

File No. 230278

Committee Item No. _____

Board Item No. 29

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: _____

Date: _____

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date: March 14, 2023

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MOU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence |

OTHER

- | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | SF Examiner Article 060914 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | PLN SF Environmental Justice Communities Map: Tech Doc |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | DPH Areas of Vulnerability Map 2016 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |

Prepared by: Arthur Khoo

Date: March 9, 2023

Prepared by: _____

Date: _____

1 [Urging the Recreation and Parks Department to Adopt Immediate Changes to its Acquisition
2 Strategies to Serve the Tenderloin, Lower Polk and Lower Nob Hill Neighborhoods]

3 **Resolution urging the Recreation and Parks Department and its Commission to**
4 **immediately adopt flexible criteria for its acquisition of potential open space and green**
5 **recreation, parklet and pocket park sites in the Tenderloin, Lower Polk and Lower Nob**
6 **Hill, including prioritizing smaller parcels of 2,000 square feet to 5,000 square feet, that**
7 **would not require years of demolition and construction, but rather think strategically**
8 **about a holistic approach that maximizes more parcels if they must be necessarily**
9 **smaller by design, and urging them to make considerable progress by the end of this**
10 **calendar year on the voter-mandated equity priorities in its Open Space Acquisition**
11 **plan.**

12
13 WHEREAS, In 2000, the voters approved Proposition C, which extended San
14 Francisco's Open Space Acquisition Fund, which is used to finance land acquisitions and
15 capital improvements for the Recreation and Parks Department; and

16 WHEREAS, Section 13.02 of the San Francisco Park Code states that in identifying
17 properties for acquisition under the Capital Plan, the Department shall consider as its top
18 priority open space acquisition sites, facilities and other real property opportunities in
19 neighborhoods designated as "high need areas" in the Recreation and Open Space Element
20 of the City's General Plan; and

21 WHEREAS, The Recreation and Parks Commission has a history of ignoring equity
22 priorities, such as the 2014 decision to approve the largest drawdown of funds for a single
23 open space acquisition for the Francisco Reservoir in a neighborhood with ample open space
24 opportunities and a district with the highest amount of open space per capita, while attempts
25 to identify potential acquisition sites in the Tenderloin languished, as documented by a June

1 2014 article in the San Francisco Examiner, on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
2 in File No. 230278, which is hereby declared to be a part of this Resolution as if set forth fully
3 herein; and

4 WHEREAS, On October 17, 2022, the Land Use and Transportation Committee heard
5 File No. 220867, a hearing on the public open space needs in the Lower Nob Hill/Upper
6 Tenderloin/Polk Gulch neighborhoods, with an overview of the consultant survey of potential
7 soft sites for acquisition, an accounting of the fund balance for the Open Space Acquisition
8 Fund, and an update on the Recreation and Park Department's ability to meet the mandated
9 "high needs" criteria of the Open Space Acquisition Fund, and community members offered
10 public comment raising concerns with the City's lack of progress serving the neighborhoods of
11 the Tenderloin, Lower Polk and Lower Nob Hill; and

12 WHEREAS, The Recreation and Parks Department claims to use SF Planning's priority
13 equity geography planning areas designated as Environmental Justice Communities,
14 referenced in San Francisco's recently adopted Housing Element, to confirm "high-need
15 areas" for investment and to guide the Department's capital plan budget and acquisition
16 investments, and the map presented at the Planning Commission and at the Capital Planning
17 Committee, informed by approximately 110 different data sets, on file with the Clerk of the
18 Board of Supervisors in File No. 230278, which is hereby declared to be a part of this
19 Resolution as if set forth fully herein, clearly includes and identifies the top 30% of burdened
20 area as the Tenderloin up to Bush Street and Redding Elementary School, (one of the top ten
21 most diverse public schools in San Francisco), on Frank Norris Alley; and

22 WHEREAS, The Department of Public Health also has equity overlays (also referenced
23 in the City's Housing Element), defined as "Areas of Vulnerability" dating back to 2016, on file
24 with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File No. 230278, which is hereby declared to be
25 a part of this Resolution as if set forth fully herein, which include the entirety of the Tenderloin

1 all the way up to Bush Street between Van Ness Avenue to the west and Stockton Street to
2 the east, a zone which has only increased its vulnerable population density in the last two
3 years with the addition of over 1,032 units of permanent supportive housing (PSH) and
4 transitional shelter for high-needs residents within a densely concentrated three block radius
5 and more pipeline PSH units and high-needs public health and harm reduction facilities
6 planned for the immediate future, albeit no plans to address the lack of open space in the
7 neighborhood; and

8 WHEREAS, The dense neighborhoods of the Tenderloin, Lower Polk and Lower Nob
9 Hill have very few opportunity development sites for open space, given the historically built out
10 nature of these neighborhoods and relatively small lot sizes, which makes the Recreation and
11 Parks Department's arbitrary size criteria virtually prohibitive for open space acquisitions; and

12 WHEREAS, The dense nature of these neighborhoods means that every potential
13 opportunity site is critical to meet the massive demand for open space, specifically pocket
14 parks, such as the Tenderloin National Forest in Cohen Alley, which is a community-activated
15 23 foot wide and 136 foot deep green space; and

16 WHEREAS, The pandemic only served to highlight the immense need for neutral open
17 space to convene community safely with neighborhood programming, with the need for open
18 space opportunities in the Tenderloin, Lower Polk and Lower Nob Hill neighborhoods
19 especially highlighted within the dense areas bounded by Geary Street to the south and Bush
20 Street to the north and Van Ness Avenue to the west and Taylor Street to the east, which has
21 no parks or open space recreation sites, but many low-income families and seniors; now,
22 therefore, be it

23 RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco
24 urges the Recreation and Parks Department and its Commission to immediately adopt flexible
25 criteria for its acquisition of potential open space and green recreation, parklet and pocket

1 park sites in the Tenderloin, Lower Polk and Lower Nob Hill, including prioritizing smaller
2 parcels of 2,000 square feet-5,000 square feet, that would not require years of demolition and
3 construction, but rather think strategically about a holistic approach that maximizes more
4 parcels if they must be necessarily smaller by design, and make considerable progress by the
5 end of this calendar year on the voter-mandated equity priorities in its Open Space Acquisition
6 plan.

https://www.sfexaminer.com/news/francisco-reservoir-plan-touches-on-san-francisco-parks-and-housing-issues/article_1005098a-1c29-5097-9131-47adf3778f5a.html

Francisco Reservoir plan touches on San Francisco parks and housing issues

By Examiner Staff

Jun 9, 2014



Nathaniel Y. Downes/Special to the S.F. ExaminerThe struggle ensues on what to do with Francisco Reservoir sitting atop some of...

By Examiner Staff

For years, the nearly 4-acre abandoned Francisco Reservoir has been eyed for a new Russian Hill park.

But now, as the deal is on the verge of approval, questions remain about whether more open space in the neighborhood is the best course of action for San Francisco.

Some arguments draw on The City's housing crisis, saying the site, which has sweeping views of San Francisco Bay, should be developed. Others are worried that lower-income and more dense communities may lose out if such a large chunk of The City's Open Space Acquisition Fund is spent in an affluent neighborhood already rich with parkland.

But Supervisor Mark Farrell, whose district includes the reservoir, and a coalition of neighbors who have pledged millions of dollars for the project are celebrating the pending new park space, which is up for approval from the Recreation and Park Commission.

Phil Ginsburg, general manager of the Recreation and Park Department, and Mark Buell, president of the commission, have both praised the open-space project.

"It's time to strike and move forward," Buell said during the commission's capital committee hearing Wednesday. "We have no choice but to embrace this."

John Stewart, chairman of housing developer The John Stewart Company, has made the case that given the current housing climate, the site is ideal for up to 60 units of moderate-income housing. That would fall in line with Mayor Ed Lee's goal of building 30,000 units by 2020 to address increasing rents and evictions.

Stewart told The San Francisco Examiner last week that he met with Farrell in recent months to try to convince him of the housing potential to no avail. Nevertheless, he is not giving up. "Nobody wants housing in the neighborhood once they are in – what else is new?" he said.

Meanwhile, Supervisor Jane Kim is questioning the use of the open-space acquisition fund.

Rec and Park would acquire the site from the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission for the fair-market value of \$9.9 million, which would be paid back with interest over the next 12 years.

However, according to Kim's office, such a large expenditure could jeopardize Rec and Park's commitment to purchase up to three open-space parcels in Kim's District 6, which includes the densely populated Tenderloin and South of Market areas. The case is being made that District 6 should not lose out given that it has 0.6 acres of open space per resident compared to the 26 acres per resident in District 2, which includes the reservoir site.

Every year, The City invests about \$2 million of tax revenue into the open-space acquisition fund. According to a Recreation and Park Commission report, there is \$9.1 million in the fund, which would be reduced to \$5 million this year if payments started on the reservoir purchase along with an estimated \$3.9 million expenditure for a project at 900 Inness Ave. in the Bayview district. There is also an untold amount expected to be used for the purchase of two parks as part of the housing development of the former Schlage Lock site in Vistacion Valley.

“The reality here is this has been zoned open space for decades and we’ve been able to build consensus among many different neighborhood groups and citywide organizations around building a brand new park,” Farrell said of the reservoir site.

Farrell said he does not agree with Kim's concerns, noting the size of the fund. The fund, according to the commission report, would contain \$57.5 million by 2030 if no acquisitions were made.

The commission may vote on the deal as early as June 19.

Access to open space

<p>Parkland varies in abundance throughout The City.

District 6 (Tenderloin, SoMa, South Beach, Mission Bay, Rincon Hill, Treasure Island): 0.6 acres per resident

District 2 (Presidio, Marina, Cow Hollow, Pacific Heights, parts of Russian Hill): 26 acres per resident

Correction: This story was updated June 9 to correct the amount of parkland available per resident in District 6.



SAN FRANCISCO ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COMMUNITIES MAP: TECHNICAL DOCUMENTATION

Background

California Senate Bill 1000 (“SB 1000”) requires jurisdictions that have Disadvantaged Communities (DACs)¹ to incorporate environmental justice into their general plans upon the next revision to two or more elements. SB 1000 cites CalEnviroScreen, a statewide mapping tool from California Protection Agency (CalEPA) and Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA), to identify DACs. Using 20 pollution, health, and socioeconomic indicators, CalEnviroScreen identifies the top 25% of census tracts in the state as DACs. DACs are used to administer grant funding from the State’s Cap-and-Trade Program, prioritize toxic site cleanup, and promote sustainable economic development. In San Francisco, portions of Bayview Hunters Point, SoMa, Treasure Island, and Tenderloin are identified as DACs. A common critique of CalEnviroScreen among San Francisco environmental justice advocates and City agencies is that several other neighborhoods with health and environmental challenges do not meet the criteria to be considered disadvantaged.

In compliance with SB 1000 and guidance from the Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR), the San Francisco Planning Department (“Department”) chose to conduct additional analysis to better understand environmental justice in San Francisco. Municipalities are encouraged to define additional areas facing environmental and health challenges in their jurisdiction that should be considered as part of General Plan policies to address environmental justice.²

The Department has developed the Environmental Justice Communities Map (“EJ Communities Map”) to identify areas in the City that face disproportionate burden of environmental health challenges, informed by state and local data. The EJ Communities Map is included in the [Environmental Justice Framework](#) (“EJ Framework”), a set of visions and priorities to ensure all residents and workers live in and enjoy healthy, clean

¹ Disadvantaged Communities” means an area defined by the California Environmental Protection Agency. These areas are pursuant Health and Safety Code §39711 OR areas that are low-income and disproportionately affected by environmental pollution and other hazards that can lead to negative health effects, exposure, or environmental degradation (Government Code §65302(h)(4)(A)). The statute further defines “low-income area” to mean “an area with household incomes at or below 80 percent of the statewide median income OR with household incomes at or below the threshold designated as low income by the Department of Housing and Community Development’s list of state income limits adopted pursuant to §50093” (Government Code §65302(h)(4)(C)).

² Although communities are encouraged to conduct analysis and define additional areas facing environmental and health challenges, this analysis would only apply to local policymaking. CalEnviroScreen will continue to be the official map for state policies and programs.

environments.³ The EJ Framework is meant to highlight policy priorities that can explicitly improve health in EJ Communities.

Methodology

OPR published guidelines to encourage municipalities to incorporate local data on pollution burden and health risk factors in their analysis of DACs in their own jurisdictions (Figure 1).⁴




Figure 1. OPR's Recommended Screening Process for Identifying Additional Disadvantaged Communities

Goals of San Francisco's EJ Communities Map:

The Department had several goals in developing the EJ Communities Map:

- Use local data to show additional areas that are lower-income and face high pollution and other health challenges
- Create a map that better aligns with maps by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, San Francisco Department of Public Health, San Francisco Recreation & Parks, and other local agencies
- Designate areas where policies and resources could be directed to promote community health
- Develop an analysis that could be easily replicated in the future
- Reflect community feedback on areas of high need

The Department considered over 100 data sets and indicator maps for inclusion in the EJ Communities Map. This included maps that provide an index or composite of other data, such as the Communities of Concern Map (San Francisco County Transportation Authority) and the Community Vulnerability Map (Bay Conservation and



³ The EJ Framework outlines key environmental justice priorities that City policymakers should work to address. It is a state-mandated component of the General Plan, and it includes a set of visions and priorities in strong alignment with citywide racial and social equity goals. For more information: <https://sfplanning.org/project/environmental-justice-framework-and-general-plan-policies#engagement>



⁴ General Plan Guidelines. Chapter 4: Required Elements. July 2020. Governor's Office of Planning and Research. Last accessed January 2023: https://opr.ca.gov/docs/20200706-GPG_Chapter_4_EJ.pdf

Development Commission), as well as individual datasets on related topics (e.g., housing, transportation, and climate).

After thorough review of data applicability, the Department used the following data sets for the EJ Communities Map:

Table 1. EJ Communities Map Datasets & Weights

Dataset and Weight (see “Raster Analysis & Symbology” for more)	Indicator(s)
<p>CalEnviroScreen 4.0 – 60% Source: CalEPA, OEHHA</p> 	<p>Pollution exposure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ozone • PM2.5 • Diesel particulate matter • Pesticide use • Toxic release from facilities • Cleanup sites • Hazardous waste generators and facilities • Solid waste sites and facilities • Drinking water contaminants • Traffic density <p>Population characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educational attainment • Linguistic isolation • Poverty • Unemployment • Housing burdened low-income household • Asthma • Cardiovascular disease • Low birthweight infants
<p>State Housing Income Limits: median household income – 10% Source: CA HCD</p> 	<p>Median HH income below \$69,600 (San Francisco threshold for very low-income, two-person household)</p>

<p>Areas of Vulnerability (AOV) – 10% Source: SF DPH</p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poverty • Persons of color • Youth • Seniors • Unemployment • High school or less • Limited English proficiency persons • Linguistically isolated households • Disability
<p>Air Pollution Exposure Zone (APEZ) – 20% SFDPH, SF Planning</p> 	<p>Data included: PM2.5 concentrations greater than 10µg/m3 (including ambient levels)</p>

Raster Analysis & Symbolology

The EJ Communities Map was developed by conducting a raster analysis in ArcGIS that combined multiple layers of data into a final raster map. A raster analysis is a type of spatial and quantitative analysis that places two or more thematic maps on top of one another to form a new map.

In a raster analysis, geographic areas are broken up into individual cells or pixels, and each cell is assigned a numerical value. For the EJ Communities Map, these values are computed as a weighted average of the underlying datasets, as indicated in Table 1. For instance, CalEnviroScreen 4.0 is the most heavily weighted dataset at 60%. (Or put another way, 60% of the final map is a result of this dataset.)

To display the final map, the Department grouped the raster analysis results into categories and assigned a color ramp that was modeled on CalEnviroScreen 4.0 (with green indicating the lowest cumulative environmental burden, and red indicating the highest environmental burden). The final symbology of the map reflects 30 classes, grouped into seven categories, arranged from least to highest cumulative environmental burden (Figure 2).



Figure 2. EJ Communities Map Legend

The colors used for symbolizing the values are meant to be very similar with the colors used in CalEnviroScreen 4.0 to identify the tracts with the lowest scores (green and yellow colors) and highest scores (orange and red colors) of environmental burden. The values between 21 and 30 represent the top 30% of burdened areas and are deemed Environmental Justice Communities. In other words, these are the areas with the highest cumulative environmental burdens. These areas are symbolized with the red color.

The value 999 represents the major parks and industrial areas in San Francisco. This is Golden Gate Park, Lincoln Park, McLaren Park, and the industrial area around Islais Creek. These areas are symbolized with the grey color.

Please note that there is missing data for the census tract around Islais Creek. The statewide data set, CalEnviroScreen 4.0, excludes this tract, due to the small population size, even though the area is known to contain multiple sources of pollution (which is also reflected in CalEnviroScreen’s underlying datasets). Therefore, the Department decided to symbolize this area with a red and grey hatching pattern to reflect the high environmental burdens in this area.

- Dark Green (least environmental burden): 0, 1, 2, 3
- Medium Green: 4, 5, 6, 7
- Green: 8, 9, 10
- Light Green: 11, 12, 13
- Yellow: 14, 15, 16
- Orange: 17, 18, 19, 20
- Red (top 30% of environmental burden): 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30

Feedback

The draft EJ Communities Map was released in December 2020. The map received public feedback for refinement throughout the community engagement process. Overall, the public feedback was positive on the draft map, and it also received positive reception from other City agencies. In particular, the Environmental Justice Working Group appreciated the opportunity to think collectively about neighborhoods that are facing various health and economic challenges.⁵

⁵ The Environmental Justice Working Group is a group of community and City government leaders who collaborated to co-create policy recommendations for the EJ Framework, identify community needs and assets, and provide feedback on specific needs for its implementation. The Working Group met on a monthly basis from June to January 2022. The Working Group developed a list of policy recommendations for the City to consider as part of the EJ Framework. For more information: <https://sfplanning.org/project/environmental-justice-framework-and-general-plan-policies#engagement>

Final Environmental Justice Communities Map




Figure 3. Environmental Justice Communities Map

Source: SF Planning, 2023

The Environmental Justice Communities Map (Figure 3) identifies the top 30% of areas experiencing environmental burden in San Francisco. These Environmental Justice Communities include the Mission, Potrero Hill, Excelsior, Outer Mission, Oceanview-Merced Heights-Ingleside, Chinatown, SoMa, Japantown, Western Addition, Bayview Hunter's Point, Visitacion Valley, Treasure Island, and the Tenderloin. Environmental Justice Communities are often low-income communities and communities of color. As environmental justice is defined by remedying past harms and enabling community-led solutions,⁶ it is important to focus policies and resources to these communities, which are often overlooked in local decision-making processes.

⁶ For the purposes of the EJ Framework, the City defines environmental justice as follows: Environmental Justice is the equitable distribution of environmental benefits and elimination of environmental burdens to promote healthy communities where everyone in San Francisco can thrive. Government should foster environmental justice through processes that address, mitigate, and amend past injustices while enabling proactive, community-led solutions for the future.

The Department has also prepared versions of the map that are more visualized and for presentation purposes (Appendix A).

Next Steps and Future Applications

As the map methodology was designed with easy replicability in mind, the map can be updated whenever any of the four data sets is updated. In practice, the most logical opportunity to update the map would be whenever CalEnviroScreen is updated, which has generally occurred every 2-5 years.

Additionally, the Department created an interactive ArcGIS StoryMap (Data Portal) that allows users to explore other data relevant to environmental justice, such as housing, transportation, climate, public services, etc. The Data Portal also includes excerpts from interviews with residents and workers in EJ Communities.

The primary function of the EJ Communities Map is to guide the San Francisco General Plan. EJ Communities are referenced within General Plan policies, including the Safety & Resilience Element (adopted 2022) and the Housing Element (anticipated adoption 2023). However, the map may be used by a range of City agencies and partners to support programs and policies that can advance environmental justice and equity. For instance:

- The Department is using the map for other processes, including the Budget Equity Assessment Tool, Racial & Social Equity Plan, and the Environmental Justice Analysis of the Housing Element 2022 Update.
- The Department is coordinating with other City agencies who are interested in using the map for similar mapping efforts and programs, including the Equity Zones (Recreation and Parks), Green Infrastructure Grant Program (Public Utilities Commission), Waterfront Resilience Program (SF Port) and others.

Areas of Vulnerability, 2016



Based on [Areas of Vulnerability, 2016](#)

These geographic designations were created to define geographic areas within San Francisco that have a higher density of vulnerable populations. These geographic designations will be used for the Health Care Services Master Plan and DPH's Community Health Needs Assessment.


aov_fin - 1 = YES

aov_fin - 0 = NO

AOV's were defined using 2012-2016 ACS data at the census tract level and the following criteria:

- 1) Top 1/3rd for < 200% poverty or < 400% poverty & top 1/3rd for persons of color OR
 - 2) Top 1/3rd for < 200% poverty or < 400% poverty & top 1/3rd for youth or seniors (65+) OR
 - 3) Top 1/3rd for < 200% poverty or < 400% poverty & top 1/3rd for 2 other categories (unemployment, high school or less, limited English proficiency persons, linguistically isolated households, or disability)
- Tracts that had unstable data for an indicator were automatically given zero credit for that indicator. That is why two language variables are included in the bonus group, because there tend to be a high number of tracts with unstable data for language variables.


[More Views](#) [Export](#) [Discuss](#) [Embed](#) [About](#)



Map data ©2023 Google [Terms of Use](#) [Report a map error](#)

Introduction Form

(by a Member of the Board of Supervisors or the Mayor)



I hereby submit the following item for introduction (select only one):

- ☐ 1. For reference to Committee (Ordinance, Resolution, Motion or Charter Amendment)
- ☒ 2. Request for next printed agenda (For Adoption Without Committee Reference)
(Routine, non-controversial and/or commendatory matters only)
- ☐ 3. Request for Hearing on a subject matter at Committee
- ☐ 4. Request for Letter beginning with "Supervisor [] inquires..."
- ☐ 5. City Attorney Request
- ☐ 6. Call File No. [] from Committee.
- ☐ 7. Budget and Legislative Analyst Request (attached written Motion)
- ☐ 8. Substitute Legislation File No. []
- ☐ 9. Reactivate File No. []
- ☐ 10. Topic submitted for Mayoral Appearance before the Board on []

The proposed legislation should be forwarded to the following (please check all appropriate boxes):

- ☐ Small Business Commission ☐ Youth Commission ☐ Ethics Commission
☐ Planning Commission ☐ Building Inspection Commission ☐ Human Resources Department

General Plan Referral sent to the Planning Department (proposed legislation subject to Charter 4.105 & Admin 2A.53):

- ☐ Yes ☐ No

(Note: For Imperative Agenda items (a Resolution not on the printed agenda), use the Imperative Agenda Form.)

Sponsor(s):

Supervisor Peskin

Subject:

[Urging the Recreation and Parks Department to Adopt Immediate Changes to its Acquisition Strategies to serve the Tenderloin, Lower Polk and Lower Nob Hill neighborhoods]

Long Title or text listed:

Resolution urging the Recreation and Parks Department and its Commission to immediately adopt flexible criteria for its acquisition of potential open space and green recreation, parklet and pocket park sites in the Tenderloin, Lower Polk and Lower Nob Hill, including prioritizing smaller parcels of 2,000 square feet to 5,000 square feet, that would not require years of demolition and construction, but rather think strategically about a holistic approach that maximizes more parcels if they must be necessarily smaller by design, and urging them to make considerable progress by the end of this calendar year on the voter-mandated equity priorities in its Open Space Acquisition plan.

Signature of Sponsoring Supervisor:

