File No. 120531

Committee Item No. 2
Board Item No. 31

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee Government Audit & Oversight Date June 21, 2012

Board of Supervisors Meeting Date July 10, 2012

Cmte	Board	
☐	☐	Motion
☐	☒	Resolution
☐	☐	Ordinance
☐	☐	Legislative Digest
☐	☐	Budget Analyst Report
☐	☐	Legislative Analyst Report
☐	☐	Introduction Form (for hearings)
☐	☒	Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
☐	☐	MOU
☐	☐	Grant Information Form
☐	☐	~~Grant Budget~~
☐	☐	Subcontract Budget
☐	☐	Contract/Agreement
☐	☐	Award Letter
☐	☐	Application
☐	☒	Public Correspondence

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

*	☐	☐	General Plan Referral Addendum
*	☐	☐	San Francisco Clean + Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond
	☐	☐	
	☐	☐	
	☐	☐	

Completed by: Rene Calonsag Date 7-5-12
Completed by: Date

An asterisked item represents the cover sheet to a document that exceeds 20 pages. The complete document is in the file.

[General Obligation Bond - San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks - $195,000,000]

Resolution determining and declaring that the public interest and necessity demand improving the safety and quality of neighborhood parks and waterfront open spaces across the City, enhancing water quality and cleaning up environmental contamination along the Bay, replacing unsafe playgrounds, fixing restrooms, improving access for the disabled, and ensuring the seismic safety of park and recreation facilities under the jurisdiction of, or maintained by, the Recreation and Park Commission or the jurisdiction of the Port Commission or any other projects, sites or properties otherwise specified in the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters, and the payment of related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes; finding that the estimated cost of $195,000,000 for such improvements is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require incurring bonded indebtedness; making environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan; providing for the City to declare its official intent to reimburse prior expenditures; and waiving the time limits set forth in Administrative Code Section 2.34.

WHEREAS, City and County of San Francisco (the "City") staff has identified several park, open space, and recreation improvement projects to address public safety hazards, improve disabled access, improve water quality in the Bay and enhance the condition of neighborhood and waterfront park and open space facilities and lands, and other issues facing the City's park system; and

WHEREAS, City staff has identified a capital improvement need totaling $195,000,000 in projects relating to improving the safety and quality of neighborhood parks

and waterfront open spaces across the City, enhancing water quality and cleaning up environmental contamination along the Bay, replacing unsafe playgrounds, fixing restrooms, improving access for the disabled, and ensuring the seismic safety of park and recreation facilities under the jurisdiction of, or maintained by, the Recreation and Park Commission or the jurisdiction of the Port Commission or any other projects, sites or properties otherwise specified in the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters (collectively the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond (the "Bond") is recommended by the City's 10-year capital plan, which is approved each year by the Mayor of the City and the Board of Supervisors of the City (the "Board"); and

WHEREAS, This Board recognizes the need to identify funding to better address the waterfront open spaces and recreation needs of the City's residents including access for the disabled, environmental deterioration along the Bay, as well as to provide for the safety of the City's residents and avoid a complete reconstruction of deteriorating park, recreation and open space assets at a significantly larger cost in the future; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By the Board:

Section 1. The Board determines and declares that the public interest and necessity demand improving the safety and quality of neighborhood parks and waterfront open spaces across the City, enhancing water quality and cleaning up environmental contamination along the Bay, replacing unsafe playgrounds, fixing restrooms, improving access for the disabled, and ensuring the seismic safety of park and recreation facilities under the jurisdiction of, or maintained by, the Recreation and Park Commission or the jurisdiction of the Port Commission or any other projects, sites or properties otherwise specified in the ordinance

submitting this proposal to the voters, and the payment of related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Section 2. The estimated cost of $195,000,000 of the Bond is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City, will require an expenditure greater than the amount allowed by the annual tax levy, and will require the incurrence of bonded indebtedness in an amount not to exceed $195,000,000.

Section 3. The Board, having reviewed the proposed legislation, finds, affirms and declares (i) that in regard to the Joe DiMaggio Playground (as defined in Section 3A.7. of the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters), the Board of Supervisors, in Motion No. 11-91, affirmed certification of the North Beach Public Library and Joe DiMaggio Playground Master Plan Project Final Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse Number 2009042130) and, in Ordinance No. 102-11, adopted findings under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) related to approvals in furtherance of the abovementioned Master Plan, and copies of such actions are in Clerk of the Board of Supervisors File Nos. 110615 and 110312, respectively, and incorporated by reference; (ii) that the other Identified Projects (as defined in Section 3A of the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters) are categorically exempt from CEQA as described in the memoranda dated April 30, 2012 and May 14, 2012 from the Planning Department, (iii) that the remainder of the proposed Project is excluded from CEQA because the program is not defined as a "project" under CEQA Guidelines section 15378(b)(4), but is the creation of a government funding mechanism that does not involve any commitment to any specific project, (iv) that the proposed Project is in conformity with the priority policies of Section 101.1(b) of the City Planning Code and, (v) in accordance with Section 2A.53(f) of the City Administrative Code, that the proposed Project is consistent with the City's General Plan,

and hereby adopts the findings of the City Planning Department, as set forth in the General Plan Referral Reports, dated May 31, 2012 and June 20, 2012, and incorporates said findings by reference.

Section 4. The time limit for approval of this resolution specified in Section 2.34 of the San Francisco Administrative Code is waived.

Section 5. Under Section 2.40 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters shall contain a provision authorizing landlords to pass-through fifty percent (50%) of the resulting property tax increases to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Section 6. The City hereby declares its official intent to reimburse prior expenditures of the City incurred or expected to be incurred prior to the issuance and sale of any series of bonds in connection with the Project (collectively, the "Future Bonds"). The Board hereby declares the City's intent to reimburse the City with the proceeds of the Future Bonds for the expenditures with respect to the Project (the "Expenditures" and each, an "Expenditure") made on and after that date that is no more than 60 days prior to adoption of this Resolution. The City reasonably expects on the date hereof that it will reimburse the Expenditures with the proceeds of the Future Bonds.

Each Expenditure was and will be either (a) of a type properly chargeable to a capital account under general federal income tax principles (determined in each case as of the date of the Expenditure), (b) a cost of issuance with respect to the Future Bonds, (c) a nonrecurring item that is not customarily payable from current revenues, or (d) a grant to a party that is not related to or an agent of the City so long as such grant does not impose any obligation or condition (directly or indirectly) to repay any amount to or for the benefit of the City. The maximum aggregate principal amount of the Future Bonds expected to be issued

for the Project is $195,000,000. The City shall make a reimbursement allocation, which is a written allocation by the City that evidences the City's use of proceeds of the applicable series of Future Bonds to reimburse an Expenditure, no later than 18 months after the later of the date on which the Expenditure is paid or the Project is placed in service or abandoned, but in no event more than three years after the date on which the Expenditure is paid. The City recognizes that exceptions are available for certain "preliminary expenditures," costs of issuance, certain de minimis amounts, expenditures by "small issuers" (based on the year of issuance and not the year of expenditure) and expenditures for construction projects of at least 5 years.

Section 7. Documents referenced in this resolution are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 120531, which is hereby declared to be a part of this resolution as if set forth fully herein.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

By: Kenneth David Roux
KENNETH DAVID ROUX
Deputy City Attorney

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

File # 120531

June 28, 2012

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

NOTE TO FILE

CASE NO. 2011.1359R
$160 Million General Obligation
Bond for Park Renovation

On April 26, 2012, the Planning Department completed a General Plan Referral on the Recreation and Park Department's portion of the City's proposed $195,000,000 General Obligation Bond (hereinafter "Bond") to fund improvements to Recreation and Park Department properties. The Bond would provide funds for two programs: a Project Specific Program that would fund renovation of specific parks, and a Citywide Funding Program, that could be used to renovate park features throughout the City, for which individual projects have not been identified.

General Plan Referral Case 2011.1359R considered a number of Citywide programs. One of those considered was the Landscape Restoration, Pathway and Trail Improvements Program, which would improve trails, pathways and landscapes in the City's park system. Another was the Larger Parks Program, which would provide funding for projects at the City's larger parks, specifying both McLaren and Golden Gate Park, stating that these parks may have specific funding identified or combined with other parks. These financing programs were not considered projects for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and no environmental review was required.

After the Referral was completed, the General Obligation Bond was amended at the Board of Supervisors, revising the Landscape Restoration, Pathway and Trail Improvements Program to specifically fund trails in McLaren and Golden Gate Parks. Both of those parks were already identified to receive funding via the Citywide programs. Case No. 2011.1359R found that funding allocated to trails via the Landscape Restoration, Pathway and Trail Improvements Program, as well as specific funding for McLaren and Golden Gate Parks, was consistent with the General Plan. The change adopted at the Board of Supervisors does not change that consistency. This change also does not affect the status of the programs for the purposes of CEQA.

This Note to the File clarifies that that the Bond proposal as amended, specifying funding for trails in McLaren and Golden Gate Parks, continues to be consistent with the General Plan.

cc: Karen Mauney-Brodek, SFRPD
Sarah B. Jones, Planning Department
Marlena Byrne, City Attorney

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

General Plan Referral

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Date:	June 20, 2012
Case	**2012.0754R** **2012 General Obligation Bond for Neighborhood and Waterfront Parks - $35 million portion for Waterfront Parks, Plazas and Open Space on Land under Port Commission Jurisdiction**
Block/Lot No.:	Bond would fund improvements to various Piers and Property under the jurisdiction of the Port Commission (No specific parcels)
Project Sponsor:	Diane Oshima Port of San Francisco Pier 1, The Embarcadero San Francisco, CA 94111
Staff Contact:	Stephen Shotland – (415) 558-6308 *stephen.shotland@sfgov.org*
Recommendation:	Finding the proposed General Obligation Bond, on balance, is **in conformity** with the General Plan
Recommended By:	John Rahaim, Director of Planning

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Port of San Francisco and the Recreation and Parks Department, working with the City's Capital Planning Committee propose placing a General Obligation Bond measure on the November 2012 ballot for $195 million for Neighborhood and Waterfront Parks. Of that amount, $35 million is proposed to fund creation and improvement of Waterfront Parks, Plazas and other Waterfront Open Space property under Port Commission jurisdiction. In Case No. 2011.1359ER, the Planning Department reviewed a $160 million portion of the $195 million

General Obligation Bond that would be used to fund park improvements on property under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Parks Department.

Pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code Section 2A.52, the Port of San Francisco submitted a General Plan Referral application to the Planning Department on June 14, as revised on June 18, 2012, for review of the $35 million portion of the 2012 Neighborhood and Waterfront Parks General Obligation Bond (G.O.Bond) that would be used to fund open space improvements on property under the jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco.

The remainder of this General Plan Referral focuses on the $35 million portion of the proposed ballot initiative that would fund the creation and improvement of waterfront public parks and public open space on land under the jurisdiction of the Port Commission.

The Port has identified some potential candidate sites. Potential Port sites proposed would be based upon their ability to deliver the maximum public benefit including: 1) creating new open spaces in areas where the needs for new open spaces are greatest; 2) opening up new areas of the waterfront for the public to enjoy; where it is currently restricted 3) creating multi-functional open spaces for a variety of recreation types; 4) closing gaps in the Bay Trail and Blue Greenway; and 5) improving environmental shoreline conditions and life safety conditions. Potential candidate improvement project sites may include:

- Pier 43 Plaza, adjacent to the Bay Trail, from Powell to Mason Streets
- Northeast Wharf Plaza, located at Pier 27
- Pier 27 Public Spaces, located at the northern tip of Pier 27
- Agua Vista Park, east of Terry Francois Blvd., and Central Basin Pier 70 Parks/ Open Spaces
- Warm Water Cove, along the eastern terminus of 24th Street extending to 25th Street terminus
- Islais Creek Improvements, northern shore of Islais Creek east of the Third Street Bridge

If the G.O. Bond is approved by Francisco voters, Port Commission and staff would conduct public hearings to consider the candidate improvement projects to determine which would receive the G.O. Bond funding. At this time, the Port has requested environmental review and a General Plan Referral on the programmatic strategy for the waterfront public open space element of the proposed 2012 GO Bond measure. If the G.O. Bond measure is approved, the specific waterfront open space sites, designs and improvements would undergo project-specific CEQA environmental review. The Port will also submit General Plan referral application or applications to the Planning Department for projects that are subject to a General Plan referral, pursuant to San Francisco Administrative Code §2A.53 and Charter §4.105, when specific improvement plans are prepared.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

On 6/19/2012, the Environmental Review section of the Planning Department determined that the $35 million in funding for Waterfront parks under the jurisdiction of the Port Commission included as part of the 2012 Neighborhood and Waterfront General Obligation Bond for Neighborhood and Waterfront Parks is not a project, per CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(b)(4). If the General Obligation Bond is approved by San Francisco voters, individual open space improvement projects that receive Bond funding would require may require separate Environmental Review.

GENERAL PLAN COMPLIANCE AND BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

Based on a review of the application, the Planning Department finds that the proposed GO Bond for renovating existing and establishing new Waterfront Parks, Plazas and public open spaces would be consistent with the Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1(b) and would be, on balance, in conformity with the with the following Objectives and Policies of the General Plan, as described below.

Note:
General Plan Objectives are shown in **BOLD UPPER CASE** font; Policies are in **Bold** font; staff comments are in *italic* font.

RECREATON AND OPEN SPACE ELEMENT

OBJECTIVE 2
DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN A DIVERSIFIED AND BALANCED CITYWIDE SYSTEM OF HIGH QUALITY PUBLIC OPEN SPACE.

POLICY 2.1
Provide an adequate total quantity and equitable distribution of public open spaces throughout the City.

POLICY 2.2
Preserve existing public open space.

POLICY .2.7
Acquire additional open space for public use.

Comment: The proposed G.O. Bond, if approved by San Francisco voters, would provide $35 million that could be used to fund renovation of existing and provision of additional publicly accessible open spaces on Port property.

POLICY 3.2
Maintain and improve the quality of existing shoreline open space.

Most of San Francisco's shoreline open spaces are located on the headlands and on the western and northern shorelines. For the most part they are now incorporated as part of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and administrated by the National Park Service which has made them much more accessible to the public. However, the National Park Service must be adequately funded to assure they are adequately maintained and policed.

Existing open spaces on the northeastern waterfront should be improved to promote increased public use. Simple public improvements such as effective signs, well marked trails, safety features, landscaping and general cleanup are needed to promote greater use of these and other shoreline areas.

The beaches and tidal flats in the Warm Water Cove, Agua Vista and Mission Rock areas have been dumping grounds for tires, auto parts, concrete slabs, and other debris that limits public use and enjoyment. In addition, severe winter storms have eroded sections of the shoreline. While periodic shoreline clean-up efforts and shoreline stabilization at Warm Water Cove have occurred, regular maintenance should be improved and should include repair and stabilization of any future erosion along these shoreline areas.

Several city agencies, as well as the State and Federal government, provide public open space along the shoreline. Additional coordination and cooperation between agencies could result in more consistent maintenance and result in increased public use and enjoyment. Plans for improvements and renovation should also be coordinated by the affected agencies.

POLICY 3.4
Create a visually and physically accessible urban waterfront along the Embarcadero corridor between Fisherman's Wharf and China Basin.

POLICY 3.5
Provide new public open spaces along the shoreline.

The City cannot meet all its shoreline recreation potential simply by improving existing public open spaces and by applying the guidelines governing new development. Certainly, shoreline access in private developments and places to fish or view port operations will help realize the shoreline's recreation potential. But some new larger public open spaces are also needed.

Development of planned shoreline open space on the northeastern and eastern edge of the City should continue to be given high priority, particularly south of China Basin, which is the area most deficient in shoreline open space. It also has the most potential for meeting the recreation needs of neighborhoods in the eastern half of the City.

Central Basin—Agua Vista Park

Maintain and expand Agua Vista park. Allow some fill, using materials such as beach sand, if necessary for public recreation. Plant and maintain landscape materials suitable for the waterfront setting. Provide additional informational signing, and seating areas, to encourage additional use.

As opportunities arise, expand the area into a major public waterfront park, providing large waterside areas for beach, park and picnic facilities with continuous, safe public access.

In the event it is determined that this area is needed for Port maritime expansion provide comparable open space elsewhere on the eastern shoreline.

Warm Water Cove

Improve the park site and cove shoreline along the Bay at the end of 24th Street with shoreline fishing as the primary recreation use. Any fill placed at or adjacent to the cove should retain and enhance the natural and man-made factors that make the cove desirable for fishing. These factors include maximum open water and circulation into and out of the cove to prevent stagnation. Create a more interesting park landscape by regrading the site to maximize Bay views, and improve the soil as required to permit more vigorous vegetation growth and install marine tolerant plant species.

As opportunities arise, improve the waterfront picnic area west of Maryland Street. Continue to provide public access to the cove from Twenty Fourth Street and improve visibility of the park from the street. Provide a consistent level of maintenance for landscaped and developed areas. As opportunities arise, extend the park to the north bank of the channel along the shoreline in front of the PG & E facility. When and if that facility is deactivated, give priority to expanding the public open space along the shoreline.

Islais Creek

Continue to provide well defined public access to the banks of Islais Creek at the Third Street bridge. Contingent upon development of a train trestle along the channel, construct a broad public access boardwalk along Islais Creek that provides areas for fishing and public enjoyment. Maintain and enhance view corridors along Islais Creek to the Bay.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ELEMENT

POLICY 7.1
Preserve and add to public open space in accordance with the objectives and policies of the Recreation and Open Space Element.

NORTHEASTERN WATERFRONT AREA PLAN

POLICY 10.14
Design open spaces to maximize sun exposure, wind protection, noise buffering, and to create a sense of security.

OBJECTIVE 15
TO PROVIDE MAXIMUM OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENJOYING THE BAY AND ITS RELATED ACTIVITIES BY ENHANCING AND INCREASING PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND ACCESS AREAS WHICH SAFELY AND COMFORTABLY ACCOMMODATE THE MOVEMENT OF PEDESTRIANS.

POLICY 15.1
Develop generally continuous public pedestrian access to the water's edge, excepting areas where such access would interfere with maritime activities. In those areas, provide that public viewing and access which will not substantially interfere with these activities.

POLICY 18.7
Encourage the provision of landscaping and publicly accessible open space in new development in the Base of Telegraph Hill area.

CENTRAL WATERFRONT AREA PLAN

OBJECTIVE 5.4
THE OPEN SPACE SYSTEM SHOULD BOTH BEAUTIFY THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND STRENGTHEN THE ENVIRONMENT.

OBJECTIVE 5.5
ENSURE THAT EXISTING OPEN SPACE, RECREATION AND PARK FACILITIES ARE WELL MAINTAINED.

Comment: If the G.O. Bond is approved, it would provide funding to improve open space opportunities in the Central Waterfront, if potential candidate sites in the Central Waterfront are designated for further consideration and improvements (Agua Vista Park, Warm Water Cove, Pier 70, Islais Creek, etc.).

REQUIRED GENERAL PLAN REFERRAL SUBMITTALS FOR SPECIFIC PROJECTS

In the future, if the G.O. Bond is approved by the voters, individual Waterfront Park projects that include the following elements should be referred to the Planning Department for General Plan conformity determination, pursuant to Section 4.105 of the Charter and Sections and 2A.53 of the Administrative Code:

- Demolition of buildings / structures
- Construction of new buildings / structures
- Additions to existing structures (enlargement)
- Relocation of structures and/or facilities
- Changes to land use, roads or park infrastructure
- Street vacations, widening, shortening, etc.
- Significant changes to park landscapes or land use within a park or public open space

PROPOSITION M FINDINGS – PLANNING CODE SECTION 101.1

Planning Code Section 101.1 establishes Eight Priority Policies and requires review of discretionary approvals and permits for consistency with said policies. The Project, $35 million of the $195 million 2012 Neighborhood and Waterfront Park General Obligation Bond, proposed to be placed on the November 2010 ballot, is found to be consistent with the Eight Priority Policies as set forth in Planning Code Section 101.1 for the following reasons:

Eight Priority Policies Findings

The subject project is found to be consistent with the Eight Priority Policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 in that:

The proposed project is found to be consistent with the eight priority policies of Planning Code Section 101.1 in that:

1. That existing neighborhood-serving retail uses be preserved and enhanced and future opportunities for resident employment in and ownership of such businesses enhanced.

   The General Obligation Bond would have no adverse effect on neighborhood serving retail uses or opportunities for employment in or ownership of such businesses.

2. That existing housing and neighborhood character be conserved and protected in order to preserve the cultural and economic diversity of our neighborhood.

   The General Obligation Bond would have no adverse effect on the City's housing stock or on neighborhood character. If approved, the G.O. Bond would provide funding that to improve neighborhood parks under the jurisdiction of the Recreation and Park Department, as well as waterfront parks and open spaces under the jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco. The Bond would help to improve neighborhood character in those neighborhoods in which park and open space improvements are implemented.

3. That the City's supply of affordable housing be preserved and enhanced.

   The General Obligation Bond would have no adverse effect on the City's supply of affordable housing.

4. That commuter traffic not impede MUNI transit service or overburden our streets or neighborhood parking.

   The General Obligation Bond would not result in commuter traffic impeding MUNI's transit service, overburdening the streets or altering current neighborhood parking.

5. That a diverse economic base be maintained by protecting our industrial and service sectors from displacement due to commercial office development, and that future opportunities for residential employment and ownership in these sectors be enhanced.

   The General Obligation Bond would not negatively affect the existing economic base in this area. Any improvements to Waterfront open space under the jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco would protect the existing industrial / maritime sector from displacement.

6. That the City achieve the greatest possible preparedness to protect against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

   The General Obligation Bond would not adversely affect achieving the greatest possible preparedness against injury and loss of life in an earthquake.

7. That landmarks and historic buildings be preserved.

   This General Obligation Bond, if approved, would establish a financing mechanism to fund improvements to Neighborhood and Waterfront parks and publicly accessible open space. Any specific improvements would be subject to separate Environmental Review and General Plan Referrals, and may be subject to other authorization and approval.

8. That our parks and open space and their access to sunlight and vistas be protected from development.

   The General Obligation Bond would have no adverse effect on parks and open space or their access to sunlight and vistas. If approved, the Bond would provide funding for improvements to neighborhood and waterfront parks and open space.

RECOMMENDATION: Finding the $35 million portion of General Obligation Bond for Waterfront Parks, on balance, in conformity with the General Plan

If the G.O. Bond is approved by the voters, the Port will determine which candidate sites would receive funding. Individual Waterfront Park improvement projects would be subject to Environmental Review. Similarly, the Port should submit the proposed projects to the Planning Department for General Plan consistency determination, pursuant to Section 4.105 of the Charter and Sections and 2A.53 of the Administrative Code.

Edwin M. Lee, Mayor
Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

March 29, 2012

Sarah Jones
Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: Rec Park Bond's Funding Programs

Dear Ms. Jones:

This is a request for determination on the CEQA needed, if any, for the following citywide programs for which funding would be established within a proposed General Obligation Bond ("Bond") for park and open space improvements owned or managed by the Recreation and Parks Department under consideration for placement on the November 2012 ballot. As you know, the proposed Bond contains two different kinds of programs that will be funded with this Bond for use by the Recreation and Parks Department, if approved by the voters. This letter describes one of the programs included in the Bond.

The following city-wide funding programs are proposed for inclusion in the Bond.

- Funding for a community opportunity program: This program would allow for communities to nominate parks for improvements.
- Funding for a forestry program: This program would remove, prune and replace hazardous trees in our park system.
- Funding for a trail improvements, landscape restoration, and pathway program: This program would improve trails, pathways and landscapes in the City's park system.
- Funding for a replacement of dilapidated children's play areas program: This program would renovate dilapidated children's play areas and their related features.
- Funding for a water conservation program: This program would make improvements to irrigation systems improvements and other water conservation projects.
- Funding for a leveraging resources program: This program would provide matching and other funding for not-yet-identified projects.
- Funding for a citywide resources and larger parks program: This program would provide funding for projects in larger parks such as McLaren Park (including adjacent parks), Golden Gate Park, Lake Merced or other city parks. McLaren Park and its adjacent properties may be listed separately or combined with other parks.

None of these funding programs would involve a commitment of the Bond proceeds to a particular project at a particular site. Instead, the Bond provides a financing mechanism to fund projects that meet the general criteria stated above. Specific projects would be determined, reviewed and funded under these programs after the Bond is passed.

In addition to these funding programs, we have separately submitted a list of site-specific projects with defined scopes of work for CEQA review. Both elements, this funding program and those specific projects, would be included in the same Bond proposed for submittal to the voters in November 2012.

Please contact me at (415) 575-5601 if you have any questions.

Not a project per CEQA Guidelines Section 15378(b)(4).

Regards,

Karen Mauney-Brodek
Deputy Director for Park Planning

Brett Bollinger 5/15/12
Approved Planning Dept. Brett Bollinger

cc: Dawn Kamalanathan, Director of Planning and Capital Management

2011.1359E

Edwin M. Lee, Mayor
Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

March 29, 2012

Sarah Jones
Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: Rec Park Bond's Funding Programs

Dear Ms. Jones:

This is a request for determination on the CEQA needed, if any, for the following citywide programs for which funding would be established within a proposed General Obligation Bond ("Bond") for park and open space improvements owned or managed by the Recreation and Parks Department under consideration for placement on the November 2012 ballot. As you know, the proposed Bond contains two different kinds of programs that will be funded with this Bond for use by the Recreation and Parks Department, if approved by the voters. This letter describes one of the programs included in the Bond.

The following city-wide funding programs are proposed for inclusion in the Bond.

- Funding for a community opportunity program: This program would allow for communities to nominate parks for improvements.
- Funding for a forestry program: This program would remove, prune and replace hazardous trees in our park system.
- Funding for a trail improvements, landscape restoration, and pathway program: This program would improve trails, pathways and landscapes in the City's park system.
- Funding for a replacement of dilapidated children's play areas program: This program would renovate dilapidated children's play areas and their related features.
- Funding for a water conservation program: This program would make improvements to irrigation systems improvements and other water conservation projects.
- Funding for a leveraging resources program: This program would provide matching and other funding for not-yet-identified projects.
- Funding for a citywide resources and larger parks program: This program would provide funding for projects in larger parks such as McLaren Park (including adjacent parks), Golden Gate Park, Lake Merced or other city parks. McLaren Park and its adjacent properties may be listed separately or combined with other parks.

None of these funding programs would involve a commitment of the Bond proceeds to a particular project at a particular site. Instead, the Bond provides a financing mechanism to fund projects that meet the general criteria stated above. Specific projects would be determined, reviewed and funded under these programs after the Bond is passed.

In addition to these funding programs, we have separately submitted a list of site-specific projects with defined scopes of work for CEQA review. Both elements, this funding program and those specific projects, would be included in the same Bond proposed for submittal to the voters in November 2012.

Please contact me at (415) 575-5601 if you have any questions.

Statutory exempt per CEQA Guidelines Section 15273: Rates, Tolls, Fares, & Charges.

Regards,

Karen Mauney-Brodek
Deputy Director for Park Planning

4/20/12
Approved Planning Dept. Brett Bollinger

cc: Dawn Kamalanathan, Director of Planning and Capital Management

Edwin M. Lee, Mayor
Philip A. Ginsburg, General Manager

May 11, 2012

Sarah Jones
Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Dear Ms. Jones:

Please find attached two project descriptions and additional information for environmental review for two possible site-specific projects for the Recreation and Park Department's portion of the General Obligation Bond for park and open space improvements. The proposed site-specific project scopes are dependent on available funding.

The Recreation and Park Department will consult with the Environmental Planning and Preservation staff of the Planning Department during the design stage of each project to verify the consistency of the project proposals with the applicable project descriptions and assumptions.

Please contact me at (415) 575-5601 if you have any questions.

Regards,

Karen Mauney-Brodek
Deputy Director for Park Planning

cc: Dawn Kamalanathan, Director of Planning and Capital Management
Brett Bollinger, San Francisco Planning Department
Tina Tam, San Francisco Planning Department
Shelly Caltagirone, San Francisco Planning Department

SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING
CATEGORICALLY EXEMPT FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

CLASS 1- Existing Facilities

CEQA State Guidelines Section 15301(a) Provides an exemption from environmental review for exterior alterations to an existing park.

Brett Bollinger 05/14/12
Approved Planning Dept. Brett Bollinger 2011.1359E

SOUTH PARK
Block 3775/ Lot 103

Existing Site Description

South Park is located at 64 South Park Avenue. The park is approximately 34,097 square feet and has two playgrounds, a walkway, natural lawn and landscaped areas, benches, and picnic tables. This site is owned by the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department.

Proposed Project Scope

The proposed project would include in kind improvements to the park's playgrounds, pathways, picnic areas, and natural lawn areas, described in further detail below. The existing playgrounds would be replaced in-kind and new surface materials would be included in order to meet current ADA standards. The proposed site work would also involve improvements to the pathways where needed in order to meet current ADA standards as well as provide replacement of playground benches, picnic areas, and natural lawn areas, in-kind and as needed. All features in the site are expected to remain in their current locations and configuration.

Pahtways
The existing paths are asphalt. In limited areas, the slope of the pathways may need to be adjusted by 3% as required to meet ADA codes, but this will be slight and not change their character. The pathways would remain asphalt and remain in their current configuration and width.

Benches/Picnic Areas
The existing picnic tables and benches are a combination of metal and painted wood; they are not original. They would be replaced with metal and wood tables and benches.

Play Equipment
The existing play equipment is a combination of painted wood and metal with a sand surface; it is not original. The new equipment would be required to meet current safety, ADA and maintenance standards. The new equipment would be metal. The new surface material in the play areas would be safety rubber matting. The play areas would remain in their existing location and areas, maintaining the same configuration, materials and height.

Fencing
There is fencing in limited areas (around the play areas) of the park, which is not original. This metal fencing would be replaced, as needed and in-kind, with metal fencing. The location, height, and configuration of the fencing would not change.

Lawns and Landscaped Areas
The natural lawns would be smoothed and seeded or sodded in areas to improve their appearance and drainage. Existing planting beds would remain. Irrigation (which is broken in areas) would be repaired or replaced to provide adequate irrigation.

SITE PHOTOS: SOUTH PARK



Playground #1

Playground #2

Picnic Area

Pathways & Natural Lawn Area

SITE MAP: SOUTH PARK



Main access point

Playground locations

** Complete copy of document is located in

File No. 120531

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

General Plan Referral Addendum

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Date:	May 31, 2012
Case	**2011.1359R Addendum** **$160,000,000 General Obligation Bond for Park and Open Space Improvements on Property Owned and Managed by the Recreation and Park Department – the Addendum Adds $10,000,000 to the Bond, two additional Candidate Park Sites and makes other minor changes**
Block/Lot No.:	Various, Citywide
Project Sponsor:	Karen Mauney-Brodek Recreation and Park Department 30 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102
Staff Contact:	Stephen Shotland – (415) 558-6308 *stephen.shotland@sfgov.org*
Recommendation:	Finding the proposed General Obligation Bond, as revised, on balance, in conformity with the General Plan. The bond would provide up to $160,000,000 (rather than $150,000,000) in funds, and include two additional candidate park renovation sites (South Park and Hyde & Turk Mini Park). This Addendum describes the bond as proposed to be revised and provides additional analysis.
Recommended By:	John Rahaim, Director of Planning

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This is an addendum to Case 2011.1359R, a General Plan Referral on the proposed General Obligation Bond found in-conformity with the General Plan in a Planning Department Memorandum for Case 2011.1359R dated April 26, 2012. On May 8, 2012, the Recreation and Park Department proposed changes to the General Obligation Bond for park and open space improvements, increasing the bond by $10,000,000 to $160,000,000 and adding two additional candidate park sites for potential funding by the General Obligation Bond: South Park and Hyde &Turk Minipark, and other minor revisions. The addendum considers the increased Bond amount ($160,000,000) incorporating two additional candidate Recreation and Park Department sites, and providing additional analysis and comment. As described earlier, the Bond would provide funds for renovation of specific parks, and would include a Citywide Funding Program that could be used to fund park elements citywide. The addendum makes no changes to other project elements reviewed and described in the Planning Department Memorandum dated

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEMO

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

DATE: May 10, 2012

TO: File

FROM: Shelley Caltagirone, Preservation Planner, NW

RE: Parks General Obligation Bond - South Park Project
Case No. 2011.1359E
Historic Resource Evaluation

This memo is an addendum to the Historic Resource Evaluation Response memo issued by the Planning Department on April 25, 2012 to analyze an additional element of the Parks General Obligation Bond Project. The project under review is the renovation of South Park, located on Lot 103 in Assessor's Block 3775 and bounded by South Park Avenue between 2nd and 3rd Streets. The park was evaluated in 2009 and found to be eligible for listing local designation as a contributing feature of the South Park Historic District. As such, South Park is considered a "Category A" property (Known Historical Resources) for the purposes of the Planning Department's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review procedures. The following excerpts are taken from the DPR 523D Form prepared by Page & Turnbull in June 2009.

> *The Historic District includes a total of thirty-four buildings and thirty-seven parcels. There are twenty-four contributing resources: twenty-three buildings and the park. The remaining thirteen properties are non-contributing. The South Park Historic District generally conforms to the block bounded by Taber Place to the northwest, 2nd Street to the northeast, Varney Place to the southeast, and 3rd Street to the southwest. It is situated just south of Rincon Hill and a block south of the I-80 approach to the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge.*
>
> *Designed in 1854, South Park is an ovoid open space measuring 550 feet long and 75 feet wide, and tapering at either end. It is oriented northeast-southwest, following the diagonal street pattern of the South of Market area. The park may be loosely described as oval-shaped or lozenge-shaped, but in fact, it features long, straight sides with rounded ends. Its shape and relationship to the surrounding buildings resembles Louisburg Square on Beacon Hill in Boston (developed in the 1840s), though Louisburg Square is only about 200 feet long and 45 feet wide. South Park is bordered by a high, non-original, concrete curb. The outer edges of the park are ringed with shrubs and trees, including poplars and elms. The center space contains a lush lawn. Paved paths ring and criss-cross the park. Wood benches are placed at intervals along the paths. Additional benches and wood picnic tables are located at the center of the park, amidst a cluster of trees and plaza, and two playgrounds with climbing structures and sand are positioned in the northern and southern halves.*
>
> *The period of significance for related important events (National Register Criterion A) is 1854 to 1935, while the period of significance for important architectural trends of the extant resources (National Register Criterion C) is 1906 to 1935. Within the broader period of time, the most pronounced periods of construction occurred from 1854 to about 1869 (of those resources, only the*

park remains), 1906 to 1913, and 1920 to 1925. The Historic District's periods of significance end at 1935 because by this time, South Park was largely built out and development nearly halted. Only two buildings were constructed between 1935 and 1959, which at the present time (2009) is the fifty-year mark that qualifies buildings as historic resources. The ending date of 1935 also corresponds to the general drop-off in development in the South of Market area as a whole, which is reflected in the end dates of the locally- and National Register-designated South End Historic District, the potential South End Historic District Addition, and the potential Western SoMa Light Industrial and Residential Historic District. The South Park Historic District contains twenty-four contributing properties and fourteen non-contributing properties.

The proposed project would include the following work: improvements to the asphalt-paved pathways to meet current ADA standards, maintaining the current configuration and materials while slightly modifying grade; in-kind replacement of site seating, tables, and fencing; replacement of playground equipment and surface materials in order to meet current ADA and safety standards; replacement of natural lawn with seed and/or sod. All features in the sites are expected to remain in their current locations and configuration. The Recreation and Park Department will consult with the Environmental Planning Division and Preservation staff of the Planning Department during the design stage of each project to verify the consistency of the project proposals with the applicable project descriptions and assumptions.

The work consists of in-kind replacement of primarily non-historic features of the park, including the seating, tables, fencing, and playground equipment. While it is unknown if the current pathway alignment dates from the period of significance for the historic district, the path alignment would not be altered and the grade would only be minimally altered. In sum, the work would result in no significant change in the appearance of the park and would have no impact to the overall character of the South Park Historic District. Therefore, the project would not cause any significant adverse impacts to known or potential historic resources.

G:\DOCUMENTS\Cases\CEQA\CatEx\South Park memo.doc

HYDE & TURK MINI PARK
Block 0336/ Lot 003

Existing Site Description

Hyde & Turk Mini Park is located at 201 Hyde Street. The park is approximately 6,552 square feet and has a playground, landscaping, and related amenities. This site is owned by the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department.

Proposed Project Scope

The proposed project would include improvements to the site playground, landscaping, and fencing. The existing playground would be replaced in-kind and new surface materials would be included in order to meet current ADA standards. The proposed site work would also involve improvements to access where needed in order to meet current ADA standards as well as provide improvements to existing planting areas, in-kind and as needed. All features in the site are expected to remain in their current locations and configuration.

SITE PHOTOS: HYDE & TURK MINI PARK



Fencing and Plantings

Children's Play Area Equipment

Children's Play Area Equipment



Children's Play Area Equipment

SITE MAP: HYDE & TURK MINI PARK



Main access point

SAN FRANCISCO
PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Certificate of Determination
EXEMPTION FROM ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

1650 Mission St.
Suite 400
San Francisco,
CA 94103-2479

Reception:
415.558.6378

Fax:
415.558.6409

Planning
Information:
415.558.6377

Case No.:	2011.1359E
Project Title:	**Recreation & Park Department 2012 General Obligation Bond**
Zoning:	P (Public)
Block/Lot:	Various
Project Sponsor	Karen Mauney-Brodek, Recreation & Park Department (RPD) (415) 575-5601
Staff Contact:	Brett Bollinger – (415) 575-9024 Brett.Bollinger@sfgov.org

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (RPD) General Obligation Bond ("Bond") funds would be used to address improvement needs at park facilities. If passed by the electorate, the General Obligation Bond would fund improvements to parks including playgrounds, recreation buildings, outdoor courts, fields, pathways, lawns, landscaped planted areas and other open space areas. The proposed Bond involves two types of funding programs; a project-specific program, which is addressed in this Categorical Exemption certificate and a city-wide funding program, which is exempt from environmental review by statute (see Remarks).

EXEMPT STATUS:

Categorical Exemption, Class 1 [State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15301(a]

DETERMINATION:

I do hereby certify that the above determination has been made pursuant to State and Local requirements.

for

BILL WYCKO
Environmental Review Officer

4/30/12
Date

cc: Project Sponsor
Supervisor Mar, District 1
Supervisor Farrell, District 2
Supervisor Chiu, District 3
Supervisor Chu, District 4
Supervisor Olague, District 5
Supervisor Kim, District 6
Supervisor Elsbernd, District 7
Supervisor Weiner, District 8
Supervisor Campos, District 9
Supervisor Cohen, District 10
Supervisor Avalos, District 11

REMARKS:

Project-Specific Program: The Recreation and Park Department General Obligation Bond ("Project") implementation of the proposed site-specific projects would involve repairs and improvements to following 17 parks throughout the City and County of San Francisco:

1. Christopher Playground
2. Douglass Playground
3. Excelsior Playground
4. Gilman Playground
5. Glen Canyon Park
6. Golden Gate Heights Park
7. Richmond Playground
8. Willie "Woo Woo" Wong Playground
9. Allyne Park
10. Angelo J. Rossi Playground
11. Balboa Park
12. Garfield Square
13. Margaret Hayward Playground
14. Potrero Hill Playground
15. West Sunset Playground
16. Mountain Lake Park
17. Moscone Recreation Center/East Playground

The Recreation and Park Department would consult with Environmental Planning and Preservation staff of the Planning Department during the design stage of each park project to verify the consistency of the project proposals with the applicable project descriptions and assumptions.

The Project would also fund renovation and reorganization of the Joe DiMaggio Park/North Beach Playground (Block 0075/Lot 001). An Environmental Impact Report was prepared for this project (Planning Department Case No 2008.0968E) and certified by the Planning Commission in April 2011. Improvements at this site are not addressed in this Certificate of Determination.

City-Wide Funding Program: Also included as part of the proposed Bond, the City-Wide Funding Program involves the establishment of funding for park and open space improvements on property owned or managed by the Recreation and Parks Department.

The following city-wide funding programs are proposed for inclusion in the Bond.

- Funding for a community opportunity program: This program would allow for communities to nominate parks for improvements.
- Funding for a forestry program: This program would remove, prune and replace hazardous trees in our park system.
- Funding for a trail improvements, landscape restoration, and pathway program: This program would improve trails, pathways and landscapes in the City's park system.
- Funding for a replacement of dilapidated children's play areas program: This program would renovate dilapidated children's play areas and their related features.
- Funding for a water conservation program: This program would make improvements to irrigation systems improvements and other water conservation projects.
- Funding for a leveraging resources program: This program would provide matching and other funding for not-yet-identified projects.
- Funding for a citywide resources and larger parks program: This program would provide funding for projects in larger parks such as McLaren Park (including adjacent parks), Golden Gate Park, Lake Merced or other city parks.

None of these funding programs would involve a commitment of the Bond proceeds to a particular project at a particular site. Instead, the Bond provides a financing mechanism to fund projects that meet

the general criteria stated above. Specific projects would be determined, reviewed and funded under these programs after the Bond is passed.

For CEQA compliance, the City-Wide Funding Program was evaluated separately from the Project-Specific Program and was determined that the statutory exemption provided under CEQA Guidelines Section 15273: Rates, Tolls, Fares, and Charges would apply.[1]

Project-Specific Program Project Descriptions

The following are the proposed project descriptions for each individual park under the Project-Specific Program:

Christopher Playground
Block 7521/Lot 007

The proposed project would include improvements to the site pathways, tennis courts, baseball field, exterior clubhouse restrooms, and playground. The proposed site work would involve slight re-grading of the pathways in order to meet current ADA standards, as well as repaving of the existing tennis courts. The softball field would be replaced with seed and/or sod and re-graded, and the irrigation system would be replaced. The existing field backstop would also be replaced in order to meet current ADA standards. The proposed project would also provide in-kind replacement of seating, pedestrian lighting, picnic areas, and signage. The existing clubhouse restrooms would receive minor modifications to meet current ADA standards, and the existing playground would be replaced and new surface materials would be included in order to meet current ADA and safety standards. All proposed improvements to park features are expected to remain in their current locations and configuration. None of the proposed improvements would occur inside of the adjacent Glen Canyon Park Natural Areas.

Douglass Playground
Block 7500/Lot 001

The proposed project includes improvements to the dog play area, sport courts, accessibility for ADA access, playground and exterior clubhouse restrooms. The proposed site work involves replacement of the natural lawn in the dog play area and lawn areas in the lower level with new seed and/or sod. The sport courts would be repaved, and park accessibility would be improved for ADA access. The proposed project would also provide in-kind replacement of site benches, picnic tables, paving and fencing, and the existing playground would be replaced with new play equipment and appropriate surface materials to meet ADA and safety standards. Improvements to slope stabilization and erosion control would also be made. The existing clubhouse restrooms would receive minor modifications to meet current ADA standards. All features on the site would be expected to remain in their current locations and configuration.

Excelsior Playground
Block 6088/Lot 008

The proposed project includes improvements to the site perimeter, landscaping, natural turf, sport courts, and exterior clubhouse restrooms. The proposed site work involves overall site accessibility improvements to the park perimeter which include in-kind repair and/or replacement of the sidewalk,

[1] On file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, as part of project file 2011.1359E.

fencing, and retaining walls to meet current ADA standards. The site landscaping would be replaced in-kind as necessary. The natural turf would be replaced with new seed and/or sod and the irrigation system would be upgraded. The site's seating would be replaced in-kind and some playground elements would be repaired or replaced as needed to meet ADA and safety standards. The existing sport courts would be repaved as well as repairs to their surrounding fencing, as needed. The exterior facing restrooms would receive minor modifications to meet current ADA standards. All features in the site are expected to remain in their current locations and configuration.

Gilman Playground
Block 4963/Lot 003
The proposed project includes improvements to the playfield, basketball courts, lighting, picnic area, playground, and minor improvements to the exterior restrooms. The proposed site work involves in-kind repairs and/or replacement to landscaping, pathways, and fencing throughout site as needed. The softball field would be replaced with seed and/or sod, and the irrigation system would be replaced. The existing basketball court would be resurfaced and the lighting would be replaced in-kind. The proposed project would also provide in-kind replacement of site picnic tables and benches. The existing playground would be replaced and new surface materials would be included in order to meet current ADA standards. The exterior facing restrooms would receive minor modifications to meet current ADA standards. All features in the site would be expected to remain in their current locations and configuration.

Glen Canyon Park
Block 7560/Lot 002
The park's natural turf fields and lawn areas would be repaired and/or replaced with seed and/ or sod. Minor grading, irrigation and drainage repair would be performed. There would also be in-kind replacement of the backstop, fencing, and benches around the ball fields. The ball fields would remain approximately the same size and footprint. None of the improvements or construction would occur inside of designated Natural Areas as identified in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

The project would also include the renovation of the existing Glen Canyon Park's Recreation Center, as described below:

- The Recreation Center would retain its overall configuration, circulation, and massing in the renovation.
- The historic character of the Recreation Center would be retained through the preservation of its character-defining features, which include the following: complex massing, high roofs, chimneys, multi-lite steel sash windows, gymnasium and large, multi-purpose auditorium.
- All deteriorated historical features would be repaired with in-kind materials, rather than replaced, if possible.
- Rooflines and appearance would remain the same for the gymnasium and auditorium space and the connecting smaller spaces and hallways.
- The repair or replacement of the building systems (electrical, plumbing, and mechanical) would be done in their current locations to minimize visual intrusion on the main spaces and limit alteration of existing fabric. Most of these locations are in non-visible utility rooms.
- The openness of primary interior spaces (auditorium/multipurpose room and gymnasium) would be retained. Where possible and feasible, repair of deteriorated features such as finishes and materials would be done. In other areas, replacement of the materials due to rot or other degradation may be

necessary. Where new materials are provided, they would match the original materials in design, color, material and texture.

- In the repair or replacement of glazing and windows, new windows would have a higher level of transparency than the current panels in order to restore more of the building's original appearance (Original documentation is extant to show existing glazing patterns and materials).
- Any structural seismic reinforcement would be additive, and augment existing steel, wood and concrete structural systems rather than replacing them. The existing structural systems would remain visible and the gymnasium and auditorium spaces would remain open in feel and character. These additions would match the existing structural system in material, appearance and character.

The project would also include two new additions totaling approximately 4,500 sf to provide more classroom space and gymnasium seating, as described below:

- The proposed additions would both be differentiated from and compatible with the historic materials and features of the recreation center. Materials include wood, glass, metal and concrete, all of which are used in the current structure. The multi-purpose classroom additions would be glass, steel and concrete structures, clearly different than the existing, with different but compatible roof lines. One of the new additions would have a green roof.
- The two multi-purpose classroom additions, each approximately 1900 sf, would attach to the existing structure at two distinct areas on secondary facades and would not block existing windows. Approximately 400 sf of existing wall materials would be removed to attach the additions to the existing building.
- The gym seating addition would remove approximately 400 sf of the northern wall of the gym but would not affect the existing windows. The gym addition would be approximately 700 sf.
- All of the additions would be 10'-15' in height, much lower than the gym auditorium roof lines, which are approximately 50' in height. The height of the building additions would be similar to the height of the minor connecting hallways and rooms between the gym and the auditorium, which range from 10'-20' in height.
- The existing exterior entry sequence and circulation would remain.
- The two main entries and entry sequence would remain as currently configured.

Golden Gate Heights Park
Block 2132A/Lot 001

The proposed project includes improvements to the lawn, accessibility, tennis courts, and playground. The proposed site work involves replacement of the existing natural lawn with seed and/or sod within the existing boundaries, tree pruning and hazard related pruning, removal and/or replacement, as well as replacement and/or upgrades to the irrigation system. Existing site paving, fencing, trail and site access would be improved as necessary to meet current ADA standards. The tennis courts would be repaved as well as repairs to their surrounding fencing, and the existing playground would be replaced and new safety surface materials would be included in order to meet current ADA and safety standards. All features in the site are expected to remain in their current locations and configuration. None of the improvements would occur inside of designated Natural Areas as defined in the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan.

Richmond Playground
Block 1378/Lot 007

The proposed project would include improvements to accessibility and site furnishings, sport courts, playground and exterior clubhouse restrooms. The proposed site work involves improvements to site

pathways to meet current ADA standards. The proposed project would also provide garbage and recycling storage enclosure, and in-kind repair and/or replacement of benches and drinking fountains. The existing sport courts would be repaved, and repairs to their surrounding fencing would be made as needed and in-kind. The playground would be replaced and new surface materials would be included in order to meet current ADA and safety standards. The clubhouse exterior-facing restrooms would receive minor modifications to meet current ADA standards. All features on the site are expected to remain in their current locations and configuration.

Willie "Woo Woo" Wong Playground
Block 0225/Lot 018
The proposed project includes improvements to site accessibility, site perimeter, access routes (including the adjacent alley which runs from Sacramento Street to Clay Street), sport courts, playground and clubhouse. The proposed site work involves re-grading and re-paving existing walkways, and upgrades to ramps and stairways to meet current ADA standards. Site fencing and retaining walls would be repaired and/or replaced as needed and in-kind. The existing sport courts would be repaved, and repairs to their surrounding fencing would be made as needed and in-kind. The playground would be replaced and repaired as needed and new surface materials would be included in order to meet current ADA and safety standards. The proposal would also renovate, remove or replace existing clubhouse. If removed, additional open space features would be provided such as picnic area, seating, sport court, or a covered open air pavilion. All work proposed is confined to existing constructed site features such as playground, courts, and building structures. Excavation required would work in areas and at depths that were previously excavated at original construction.

Allyne Park
Block 0544/Lot 003
The proposed project would include improvements to the natural lawn areas, site pathways, and site amenities. The proposed site work involves replacing the natural lawn areas with seed and/or sod, and replacing the irrigation system. The proposed site work also involve slight re-grading of the pathways where needed in order to meet current ADA standards. The proposed project would also provide in-kind replacement of site seating and fencing, and would add a separate and distinct garbage storage area within current green waste area and equipment storage. All features on the site are expected to remain in their current locations and configuration.

Angelo J. Rossi Playground
Block 1140A/Lot 001
The proposed project would include improvements to pool building, maintenance storage facility, playfields, and improved park accessibility to meet ADA standards. The proposed site work would include upgrades to pool building which include plumbing, mechanical, and electrical systems. The degraded roof element would be replaced in-kind, and interior partitions in staff and restroom areas would be adjusted to meet current ADA standards. The playfields would be replaced with seed and/or sod and re-graded, and the irrigation system would be replaced. All features in the site are expected to remain in their current locations and configuration.

The renovations of the pool and building would be proposed as follows:

- The pool would retain its current size, general configuration, principal interior circulation patterns, exterior walls, and overall massing in the renovation.
- The openness of the primary interior space, the natatorium, would be retained.

- The repair or replacement of the building systems (electrical, plumbing, mechanical, and filtration) would be done in their current locations in order to minimize visual intrusion on the main natatorium space and limit alteration of existing fabric. Most of these locations are in non-visible utility rooms.
- Pool shell and liner would be replaced, waterproofed, and sealed to match existing.
- ADA upgrades needed to reach the pool entrance or exits, or to provide a lift at the edge of the pool, would be done in a consolidated area to minimize removal of existing materials.
- Where possible and feasible, repair of deteriorated features such as finishes and materials would be done; in other areas, replacement of the materials due to rot or other degradation may be necessary. Where new materials are provided, they will match the original materials in material, design, color, and texture.
- In the repair or replacement of glazing and windows, new windows would have a higher level of transparency than the current panels (most of which are not original) in order to restore more of the building's original appearance (Original documentation is extant to show existing glazing patterns and materials). The renovation would use glazing with wood and metal frames.
- Rooflines would remain the same and maintain the same appearance.
- Any structural/seismic reinforcement would be additive, and augment existing structural systems rather than replacing them. The work would include adding steel plates to the existing roof diagram, which would be attached to the existing ceiling and painted to match the ceiling. The existing structural systems (concrete and steel system) would remain visible and the natatorium would remain open in feel and character. Along the side walls, individual steel cross braces elements of 4"x6" in thickness would be added between the concrete frames to provide additional reinforcement to the existing structural system.
- The existing exterior entry sequence and circulation would remain the same. Additional ADA access may be added to from the main entry area, with the addition of a ramp along the side of Arguello Street, connecting to entry pathways but the existing stairs, main entry and entry sequence would remain.

Balboa Park
Block 3179/Lot 011

The proposed project would include renovations to the pool, surrounding access routes, and related adjacent amenities. The proposed site work includes improvements to mechanical, electrical and pool equipment; renovation to path of travel within and directly adjacent to pool building to meet current ADA accessibility standards; and a possible addition of 800 square foot multiuse space on the northwest side of building on existing un-programmed lawn space. All features on the site are expected to remain in their current locations and configuration.

The renovations of the pool and building would be proposed as follows:

- The pool would retain its current size, general configuration, principal interior circulation patterns, exterior walls, and overall massing in the renovation.
- The openness of the primary interior space, the natatorium, would be retained.
- The repair or replacement of the building systems (electrical, plumbing, mechanical, and filtration) would be done in their current locations in order to minimize visual intrusion on the main natatorium space and limit alteration of existing fabric. Most of these locations are in non-visible utility rooms.
- Pool shell and liner would be replaced, waterproofed, and sealed to match existing.

- ADA upgrades needed to reach the pool entrance or exits, or to provide a lift at the edge of the pool, would be done in a consolidated area to minimize removal of existing materials.
- Where possible and feasible, repair of deteriorated features such as finishes and materials would be done; in other areas, replacement of the materials due to rot or other degradation may be necessary. Where new materials are provided, they would match the original materials in material, design, color, and texture.
- In the repair or replacement of glazing and windows, new windows would have a higher level of transparency than the current panels (most of which are not original) in order to restore more of the building's original appearance (Original documentation is extant to show existing glazing patterns and materials). The renovation would use glazing with wood and metal frames.
- Rooflines would remain the same and maintain the same appearance.
- Any structural/seismic reinforcement would be additive, and augment existing structural systems rather than replacing them. The work would include adding steel plates to the existing roof diagram, which would be attached to the existing ceiling and painted to match the ceiling. The existing structural systems (concrete and steel system) would remain visible and the natatorium would remain open in feel and character. Along the side walls, individual steel cross brace elements of 4"x6" in thickness would be added between the concrete frames to provide additional reinforcement to the existing structural system.
- A single-level addition of approximately 800 sf of multi-purpose space for pool users is proposed. This new space would be differentiated from the existing structure, yet compatible. It would be placed adjacent to the west façade (a secondary elevation) and attach in one location with a 8' long glass hyphen connector to limit the loss of existing materials and clearly delineate new from old. The opening to the main pool space would be limited to one opening within an area of 12'x10' (120 sf) where the original materials of the west façade would be removed (concrete wall, there are no windows in the area of where the proposed would connect).
- The addition would be one level, with a roof line about 12' above the existing level of the main floor. This would be considerably lower than the existing roofline height of the main natatorium space, which is approximately 30' in height from the main first floor slab. This would also be lower than the approximately 20' tall entry structure. The addition would use a combination of concrete, wood, metal, and glass to reference design elements of the existing building, but not duplicate its design. The addition would have a roof lower than the natatorium's roof and would be relatively small compared to the large main natatorium structure to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
- No work on the concrete planter attached to the southwest corner of pool building is included in the project scope.
- The existing exterior entry sequence and circulation and ramp would remain. One additional ramp designed to be similar in appearance would be added behind the right ramp, which would provide ADA access and connect to the main entry exterior platform and main entry door to the facility.

Garfield Square
Block 6523/Lot 001

The proposed project would include improvements to the park's perimeter, pathways, site amenities, sport courts, and pool and clubhouse complex. The proposed site work involves overall site accessibility improvements to the park perimeter which include in-kind repair and/or replacement of the sidewalk, pathways, and benches to meet current ADA standards. Irrigation replacements and/or upgrades would be made as necessary and in-kind. The existing sport courts would be repaved in-kind as well as repairs to their surrounding fencing, as needed. The site project may include demolition of the existing clubhouse

and restroom buildings and construction of an approximately 3,000 sf addition that would include restrooms accessible from the exterior of the building for park use. The existing sports courts would be replaced in this scenario.

The renovations of the pool and clubhouse would be proposed as follows:

- The pool would retain its current size, general configuration, principal interior circulation patterns, exterior walls, and overall massing in the renovation.
- The openness of the primary interior space, the natatorium, would be retained.
- The repair or replacement of the building systems (electrical, plumbing, mechanical, and filtration) would be done in their current locations in order to minimize visual intrusion on the main natatorium space and limit alteration of existing fabric. Most of these locations are in non-visible utility rooms.
- Pool shell and liner would be replaced, waterproofed, and sealed to match existing.
- ADA upgrades needed to reach the pool entrance or exits, or to provide a lift at the edge of the pool, would be done in a consolidated area to minimize removal of existing materials.
- Where possible and feasible, repair of deteriorated features such as finishes and materials would be done, in other areas, replacement of the materials due to rot or other degradation may be necessary. Where new materials are provided, they would match the original materials in material, design, color, and texture.
- In the repair or replacement of glazing and windows, new windows would have a higher level of transparency than the current panels (most of which are not original) in order to restore more of the building's original appearance (Original documentation is extant to show existing glazing patterns and materials). The renovation would use glazing with wood and metal frames.
- Rooflines would remain the same and maintain the same appearance.
- Any structural/seismic reinforcement would be additive, and augment existing structural systems rather than replacing them. The work would include adding steel plates to the existing roof diagram, which would be attached to the existing ceiling and painted to match the ceiling. The existing structural systems (concrete and steel system) would remain visible and the natatorium would remain open in feel and character. Along the side walls, individual steel cross brace elements of 4"x6" in thickness would be added between the concrete frames to provide additional reinforcement to the existing structural system.
- A single-level addition to the pool of approximately 3,000 sf of multi-purpose space is proposed. This new space would be differentiated from the existing structure, yet compatible with the existing design. It would be placed adjacent to the west façade and attached in two locations where there are current door openings with two 8' long glass hyphen connectors, limiting the loss of existing materials and clearly delineating the new construction from the old. The openings to the main natatorium space would be limited to two openings of 12'x10', resulting in the removal of a total of 240 sf of the existing wall materials at the west façade.
- The addition would be one level, with a roof line about 12' above the existing level of the main floor. This would be considerably lower than the existing roofline height of the main pool space, which is approximately 30 feet in height from grade. This would also be lower or similar to the 12'-14' height of the entry portion of the pool structure. The addition would use a combination of concrete, wood, metal, and glass to reference design elements of the existing building, but not duplicate its design. The addition would have a roof lower than the natatorium's roof and would be relatively small compared to the large main pool structure to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
- The existing exterior entry sequence and circulation would remain the same.

Margaret Hayward Playground
Block 0759/Lot 001
The proposed project would include improvements to the site pathways, sport courts, playfields, playground, and recreational buildings. The proposed building -related work includes renovation of both clubhouses, the multipurpose/storage building, or replacement of the three structures with a combined facility of same size.

The bleachers would be renovated or replaced in-kind. If renovated, the bleachers would be renovated for ADA access and the interior rooms and storage areas would be re-configured for additional storage purposes. Key decorative elements would be retained: decorative gates, stone veneer, concrete planters (Turk Street Entrance), and accessibility upgrades consolidated to minimize alteration of historic fabric. Any additional storage adjacent to current building would be subordinate in design (ornamentation, materials, color) to existing structure. If replaced, the bleachers would be replaced with a similar bleachers and storage structure.

The proposed site work involves in-kind repairs and/or replacement to pathways throughout site as needed to meet current ADA standards. The sport courts would be resurfaced and the lighting would be replaced in-kind. The playfields would be replaced with seed and/or sod, and the irrigation system would be replaced. The existing playground would be replaced and new surface materials would be included in order to meet current ADA standards.

Potrero Hill Playground
Block 4163/Lot 001
The proposed project would include improvements to the existing clubhouse and immediately surrounding areas to meet current code and ADA standards, as well as improvements to the playfields. The proposed site work involves repair and/or upgrading of electrical, plumbing, and mechanical building systems to meet current code. The playfields would be replaced with seed and/or sod and re-graded, and the irrigation system would be replaced. All work is confined to existing footprint. Excavation required would occur in areas and at depths that were previously excavated at original construction. All improvements to park features are expected to remain in their current locations and configuration.

The renovations of the recreation center would be proposed as follows:

- The facility would retain its current size, general configuration, principal interior circulation patterns, exterior walls, and overall massing in the renovation.
- The openness of primary interior spaces (auditorium/multipurpose room and gymnasium) would be retained.
- The repair or replacement of the building systems (electrical, plumbing, and mechanical) would be done in their current locations to minimize visual intrusion on the main spaces and limit alteration of existing fabric. Most of these locations are in non-visible utility rooms.
- Where possible and feasible, repair of deteriorated features such as finishes and materials would be done. In other areas, replacement of the materials due to rot or other degradation maybe necessary. Where new materials are provided, they would match the original materials in design, color, material and texture.
- In the repair or replacement of glazing and windows, new windows would have a higher level of transparency than the current panels (most of which are not original) in order to restore more of the

building's original appearance (Original documentation is extant to show existing glazing patterns and materials). The renovation would use glazing with wood and metal frames.

- Rooflines and the domed gym roof would remain the same and maintain the same appearance.
- Proposed structural seismic reinforcement would be additive, and augment existing structural systems rather than replacing them. The existing structural systems would remain visible and the gymnasium and auditorium spaces would remain open in feel and character. The structural work would add additional wooden beams alongside the existing wooden beams which run the length of the half dome ceiling on the interior. These would match the existing structural system in material, appearance and character.
- The existing exterior entry sequence and circulation would remain.

West Sunset Playground
Block 2094/Lot 005

The proposed project includes certain improvements to the plantings, retaining walls, lighting, bleachers, and sports courts, as described in further detail below. The proposed site work involves overall site accessibility improvements to the park perimeter and paths which include in-kind repair and/or replacement of the sidewalk, fencing, and retaining walls to meet current ADA standards. The existing sport courts would be repaved in-kind and their surrounding fencing would be repaired, as needed. The field and court lighting would be replaced in-kind and as-needed. The playfields would be replaced with seed and/or sod and re-graded, and the irrigation system would be replaced. The bleacher seating would be renovated and repaired. The bleachers storage would be renovated to provide additional storage, restrooms and administrative space for field management. All improvements to park features are expected to remain in their current locations and configuration.

Mountain Lake Park
Block 1345/Lot 001

The proposed project would include improvements to the playground. The existing playground would be replaced in-kind and new surface materials would be included in order to meet current ADA standards. The proposed project would also provide replacement of adjacent playground benches, in-kind and as needed. All park features would remain in their current locations and configuration.

Moscone Recreation Center/East Playground
Block 0469/Lot 001

The proposed project would include improvements to the East playground, near the corner of Chestnut and Laguna Streets. The existing playground would be replaced in-kind and new surface materials would be included in order to meet current ADA standards. The proposed project would also provide replacement of adjacent playground benches, in-kind and as needed. All park features would remain in their current locations and configuration.

CEQA ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCE(S) EVALUATION

No recorded archaeological sites are located on or near the project sites and none are expected to occur in the location of the proposed ground disturbance for the various park projects. Soil disturbance resulting from the proposed project would require excavation below the existing ground surface (bgs) for the various project elements. The Planning Department reviewed all proposed park projects for impacts to archeological resources and determined that no CEQA-significant archeological resources are expected within project-affected soils.[2]

CEQA HISTORICAL RESOURCE(S) EVALUATION

As noted in a memorandum dated April 25, 2012[3] prepared to assess the potential impacts of the Project on historical resources, the Project involves repairs and improvements to 17 parks and open spaces throughout the City and County of San Francisco (see properties listed under Category B and C Properties below). Of these sites, none (0) contain known historic resources, thirteen (13) contain age-eligible buildings, structures or features that have not yet been evaluated for historical significance, and four (4) contain buildings, structures or features that are less than 50 years in age and are not eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR).

Category A Properties:
None of the park properties have been previously evaluated and found to be eligible for listing in the California Register of Historic Places. There are no buildings, structures or features considered "Category A" properties (Known Historical Resources) for the purposes of the Planning Department's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review procedures.

Category B Properties:
The following thirteen (13) properties are not included in any historic resource surveys or listed in any local, state or national registries. These buildings are considered a "Category B" property (Properties Requiring Further Consultation and Review) for the purposes of the Planning Department's California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review procedures due to their age (constructed prior to 1962).[4]

- Angelo Rossi Park (1140A/001) – Park created 1933; Pool constructed 1956
- Balboa Park (3179/011) – Park created 1854; Pool constructed 1956; Stadium constructed 1957
- Douglas Playground (7500/001) – Clubhouse constructed 1920-1930
- Excelsior Playground (6088/008) – Clubhouse constructed 1927
- Garfield Square (6523/001) – Park created 1881; Pool constructed 1956; Clubhouse constructed 1966
- Glen Canyon Park (7560/002) – Recreation Center constructed 1938
- Golden Gate Heights Park (2132A/001) – Date unknown
- Margaret Hayward Park/James P. Lang Field (0759/001) – Park created 1922; Old Clubhouse constructed 1918; Bleachers constructed 1954
- Moscone Recreation Center/East Playground (0469/001) – Park created circa 1860; Playground constructed circa 1960

[2] Archeological Response for SF RPD 2012 General Obligation Bond, Memorandum from Don Lewis/Randall Dean, Environmental Planning, April 23, 2012. This document is available for public review at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor, as part of Case File No. 2011.1359E.

[3] Historic Resource Evaluation Response Memorandum from Shelley Caltagirone, Preservation Technical Specialist, to Brett Bollinger, Environmental Planner, issued April 25, 2012. A copy of this memorandum is attached.

[4] All dates provided by the Recreation and Parks Department.

- Mountain Lake Park (1345/001) – Park created circa 1867; Playground constructed circa 1960
- Potrero Hill Park (4163/001) – Park created 1926; Recreation Center constructed 1949
- Richmond Playground (1378/007) – Clubhouse constructed 1950
- West Sunset Playground (2094/005) – Bleachers, Clubhouse, and Restroom building constructed 1953

Category C Properties:
The following four (4) properties have either been affirmatively determined not to be historical resources due to their age (less than 50 years of age) or are properties for which the City has no information indicating that the property qualifies as an historical resource.

- Allyne Park (0544/003) – Park created circa 1965
- Christopher Playground (7521/007) – Clubhouse constructed 1969
- Gilman Playground (4963/003) – Clubhouse constructed 1969
- Willie "Woo Woo" Wong Playground (0225/018) – Clubhouse constructed 1977

Planning Department staff has determined that eleven (11) of the thirteen (13) Category B properties under the current environmental review application do not require an evaluation of historical significance per the Planning Department's CEQA review procedures, as the proposed work at these sites would not result in any substantial changes in the appearance of the buildings, structures or features located at the park sites. Since there is no potential for an adverse impact to potential historic resources in these locations, evaluations of historical significance are not necessary at this time. Such evaluations are only required per the Department's CEQA review policy when there is a potential risk to an identified or potential historic resource. The remaining two (2) Category B properties have been evaluated for historical significance as the work proposed in these areas involves possible demolition and could result in substantial changes to these sites. The properties are:

- Glen Canyon Park – Recreation Center [5]
- Margaret S. Hayward Playground/James P. Lang Field – Old Clubhouse and Bleachers [6]

Based on information in the Planning Department's files and provided by the project sponsor, both sites are historically significant per one or more of the California Register criteria.

Glen Canyon Park Glen Canyon Recreation Center, completed in 1938, was evaluated for historical significance by Carey & Company in August 2011 and determined to be eligible for listing in the CRHR as an individual resource under Criteria 1/A and 3/C for its association with the San Francisco Recreation Commission's 1930s expansion of the City's recreation facilities and implementation of New Deal programs. The clubhouse is also the work of master architect William G. Merchant. The center has undergone few modifications and appears to retain its integrity. No other historic resources have been identified at the Glen Canyon Park site.

The character-defining features of Glen Canyon Park Recreation Center include the following:

- Complex massing
- High roof forms

[5] Carey & Co, Inc. *Historic Resources Evaluation, Glen Park Recreation Center,* August 29, 2011 and on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, as part of project file 2011.1359E.

[6] Hahn, Sara, Garavaglia Architecture Inc. *Historic Resources Evaluation, Margaret S. Hayward Playground Old Clubhouse and James P. Lang Field Bleachers,* April 12, 2012 and on file and available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Fourth Floor, as part of project file 2011.1359E.

- Multi-lite steel casement windows
- L-shaped plan and partially enclosed courtyard, gymnasium, and auditorium
- Chimneys

Glen Canyon Park Recreation Center retains a high level of integrity in location, setting, association, feeling, design, materials, and workmanship, having undergone few alterations since its construction.

Margaret S. Hayward Playground Clubhouse and James P. Lang Field Bleachers, completed in 1918 and 1954 respectively, were both evaluated for historical significance by Sara Hahn, Garavaglia Architecture, Inc. in April 2012. Hahn determined that the overall site, including both the Margaret S. Hayward Playground and James P. Lang Field, would be eligible for listing on the CRHR as a cultural landscape under Criterion 1/A for its association with the 'reform park' playground movement that became popular in the nation at the turn of the 20th century. The Old Clubhouse was built during the period of development and would contribute to the site's historical significance if the site retained its integrity (see below). The Field Bleachers, however, date from the post-war period and do not contribute to the site's historical significance and do not qualify as individual resources outside of the 'reform park' context. Therefore, only the Old Clubhouse is potentially eligible for listing on the CRHR as a contributing resource to the Margaret S. Hayward Playground, but would not be eligible as an individual resource.

Margaret S. Hayward Playground does not retain integrity having undergone significant alterations in its original layout, architectural features, topography, and circulation patterns. Therefore, neither the playground nor the Old Clubhouse building is eligible for listing on the CRHR.

Historical Project Evaluation

The Parks General Obligation Bond Project can be divided into four (4) basic scopes of work:

Safety and ADA Upgrades – For projects falling under this scope of work, all features in the sites are expected to remain in their current locations and configuration. The projects would include in part or whole, the following work: improvements to the site pathways to meet current ADA standards; re-paving of sports courts; re-grading and seeding of lawn and natural turf areas; replacement of the irrigation system; in-kind replacement of site seating, pedestrian lighting, picnic areas, fencing, and signage; minor modification of restrooms to meet current ADA standards; replacement of playground equipment and surface materials in order to meet current ADA and safety standards; replacement of natural lawn with seed and/or sod; in-kind replacement of windows to match the original configuration, materials, and details; in-kind replacement of deteriorated roofing systems; and, reinforcement of existing structural systems for seismic stability.

- Allyne Park
- Angelo Rossi Pool
- Christopher Playground
- Douglass Playground
- Excelsior Playground
- Gilman Playground
- Golden Gate Heights Park
- Mountain Lake Park
- Moscone Recreation Center/East Playground
- Potrero Hill Park
- Richmond Playground
- West Sunset Playground

Rehabilitation with Multiple Additions - Rehabilitation with Minor Addition – In addition to safety and ADA upgrades, these projects include minor building additions at the secondary facades of the pool buildings. The following two (2) sites are proposed to undergo this scope of work as detailed below:

- Balboa Park
- Garfield Square

Rehabilitation with Multiple Additions – In addition to safety and ADA upgrades, the Glen Canyon Park project includes multiple additions.

Demolition – The projects in this scope of work would include the possible demolition and/or replacement of select buildings, structures or features in addition to safety and ADA upgrades (described above) for the following three (3) sites:

- Garfield Square – Clubhouse
- Margaret S. Hayward Playground/James P. Lang Field – Old Clubhouse and Bleachers
- Willie "Woo Woo" Wong Playground - Clubhouse

The proposed scopes of work listed below would not have a significant impact on any historic resources; including Glen Canyon Park Recreation Center which is the single (1) identified historic resource under the current Environmental Evaluation, or on the eleven (11) unevaluated properties that are considered potential historic resources for the purposes of this review.

Safety and ADA Upgrades/Rehabilitation with Minor Addition – The work outlined under the Safety and ADA Upgrade and Rehabilitation with Minor Addition scopes of work would affect eleven (11) potential historic resources and three (3) properties that have been found not to be historic resources. The work would not result in any substantial change in the appearance of the buildings, structures, or features at the park sites; therefore, it was determined that there will be no potential for significant adverse impact to known or potential historic resources.

Rehabilitation with Multiple Additions - The work outlined under the *Rehabilitation with Multiple Additions* scope of work would affect the single identified historic resource, the Glen Canyon Recreation Center. Staff has reviewed the proposal and found that the work would be in keeping with the *Secretary of the Interior Standards* for the Rehabilitation of historic resources and would, therefore, have no significant adverse impact to the historic resources. An analysis of the project scopes per the applicable Standards is listed below:

> *Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.*
>
> The proposed projects would maintain the park and recreation uses of the properties and would retain their distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships through appropriate repairs and in-kind replacement.
>
> *Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*
>
> The historic character of the sites would be retained and preserved through the careful preservation and retention of all distinctive features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. No character-defining features or materials are proposed for alteration or removal.

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.
The projects would not add new exterior features to the sites or alter the facades in a way that would create a false sense of historical development.

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.
Distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the properties would be preserved.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.
The proposed project will repair rather than replace deteriorated features or replace in-kind features that have deteriorated beyond repair.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
The proposed new additions would be contemporary in their materials and design to differentiate the new work from the old and would be subordinate to the historic building in terms of siting, height, and massing so that they do not detract from the character-defining features of the resource.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
The proposed additions would attach to the historic building at secondary facades and with minimal removal of historic material so that in the event that the additions are removed in the future, the area could be restored without harming the form and integrity of the historic building.

Demolition – Selective demolition is proposed for the four (4) buildings/structures at three (3) sites: the Old Clubhouse and the Field Bleachers at Margaret S. Hayward Playground/James P. Lang Field, the Clubhouse at Garfield Square' and the Clubhouse at Willie "Woo Woo" Wong Playground. As noted above, the Margaret S. Hayward Playground/James P. Lang Field structures are not eligible for listing on the CRHR. The clubhouses at Garfield Square and Willie "Woo Woo" Wong Playground were constructed in 1966 and 1977 respectively and are not age-eligible for listing on the CRHR. Therefore, the work would have no impact to historic resources.

Conclusions

CEQA State Guidelines Section 15301(a), or Class 1, provides an exemption from environmental review for interior and exterior alterations to an existing park structure and/or park configuration, including demolition of small structures. Therefore, the proposed implementation of the Recreation and Park Department 2012 Bond Project-Specific Program would be exempt under Class 1.

CEQA State Guidelines Section 15300.2 states that a categorical exemption shall not be used for an activity where there is a reasonable possibility that the activity would have a significant effect on the environment due to unusual circumstances. As described above, each individual park project would not have a significant effect on a historic resource. There are no unusual circumstances surrounding the current proposal that would suggest a reasonable possibility of a significant environmental effect. The project would be exempt under each of the above-cited classification.

For all of the above reasons, the proposed project is appropriately exempt from environmental review.

** Complete copy of document is located in

File No. 120531

SAN FRANCISCO CLEAN & SAFE NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS BOND

GAO Committee
File #120531

Lake Mac Nab Water Fall
And
Cleaning Project Description:

From: Belles Yelda
426 Cambridge Street
San Francisco, CA 94134
Phone # 415-2392332
Cell # 415-656-7293

Date: 6/11/12

rec'd in Committee 6/14/12 RC

To. Honorable Supervisors
JOHN AVALOS. (415) 554-6975 Fax: (415) 554-6979
MALIA COHEN. (415) 554-7670 Fax: (415) 554-7674

This lake is located in Mc Laren Park close to the Club House at Lewis Sutter Play ground. It has an area 76,426 SF a parameter of 1,056 linear feet and 2 ½ to 3 feet dept of water. It is home for various species of birds, ducks coot, fish, turtles, and also a place for walkers who walk around the lake. The clubhouse been used for seniors citizen's bingo in the morning, and the afternoon school children come for educational purposes. All together this facility need improvement. There are potholes on the asphalted road going to the clubhouse. The lake is covered with algae and at the bottom there is one foot of sediment, this has been a costly Maintenance problem as long as I can remember. Every 5 years so the Rec. and Park has emptied million gallons of water in order to clean the sludge without solving the main cause of the problem. I as a retired Civil Engineer, a neighbor and a senior member of the Friend of Mc Laren Park together with two members 6 years ago took measurements, and did a survey and I prepared design drawings for the waterfall on the existing inlet ditch, which is located on steep slope, where most erosion is caused by winter storm runoff with high velocity. These drawings were submitted three times to the Rec. and Park authority and last time to Eric Zckler an Rosey Jencks SF PUC. Every time we were told there are no budgets. This waterfall design as shown on the drawings has a pump to circulate the lake's water by pumping it on top 30 feet high. Then by constructing 12 steps each 10'x10' wide and flat slope at 2 feet rises. This type of waterfall construction is known to prevent not only the erosion also aired the water that reduce the algae and reduce the storm runoff velocity, and sediment will be prevented to travel to the lake. The pumps will have an automatic timing and shutoff valves.

The electricity will be provided by the required solar panels that will be installed on the circular roof of the Club House. (By others.)

Cleaning Mac Nab Lake:

1.We need to empty the 1.5 million gallons of water by irrigating the lawns around.
2. Clear 7,657 CY of sludge and hull out to A designated area in Mc Laren Park.
3. Place 76,426 Sq feet plastic liner 20 mill thick at the bottom area to prevent the vegetation from growing.
4. Place 4" gravel (945 CY) over the plastic liner.

I am hoping You our District Supervisors at this time will take actions to improve our park and approve the budget for this project which is long over due.

Respectfully.

Belles Yelda

Belles Yelda

Visit www.SFForest.net

SPEAK UP NOW!

Oppose all programs and bonds that destroy healthy trees, spray dangerous herbicides, disrupt healthy ecosystems that support hundreds of species, and restrict access to our city parks.

Sign the Petition
Contact SF Politicians

Sign Up for Action Notices
Volunteer / Get Involved
Tell Your Friends

- Per the 2011 draft environmental impact review (EIR) of the NAP plan, the **"Maintenance" alternative is the "Environmentally Superior" alternative** not the Natural Areas Program (NAP) plan. Public comments overwhelming opposed the NAP plan.
- NAP's $1.7 million operating budget keeps growing, while other essential services are being cut. Other NAP costs are also hidden within millions for bond projects coded as "trails", "habitat restoration", and "forestry" and in volunteer programs.
- SF forests trap moisture from the summer fog and create "cloud forest" type environments with almost no risk of fire.
- Only 194 acres (7%) of the "natural areas" has endangered, sensitive, or unique species, yet NAP claims 1,107 acres including most forests. NAP's intent is to restore SF Natural Heritage to "natural areas" even though no forest covered San Francisco prior to the arrival of the Spanish in the 1769, and the SF environment has changed. Redwoods, Monterey Cypress and Pines, Eucalyptus, and much of park greenery are not SF native.



San Francisco Forest Alliance

Preserving Public Parks for the Public

Ax "Natural Areas Program"

The Natural Areas Program (NAP) claims 1/3 of city-managed park land.
NAP repeatedly destroys healthy, self-sustaining trees and plants, replacing them with native plants that require constant care, huge amounts of pesticides, and ongoing taxpayer funds.



Costs Millions per Year of Scarce Park Funds

Fells 18,500+ Trees

Initial NAP Tree Cutting Plans

1,600 Mount Davidson
809 McLaren Park
511 Bayview Park
140 Interior Greenbelt
134 Lake Merced
120 Glen Canyon Park
82 Golden Gate Park
15,000 Sharp Park

Plus More.....

Tree Benefits

- Remove air pollutants
- Absorb carbon dioxide and release oxygen
- Reduce global warming
- Increase property values
- Buffer city sounds, sights, and wind
- Manage storm water runoff
- Provide wildlife habitat

Herbicides, Closures, & Habitat Loss

Uses more of the most toxic herbicides than any other comparable park department.



Closes 10 miles (25%) of trails and discourages people from leaving the trail.

Calls dogs "invasive" and closes 15% of dog play area plus allows closure of up to 80%.



Sprays and removes non-natives used by existing wildlife for food, shelter, and nesting areas.

GAO
Item 2 + 3
File Nos. 120525 & 120531
Rec'd in Committee
6/14/12
PC

Save Mount Sutro Forest
aving the Mt Sutro Open Space Reserve

Native Restorations Don't "Restore" Anything – Professor Arthur Shapiro

Posted on October 15, 2011

We are reprinting, with permission, Professor Shapiro's comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report on the Significant Natural Areas Program. It was first published on Death of a Million Trees.

Mission blue butterfly Wikimedia Commons

With permission and in its entirety we are publishing the ***comment of Arthur M. Shapiro.*** *He is* ***Distinguished Professor of Evolution and Ecology at UC Davis and a renowned expert on the butterflies of California.*** *We hope that you will take his credentials into consideration as you read his opinion of native plant restorations in general and the Natural Areas Program in San Francisco in particular. We hope that Professor Shapiro's comment will inspire you to write your own comment by the deadline, which has been extended to October 31, 2011. Details about how to submit your comment are available* ***here.***

****

October 6, 2011

Mr. Bill Wycko

San Francisco Planning Department

Re: DRAFT EIR, NATURAL AREAS PROGRAM

Dear Mr. Wycko:

Consistent with the policy of the University of California, I wish to state at the outset that the opinions stated in this letter are my own and should not be construed as being those of the Regents, the University of California, or any administrative entity thereof. My affiliation is presented for purposes of identification only. However, my academic qualifications are relevant to what I am about to say. I am a professional ecologist (B.A. University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D. Cornell University) and have been on the faculty of U.C. Davis since 1971, where I have taught General Ecology, Evolutionary Ecology, Community Ecology, Philosophy of Biology, Biogeography, ɔpical Ecology, Paleoecology, Global Change, Chemical Ecology, and Principles of Systematics. I have trained some 15 Ph.D.s, many of whom are now tenured faculty at institutions including the University of

Massachusetts, University of Tennessee, University of Nevada-Reno, Texas State University, and Long Beach State University, and some of whom are now in government agencies or in private consulting or industry. I am an or the author of some 350 scientific publications and reviews. The point is that I do have the *bona fides* to say what I am about to say.

At a time when public funds are exceedingly scarce and strict prioritization is mandatory, I am frankly appalled that San Francisco is considering major expenditures directed toward so-called "restoration ecology." "Restoration ecology" is a euphemism for a kind of gardening informed by an almost cultish veneration of the "native" and abhorrence of the naturalized, which is commonly characterized as "invasive." Let me make this clear: ***neither "restoration" nor conservation can be mandated by science—only informed by it.*** The decision of what actions to take may be motivated by many things, including politics, esthetics, economics and even religion, but it cannot be science-driven.

In the case of "restoration ecology," the goal is the creation of a simulacrum of what is believed to have been present at some (essentially arbitrary) point in the past. I say a simulacrum, because almost always there are no studies of what was actually there from a functional standpoint; usually there are no studies at all beyond the merely (and superficially) descriptive. Whatever the reason for desiring to create such a simulacrum, it must be recognized that it is just as much a garden as any home rock garden and will almost never be capable of being self-sustaining without constant maintenance; it is ***not going to be a "natural," self-regulating ecosystem***. The reason for that is that the ground rules today are not those that obtained when the prototype is thought to have existed. The context has changed; the climate has changed; the pool of potential colonizing species has changed, often drastically. Attempts to "restore" prairie in the upper Midwest in the face of European Blackthorn invasion have proven Sisyphean. And they are the norm, not the exception.

The creation of small, easily managed, and educational simulacra of presumed pre-European vegetation on San Francisco public lands is a thoroughly worthwhile and, to me, desirable project. ***Wholesale habitat conversion is not***.

A significant reaction against the excesses of the "native plant movement" is setting up within the profession of ecology, and there has been a recent spate of articles arguing that hostility to "invasives" has gone too far—that many exotic species are providing valuable ecological services and that, as in cases I have studied and published on, in the altered context of our so-called "Anthropocene Epoch" such services are not merely valuable but ***essential***. This is a letter, not a monograph, but I would be glad to expand on this point if asked to do so.

I am an evolutionary ecologist, housed in a Department of Evolution and Ecology. The two should be joined at the proverbial hip. Existing ecological communities are freeze-frames from a very long movie. They have not existed for eternity, and many have existed only a few thousand years. There is nothing intrinsically sacred about interspecific associations. ***Ecological change is the norm, not the exception***. Species and communities come and go. The ideology (or is it faith?) that informs "restoration ecology" basically seeks to deny evolution and prohibit change. But change will happen in any case, and it is foolish to squander scarce resources in pursuit of what are ideological, not scientific, goals with no practical benefit to anyone and only

psychological "benefits" to their adherents.

f that were the only argument, perhaps it could be rebutted effectively. But the proposed wholesale habitat conversion advocated here does serious ***harm,*** both locally (in terms of community enjoyment of public resources) and globally (in terms of carbon balance-urban forests sequester lots of carbon; artificial grasslands do not). At both levels, wholesale tree removal, except for reasons of public safety, is sheer folly. Aging, decrepit, unstable Monterey Pines and Monterey Cypresses are unquestionably a potential hazard. Removing them for that reason is a very different matter from removing them to actualize someone's dream of a pristine San Francisco (that probably never existed).

Sociologists and social psychologists talk about the "idealization of the underclass," the "noble savage" concept, and other terms referring to the guilt-driven self-hatred that infects many members of society. Feeling the moral onus of consumption and luxury, people idolize that which they conceive as pure and untainted. That may be a helpful personal catharsis. It is not a basis for public policy.

Many years ago I co-hosted John Harper, a distinguished British plant ecologist, on his visit to Davis. We took him on a field trip up I-80. On the way up several students began apologizing for the extent to which the Valley and foothill landscapes were dominated by naturalized exotic weeds, mainly Mediterranean annual grasses. Finally Harper couldn't take it any more. "Why do you insist on treating this as a calamity, rather than a vast evolutionary opportunity?" he asked. Those of us who know the detailed history of vegetation for the past few million years—particularly since the end of Pleistocene glaciation—understand this. "Restoration ecology" is owing the sea.

Get real.

Sincerely,

Arthur M. Shapiro

Distinguished Professor of Evolution and Ecology

Share this: Facebook 1 Twitter Reddit +1 0 Pinterest Tumblr Press This StumbleUpon Print Email More

This entry was posted in Environment, nativism, Natural areas Program and tagged EIR, Environmental Impact Report, native plants, Natural Areas Program, unscientific. Bookmark the permalink.

One Response to *Native Restorations Don't "Restore" Anything – Professor Arthur Shapiro*

Pingback: *Professor Arthur Shapiro Comments on the Environmental Impact Report of the Natural Areas Program in San Francisco « Coyote Yipps*

Tree Fall Fatalities are Rare

- *The Myth: Eucs Fall on People*
- Reality: *All* Tree Fall Fatalities are Rare
  - In 1995-2007 there were 407 tree-fall deaths nationwide. (*Shmidlin, 2008*), averaging **34** per year. Lightning kills **62** people annually. (*National Storm Service data, 1998-08 data*)
  - California: 5 fatalities in 10 year, caused by:
    - Oak: (2010, 2011)
    - American Elm: (2010)
    - Redwood: (2008)
    - Monterey Pine (dead): (2003)

Euc Forests are Bio-diverse

Myth: Eucalyptus poisons the soil, nothing else can grow there.

- In fact, in San Franciso, eucalyptus forests have a lush understory as these pictures show.
- Many trees, including oaks, are allelopathic to certain species of plants. (*Lodhi, 1976; Djurdevic et al, 2005*)
- Eucalyptus forest have as much biodiversity as oak forests. (*Sax, 2002*)

Eucs Are Less of a Fire Hazard

- *Myth: Eucalyptus is a fire Hazard*

- **San Francisco is in the fog belt**. Eucalyptus harvests moisture from fog, so forested areas remain wet through the summer. **CALFIRE** considers all of San Francisco a "Moderate" fire risk, **its lowest rating**.

- A 3-month daily log of Sutro Forest in Fall 2009 (the "fire season") yielded only 10 days when the forest was not watered by fog or rain.

- "Native" grasses, scrub more flammable than any tree. Grass fires ignite more easily, move faster.

- Angel Island example: no wild-land fires while covered with eucalyptus trees. After trees felled in 1996, several fires culminating in the 2008 fire covering half the island.



- Eucalyptus is not as flammable as it's made out to be.
- This NYTimes picture shows the aftermath of the Scripps Ranch fire, San Diego.)
- Houses burned, the eucs standing right there did not.
- The city wanted to cut down the eucs... but the residents, including those who lost their homes, objected. This picture suggests why.



Mgmt Area	Action
MA-1a	• Maintain diverse native grassland • Augment sensitive plant populations • Reintroduce sensitive plants • Limit access including dogs to trails
MA-1b	• Maintain rich native scrub • Maintain Pacific reed grass prairie • Augment sensitive plant populations • Reintroduce sensitive plants
MA-1c	• Remove approximately 1,000 small and medium sized invasive trees • Maintain Pacific reed grass prairie. • Augment sensitive plant populations • Reintroduce sensitive plants
MA-2a	• Maintain and enhance grassland-scrub mosaic
MA-2b	• Maintain and enhance grassland
MA-2c	• Remove approximately 200 invasive trees • Maintain and enhance structurally diverse cypress and oak tress, native berry-producing scrub; and Pacific reed grass prairie • Augment sensitive plant populations • Reintroduce sensitive plants • Limit access including dogs to trails
MA-2d	• Maintain and enhance a elderberry scrub-Pacific reed grass mosaic • Augment sensitive plant populations • Limit access including dogs to trails

Mgmt Area	Action
MA-2e	• Remove approximately 300 small to medium sized and 100 large invasive trees • Maintain and enhance a Pacific reed grass prairie-scrub mosaic • Augment sensitive plant populations • Reintroduce sensitive plants • Consider creating spring box for wildlife
MA-3a	• Maintain and enhance urban forest

Natural Area Wide Management Actions
- Reduce and contain herbaceous and woody weeds
- No invasive tree removal unless specified above
- Prevent recruitment of invasive trees unless specified above
- Total trails to remain: 12,589 linear-feet
- Provide access on designated trails only
- Social trails subject to closure
- Total invasive trees to remove: 1,600; Total invasive trees to remain: 9,400
- Implement erosion control as required (GR-12)
- Implement wildlife enhancements as appropriate

Management Areas
- management area 1
- management area 2
- management area 3

Trails
- primary
- secondary
- proposed

EIP

Source: Management areas and trails data collected by San Francisco Department of Recreation and Park Natural Areas Program (NAP), 2005; trails data digitized by San Francisco State University Institute for GISc (SFSUGIS), 2005; streets data excerpted from Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI), Inc's StreetMap 2000 data copyright ESRI 1998-2001; aerial photography San Francisco Department of Public Works, 2002, Orthophoto - San Francisco - 1-foot resolution - 2001; all data are in California State Plane Zone III projection, NAD 1983; map produced using ArcGIS 9.0 software by ESRI.

Map created May 29, 2005 by Debra Dwyer, San Francisco State University, Institute for Geographic Information Science (SFSU-IGIS); revised August 22, 2005.

N

0 75 150 300
Feet

FIGURE 6.2 - 5
MANAGEMENT AREAS AND TRAIL PLAN
Mt. Davidson
Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan
San Francisco, California

FILE NO. RESOLUTION NO.

[San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks General Obligation Bonds]

Resolution determining and declaring that the public interest and necessity demand improving the safety and quality of neighborhood parks and waterfront open spaces across the City, enhancing water quality and cleaning up environmental contamination along the Bay, replacing unsafe playgrounds, fixing restrooms, improving access for the disabled, and ensuring the seismic safety of park and recreation facilities under the jurisdiction of, or maintained by, the Recreation and Park Commission or the jurisdiction of the Port Commission or any other projects, sites or properties otherwise specified in the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters, and the payment of related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes; finding that the estimated cost of $195,000,000 for such improvements is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require incurring bonded indebtedness; making environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan; providing for the City to declare its official intent to reimburse prior expenditures; and waiving the time limits set forth in Administrative Code Section 2.34.

WHEREAS, City and County of San Francisco (the "City") staff has identified several park, open space, and recreation improvement projects to address public safety hazards, improve disabled access, improve water quality in the Bay and enhance the condition of neighborhood and waterfront park and open space facilities and lands, and other issues facing the City's park system; and

WHEREAS, City staff has identified a capital improvement need totaling $195,000,000 in projects relating to improving the safety and quality of neighborhood parks

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO

EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2012 MAY 15 PM 2:13

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors

FROM: per Mayor Edwin M. Lee

RE: San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks General Obligation Bonds

DATE: May 15, 2012

Attached for introduction to the Board of Supervisors is the resolution determining and declaring that the public interest and necessity demand improving the safety and quality of neighborhood parks and waterfront open spaces across the City, enhancing water quality and cleaning up environmental contamination along the Bay, replacing unsafe playgrounds, fixing restrooms, improving access for the disabled, and ensuring the seismic safety of park and recreation facilities under the jurisdiction of, or maintained by, the Recreation and Park Commission or the jurisdiction of the Port Commission or any other projects, sites or properties otherwise specified in the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters, and the payment of related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes; finding that the estimated cost of $195,000,000 for such improvements is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require incurring bonded indebtedness; making environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan; providing for the City to declare its official intent to reimburse prior expenditures; and waiving the time limits set forth in Administrative Code Section 2.34.

Please note this item is cosponsored by Supervisors Chu, Mar, Farrell, Chiu, Elsbernd, Wiener, Campos, Cohen, Kim, and Olague.

I request that this item be calendared in Government Audit and Oversight Committee on June 21st, 2012.

Should you have any questions, please contact Jason Elliott (415) 554-5105.

cc. Supervisor Carmen Chu
Supervisor Eric Mar
Supervisor Mark Farrell
Supervisor David Chiu
Supervisor Sean Elsbernd
Supervisor Scott Wiener
Supervisor David Campos
Supervisor Malia Cohen
Supervisor Jane Kim
Supervisor Christina Olague

1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PLACE, ROOM 200
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102-4681
TELEPHONE (415) 554-6141

120531

Amendment offered by Supervisor Wiener

FILE NO. 120531 RESOLUTION NO.

Rec'd in committee 6/21/12

[San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks General Obligation Bonds]

Resolution determining and declaring that the public interest and necessity demand improving the safety and quality of neighborhood parks and waterfront open spaces across the City, enhancing water quality and cleaning up environmental contamination along the Bay, replacing unsafe playgrounds, fixing restrooms, improving access for the disabled, and ensuring the seismic safety of park and recreation facilities under the jurisdiction of, or maintained by, the Recreation and Park Commission or the jurisdiction of the Port Commission or any other projects, sites or properties otherwise specified in the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters, and the payment of related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes; finding that the estimated cost of $195,000,000 for such improvements is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require incurring bonded indebtedness; making environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan; providing for the City to declare its official intent to reimburse prior expenditures; and waiving the time limits set forth in Administrative Code Section 2.34.

WHEREAS, City and County of San Francisco (the "City") staff has identified several ~~park, open space, and recreation improvement projects to address public safety hazards,~~ improve disabled access, improve water quality in the Bay and enhance the condition of neighborhood and waterfront park and open space facilities and lands, and other issues facing the City's park system; and

WHEREAS, City staff has identified a capital improvement need totaling $195,000,000 in projects relating to improving the safety and quality of neighborhood parks

and waterfront open spaces across the City, enhancing water quality and cleaning up environmental contamination along the Bay, replacing unsafe playgrounds, fixing restrooms, improving access for the disabled, and ensuring the seismic safety of park and recreation facilities under the jurisdiction of, or maintained by, the Recreation and Park Commission or the jurisdiction of the Port Commission or any other projects, sites or properties otherwise specified in the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters (collectively the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond (the "Bond") is recommended by the City's 10-year capital plan, which is approved each year by the Mayor of the City and the Board of Supervisors of the City (the "Board"); and

WHEREAS, This Board recognizes the need to identify funding to better address the waterfront open spaces and recreation needs of the City's residents including access for the disabled, environmental deterioration along the Bay, as well as to provide for the safety of the City's residents and avoid a complete reconstruction of deteriorating park, recreation and open space assets at a significantly larger cost in the future; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By the Board:

Section 1. The Board determines and declares that the public interest and necessity demand improving the safety and quality of neighborhood parks and waterfront open spaces across the City, enhancing water quality and cleaning up environmental contamination along the Bay, replacing unsafe playgrounds, fixing restrooms, improving access for the disabled, and ensuring the seismic safety of park and recreation facilities under the jurisdiction of, or maintained by, the Recreation and Park Commission or the jurisdiction of the Port Commission or any other projects, sites or properties otherwise specified in the ordinance

submitting this proposal to the voters, and the payment of related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Section 2. The estimated cost of $195,000,000 of the Bond is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City, will require an expenditure greater than the amount allowed by the annual tax levy, and will require the incurrence of bonded indebtedness in an amount not to exceed $195,000,000.

Section 3. The Board, having reviewed the proposed legislation, finds, affirms and declares (i) that in regard to the Joe DiMaggio Playground (as defined in Section 3A.7. of the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters), the Board of Supervisors, in Motion No. 11-91, affirmed certification of the North Beach Public Library and Joe DiMaggio Playground Master Plan Project Final Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse Number 2009042130) and, in Ordinance No. 102-11, adopted findings under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) related to approvals in furtherance of the abovementioned Master Plan, and copies of such actions are in Clerk of the Board of Supervisors File Nos. 110615 and 110312, respectively, and incorporated by reference; (ii) that the other Identified Projects (as defined in Section 3A of the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters) are categorically exempt from CEQA as described in the memoranda dated April 30, 2012 and May 14, 2012 from the Planning Department, (iii) that the remainder of the proposed Project is excluded from CEQA because the program is not defined as a "project" under CEQA Guidelines section 15378(b)(4), but is the creation of a government funding mechanism that does not involve any commitment to any specific project, (iv) that the proposed Project is in conformity with the priority policies of Section 101.1(b) of the City Planning Code and, (v) in accordance with Section 2A.53(f) of the City Administrative Code, that the proposed Project is consistent with the City's General Plan,

and hereby adopts the findings of the City Planning Department, as set forth in the General Plan Referral Reports, dated May 31, 2012 and June 20, 2012, and incorporates said findings by reference.

Section 4. The time limit for approval of this resolution specified in Section 2.34 of the San Francisco Administrative Code is waived.

Section 5. Under Section 2.40 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters shall contain a provision authorizing landlords to pass-through fifty percent (50%) of the resulting property tax increases to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Section 6. The City hereby declares its official intent to reimburse prior expenditures of the City incurred or expected to be incurred prior to the issuance and sale of any series of bonds in connection with the Project (collectively, the "Future Bonds"). The Board hereby declares the City's intent to reimburse the City with the proceeds of the Future Bonds for the expenditures with respect to the Project (the "Expenditures" and each, an "Expenditure") made on and after that date that is no more than 60 days prior to adoption of this Resolution. The City reasonably expects on the date hereof that it will reimburse the Expenditures with the proceeds of the Future Bonds.

Each Expenditure was and will be either (a) of a type properly chargeable to a capital account under general federal income tax principles (determined in each case as of the date of the Expenditure), (b) a cost of issuance with respect to the Future Bonds, (c) a nonrecurring item that is not customarily payable from current revenues, or (d) a grant to a party that is not related to or an agent of the City so long as such grant does not impose any obligation or condition (directly or indirectly) to repay any amount to or for the benefit of the City. The maximum aggregate principal amount of the Future Bonds expected to be issued

for the Project is $195,000,000. The City shall make a reimbursement allocation, which is a written allocation by the City that evidences the City's use of proceeds of the applicable series of Future Bonds to reimburse an Expenditure, no later than 18 months after the later of the date on which the Expenditure is paid or the Project is placed in service or abandoned, but in no event more than three years after the date on which the Expenditure is paid. The City recognizes that exceptions are available for certain "preliminary expenditures," costs of issuance, certain de minimis amounts, expenditures by "small issuers" (based on the year of issuance and not the year of expenditure) and expenditures for construction projects of at least 5 years.

Section 7. Documents referenced in this resolution are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. _____, which is hereby declared to be a part of this resolution as if set forth fully herein.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

By:_____
KENNETH DAVID ROUX
Deputy City Attorney

FILE NO. RESOLUTION NO.

[San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks General Obligation Bonds]

Resolution determining and declaring that the public interest and necessity demand improving the safety and quality of neighborhood parks and waterfront open spaces across the City, enhancing water quality and cleaning up environmental contamination along the Bay, replacing unsafe playgrounds, fixing restrooms, improving access for the disabled, and ensuring the seismic safety of park and recreation facilities under the jurisdiction of, or maintained by, the Recreation and Park Commission or the jurisdiction of the Port Commission or any other projects, sites or properties otherwise specified in the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters, and the payment of related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes; finding that the estimated cost of $195,000,000 for such improvements is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require incurring bonded indebtedness; making environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan; providing for the City to declare its official intent to reimburse prior expenditures; and waiving the time limits set forth in Administrative Code Section 2.34.

WHEREAS, City and County of San Francisco (the "City") staff has identified several park, open space, and recreation improvement projects to address public safety hazards, improve disabled access, improve water quality in the Bay and enhance the condition of neighborhood and waterfront park and open space facilities and lands, and other issues facing the City's park system; and

WHEREAS, City staff has identified a capital improvement need totaling $195,000,000 in projects relating to improving the safety and quality of neighborhood parks

[General Obligation Bonds - San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks - $195,000,000]

Resolution determining and declaring that the public interest and necessity demand improving the safety and quality of neighborhood parks and waterfront open spaces across the City, enhancing water quality and cleaning up environmental contamination along the Bay, replacing unsafe playgrounds, fixing restrooms, improving access for the disabled, and ensuring the seismic safety of park and recreation facilities under the jurisdiction of, or maintained by, the Recreation and Park Commission or the jurisdiction of the Port Commission or any other projects, sites or properties otherwise specified in the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters, and the payment of related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes; finding that the estimated cost of $195,000,000 for such improvements is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City and County and will require incurring bonded indebtedness; making environmental findings and findings of consistency with the General Plan; providing for the City to declare its official intent to reimburse prior expenditures; and waiving the time limits set forth in Administrative Code Section 2.34.

WHEREAS, City and County of San Francisco (the "City") staff has identified several park, open space, and recreation improvement projects to address public safety hazards, improve disabled access, improve water quality in the Bay and enhance the condition of neighborhood and waterfront park and open space facilities and lands, and other issues facing the City's park system; and

WHEREAS, City staff has identified a capital improvement need totaling $195,000,000 in projects relating to improving the safety and quality of neighborhood parks

and waterfront open spaces across the City, enhancing water quality and cleaning up environmental contamination along the Bay, replacing unsafe playgrounds, fixing restrooms, improving access for the disabled, and ensuring the seismic safety of park and recreation facilities under the jurisdiction of, or maintained by, the Recreation and Park Commission or the jurisdiction of the Port Commission or any other projects, sites or properties otherwise specified in the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters (collectively the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, The San Francisco Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond (the "Bond") is recommended by the City's 10-year capital plan, which is approved each year by the Mayor of the City and the Board of Supervisors of the City (the "Board"); and

WHEREAS, This Board recognizes the need to identify funding to better address the waterfront open spaces and recreation needs of the City's residents including access for the disabled, environmental deterioration along the Bay, as well as to provide for the safety of the City's residents and avoid a complete reconstruction of deteriorating park, recreation and open space assets at a significantly larger cost in the future; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By the Board:

Section 1. The Board determines and declares that the public interest and necessity demand improving the safety and quality of neighborhood parks and waterfront open spaces across the City, enhancing water quality and cleaning up environmental contamination along the Bay, replacing unsafe playgrounds, fixing restrooms, improving access for the disabled, and ensuring the seismic safety of park and recreation facilities under the jurisdiction of, or maintained by, the Recreation and Park Commission or the jurisdiction of the Port Commission or any other projects, sites or properties otherwise specified in the ordinance

submitting this proposal to the voters, and the payment of related costs necessary or convenient for the foregoing purposes.

Section 2. The estimated cost of $195,000,000 of the Bond is and will be too great to be paid out of the ordinary annual income and revenue of the City, will require an expenditure greater than the amount allowed by the annual tax levy, and will require the incurrence of bonded indebtedness in an amount not to exceed $195,000,000.

Section 3. The Board, having reviewed the proposed legislation, finds, affirms and declares (i) that in regard to the Joe DiMaggio Playground (as defined in Section 3A.7. of the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters), the Board of Supervisors, in Motion No. 11-91, affirmed certification of the North Beach Public Library and Joe DiMaggio Playground Master Plan Project Final Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse Number 2009042130) and, in Ordinance No. 102-11, adopted findings under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) related to approvals in furtherance of the abovementioned Master Plan, and copies of such actions are in Clerk of the Board of Supervisors File Nos. 110615 and 110312, respectively, and incorporated by reference; (ii) that the other Identified Projects (as defined in Section 3A of the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters) are categorically exempt from CEQA as described in the memoranda dated April 30, 2012 and May 14, 2012 from the Planning Department, (iii) that the remainder of the proposed Project is excluded from CEQA because the program is not defined as a "project" under CEQA Guidelines section 15378(b)(4), but is the creation of a government funding mechanism that does not involve any commitment to any specific project, (iv) that the proposed Project is in conformity with the priority policies of Section 101.1(b) of the City Planning Code and, (v) in accordance with Section 2A.53(f) of the City Administrative Code, that the proposed Project is consistent with the City's General Plan,

and hereby adopts the findings of the City Planning Department, as set forth in the General Plan Referral Report, dated June 20, 2012, and incorporates said findings by reference.

Section 4. The time limit for approval of this resolution specified in Section 2.34 of the San Francisco Administrative Code is waived.

Section 5. Under Section 2.40 of the San Francisco Administrative Code, the ordinance submitting this proposal to the voters shall contain a provision authorizing landlords to pass-through fifty percent (50%) of the resulting property tax increases to residential tenants in accordance with Chapter 37 of the San Francisco Administrative Code.

Section 6. The City hereby declares its official intent to reimburse prior expenditures of the City incurred or expected to be incurred prior to the issuance and sale of any series of bonds in connection with the Project (collectively, the "Future Bonds"). The Board hereby declares the City's intent to reimburse the City with the proceeds of the Future Bonds for the expenditures with respect to the Project (the "Expenditures" and each, an "Expenditure") made on and after that date that is no more than 60 days prior to adoption of this Resolution. The City reasonably expects on the date hereof that it will reimburse the Expenditures with the proceeds of the Future Bonds.

Each Expenditure was and will be either (a) of a type properly chargeable to a capital account under general federal income tax principles (determined in each case as of the date of the Expenditure), (b) a cost of issuance with respect to the Future Bonds, (c) a nonrecurring item that is not customarily payable from current revenues, or (d) a grant to a party that is not related to or an agent of the City so long as such grant does not impose any obligation or condition (directly or indirectly) to repay any amount to or for the benefit of the City. The maximum aggregate principal amount of the Future Bonds expected to be issued for the Project is $195,000,000. The City shall make a reimbursement allocation, which is a

written allocation by the City that evidences the City's use of proceeds of the applicable series of Future Bonds to reimburse an Expenditure, no later than 18 months after the later of the date on which the Expenditure is paid or the Project is placed in service or abandoned, but in no event more than three years after the date on which the Expenditure is paid. The City recognizes that exceptions are available for certain "preliminary expenditures," costs of issuance, certain de minimis amounts, expenditures by "small issuers" (based on the year of issuance and not the year of expenditure) and expenditures for construction projects of at least 5 years.

Section 7. Documents referenced in this resolution are on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 120531, which is hereby declared to be a part of this resolution as if set forth fully herein.

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney

By: Kenneth David Roux
KENNETH DAVID ROUX
Deputy City Attorney

File No. 120531 Committee Item No. 3
Board Item No. _____

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Government Audit and Oversight **Date** June 14, 2012

Board of Supervisors Meeting **Date** _____

Cmte	Board	
☐	☐	Motion
☒	☐	Resolution
☐	☐	Ordinance
☐	☐	Legislative Digest
☐	☐	Budget and Legislative Analyst Report
☐	☐	Legislative Analyst Report
☐	☐	Youth Commission Report
☐	☐	Introduction Form (for hearings)
☒	☐	Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report
☐	☐	MOU
☐	☐	Grant Information Form
☐	☐	Grant Budget
☐	☐	Subcontract Budget
☐	☐	Contract/Agreement
☐	☐	Form 126 – Ethics Commission
☐	☐	Award Letter
☐	☐	Application
☐	☐	Public Correspondence

OTHER **(Use back side if additional space is needed)**

* ☒	☐	General Plan Referral Addendum
* ☒	☐	SF Clean & Safe Neighborhood Parks Bond
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	
☐	☐	

Completed by: Alisa Miller **Date** June 8, 2012
Completed by: _____ **Date** _____

An asterisked item represents the cover sheet to a document that exceeds 25 pages.
The complete document can be found in the file.