

Patrick Monette-Shaw

975 Sutter Street, Apt. 6
San Francisco, CA 94109

September 13, 2025

Ed Harrington, Chair
Commission Streamlining Task Force
c/o City Administrator's Office
City Hall, Room 316
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4694

“ Claiming San Franciscans can interact with the Parks Department through their local gardener or recreation center staff is not a valid reason to eliminate PROSAC! ”

Re: **Recreation and Parks Commission and PROSAC
(Open Spaces Committee)**

Dear Mr. Harrington and Commission Streamlining Task Force Members,

Don't eliminate or combine PROSAC.

The City Administrator's "*staff discussion*" recommendation to the Streamlining Task Forces claims that the "*Parks, Recreation and Open Spaces Committee*" (PROSAC) provides written comments to the Parks Department on the Department's proposed plans (strategic, capital, operational), provides input on departmental acquisitions, conducts two public hearings related to the budget, liaises between the Recreation and Park Commission and residents, and reports quarterly to the Recreation and Park Commission on issues heard at PROSAC. City Administrator staff assert the two bodies reportedly overlap substantially in terms of topics that they review (according to the Streamlining Task Force), but they play different roles — with PROSAC providing initial community "*advisory*" input and feedback, and the Recreation and Park Commission acting as the Department's governing body.

Staff advising the Streamlining Task Force assert advisory committees should bring outside expertise that would otherwise be missing from government, **or create pathways** for public involvement on an issue.

City Administrator staff assert Rec and Park has numerous **pathways** for the public to get involved in departmental decision-making, with the department conducting extensive engagement around all capital projects and holds two or three public budget meetings for San Francisco residents to weigh in on department priorities before the budget goes to the Recreation and Park Commission.

City Administrator staff also claim that because Rec and Park is also a field organization with over 1,000 employees working in parks, playgrounds, and open spaces throughout San Francisco, and its employees interact with residents each and every day listening to feedback and implementing changes and improvements on the spot, perhaps PROSAC can be eliminated or combined with the larger Parks Commission.

“ PROSAC costs just \$25,110 annually '0.000157925% of the \$15.9 billion City Budget. (Sixteen hundred-thousandths of one percent!) The \$25,110 are 'soft costs' of part-time staff who will keep their jobs on other tasks. Eliminating or combining PROSAC won't save one red cent! ”

Staff assert that because San Franciscans interact with the Parks Department through their local gardener, recreation center staff, or maintenance worker, and by contrast there are typically few, or no, public comments raised during PROSAC meetings, perhaps it would be OK to eliminate or combine PROSAC with the larger Parks Commission.

The BLA report acknowledges PROSAC costs just \$25,110 annually — all of which are "*soft costs*" of part-time Park Department staff who will still keep their jobs performing other duties, which won't save the City another red cent according to the BLA costs analysis. That \$25,110 is laughably small, 0.000157925% of the \$15.9 billion City Budget. That's **sixteen hundred-thousandths of one percent!** It's also chump change in the scheme of things. This isn't just sheer nonsense; it's plainly completely bonkers to eliminate PROSAC.

Eliminating or combining PROSAC won't result in actual "*hard cost*" savings for the City, according to the BLA cost analysis report, precisely because it doesn't rely on any full-time staff "*hard costs*."

September 13, 2025

Recreation and Parks Commission and PROSAC (Open Spaces Committee)

Page 2

My former *Westside Observer* columnist, Nancy Wuerfel, who worked so hard advocating for PROSAC, must be rolling over in her grave in a fit of laughter in the great beyond! Is this what the “*Prop. D*” Astroturf backers though would bring “*efficiency*” to City governance?

Are the five members of this Streamlining Task Force that hell bent on saving the City a mere \$25K as part of their legacy?

Finally, the larger Rec and Park Commission has traditionally nominated candidates for General Manager (GM) of the Recreation and Park Department to the Mayor, and may remove the GM by the Commission’s own initiative. That’s recommended to also be changed to a “*consultative responsibilities*” role only. Again, City Administrator staff supporting the Streamlining Task Force has also recommended the Task Force forcibly “*align*” the Rec and Park Commission to the largely inflexible “*governance template*” to change Park Commission members from can only be removed “*for cause*,” to allowing Commissioner removal by the Mayor “*at will*.”

Don’t eliminate or combine PROSAC. Leave it as the fine community advisory body that it is!

Sincerely,

/s/

Patrick Monette-Shaw

cc: Rachel Alonso, Project Director, City Administrator’s Office