

**Comments on Recreation and Open Space Element (ROSE) Revised Draft, June 2011  
Request for Continuance**

The Draft Implementation Plan for the ROSE contains fairly detailed actions for nearly every policy in the revised draft ROSE *except* Policy 1.7, the policy to “preserve existing open space by restricting conversion to other uses and limiting encroachments from other uses.”

**There is no implementation plan to preserve existing open space** even in the Measures for Future Consideration. The only mention of Policy 1.7 under Future Consideration is in a section on parklets. The ROSE and its Implementation Plan *must* outline how San Francisco will preserve existing space. Without that, it is incomplete and should be considered for approval.

These inconsistencies with state guidelines, state code, and other elements of the General Plan must be resolved before the Planning Commission can even consider the revised draft ROSE. A continuance is necessary to fully address these inconsistencies for San Francisco’s new ROSE.

**In addition to not following state guidelines, the CSFN Open Space Committee has identified additional deficiencies with the revised draft ROSE:**

- The maps included in the revised draft ROSE do not show all existing open space. For example, the open space surrounding Laguna Honda Hospital is not shown in Map 01. A comprehensive (and better) inventory of existing open space must be included as part of the ROSE. If we don’t know what we have now, how can we plan for the future?
- The maps do not adequately reflect areas identified for future growth in the Housing Element, e.g., along transit corridors. The increasing need for open space in those areas as their populations increase is not addressed. The ROSE must be consistent with all other Elements and coordinate the needs for acquiring open space.
- The revised draft ROSE makes *no* mention of the Open Space Fund, a set-aside fund that has existed for over 40 years to purchase open space. How does the Open Space Fund fit into the ROSE? This must be clarified.
- Policy 2.1 in the current ROSE states: “where new recreation and cultural buildings are needed they should be located outside of existing parks and playgrounds. When new indoor facilities are needed, the City should allocate funds for land acquisition as well as for construction.” The revised draft ROSE allows new buildings on existing open space. This radical change in philosophy has not been adequately vetted by the public, and, until it is the revised draft ROSE cannot be considered for approval.

These are just a few of our concerns, which must be addressed by a wider public than has been involved up to this time. San Francisco is under no deadline to revise the ROSE. There is time to get it right. The ROSE will govern the future of our open space and thus be one of the decisive factors in molding how our city will look in future years and the quality of life for its residents. Therefore, we request continuance of at least 90 days and the participation of a broader spectrum of the public in the crafting and final decision-making regarding this vital policy document.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

—  
Judith Berkowitz  
President

Nancy Wuerfel, Chair  
CSFN Open Space Committee