



SAN FRANCISCO PARK, RECREATION AND COMMUNITY OPPORTUNITY FUND TASKFORCE COMMITTEE



McLAREN LODGE, GOLDEN GATE PARK, 501 STANYAN STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94117
Tel: 415-831-2708 Fax: 415-831-2096

Community Opportunity Fund Task Force
Wednesday, April 8th, 2009

6:30 – 8:30 pm

City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Rm 421
San Francisco, CA

MEETING #4: Grantmaking Best Practices Minutes

Members Present: Julie Christensen, Meghan Tiernan, Craig Dawson, Sheila Kolenc, Linda Shaffer, Jacob Gilchrist, Meredith Thomas, Kiersten Krehbiel, Catherine Spaulding, Jeanne McKinney

Members Absent: Meredith Thomas, Chris Boettcher

Facilitator: Dawn Kamalanathan

I. Introduction

Ms. Dawn Kamalanathan outlined the agenda for the evening. There was a transcription of the minutes from the last meeting, minutes are to be reviewed at the next meeting.

II. Discussion: Program Goal/Purpose statement

Ms. Kamalanathan had asked members to think about two main things in the last meeting: 1) a program goal statement and 2) the structure of the program. Possible program goals discussed were:

- Ms. Meghan Tiernan: Strengthening community identity and values
- Mr. Craig Dawson: Sustainable improvements, designing smarter
- Ms. Julie Christensen: Address the structure of maintenance at RPD – it leaves huge gaps; create projects that include a sense of place, beautification, improve use so that more people may use the park, social improvement, saves money, incorporates art, provides education
- Ms. Kiersten Krehbiel: Activating parks through leveraging foundation support and resources
- Mr. Jacob Gilchrist: Include in the goals that proposals are coming from the community

III. Discussion: Program Structure – Skeleton Proposal

Ms. Kamalanathan brought up some issues that had been raised at the last meeting: the interest in having both small and larger projects, balancing administrative costs, and allowing different kinds of partnerships. She noted that you have 2 ways of allocating funds through the COF. One way is by job order contracting - used for small and simple projects, for grants up to \$200,000 (or less). It uses a menu, is simple, standardized, quick, volunteers can easily participate, and has low administrative costs.

She calls the second way “large leverages” for larger scale projects – those requiring \$200,000 - \$500,000 funding. The large leverages would have greater overhead costs, longer time commitment, more complicated application process, and a higher threshold for participation.

A discussion followed in response. Mr. Gilcrest, speaking from his experience as a landscape architect, felt that even for things as small as a bench or drinking fountain, needed oversight and some level of design.

Ms. Kolenc was concerned that using a menu would have the effect of all parks looking the same. Ms. Krehbiel thought there could be a "blended option".

There was a discussion about the difference between capital projects and maintenance projects. Ms. Kamalanathan stated that fixing things that are broken is maintenance, replacing things is capital. Ms. Krehbiel suggested including innovation/improvement when replacing assets. She further suggested prompting the community groups to work with the Department in developing maintenance plans. Ms. Christensen suggested that it would be good to use funds like this as the impetus for better designed things.

There was a discussion about community volunteers and gardeners. Ms. Krehbiel noted that you need a gardener, volunteer coordinator or Rec and Park staff for over 15 volunteers.

- IV. Next Meeting
The next meeting is planned for 2 weeks from today. Ms. Kamalanathan asked members to send her suggestions for some good sites visits. She was looking for a small, medium, and large site to visit.
- V. Public Comment - none
- VI. Adjournment