with earned revenue, what they're bringing with open space, what they're bringing in with general fund.

Richard Rothman: Because some people aren't happy with that and so maybe saying it might go down or [unintelligible] because I think that would help sell it.

Rachel: I mean I can't say from the analysis that I've done of the Department's budget that I could recommend that they could cut back on their earned revenue because that would just create another hole somewhere else that we just plugged. So I mean that would not be a recommendation of mine at this money but you know I hear your point I've certainly heard those people and many of them live in our neighborhood.

Nick Belloni: Just one question. You were talking about how this will keep revenue staying constant after downturns and everything, general fund revenue being constant. Now the question—the quick question is you know how during those downturns we've had like in the middle of the year and the middle of the budget cycle pull ten percent of your budget. Is this going to stop that?

Rachel: Yes.

Matt O'Grady: Yes. The mechanism is a baseline that starts at the current level of funding of the general fund which is \$64.something million, cannot drop from that and it's not a percentage, it's \$3 million a year on top of \$3 million a year for ten years and then it gets tied to whatever is the overall city budget up or down that's what happens to the Recreation and Park Department budget. The trigger mechanism that's included would allow the Mayor's Office to pull the increase in a deficit year but it can't actually do any of [simultaneous comments]. The only trigger would allow them to do is to not award that \$3 million increase that year. So it can't go down. This I think is the secret sauce is perhaps even more important than the dollar amount increases is they can't eviscerate the Department anymore.

Dawn Kamalanathan: The only thing I would add to that you're talking about kind of [unintelligible] budget instructions that's reduced by 10 percent. So when you're a baseline Department your budget instructions become absorb all costs within your baseline and that's it for the season.

[simultaneous comments]

Rachel: That's why—remember, I don't know if everybody knows this but the way that all city salaries are negotiated is centrally, they're not—the Department does not negotiate its own labor contracts so whatever that comes out of those labor negotiations that are conducted centrally then are part of those budget instructions. You will pay your

people 2.5 percent more next year, whatever. So that's why this becomes very important and something that we were very concerned about when we first heard the \$3 million annual increase proposal because you don't want to lock in money and then over time have that eaten away by those cost increases to while I think the 2.5 percent is conservative there are some units that are looking at perhaps 3 percent next year over at the School District we gave our teacher 3 percent a year for three years so this gray line would get steeper and we should be aware of that because they will, that's the downside to being a baseline Department, they will have to absorb whatever those increases are but we do think that there's enough built in here that they will come out ahead even in the biggest and most generous year for city employees.

Ancel Martinez: I wanted to follow up on the speakers remark that this legislative digest has described it, it requires that any excess revenue earned by the Department be retained for the Department's future use. So thank you for these bar charts and analysis. What percentage of the current operating budget or revenue is earned revenue from the Department?

Rachel: It used to be a third. [simultaneous comments] Out of \$163 million last year it was about \$55 million in earned revenue.

Matt O'Grady: It's roughly a third, a third, a third but it is interesting to note that the Department hit a milestone I think last year that earned income became the single biggest source of revenue. [simultaneous comments]

Rachel: No, just because of the extra capital that they got as part of the general fund, if you look at the last green bar here how that jumps way up. That's why this was a good year to baseline but I don't know what the actuals will be on their earned revenue for this year yet but it may in fact be that the general fund will again be the biggest source of revenue over [unintelligible].

Ancel Martinez: So this proposed legislation would offer the Department that you don't lose that essentially. So in the lean years how much does the city take back essentially from that earned revenue?

Rachel: It wasn't so much that they took back the earned revenue but they cut the general fund allocation. So that's this bouncing around here, this gets so much smaller because they're giving them less and saying use more of your earned revenue towards operating because you're going to get less.

Ancel Martinez: So what was the net effect of that? Let's say they got \$50 million in those lean years, how much did they lose, however you want to describe it?

Rachel: Katie Petruccione would have to answer that question. [simultaneous comments]

Ancel Martinez: I just offered from my membership in terms of its—I like facts and analysis, at least I'd like informed discussion so understanding [simultaneous comments]. Understanding the effect of the benefit of having excess revenue is important.

Robert Brust: I just want to bring this discussion back to something that was mentioned a few times, Dawn brought it up and then you brought it up, there always was a discussion and a possibility of extending the life of the Open Space Fund charter for maybe another fifteen years and that would give us a little bit more wiggle room so we could actually afford some neighborhood parks in District 6 and some of the other areas. Can you please tell us why this got knocked off?

Rachel: Well, I wasn't in the room when it got knocked off so I don't actually know.

Robert Brust: These are discussions between Mark Ferrell and his Department?

Rachel: The text of the legislation that you have is the product of extended negotiations between Supervisor Ferrell and the Mayor's Office. As far as who said what and why I will tell you that extending the Open Space Fund was definitely on the list of things that we suggested to the Supervisor as being something that would be a good thing to do and I think he was amenable to that and I don't—you'd have to ask him and the Mayor why that changed. I think there was some concern. I think overall there was concern about everyone's lack of ability to completely quantify the problem. While we know that this doesn't solve the problem we don't actually know what will solve the problem and I think some of the concern is that if you lock in a certain amount of money going much further on you may actually—I mean our concern certainly way that you could actually under-resource the Department over the long term so that was why for us we didn't fight, we didn't say well this is something that we can't accept. I think we thought well you know there's definitely advantages to extending and we could see some arguments why going back sooner could be to the Department's benefit. So at the end of the day it's a concern, I get that, I don't know that we're thrilled about it but it is what it is.

Dawn Kamalanathan: The language was modified to allow open space acquisition [unintelligible] for acquisition and development, so that change did occur but it can be used for both when you acquire a park and then you can use the money to build it as well so that changed [unintelligible].

Rachel: I do understand that this is a real issue here in this room and I think that any statement that you as a body decide to make about this legislation if you want to touch on that I think that's perfectly appropriate. I think there are some options beyond extending the Open Space Fund that might allow us to solve the cash flow problem that Dawn mentioned. I mean she did talk about doing some commercial paper possibly as an option or even the next bond possibly having some kind of acquisition component to it. So I don't think that we're out of options but this certainly be one option for getting—for solving that cash flow problem.

Robert Brust: I sent a note to Supervisor Weiner also and he said he's not opposed to it, it sounds like a good idea but we should talk to Parks Alliance, we should talk to Mark's office so I think we should talk to Mark's office.

Chair: Okay, Linda Shaffer, Toby, and [unintelligible].

Linda Shaffer: District 10. Robert, I agree that we should talk to the Supervisor's office and see if we can't do something about this. I should preface my problem is that I've studied too much economics and right now my head is exploding. The Open Space Fund would continue through 2030 though. But a big difference unless I've missed something is that the proposal essentially moves funding for RPD away from property tax assessments and has them coming from a difference source of city revenues and that's kind of a big thing so I really think this is—

Rachel: I guess you're saying it shifts because a bigger stream comes from city revenues as opposed to the Open Space Fund, that's one way of characterizing it. I would just say that we're additional stream of funding for the Department that happens to come through the city's general fund.

Linda Shaffer: I understand that. I'm thinking ahead to when the Open Space Fund no longer exists and the funding for the Open Space Fund comes from property taxes and that's what we're proposing to stop after 2030.

Rachel: Well I don't think the Parks Alliance, I'm just going to go out on a limb here and say we would be absolutely in favor of extending the Open Space Fund.

Linda Shaffer: But that's why I think—

Rachel: I mean it has to be reauthorized but I don't thinking anybody even Supervisor Ferrell himself would entertain the thought that perhaps we wouldn't reauthorize the open space fund.

[simultaneous comments]

Matt O'Grady: Think big picture, think several [unintelligible], think about five years out. So several things happen. One is first off this bout the charter amendment passes, the Department starts to do some pretty robust planning, they actually have the funding and the staff and the expertise in-house so they can actually put into place scheduled maintenance for their playgrounds, all the scheduled and regular maintenance that they have no bandwidth to do now. That's in place and we have a new Mayor and we have the impending sunset of the Open Space Fund. Well we're going to do something about that. We're going to know by that point much more precisely than we do now what does it really take to run and maintain this park system? What's the budget that's the right number. We're going to have a lot more data about that based on experience that the

Planning Department will have done by that point. Then we go back to voters for an early renewal of the Open Space Fund and this baseline and that's going to be a new opportunity to really right size the Department's budget. [simultaneous comments]

Rachel: But in no way shape or form is anyone actually proposing here that we would then somehow. I mean maybe somebody in the Mayor's office is like oh, we can maybe do that but I don't know of anybody who really is seriously proposing that we would not reauthorize the Open Space Fund.

Linda Shaffer: Well that was one thing, I was a little startled to hear that.

Rachel: I thank you for asking that but I don't think I could say it any more strongly. I mean if I can say it more strongly I will because that's not on the horizon at all here.

Linda Shaffer: Thank you and if I may I just had one other concerned comment. When you start talking about projected budget deficits we're talking about something worse—imagine the worst prediction scenario that you could possibly imagine. Usually we talk about whether and how bad people [unintelligible] anybody who claims that they can really project the size of budget deficits there's going to be a wide band of margin so I'm just a little—I need to read this about 27 more times but the circumstance—I'm sorry about what happens when things go back and that's the projected budget deficit of \$200 million or more but then could somebody explain to me the proposal would require that the \$200 million benchmark be adjusted annually by the percentage change in aggregate city discretionary revenue.

Rachel: That's essentially the general fund, that is the rise or fall is what the discretionary general fund is.

Linda Shaffer: Okay, it could just say that.

Rachel: We can make it clearer, thank you for that.

Toby Levy: Matt I appreciate that. I want to point out to this committee that we did give Mark Farrell a lion's share of the acquisition fund for the reservoir and that is one reason D6 and D10 will not have enough money to acquire new funds so I would really like this committee to ask Mark Farrell to put another—extend the acquisition fund for another fifteen years because that would give us a lot more flexibility in predicting the amount of money that it could spend. So I would urge us to have—I would like to propose that type of amendment—request that we say that this committee has been very generous to a lot of neighborhoods including putting money from the acquisition for the reservoir and that we need to extend the Open Space Fund so there's money for D6 and D10 in the more immediate future based on future income. Do I have a second for that? [simultaneous comments]

Chair: Second was [unintelligible]. Do we want some discussion on that or do we want to just move on?

Male Speaker: I'd like to hear the motion again please.

Toby Levy: We would like to urge Supervisor Ferrell to extend the Open Space Fund acquisition fund for an additional fifteen years until 2046 so that funds will be—so that funding stream would be available for sooner use for acquisition in D6 and D10 given the fact that a big chunk of it was used for the acquisition for the reservoir.
[simultaneous comments]

Chair: We have Les then [unintelligible].

Les Hilger: Toby, I'm not trying to knock down the amendment but what I did wonder is if what I'm hearing is the subtle conversation which is maybe this plus what you're proposing is too big an ask all at once and may sour the whole conversation how do you feel about that? Do you think it's perfectly fine to go for both?

Toby Levy: You mean to support?

Les Hilger: In other words I'm assuming that there was probably some higher-level discussion about how much we could actually get the public to agree to and the acquisition fifteen year re-up was probably considered a little too much to ask in addition to this conversation.

Toby Levy: We can amend this to say we support the legislation as written but would like to urge the inclusion, okay.

Nick Belloni: I was going to echo what Les was saying, is either we say do we want to include it in this legislation or do we want to have him look at it in another amendment in a year or so. We need to find a way to get it in. We're not what you said, didn't actually include it in this legislation it just said [simultaneous comments]. But that's what I'm saying do you want to put that in there.

Steffan Franz: Toby to your point you were concerned [unintelligible] is that Supervisor Ferrell spent [unintelligible] and you're proposing adding more time so that your district can now be funded so what about District 10 or District 11?

Toby Levy: I'm putting District 10—we're not taking that all, I'm just using that as an example.

Steffan Franz: I guess my point is aren't you just propagating this even further by pushing it out rather than coming up with a more realistic solution rather than spending money we're asking for that we don't have already?

Chair: I think Dawn needs to explain.

Dawn Kamalanathan: So the point of extending the term of the Open Space portion of the Open Space set-aside rather than the general fund. So the general fund baseline [unintelligible] but extending the open space is that it would allow you to revenue bond against those future incomes so that you would have the dollars you needed now and kind of more of a balloon payment fashion that you could then use to aggressively pursue acquisitions in D6, in D10, basically in the high-needs areas that City Planning and the city as a whole have defined as needing [unintelligible]. So that's the reason for the extension is to allow for that financing mechanism to occur.

Steffan Franz: But you just talked about [unintelligible].

Dawn Kamalanathan: No, because the commercial paper I can only issue for again what I know is the affirmed payments and so if I only have seventeen years ahead of me rather than thirty or whatever, right, that seventeen more years of payments I can show you the cash flow doesn't get you that much actually given what our current obligations are to Francisco, Noe Valley, Town Square, Schlage Lock, 900 Innes, all those properties that have been paid out and so if we've got these two very small but because it's SOMA and the real estate market we're in right now super expensive right so to just buy these two little properties and then if we wanted to buy a rec center, one more rec center and then one 30,000 square foot parking development the money is gone the seventeen years. So I can do commercial paper now maybe if the Mayor's Office—commercial paper by the way does not have the same tax benefits that tax exempt revenue bonds would allow so you're also paying more money to borrow that money and so especially over a seventeen year timeline. To use commercial paper—

Steffan Franz: Extend that time.

Dawn Kamalanathan: Yeah. [simultaneous comments] Right now the existing Open Space Fund language gives the Board of Supervisors authority to revenue bond against future Open Space dollars but because the term is only seventeen years in order to do revenue bonding we need at least a thirty-year term. That was the whole kind of context behind the reason for the acts.

Male Speaker: So that adding of the fifteen years actually does change the conversation today? [simultaneous comments]

Linda Shaffer: Toby, may I offer a friendly amendment based on what we've just heard, something simpler like PROSAC urges a renegotiation of the issue—what I want to say is go back and reconsider the expiration of the Open Space Fund.

Toby Levy: This is what I have. PROSAC supports the legislation as written and urges Supervisor Ferrell to include the extension of the Open Space Fund for another fifteen years to 2046 so there will be more funds available to acquire open space in D6, D10, and other high need areas in the near future.

Male Speaker: Before you move on that, just a typo if you don't mind Toby. The Open Space Fund, not the acquisition fund [simultaneous comments].

Steffan Franz: Actually Toby my response to you wasn't my question. My question—I keep hearing deferred maintenance and I think at some point we need clarity on deferred maintenance as part of the capital effort because wouldn't that swing a little bit different is there was real clarity and you guys define what I'm hearing from the Parks Alliance is they don't know how many chickens to count, they don't know how big the hole is. So you had said that potentially within a year you might be able to tell us what the hole looks like.

Rachel: On the deferred maintenance?

Steffan Franz: Right. Would that help in the charter for a revenue line what we were told is that money couldn't be spent except on capital projects, except if it's a deferred maintenance project, is that correct?

Dawn Kamalanathan: So you're asking for a revenue bond—

Steffan Franz: I'm saying if you ask for \$180 million generally this is towards new acquisitions and [unintelligible] projects. But isn't there somewhere in that says deferred maintenance could actually be under that?

Dawn Kamalanathan: I mean hey you get enough deferred maintenance you have a capital project. We're not building anything new, you know like brand new from scratch. 17th and Folsom has taken me like nine years, the whole time the first new park, like everything is a deferred maintenance project really that we work on but I do want to just—so the charter gives under the Open Space Fund broad powers for the Board of Supervisors again to allow the Recreation and Park Department to revenue bond against the Open Space Fund proceeds and yes we have used that revenue bonding power actually quite specifically for an emergency to bridge the 2000 bond deficit so when the 200 bond projects all kind of came to a grinding halt and there was a very painful conversation at the Board of Supervisors about what projects that had been started would be finished the way that those projects were finished was actually using revenue bond against Open Space Fund and that we put into the annual budget in the Open Space Fund a debt service payment to pay off that revenue bond. So yes those have to be used for capital deferred maintenance. Again, our acquisitions are also an eligible expense, it's a real property asset, that's the Commission. So I'm not sure if I completely answered your question.

Steffan Franz: I think you did. I think the question is if it was clear that you guys identified \$118 million for X and that money would be taken out of a revenue bond as opposed to—you can't just take it off a table. You were saying to us right here in this room that you are identifying that most of what you're doing is really just maintenance, you're not building anything.

Dawn Kamalanathan: You have to think about the Open Space Fund is not unprogrammed right now. I guess this is the other key, so except for the acquisition fund which accumulates balances that we then spend out every other penny of that fund right now is allocated to something else. So to make room for the debt service payment to do what you're talking about would mean actually forcing cuts in services or things that we're actually producing right now and so could you run the thought experiment about what that \$3 million in additional funding would get you if you dedicated it entirely to debt service and wanted to do like a massive revenue bond program you certainly could. Your problem though is again you can't do it because it's a seventeen-year term and in order to do a revenue bond we need at least I think it's thirty is the magic number and so we can't right now, as long as the term is limited to the next seventeen years whether it's \$10 million or \$100 million we actually can't revenue bond even though we have that authority because the market won't support it. I hope that answers at least one of your questions.

Richard Ivanhoe: District 5. Just a suggestion for Toby's resolution and I may have forgotten the exact language at this point but she said somewhere to provide additional funds for acquisitions and I would suggestion something like to provide additional flexibility to the Recreation and Park Department to fund acquisitions, sort of in line with Dawn's discussion that instead of providing funds it's providing a means to fund.

Toby Levy: PROSAC supports the present legislation as written and urges Supervisor Ferrell to include the extension of the Open Space Fund for an additional fifteen years to 2046 so that there will be more funds available and means of finding funds for the acquisition of open space and recreation space in D6 and D10 and other high needs areas in the near future.

Chair: You want to say something Robert?

Robert Brust: Do we need to list the districts it's going to?

Steffan Franz: I would just say deficient.

Robert Brust: Deficient areas.

Toby Levy: We started out by Dawn saying we've been talking about this certainly as long as I've been here and we finally have some pieces to acquire and we don't have any money. So that's where we started tonight.

Chair: Okay. Ancel and then I'll open is up for public comment.

Ancel Martinez: Just for clarification what do we call the legislation?

Toby Levy: It's called the Open Space Fund.

Ancel Martinez: No, no, at the beginning you said—

Toby Levy: PROSAC supports the legislation as written.

Ancel Martinez: Has it been introduced? [simultaneous comments] I'm just looking at this, it says supporting legislation. I didn't see that it was introduced.

Chair: I have a general question in my mind because after we do whatever we do there is a time when the curtain comes down and maybe Les because you have previously shared and know this better than I but at some point we can no longer advocate for positions of [unintelligible]. [simultaneous comments].

Female Speaker: Can't you take a position of support?

Chair: We can take a position of support and one of the reasons we're bringing this up tonight is so that in advance Mark knows where we're coming from and maybe within a month he'll revise his legislation.

Rachel: It's been sent to the rules committee, they will probably introduce amendments on the 22nd and then it has to sit until the next rules committee meeting so the actual hearing on the amendments would take place probably November 12th I believe—don't hold me to that date, I think it's the second Thursday in November. But the key thing is that whatever amendments are introduced would be introduced on the 22nd and then they have to sit. So you want to get into amendments before the 22nd.

Nick Belloni: District 2. Then if it goes to the rules committee are we wanted to push it—do we want to push this not just to Ferrell but to Tang, to Avalos, and to Cohen who are the rules committee Supervisors.

Steffan Franz: [unintelligible]

Chair: Any comments on the strategy around that? So where are we on this? I'm going to open it up to public comment. Do we have any public comment?

Todd David: I'm actually working for the Parks Alliance on this measure also, residents for Noe Valley Town Square, so I'm fairly familiar with you guys. If I were making the suggestion on who to push this to I wouldn't suggest the rules committee I would suggest the six co-sponsors of the legislation.

Chair: Thank you. Do we have any other public comment? Mr. Pilpel.

David Pilpel: Several things. Rather than urging specific Supervisors or Mark I would just say that it be amended so whoever is reading your resolution, whoever is listening if anybody can work on it I think you can make it more generic that way. More fundamentally I think in some ways [unintelligible] an extension of the fund. It's not too late legislatively but I think in terms of the package. I'm not saying it's a bad idea. I'm

leaning in support of the idea that Matt and Rachel suggested that we'll know more in five years about how much of a problem there is and it seems to me that there are a lot of different pieces here, you've got sort of the operating needs of the Department, you've got capital projects that Dawn has I think a pretty good handle on, then you have deferred maintenance that we don't really know and you've got acquisitions and not just acquiring property but programming it and running over the long term. So there's just a lot of need and I'm not saying that it's infinite but I don't know that it's been well-quantified and to say this is how much we need to run a good Department I don't know that anyone in this room really knows the answer right now and I don't know that it's a one-time amount or an ongoing amount, I think it's a combination and even if you had all the money in the world you couldn't fix all the parks in the next year anyway, there just isn't the capacity. So it's sort of like doing a lot of things over time and I tend to think this approach that you can stabilize funding, put some better planning mechanisms in place and let them run for a few years kind of makes sense and you should trust that your successors on this committee or if you're here long enough will see this through for the next few years.

I guess my other fundamental point in 16.107I where it talks about this PROSAC it just says shall establish by ordinance. Well you already have—if you could encourage that the language that's on page 8, line 14 through 21, be augmented and moved to section I and say that for example PROSAC shall review the strategic operational and capital plans prior to their adoption by the Commission and PROSAC shall comment and the Department shall review those comments, etc. Encourage that they give more teeth to that planning process with you being a key part of it.

Chair: It's in our charter.

David Pilpel: It's in the ordinance but it's not in the charter amendment and not is the time particularly if you're talking about more accountability to that planning process that's something that I think you could add to the motion and urge. That might be more likely to happen than the other ask and I'm not saying that the other ask is bad it's not but I don't know how much at the end of the day you're going to get out of this. I mean this is good, it's not the best. It's good and that may be all that you can get in this round.

Chair: Thank you. Is there any other public comment? Being none, public comment is closed. So where are we on this?

Toby Levy: PROSAC supports the charter amendment as written and urges it be amended to include the extension of the Open Space Fund another fifteen years to 2046, that there will be more funds immediately in the near future and more ways of having funding for the—securing funding of Open Space and recreation space in high-needs area in the near future.

Male Speaker: Can we call the question? [simultaneous comments]

Chair: Can we have a show of hands in support of the resolution? It looks like it is unanimous. Thank you. [unintelligible] but I think it will give us more teeth to do what we were actually chartered to do would be a real positive step to add that in there. I would like to recommend to you folks, can that be done?

Male Speaker: I think that's easy.

Chair: How do you want us to proceed on that?

Male Speaker: Rachel, I think we can just take that to Mark.

Rachel: We'll take that suggestion to him.

Chair: Thank you. [simultaneous comments] We are done with that item. Now we're on future agenda.

Male Speaker: Linda? This will drafted up and you'll send a letter in support of it to various people?

Chair: Yes I will because you asked me to, yes sir. [simultaneous comments] Okay, do we have any items on the agenda to add? Yes, sir. Richard.

Richard Rothman: [unintelligible] [simultaneous comments]

Chair: I can do that. We have two meetings and I can give you the results when we get to that point. We're probably going to have about three or four more meetings. Thank you very much. We have—how many do we have? We saw the binder the day it was delivered, it's five and a half inches tall and I believe we have I want to say eighteen but it seems like a lot more. We're two months late on it. They did delay it for a good reason and these are some front-end things that [unintelligible] for the applicants, particularly the new pricing that's involved with getting active pricing. But we have our first one by one discussion and [unintelligible]. So it seems to me we'll have at least three to four more meetings. But I appreciate that and I will put in on here, COF update, thank you. Other than that, any public comment on agenda items?

David Pilpel: Quick thing. I suggested that some of the items be reworded slightly so they make more sense. We can talk about that offline and in particular that the operations drill-down session clubhouses add deferred maintenance because that was talked about but somehow got [unintelligible].

Chair: You're right. Okay, so that item is closed. Any general public comment?

Tom Borden: I'm with the anti-intolerance league today and I just discovered something interesting and I think everyone has forgotten it or never knew it but there's a Board of Supervisors resolution 653-02 from 2002 and it says a bunch of stuff but in particular it say further resolved that the Natural Areas Management Plan—this is about

NAP by the way—is completed and approved by the Board of Supervisors, the Natural Areas Program continue to preserve and maintain genuine remnants of San Francisco's native flora and fauna so long as those activities do not include removal of healthy trees that pose no safety hazards, trail closures or restrictions on access and recreation, trapping and removal of wild or feral animals currently inhabiting parks and lakes or expansion of activities into areas that no longer support predominantly native flora and fauna and so certainly the Natural Areas Management Plan has not been approved by the Board of Supervisors, in fact the EIR hasn't even been issued yet for approval by the Planning Commission and of course some signs went up in February saying no bicycles, stay on designated trails, there's lots of fences that have gone up since 2002 and anyway it's pretty interesting to see how there's been an end-run around this resolution.

Chair: Thank you. Any other public comment? Being none, public comment is closed. Announcements? Richard.

Richard Rothman: I just wanted to announced that Dave Chricherson who is the director of the photo center where Marks lives next to at the Harvey Milk Center asked me to come next further monthly program they have photo lecture and he asked me to come and show my slides of my mural projects that I'm working on and one is the Mother's building so if you're free next Thursday night at 6:30.

Chair: Thank you, very nice. Steffan you have announcements?

Steffan Franz: This Saturday is our second to last Saturdays in the Park. This is the children's show if any of you have children or know anybody with children it would be wonderful to attend. I'll pass out these flyers to everybody. The following week is our final show at the amphitheater, that is our blues show, it's going to be an awfully great show. We'll have cake. [unintelligible] PROSAC members. Thank you to the PROSAC members who do attend who've had a wonderful time and spread the word throughout. If you haven't been to this event, if you haven't been to amphitheater, again these guys have come, you see what we're doing. The more we can get PROSAC to come the more we feel like we're activating and getting focused out there. Kids show this week starting at 11:00 a.m. Next week is the blues show on Saturday. Please attend.

Chair: Any other announcements? Any public comment?

Male Speaker: Just to remind people that at next month's meeting I won't be here but it's Wednesday, not Tuesday. [simultaneous comments]

Chair: I have some copies here. I think there's no real conflicts with the dates. [simultaneous comments] I see Labor Day is going to be possibly a problem and the [unintelligible]. January 1st. [simultaneous comments] So that's our calendar. It's a draft, we can finalize it next meeting but if you want to do it now take a quick look and do that as well and just be done with it. But I see our first meeting is Tuesday following New Years and New Years is on a Friday. Labor Day of course is going to affect us I think on

the 6th of September. I already moved the November because of elections to Wednesday.

Male Speaker: June should also be moved.

Chair: Why?

Male Speaker: There will be an election in June.

Male Speaker: Oh yeah, that's when the bond's going to be on.

Chair: I'll move that to Wednesday. [simultaneous comments]

Male Speaker: And July 5th?

Chair: Yeah, July 5th I think is going to be a problem, getting people to come on that whole week.

Male Speaker: You might want to think about moving that to Wednesday as well.

Chair: We can go the following Tuesday. Can we go out that far?

Male Speaker: I don't think you. You can do a special.

Male Speaker: You can move it. You're setting the schedule for next year, you can set it now but in terms of the way the month works I think it's complicated with you go to the second week. So Linda what you're going to do is take these edits back and bring another version next month for approval?

Chair: I guess so. I'm not sure what to do with July 5th. [simultaneous comments]. Adjournment? [simultaneous comments]

End of Document