

## **Esprit Park Community Advisory Group (ECAG) General Meeting**

**Donated UCSF Office Space - 654 Minnesota Street, Tivoli Room**

May 22, 2019, 6:30pm-8:30pm

### **Attendees:**

#### **ECAG Member Community Representatives for 2925 community residents, \$7.7MM raised**

1. 701 Minnesota HOA -Sasha Basso
2. Homes on Esprit HOA- Gaynor Strachan Chun
3. Dogpatch Neighborhood Association -Jared Doumani
4. UCSF Dogpatch Community Task Force (DCTF), 20 yr resident - Susan Fitch
5. La Scuola International School - Nataly Gattego
6. Potrero Boosters Neighborhood Association - Denis Mauer
7. Toes and Paws for Green Space Linda James
8. DCTF, EN CAC, UCSF Community Advisory Group (CAG) - Irma Lewis;
9. GBD Board member and capital funding lead for Woods Yard Children's Playground - Alison Sullivan

**SF Planning Department-** Robin Abad

**Fletcher Studio** - David Fletcher, Cory Hallam and Andrew Prindle

**SF Rec and Parks Dept. (SFRD)** - LaMonté Bishop, Steve Cismowski , Nathan Tinclair, Alexis Ward, Toks Ajike

**UCSF Government and Community Relations** : Christine Gasparac, Leah Pimental

**Green Benefit District (GBD):** Julie Christensen

**Community Guests and Public Commenters:** Frank Kingman (Friends of Esprit Park), Rhonda Kingman (FOEP), Rob Thomas, Cheryl Thomas, Thomas Ryan, Gale Waturnan, Nicola Kucikov, Ali Nufiane, Keith Owen, Jordan Factor, Teresa Fok, Robin Evans, Lol Halsey, JR Eppler (Potrero Boosters), Greg Kat, Emily Neuman, Diana Yee, Agatha Kiekczewski, Cici Zhou, Jude Dekenbach (Friends of Jackson Park), Stefen Fenz, Jeffrey Cuppola

### **Absent ECAG members:**

Long term resident, member at large- Patrick Hoctel; Friends of Potrero Preschool - Monica Leight; Avalon Dogpatch - Tracy Ravenscraft; long term resident, member at large - George Slack

**Meeting facilitator:** Shared community engagement & RPD city wide initiatives - Southern California based design facilitator- Steve Rasmussen Cancian

### **Discussion:**

#### **Project Vision Statement**

- Vision of Esprit Renovation funded in Spring 2017 - The Vision readout from 2017 was refined into a Vision Statement by ECAG members Gaynor Chun and Nattaly Gattego, in collaboration with A. Ward.

**Decision:** Approved

#### **Funder Update- Christine Gasparac, UCSF Government and Community Relations**

- C. Gasparac noted there will be a quarterly financial review of the renovation project. **Action:** none

#### **Project Schedule - A. Ward**

- Walked group through the high level calendar leading up to the RPD Commission meeting. **Action:** None

## **RPD View of Project Delivery, Roles and Responsibilities - Toks Ajike**

1. T. Ajike asked ECAG to trust RPD, given RPD's project delivery experience.
  1. **Decision:** No agreement voiced by any ECAG member
2. RPD will be going out to hear from the hundreds of residents who can't make the ECAG meetings. T. Ajike was unable to identify the pool of targeted residents. ECAG members explained that they were chosen specifically to peer represent the thousands of people who cannot make the meetings
  1. **Action:** No next step articulated by T. Ajike
3. RPD plans to fully deplete \$35K UCSF community engagement allocation by August 2019, after one more community meeting and presentation to Rec and Park Commission, disband ECAG, and cease community engagement. ECAG member noted this deviates from the RPD precedent set with the recent SouthPark public/private renovation. CAG in place during construction viewed as best practice because it provides the design team with community input during construction change orders and cost escalation tradeoffs.
  1. **Action:** T. Ajike agreed to reconsider plans disband ECAG/community engagement before construction, after an
4. C. Gasparac noted that UCSF has a role in decision-making vis-a-vis funder agreements such as maintenance set asides, and going forward will have a staff representative at all remaining meetings to help capture and work issues that need their input.
  1. **Action:** UCSF will ensure an appropriate staff member is in attendance at all future meetings to speak for and address any UCSF funder specific issues.

## **ECAG Community Position Presentation: Sasha Basso**

1. Speaking for the ECAG working team (13 of 14 active ECAG members), S. Basso presented how neighbors currently use the park, and the impact to usage of inserting an acre of plastic. She delivered the community ask for keeping Esprit as a multi use park, with RPD maintained, multi use Duboce Park as the community's target comparable. The community requests that RPD, a taxpayer funded city agency, not exacerbate the negative, pollution related health outcomes already being suffered by Dogpatch residents. Sourced research was presented on the health impacts and costs associated with replacing an acre of grass with plastic, in a 1.8 acre park.
2. J. Doumani walked through project budget, highlighting areas of concern for ECAG members regarding fiscal responsibility.
  1. **Action:** D10 Supervisor Walton committed to S. Basso and J. Doumani to convene a meeting to address ECAG concerns regarding RPD project management and budget decisions
  2. **Decision:** ECAG members present voted unanimously, 9-0, to oppose the use of artificial turf in Esprit Park. ECAG members who worked on and approved the presentation but unable to attend the meeting brought the vote to 13/0.

## **Public comment:**

For over 20 minutes, 15+ members of the public each commented on what Esprit Park means to them - ranging from factoring into their home purchase decision to bonding with family, pets and friends. They also detailed reasons why they oppose plastic grass for their families due to its impracticality for picnics, children's play, and contributing to poor air quality and poor health outcomes. The public also expressed their expectation of being able to continued use of an existing public, taxpayer funded public benefit in the inclusive way it's currently enjoyed.

**Decision:** Public comment from local community members was 100% against installation of plastic grass/artificial turf.

## **Review of Design Alternatives**

1. ECAG members and guests broke into three groups to review the two proposed alternative designs of the park. Members then came back together and shared brief reports. **Decision:** All groups rejected the two design options. The absence of natural grass and the over activation/segmentation of the park dominant reasons for 100% rejection.

## **Next Steps**

1. RPD would like the next step to be a community meeting, presenting RPD's vision for the renovation, and not incorporate ECAG feedback. **Action:** On behalf of RPD, S. Cacia committed that any community meeting would be scheduled after Supervisor Walton's meeting with he and his staff, ECAG and RPD senior management.
2. C. Gasparac agreed that all 21 community guests would be invited to the UCSF reception for the cushioning projects. ECAG members noted possible list serve issues, since many neighbors/stakeholders have not received an invitation for a community celebration. **Next step:** RPD to ensure community members attending the ECAG meeting will receive invitations, using email addresses collected as part of public sign in.