

SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY COMMENTS (emails based on posted Options)
03.08.2011 – 03.10.2011

Entry

Everyone wants an improved and safer entrance at Elk Street, with ideas including: traffic calming interventions along Elk, loop drop off, and sidewalk widening. Others have ideas about how to improve the entrance at Bosworth. People are divided about the presence, absence, and alignment of the Alms Road segment closest to the entry, although many people would like to keep a separate access route to the trails. Most circulation comments are linked to outdoor amenities and building locations.

- Like options 1 & 2. I like the openness, improved visibility and the terraced seating. Perhaps would suggest adding anything that would facilitate meetings, pickups/drop-offs, like a few benches or covered area.
- Winding entrance path should be in keeping with the wild character of the rest of the park -- not built up a lot -- left to grow on its own -- dirt path, NOT PAVED.
- Elk Street drop-off is needed -- safety for everyone. Also, sidewalk along Elk Street needs to be made wider for safety reasons. Slowing down the traffic.
- NO hillside tree walk -- how absurd -- we're trying to keep this place wild and rustic. This kind of thing belongs in Disney World. Also, it could be dangerous. In addition, it's extremely ugly and intrusive into the environment. If you did a hillside activities course, it would have to be where it was before -- in those trees by the Elk Street entrance -- NOT further back into the park -- and not super built up or an eye-sore.
- Hillside tree walk seems excessive and unneeded. Activity area would get more use.
- Very pro traffic calming on Elk
- It would be very bad to eliminate Ohms Road from Elk Street as you have put in option 2 and 3 for two reasons: 1. The road needs to be open for emergency vehicles to be able to get to the back of the canyon. 2. keep the road open is so that dog walkers have no excuse to be on the athletic field to get to the back of the canyon
- Not clear how people can access the park from Bosworth Street. Many of us are pushing strollers and Elk Street is too steep so we come into the park down the service road. It is not clear on your plans that you have kept that route open and safe for pedestrians. One important thing to do is to install a doggie fountain along Ohms road and just regular fountains for people in the athletic field area. That too will encourage dog owners to stay off the turf area. There also should be more night lighting along the road so the dog walkers stay off the field.
- There are five different ways to get on the field. This makes it difficult to monitor illegal use of the field. Should the stairs that come down from Bosworth access the field directly?
- I prefer the lovely sinuous trail on Op.1, but the trail on Op. 2 is nice, too. I actually like Op.2 over-all the best, so I would not sacrifice it just to get the slinky trail. If the tennis courts were a bit further up the hill, you could introduce a naturally planted area just down from the lower one, next to the path.
- like the idea of having a safer Elk entryway but prefer options with LESS pavement to options with more.
- Do not add Parking (discourage increased human use)
- No to non-native decorative plum trees or anything in a row as shown in the "Curved Park Path" photo.
- No street lamps as in "Curved Park Path" photo or otherwise. Keep it dark at night. If that's dangerous, don't go there as it's closed anyway.
- First priority: traffic calming on Elk St. is SO needed. Consider also re-paving and widening the narrow pathway on the West side of Elk St. It's pretty dangerous, and small children often walk really close to on-coming cars.

- Drop-off area is also a priority: our driveway is frequently blocked by the cars of camp or sports parents.
- Native plant garden, as shown in Option 1--BUT I would advocate installing it in a larger area than the path-side spot noted in Option 1. The currently open, weedy space along Elk St is such a missed opportunity for beautifying our neighborhood. I love the echinacea and native grasses shown in the story board photos, and could envision a larger, low-maintenance, native plant statement along Elk St.
- I like to see Olms road entrance preserved or at least peel off before the building. That way the dog/ kid, etc traffic can bypass the "formal" paved entrance. Otherwise there will be tons of mud in that area. Not sure how that works with the tennis courts.
- Widening the sidewalk on Elk is a priority, so is traffic calming on Elk
- I like the idea of the pull out for drop off, it must separated from the ped entrance. Not sure how it'll work with all the camp, and soccer traffic. Parents will no longer park and walk their kids into the park, Elk will back-up, creating a drop-off pick-up problem similar to the problems around schools. I live close to the park and the parking is really crazy at pick-up time. You probably haven't seen the camp pick up -- it's a mess. It's great to have the kids in the park but getting them to and fro can be problematic.
- The Sussex tree walk sounds fun!
- I think the loop is the best option. The speed at which cars travel down the hill really requires at least a lane to pull off out of traffic.
- What changes are being made to the Bosworth entrance? I see no details on that. The Bosworth St dead end was paved for the first time in at least 20 years, this year and the portion of the street after the gate in the park seems a bit precarious. Access for strollers and bikes needs to be accommodated.
- I am not sure if Ohms road is used or not. I know that fire engines and emergency vehicles tend to come down the Bosworth street entrance. Certainly Ohms road is a more level road and easier to maneuver in the wet weather, I do remember a fire engine getting stuck going in on the Bosworth way as it went back uphill towards Ohms road.
- Traffic calming and better drop-off locations on Elk is key.
- Improving the entrance to the park and the rec center in terms of lighting and space is definitely needed. I never even realized that path by the tennis courts was supposed to be the main entrance right now.
- Improving the stairs into the park behind the baseball fields on Bosworth, which are currently extremely steep and sketchy to walk on, would be a helpful addition that I don't see mentioned in any of the options.
- I prefer Option 1 with tennis courts in Option 2. Option 1 with drop off and baseball field orientation is my preference. West entrance at rec center needs redesign, i.e. with wetland of Option 2.
- Native Gardens: native gardens are not child-friendly and are unattractive for 8-9 months of the year. A better use of this space would be a well-designed organic-only Community Garden, perhaps with raised beds. It should be wheel-chair accessible so seniors who have limited mobility could participate. Some part of it could be used for pre-schoolers to grow organic vegetables and flowers.
- The hillside tree walk seems to be similar to an overpass. Most of these tend to be unused and therefore a magnet for graffiti and other unsavory activities.
- Eliminating Ohms Rd. exit on to Elk would be a great improvement—safety first.
- Ohm Road on the East side of the buildings should be maintained at its current scale but be cut below the Rec. center and redirected with a low sloped ramp connecting the single entry path when passing the tennis courts. The movement through would follow a fairly consistent arcing path from the entry past the buildings and into the canyon. In addition a secondary circulation route around the west side of the buildings should flow more easily into a walkway across the wetlands. Both routes should track through where new construction is shown.

- The group agreed that entry to the park is difficult and poorly identified. The perimeter closest to BART and or to buses is the most impenetrable. Can a new pedestrian access point be added at the intersection of Elk and Bosworth? There is little debate that the entry on Elk should be enlarged with parking and a drop-off added. The duplication of the 2 paths in option 3 is redundant and uses up valuable area adjacent to the street.
- Create safer entrances/exits into/from the park, including traffic calming on Elk.
- Include a vehicle entry drop off loop off of Elk. Consider a design that would avoid traffic backing up onto Elk.
- Enhance entry path to recreation center.
- Create a clearly marked front entrance that does not route through the playground.
- Please do not make any plans to pave Alms Road or "improve" the native features of the canyon north of the planned renovation.
- Think about reducing lighting to save energy (technology motions detector or could be dim unless needed).
- Tree Entry is very creative. I like it!
- Addressing widening sidewalk along Elk Street with naturalistic looking barricades to provide more pedestrian safety when walking to park entrance.

Outdoor Recreation Amenities:

For the most part, people seem to like the tennis courts pushed up on the hillside, as this provides better natural lighting, provides new areas for other recreational uses, and is closer to the main entrance. Mixed reviews about the tree walk – people think it's a cool idea but were mixed on whether it fits with the character of the park. Almost all people want a bigger playground with more nature play elements. People are mixed about the amphitheater – many think it is a good way to encourage congregating and socializing, and others think it is not needed or could be detrimental. People are mixed about the reorientation of ballfields.

- Likes Option 2, then 1. I like the rec center being away from the street and being 'drawn' into the park with the first two designs. The layouts are fantastic. Any additional amenities (i.e. terraced seating and picnic areas) that facilitate congregating and socializing are great!
- My husband and I have two young children ages 7 and 8 years old, and we have lived directly across the street from the Canyon for 8 years now (we are on Diamond Hts Blvd just above Arbor St). We love being near the Rec Center and Canyon and use the facilities often, as well as other nearby Rec Centers and playgrounds such as Christopher playground, Noe Valley Rec and Haas playground. We are very excited about the funding to make some improvements, and I was able to attend the last meeting at the Rec Center to see the conceptual designs. I won't overwhelm you with comments, but would like to make one suggestion about a type of amenity I didn't see on the list of options- an outdoor, multi-purpose paved area that could be used for riding tricycles, roller skating/hockey, basketball etc. These types of spaces exist at Haas playground and Noe Valley Rec, and are much used. Also, a youth-height basketball net would be wonderful, and is something not available in many other facilities but makes a big difference to kids under 10 years old. Even if they exist in the indoor gyms, those spaces are heavily programmed and hard to access.
- Terraced tennis courts seem like a nice option as long as they must be moved.
- The childrens' play area should not look or be prefab as so many of the play structures are these days.
- Terraced amphitheater isn't really needed. Sitting on the grass, if it is drained, works great for watching a game. No more concrete.
- Love the idea of slightly larger playing field area with stadium seating. Having a general field use in the middle is fantastic as well as better drainage.

- Moving tennis courts up the canyon would be a negative as the lights provide some surface for field access. I would stay with the shifted look toward the hillside.
- The Playground should be at least 15,000 square feet. It needs to accommodate 150 kids from Silver Tree as well as all the visitors from school fieldtrips and kids in the immediate neighborhood. It needs to reflect the importance of this park as a regional park that draws from all over the city. Included in the surrounding area of the playground should be a place for tetherball, four square, hopscotch and jump rope games. Kids need more aerobic exercise on top of the more sedentary things to do inside a fenced in playground. One of the most used areas of the existing park is the three picnic tables near the playground. We should have this duplicated in a "Plaza" area like we have now with benches as well. At most sites this is all inside the playground. Many people without children come and use the picnic tables and the benches. Parents also sit there and watch the soccer.
- Along Ohms Road there should be some exercise stations. Bring active recreation into the canyon.
- I like Op. 2 the best. The tennis courts will be less shaded, the old building will be fixed up and its entry will be improved. I like the hillside activity area. The smaller diamond needs a field wall to keep hit balls out of the play area. The tree walk from the Sussex entry is very nice. I like the access road from the tail end of Bosworth to the rec center in Op. 2. I can't tell where the amphitheaters are on any maps. Is Ohms Road the trail sort of item I see on Google maps that exits to Elk just above the current tennis courts?
- Twilight softball league likes the existing orientation of the fields with 2 diamonds provided drainage is resolved, eucalyptus are thinned, backstops are fixed and bleachers are added. No artificial turf.
- Member of Senior Tennis group (20 members) likes to have two courts not one because they play 8 people at a time. Surface improvements and also lighting improvements for the courts is their main priority. Shading is also an issue. Would like the phasing plan to address finding other tennis courts to use while the project is underway
- like the play area with natural features, not the cookie-cutter play area shown in option 1.

- I like the native plant garden, constructed wetland and tree walk as ways to bring the 'natural' experience closer to this more human-created end of the park. The hillside activities also look great, although I would have concerns about how these would be supervised and maintained.
- Like the natural play Area made from nature-based material sourced from the site (not lumber from the lumber yard, even if FSC)
- Like the Tree walk idea: A good way to disperse the increased foot traffic that will inevitably occur due to the improvements, A wonderful way to observe the bird life in the tree tops without disturbing the birds. As you may be aware, there are over 100 species of birds in Glen Park. ~ Designers can take a cue from reliable, nature-based bridge suspension technologies used in remote areas in developing countries. The photo with the Tree Walk caption is a typical construction solution.
- Does not like the Amphitheatre. Building an amphitheatre will engender event programs and noise. I don't feel this approach is in the best interest of preserving the unique quality of what Glen Canyon has to offer. Design to meet the needs of nature (protect and restore) and let humans appreciate nature
- No Lawns or anything that requires water maintenance.
- Like repositioned tennis courts in Options 1 & 3. Would be great to have court lights farther away from homes.
- Age appropriate play areas in playground: our young son sometimes has a tough time playing safely when older, rowdier kids come to the playground. Would be nice to age-grade the play zones and install more modern structures.

March, 2011 | The Trust for Public Land
Glen Canyon Park Improvement Plan: Conceptual Design Options Feedback Questions

- Moving the tennis courts is a brilliant idea, gets it out of the way, opens up the entrance. The hillside location seems best to me. This location may conflict with my desire for preserving Olms Road above.
- I'm torn about the ball field reorientation. I like placing the action in the main area but the "batter box" may be off putting in the park entrance. However, there will be all that new tennis court space.
- The playground in the first version seems to work best for me.
- I'm not a fan of the amphitheater.
- The reorientation of the little league fields in option 1 makes a lot of sense, as the balls are not being hit into people. and it places the spectators of the sports at the public portion of the park where the facilities (bathrooms, picnic area and play ground) are rather than at the 'back' side.
- Good lighting on the playing fields will increase use, both formal and informal (like jogs, drills, and casual workouts) and discourage drug or other illicit activity after dark.
- Since the tennis courts are being moved we should re orient them where ever they are to make the correct alignment for the sun.
- I would expect there is a number of other activities that would be used if they were at the park, such as fitness stations or volleyball.
- I see no 'space' for dogs in these options, without a large flattish area that is open for dogs to run around and chase balls the fields will be de facto dog areas. This will cause a problem to landscape and the fields will have dog droppings on them
- Orientation of the baseball infields to allow enough grass space between them to accommodate soccer, ultimate, rugby, or other full-field sports would be excellent. Improved drainage is crucial regardless of orientation -- the current very bumpy field conditions are highly conducive to falls and ankle injuries. I like the idea of seating for the playing fields.
- The idea of the natural-feature playground is really neat.
- The tree walk is cool but doesn't seem useful. My guess is it would be a drain on maintenance given that it's a high-danger feature (height, seismic sensitivity) that could be better used on the playground, buildings, fields, and walkways. Also, keeping the forest wild in the area designated for the tree walk helps create a barrier to the street and maintains the wild character of the park that's so special.
- Option 1 for baseball fields is preferred.
- Tennis court location in Option 2 is preferred. Elevate tennis courts over swale in Option 1.
- Amphitheater sounds very good for outdoor events--esp. music & circus performances.
- Tennis courts: relocating them to Ohms Rd. seems O.K.--good light & safety at night.
- Can we squeeze in a buffer of native plants between the tennis courts and the main path? The topography would also put the tennis courts on a terrace above the entry path. So that the presence of the courts would not be so evident from the path.
- Utilize natural materials in the playground i.e. wood and sand and please do NOT replace them with rubber flooring per many of the new parks throughout the City.
- Ensure that play structures are safe yet challenging for kids.
- Build upon the natural environment and create natural features for the playground i.e. the landscaped area in the current playground is a natural attraction for kids.
- Ensure that there is fencing around the natural play spaces to keep children safe.
- If the playground is expanded, ensure that there are site lines (i.e. avoid large structures where it's easy to lose site of children) such that parents and care providers can watch multiple children.
- It is also very important that when you re-build the tennis courts you install new improved lighting for night play. It has been a long time Glen Park tradition. Both soccer and tennis are played until 10 PM every night and it provides safety lighting for the area. Is there room to build an outdoor basketball court?

- The suspension span and nest-like feel the walkway in the photo in Option 2 with caption "New Silver Tree Lodge" is more imaginative and has less physical impact on the natural setting which is what is so precious and rare for a city park.
- I like the idea of removing Eucalyptus trees shading ball fields and replacing with lower growing trees. Also cutting into the slope to give more space for ball fields a plus.

Recreation Center and Silver Tree Building

While there are many perspectives about the best way to address the recreation center, most people seem to be in favor of option 2, the renovation of the existing building in the current location to augment historical structures with a modern addition. Again, while there are many different ideas about Silver Tree, most people would like to see the existing building renovated or a new building constructed in the current location. Only a few people prefer option 3 with a new building closer to Elk Street, citing reasons such as new programming potential and site layout.

- Prefers the basic code upgrades or upgrades with an expansion. I think there is character in the existing building. I'd rather see more funds be used for a variety of improvements rather than just a new center. Silver Tree seems like it really needs help. I like the idea of combining it with the center or building a new Silver Tree.
- The park is absolutely wonderful exactly as it is. My friends and I all love walking there. All of the proposed structures pictured look horrible! KEEP IT SIMPLE. No new buildings! I'd have to choose option 1.
- For the building, my preference of the options offered would be first #1 -- renovating rather than changes. My second option is #2 preserving the gym and expanding a little -- keeping it rustic. #3 is not an option as far as I'm concerned. The drawings you offered make it look like a monster from outer space -- not in keeping with the rusticity of the park. Any building and structures that are added need to be kept RUSTIC -- no monster glass and metallic structure.
- KEEP SILVERTREE -- renovate the building. Having constant traffic of camp or pre-school seems healthy there -- otherwise school gangs or others could mess up the place. Keeping Silvertree and Glenridge at this location offers an unusual experience in the forest. Moving the camp or the kids' school up to the front would take away this very special and unique experience from those using the facility. Also, too much activity would be right here in front.
- To this day people who have never been to Glen Park have to ask where is the Rec. Center building. This is one of the reasons we should have a new building built out front as in Option three. The other reason is that we need many more rooms to serve the needs of recreation. As a regional park we need a new building to reflect a full service site. The Silver Tree site and Glenridge Nursery School should remain where it is but with a new building. The front of the park would be too congested to be able to run Rec. programs and supervise all the kids involved without a conflict between Silver Tree / Glenridge competing for space with those who are in Rec. programs run out of the Rec. Center. It seems the project team is still trying to bring the back of the canyon to the front instead of spreading some of the recreation to the back.
- The gym is closed Sundays and Mondays and many people would use them on those days and during the week when the gym is used for scheduled leagues, rentals and Rec. programming.
- While the combination of SilverTree and an all new rec center building sounds good, and I suppose it is the most economically sound approach, I find the building too imposing for an entry to an open sports/play area and natural area. If the combo building seemed more graceful, perhaps I could get behind it. A more curved façade might be helpful, I think. The improved rec center with the 'L' shaped insert looks as if it would address a lot of the current building shortcomings. It would work well, and avoid an uphill conflict with preservation groups.

- SilverTree looks as if it is poorly built, and a replacement would be a blessing. Many people think of it as a day-camp, and it would lose some of that aura if it were combined with the rec center, and be less 'remote'. I don't use it and have never even walked up to it, so I am basing what I say on what I hear others say.
- Softball twilight league likes Rec Center in Option 2 (Gorgeous) and would like a new building for Silver Tree but in existing location.
- I defer to those who use the gym and Silvertree as to how those should be organized - my only request is for accessible public bathrooms, which I assume are in all 3 options
- No buildings with glass facades = energy hogs. This has been the current trend especially in natural settings but the leading green architects are not designing this way anymore due to impact on building maintenance and ongoing, ever rising energy costs. Go for "zen views." If you want to really see nature, take a walk!
- In summary: We would advocate for Option 2's rec center/camp plan + Option 1's tennis courts, playground, native garden (expanded to Elk St) & swale + the terraced seating.
- We like the expanded rec center in Option 2. It would be nice to preserve/fix the historic existing buildings, but more function is needed badly. We would prefer this over Option 3's plan for combining the rec center and silver tree near the road: this would center too much activity near the road, and would lose the forest-y feeling of the Camp's current location.
- I prefer to keep the current location of silver tree.
- I don't think the building needs to be torn down. The improvements shown option 1 or 2 are fine.
- Love the sustainable building proposed in #2 for the Camp.
- While we prefer a more traditional architectural design to help maintain GPC's historic ambience, we like Option 3 that moves Silver Tree School into the main recreation area. We understand the need to modernize facilities for accessibility and energy efficiency, but we also believe that this option will help keep the rest of Glen Park Canyon as close to its original wild state as possible.
- Combining silver tree with the rec center takes away the experience of having a non city feel to the summer camp. It is what makes it so popular, it is in a sense a free range experience for the campers. A new facility back in the canyon a ways that allowed for storage of the glenridge/silver tree equipment would be great.
- The rec building in the new location in option 3 is ideal. It places the building at the main entrance orients it to the outdoor recreation build it into the hillside leaving it with less visual impact on the site. I can understand the idea of holding onto the 2 most useful parts of our current rec building and working around those and certainly if it is cost effective why not hold onto our history and have it work with our future.
- Having the recreation center remain set back from Elk will also help keep the park looking nature-focused.
- I like Option 1 improved with glass atrium over façade on west side of theatre and between theater and gym.
- I like Option 1 for Silver Tree with improvements to minimize maintenance. Consider removing some trees to add light to area to aid in drying.
- We concur with Wesley Day and we think Silvertree Nursery should be renovated but not relocated.
- Gym should remain in current location. A modern addition would be great. Moving it closer to Elk would give emphasis to it's bulk--putting in conflict with the residential quality of the immediate neighborhood.
- The idea of demolishing either building was seen as either culturally insensitive in the case of the Rec. center or environmentally insensitive in the case of Silver Tree.
- The addition to the current foot print of the Rec. Center only exacerbates its 'blocking effect' between the playing field areas and the natural canyon areas. If there are program elements

that require expansion of the building can it be done in ways that do not make the obstruction worse?

- Silver Tree should remain where it is in the 'wildness' of the park. Its location fits its mission. To tear down an existing structure in order to build a sustainable one, just does not make any sense. Transform the existing building, bring more light in, add sustainable features. If there are major problems with the current building that no amount of remediation will address and total reconstruction is the more economical solution, then that is a different story. But to rebuild to be green does not add up.
- Transform the existing buildings. Demolish and rebuild only if necessary.
- Create bathrooms that are easily accessible from the playground with water fountains nearby (similar to the bathroom structure at Sunnyside playground).
- Create an indoor/outdoor play area for kids to play on rainy days.
- #3 because it really looks to the future by creating a bold new use for the park's recreation facilities instead of a cheap patch job. For Silver Tree, remove existing and incorporate in redesigned Rec Center.
- We are strongly in favor of Option #1. Children who have the opportunity to go to preschool in the Canyon learn that nature is a source of endless interest and excitement. Our goal is to lay the groundwork for a lifetime respect for nature. Our children learn to love and care about the Canyon by observing the parents and teachers at Glenridge. When parents and children explore nature together, children are encouraged to be sensitive to the needs of other living things. The ten-minute walk into the Silver Tree building at a steady adult pace often translates into a 20 or 30 minute walk with a three, four, or five-year old that involves many inquisitive stops along the way. This is irreplaceable and offers numerous seeds of opportunity to engage these children in not only the uniqueness of the Canyon but respect for nature as a whole. We suspect the same is true for our friends at Silver Tree. The current location of the building offers the opportunity for City children to immerse themselves in nature. We feel very strongly that any changes to the Silver Tree building protect this unique and treasured location in the Canyon (please also see Option #3 below). In addition, we feel very strongly that the footprint of the current building well serves Glenridge programming needs and it is within this framework that we are licensed. While we recommend some adjustments to the floor plan and current space designations, and the installation of a storage shed (Level B), we believe that the building itself serves our program well. We feel that Option #1 embraces and addresses these two overarching considerations (keep the building "in" the Canyon and keep the current building footprint). In Glenridge strategic planning sessions, we developed three levels of suggestions for the building that coincidentally align very closely with the intent of Option #1 (renovation of the Silver Tree building). Of these three levels, we believe that Level C maps directly to Option #1. Level A and Level B offer two additional levels of options should resources not allow for Level C. That said, we believe that all three levels of potential renovations would improve the state of the facility and therefore programming offered through Glenridge. Please find an outline of each of the three levels below.
 - **Level C:** All items listed under Levels A and B; Wholesale renovation/remodel of interior of building to better meet needs of Glenridge/Silver Tree, including bathrooms and kitchen; Extensive structural upgrades (if necessary); Complete upgrade of plumbing and mechanical systems; Complete upgrade of lighting, electrical, security, and telecommunications systems

Islais Creek and storm water management:

Almost everyone supports improved drainage on the ball fields. Opinions on the wetlands appear to be split – many think they would enhance a transition zone and environmental education opportunity, while others think wetlands are unnecessary or could even have a negative effect.

There are a few comments supporting the grassy swale in option 1 and the underground storage tank.

- The surfaced wetlands that allow for exploration are a neat idea, especially if it lends itself to affordable maintenance.
- No wetlands - mosquitoes and upkeep. Not another native plant garden -- native plants, we've learned, require poisons to keep them up. And, we already have one.
- Drainage in the fields needs to be improved. A cistern would be nice - but not if it will be yet another concrete structure - we need minimal human "structures" - drainage can be accomplished without a cistern, for example, laying pebbles which would serve as a drain and laying the turfed field over this. This will be expensive, but it will work best and have minimal visual "intrusion" into the environment.
- Having a wetland would be disastrous. The mosquito problems are already awful. Even now they get inside the Rec. Center. People get eaten alive by the mosquitoes where the current tennis courts are located. The space where you suggest building a wetland would be better for a third tennis court. I don't understand your vision of storm water management. If it takes space away for active recreation then I feel it should be placed elsewhere. Keep in mind we have only 6 acres for recreation and 60 acres for the natural area in the canyon.
- The Grassy swale for storm water in Op.1 seems quite good. I like the orientation of the ball areas that go with it. The other options are also good, but would involve a lot of pipes under the playing fields, (or not?). I like not having storm water run into the sewer, where it has to be processed with other waste water.
- I am glad you have not tried to 'day-light Islas Creek in this area. It is just not a good fit, unless the ball fields are to be abandoned.
- Likes the grass swale for storm water storage (plus other drainage fixes)
- I'm really excited about the drainage plan that includes water storage under the ball fields
- Likes Boardwalks over wetlands
- I'm not a fan of the wetland.
- I would hope the fields have proper drainage to allow play for their seasons. Limiting or eliminating the standing water, will help greatly in reducing our mosquito problem in the area.
- I prefer Option 2 with wetland and opportunity to remove sediments. Ways to improve water flow in creek and removal of sediments should be considered. Removal of part or all of Radish Hill to expose rock outcroppings.
- The "constructed wetland" also near where children will play: How will they avoid mosquitoes? Will they need to spray insecticides? Bt dunks can be used in small ponds, but will it be practical in a larger one? Also, if it has standing water that is even a foot deep, it could be a hazard given that the area is widely used by preschools and very young children.
- Improving the drainage of the fields is key to improving Glen Canyon Park.
- Safety behind the gym is a serious issue at night. People do play tennis after dark.....Making the area behind the gym a wetlands or nature garden seems much more practical.
- The idea of a wetland behind the Rec. center was received well, in that it is the best way to celebrate Islay Creek.
- Celebrate Islay Creek as extensively as possible.
- Improve field drainage so fields are useable throughout the year.
- I do not like the wetland presentation. It appears to offer a more natural aspect and continuity with the Natural Areas section of the park. However, maintenance of this wetlands would require more staffing/volunteer work to maintain a healthy "true wetlands" and keep trash and pollutants from encroaching. Consequently, a more discreet approach (underground drainage) would be preferable.

Additional comments

Other comments include wanting to keep the character of the park rustic and minimal. There are some new ideas relating to historical signage markers and natural materials.

- You guys/gals rock! Wonderful plans. Thank You!
- get youth involved in parks & the outdoors as much as possible and wonder whether it would be practical to re-establish the ropes course?
- wow. that is just unimaginable and amazing.
- The less cement and concrete, the better -- PLEASE!! NO concrete under picnic tables -- leave that area grassy -- keep the rustic picnic tables. NO concrete classroom -- they can use the picnic table area.
- Do you plan to keep the Cargo box for the gardening supplies where it is now located? Please design a place to keep garbage cans behind a wall or screen. As it is now you enter the Rec. Center and all you see in front of the building are 9 garbage cans. And many more are placed around the playground area and completely trash the look of the park. It looks like you are sitting in an alley.
- I wanted to give feedback on the posted plans. They are very nice! My favorite features are: Native plant area , Constructed Wetlands, Natural play area
Expanded play area with natural features, Ampitheater. It seems like you have lots of great ideas. I am a great fan of places for children and adults and the animals to experience natural plants whenever possible.
- Likes Native plants
- Cluster noisy activities down by the rec center.
- Improved path from BART/Bus lines
- Think restorative, not "signature landscape or architecture design by human designer X."
- we're both delighted with the 3 options and wanted to weigh in with our feedback. Really nice job addressing the concerns of the neighborhood and everyone else who utilizes this wonderful recreation spot.
- History markers. A few years ago, I researched the history of the first dynamite factory in the United States that was located in Glen Canyon, personally licensed by Alfred Nobel. Unfortunately, the article is no longer posted at the Glen Park News website but I posted it with permission at the SF history website *FoundSF.org*:
http://foundsf.org/index.php?title=Giant_Powder_Company
Also, please see the California State Historical Marker #1002:
http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/default.asp?page_id=21482 (scroll down)
Shortly after the article was published, I broke my knee and was out of service for quite a while. Therefore, there was no follow-up as to placement of a state historical marker in the canyon. It seems the renovation might be a perfect time to incorporate it. I would also move that perhaps the statement for the marker could be updated by the state to place it more in context with Alfred Nobel and the Peace Prize.
- I think this historical fact is worthy of a plaque! Can it be done? Thanks for looking into it...
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Glen_Canyon_Park
- Boundary Survey: The precise boundary of Glen Canyon Park must be determined. At issue is the encroachment of certain adjacent homeowners, and the location of the SOTA boundaries.
- Hillside Erosion: Erosion control on trails is an overblown concern. After all this is a canyon. Much of the invasive plants are due to soils at Radish Hill and SOTA that are slowly seeping into the canyon and clogging the creek. Controlled removal of sediments from the creek may well improve flow and the health of the canyon. Perhaps the wetland of option 2. Removal of dirt from Radish Hill should be considered.
- Social Trails: Social trails exist for a reason. Attempts to close social trails with steel stake and wire mesh fencing has no place in a park. Also, the plant flags that are made of metal wire and plastic square sheets should be banned. The flags are not always removed and litter the park with plastic and dangerous rusting wire segments that can injure animals.
- Sustainability: Bond monies are taken from the future and must be repaid with interest.

Therefore, capital improvements must have longevity and minimize future maintenance costs. This is an important consideration for taxpayers. Trails must be left alone or designed to minimize maintenance, even when maintenance is accomplished by users.

- Materials: use high-end materials make them as natural-looking as possible. No concrete should be visible. Where paths must be paved, for instance for wheelchair access, cobblestone or slate or other stone should be used rather than tacky concrete ones. Any retaining walls should give the appearance of dry-stacked stone. This may be more labor intensive to design and install, but will pay off in visual beauty and preserve the wonderful natural look we treasure in the canyon. The amphitheater similarly should be built of stone rather than concrete.
- Every effort should be made to save trees and ground cover to maintain the Natural feeling of the park.
- Dogs: Some "on leash" dog walking trails behind the playing fields, gym & tennis courts--- would be very practical. If adequate dog walking area is provided behind the general sports area, there would be no need to intrude in front.
- Connect to the upper canyon in the most open and direct ways possible. Integrate as much of the character of the natural area of the canyon down into the ball fields area.
- I expect Design #3 to be the most costly. However, as was said at the outset of these meetings, the current rec center plans were begun approximately 80 years ago. We need to implement a plan that will serve the city for at least that many years into the future. This is our opportunity to build for the future. I welcome the challenge!