

Citizens Advisory Committee of the
Eastern Neighborhoods Plan,
City and County of San Francisco



**Notice of Meeting
&
Agenda**

1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor, Room 431
Monday, July 18, 2016

**Monitoring Report Working Group
5:30 PM**

**Full Citizen Advisory Committee
6:15 PM**

Chris Block
Walker Bass
Chirag Bhakta
Joe Boss
Don Bragg
Marcia Contreras

John Elberling
Keith Goldstein
Oscar Grande
Bruce Kin Huie
Henry Karnilowitz
Toby Levy

Robert Lopez
Fernando Martí
Dan Murphy
Kristian Ongoco
Abbie Wertheim

The Agenda is available at the Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, 4th floor and, on our website at encac.sfplanning.org, and at the meeting.

Five-Year Monitoring Report Working Group – 5:30

1. Five-Year Monitoring Report – Open Discussion / Questions and Answers with Community Members.

Full EN CAC – 6:15

1. Announcements and Review of Agenda.
2. Review and Approve Minutes from the June 20, 2016 CAC Meeting.
3. Eastern Neighborhoods Five-Year Monitoring Report.
 - a. Report on Comments and Requests Submitted and Planning Department Responses;
 - b. Further Discussion on Monitoring Report;
 - c. Discussion of CAC's Official Response.
4. CAC Membership. Discussion lead by CAC Chair on the status of CAC Membership.
5. Public Comment: At this time, members of the public may address the Citizens Advisory Committee on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee but do not appear on the agenda. With respect to agenda items, the public will be given an opportunity to address the Committee when the item is reached in the meeting. Each member of the public may address the Committee for up to three minutes.

The Brown Act forbids a Committee from taking action or discussing any item not appearing on the posted agenda, including those items raised at Public Comment. In response to public comment on an item that is not on the agenda, the Committee is limited to:

- Briefly responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public, or
- Requesting staff to report back on the matter at a subsequent meeting, or
- Directing staff to place the item on a future agenda. (Government Code Section 54954.2(a).)

Cell Phone and/or Sound-Producing Electronic Devices Usage at Hearings

Effective January 21, 2001, the Board of Supervisors amended the Sunshine Ordinance by adding the following provision: The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices (*67A.1 Prohibiting the use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices at and during public meetings*).

San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance

Attention: Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 21.00-2.160] to register and report

lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 581-2300; fax (415) 581-2317; and web site <http://www.sfgov.org/ethics>.

Accessible Meeting Policy

Hearings are held at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission St., Room 431, fourth floor, San Francisco, CA. The closest accessible BART station is the Van Ness Avenue station located at the intersection of Market Street and Van Ness Avenue. Accessible curbside parking has been designated at points along Mission Street. Accessible MUNI lines serving the Planning Department are the 14 Mission, 26 Valencia, 47 Van Ness, 49 Van Ness/Mission, and the F Line. Accessible MUNI Metro lines are the J, K, L, M, and N. For more information regarding MUNI accessible services, call (415) 923-6142.

Disability Accommodations: To request assistive listening devices, real time captioning, sign language interpreters, readers, large print agendas or other accommodations, please contact the Department's ADA Coordinator, Candace SooHoo, at (415) 575-9157 or candace.sooHoo@sfgov.org at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to help ensure availability. Accessible seating for persons with disabilities (including those using wheelchairs) will be available at meetings.

Language Assistance: To request an interpreter, please contact the Candace SooHoo, at (415) 575-9157, or candace.sooHoo@sfgov.org at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

SPANISH

Si desea asistir a la audiencia, y quisiera obtener información en Español o solicitar un aparato para asistencia auditiva, llame al (415) 575-9010. Por favor llame por lo menos 72 horas de anticipación a la audiencia.

CHINESE

聽會上如需要語言協助或要求輔助設備，請致電(415) 575-9010。請在聽證會舉行之前的至少72個小時提出要求。

FILIPINO

Para sa tulong sa lengguwahe o para humiling ng Pantulong na Kagamitan para sa Pagdinig (headset), mangyari lamang na tumawag sa (415) 575-9121. Mangyaring tumawag nang maaga (kung maaari ay 72 oras) bago sa araw ng Pagdinig.

RUSSIAN

За помощью переводчика или за вспомогательным слуховым устройством на время слушаний обращайтесь по номеру (415) 575-9121. Запросы должны делаться минимум за 72 часов до начала слушания.

Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review.

For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact Richard Knee, Chair of the Sunshine Ordinance Task Force, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 409, by phone at (415) 554-7724, by fax at (415) 554-7854 or by E-mail at soif@sfgov.org.

Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Library and on the City's website at www.sfgov.org/bdsupvrs/sunshine.

PUBLIC COMMENT

At this time, members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee except agenda items. With respect to agenda items, your opportunity to address the Committee will be afforded when the item is reached in the meeting with one exception. When the agenda item has already been reviewed in a public hearing at which members of the public were allowed to testify and the Committee has closed the public hearing, your opportunity to address the Committee must be exercised during the Public Comment portion of the Calendar. Each member of the public may address the Committee for up to three minutes.

The Brown Act forbids a committee from taking action or discussing any item not appearing on the posted agenda, including those items raised at public comment. In response to public comment, the committee is limited to:

1. responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public; or
2. requesting staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting; or
3. directing staff to place the item on a future agenda. (Government Code Section 54954.2(a))

4. submitting written public comment to Mat Snyder, 1650 Mission Street Ste. 400, San Francisco, CA 94103
mathew.snyder@sfgov.org

EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

JULY 18, 2016

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Central Waterfront / Dogpatch Public Realm Plan

Upcoming: Public Workshop on three streetscape corridors, Minnesota North, Minnesota South and 24th Street to be held **Wednesday July 27th, 6:00 Harmonic Brewing 1050 26th Street**

Update: 2nd Public Workshop was held May 22 and focused on three open space projects, Esprit Park, Warm Water Cove Park, and Tunnel Top Park. (Site selection was based on public polling and geographic distribution throughout the Plan Area.) Report back on workshop provided to Dogpatch Neighborhood Association, and will provide feedback to the Green Benefit District at their July Board meeting.

Planning staff working with MTA staff and Avalon Bay in creating design framework for Indiana Street bike framework.

Staff Contact: Robin Abad 575-9173 / robin.abad@sfgov.org
Web: <http://sf-planning.org/central-waterfront-dogpatch-public-realm-plan>

Railyard Alternatives and I-280 Boulevard Feasibility Study (RAB)

Upcoming: There are no public meetings currently planned.

Update: Planning staff has formed a Citizen Working Group to better understand the intricacies of the study, provide a public form, and based on discussions in the working group, aid in informing recommendations for the second phase of the RAB study. First CWG meeting is scheduled for August 1, 2016 6-8pm with a walking tour of the area and an update on the study as a whole. Second meeting will likely happen late August.

Staff Contact: Susan Gygi 575-9194 / susan.gygi@sfgov.org
Web: <http://sf-planning.org/rab>

Upcoming: Final Mission 2020 Community Meeting late summer – exact date TBD

Update: Draft Plan will be released in late August/early Sept. Short-term action items are moving forward to implementation. Informational update at the Planning Commission around in late summer with more detail on the zoning proposals on the following topics:

- Any recommendations regarding pipeline projects
- Zoning changes to strengthen PDR retention in various zoning districts (PDR, NCT, UMU), including requirement of some PDR in UMU districts
- Zoning changes to strengthen small business retention in the NCT districts
- Zoning changes to incentivize the production of affordable housing (both inclusionary and 100% affordable)
- The Latino Cultural District and an Arts District

Staff Contact: Claudia Flores 558-6473 / claudia.flores@sfgov.org

Web: <http://sf-planning.org/mission-action-plan-2020>

Central SOMA

Upcoming: Informational Presentation at the Planning Commission *tentative* August 11, 2016

Update: Revised Draft Plan and Implementation Plan to be published concurrently with Info Hearing.

Staff Contact: Steve Wertheim 558-6612 steve.wertheim@sfgov.org

Web: <http://sf-planning.org/central-soma-plan>

Child Care Impact Fee Update

Background: Planning Staff looking to introduce legislation that would enable Area Plan Child Care Impact Fees to spent outside of the Area Plan boundaries; but only after projects cannot be identified within the boundaries. Introduction for legislation has not been set. Staff is currently looking to the CAC for input on how to structure the proposal.

Staff Contact: Jacob Bintliff 575-9170 / Jacob.bintliff@sfgov.org

Monitoring report – written comments from EN CAC member Fernando Martí:

1. Executive Summary Scope. If the executive summary is the only section that summarizes the data across all Eastern Neighbors, it should be more robust. It does not matter if that adds 5-10 additional pages. It is the main thing that will be read by Commissioners and public. Otherwise, we should have a separate robust EN-wide section, with as much detail as the lengthy Area Plan sections.
2. Time period. The goal of this data is to be used is not just to analyze the last five years of EN Plan, but to understand how the whole EN is being built out, updated every five years. There is a disconnect between the EIR assumptions (2000-2025) and an analysis of the impacts caused by residential and commercial buildout from the actual rezoning and Area Plans. The report needs to explicitly state what aspect of the EIR is being reviewed (are you using the 2000-2025 period, or working backwards the portion of that which is covered after 2009?). Please explain in the report.
3. Starting or Ending Total Area – Not just Net Change. Table 1 should show total space by commercial use, either at the starting point in Jan 2009 (starting) or ending point Dec 2015 (ending). This information is shown for 2015 in the Area Plan sections, and I think can be found for 2008 in Commerce and Industry Inventory. Ideally we can compare side-by-side with the totals from previous monitoring reports, and if there are discrepancies, note why. We should then show both s.f. and % loss/gain by category, from starting point. Starting point should be Jan 2009 adoption date. (I know, we have argued for other dates: EIR shows 2000 figures as starting point, 2001 is when developers/landowners were on notice of rezoning, and 2006 is EIR initiation with published rezoning alternatives, but Jan 2009 is most conservative start date).
4. EIR Projection Comparison. Table 1 should compare these actual figures to the EIR projections for the same time period (if using Jan 2009 to Jan 2016, that would be seven years, so you can use 7/25 of the EIR 2000-2025 projections?).
5. PDR Loss by Zoning District. Add another table showing PDR space lost/gained (as total and as percent loss from starting areas) by generalized zoning areas (PDR protection zones, UMU/MUR/MUD zones, NC/R zones). This is important, because part of the framing of the Mixed Use zones was that they would continue to retain mixed use industrial character, and we need to know if this is being achieved (whereas the understanding was that the community had accepted they would lose PDR in those zones zoned NC and R, even though substantial areas of Valencia, for example, served as repair purposes, and the Harrison St tail served as Production). This should

show 2008-2015, current entitled/construction, and under review, and sum of the above.

6. Mixed-Use Zoning intent. EN Mixed Use Zoning was, from 2003 through 2007, intended to protect PDR, as stated in the 2003 Rezoning Workbook and the 2004 Commission Resolution, and the 2007 Draft EIR. It is false to say it was “never intended” to protect PDR, and this statement should be removed, or at least modified to say that after 2007, Planning decided to drop the PDR protections for mixed-use districts. This should be clarified in Executive Summary as an ongoing issue and debate.
7. Totals. Pipeline data is not very relevant unless compared to what exists, what has happened already under EN zoning, and what the EIR assumptions are. Table 2 should have additional lines at bottom, showing starting square footage as of Jan 2009, actual development 2008-2015, projected totals with buildout of all under review projects, and EIR assumptions for 2009-2025 buildout period.
8. Housing projections. Table 3. Again, as with Commercial, the tables should compare actual and projected to EIR assumptions. The time period is critical too – we should use 2008-2015. For the period 2008-2015, are we ahead, behind, or just right with the EIR assumptions for 7 years of buildout? And on Table 4, compare the pipeline projections to EIR 2009-2025 buildout projection.
9. Inclusionary Percent. Table 3 should show what % of projects do on-site units. It is important for future assumptions to understand what to expect in future inclusionary. Is the actual percent 12%, 8%, or what? In the notes, “assumption” for inclusionary, if any, should be based on past experience, which I think historically has been closer to 8% inclusionary.
10. Affordable Housing. Table 4 – add two columns showing the subsets of affordable housing (inclusionary, and 100% affordable) – you have that data for entitled and under construction, and can use the assumption (above) for “under review” inclusionary. We should then show total % affordable, so we can compare to Mayor’s citywide Prop K goals.
11. Housing Monitoring Report Data. The Planning Department now has monitoring report data going back ten years, showing summaries of net new housing as well as loss of rent control units. This data should be incorporated as a single table in the executive summary (some of this data shows up on the section 3 tables of the Area Plan chapters).
12. Projects funded by Plan Area: add another table showing actual projects, by type, funded by impact fees, by plan area (no need to show % of funds spent by plan area). For open space, show net new square feet. If on a mpa (as on

the 7-13 draft) the types of projects (open space, transpo, streets, childcare) should be color coded, and net new square feet shown on the legend.

13. Business tax info has number of employees. We should have this data for different
14. Growth in residents and workers. Need to correlate growth to needs analysis for each of the analyzed categories: open space and child care, per the 2008 EN Needs Analysis. Show how much actual open space s.f. and childcare slots were added in this time period. (Transportation and Streets is impossible to analyze due to sloppy needs analysis, which did not correlate to pop or worker growth). One would assume that for X population growth, there would be Y growth in transit (measured as increased bus capacity), etc., but not sure of methodology. If we cannot do this for the final monitoring report, this should be reported as a need for future analysis. The reason for this is to reiterate the need (identified in the plans) for funding beyond the impact fees.
15. Open Space: need to show amount of acres of open space need per Area Plans and/or underlying Seifel Needs Analysis or Nexus, based on new residents and workers that can be ascribed to the new and projected development post 2009, and compare to actual and projected new open space construction as of 2015 (whether paid by EN Fees or other sources).
16. Childcare: need to show amount of s.f. of childcare space need per Area Plans and/or underlying Seifel Needs Analysis or Nexus, based on new residents and workers that can be ascribed to the new and projected development post 2009, and compare to actual and projected new childcare construction as of 2015 (whether paid by EN Fees or other sources).
17. Finally as is clear in various statements in the report, the EN Fee program was assumed would not be sufficient to fulfill all Plan goals, Needs Analysis and Nexus requirements. The report should state any local efforts since plan adoption to provide for that gap (Citywide revenue measures, attempts at local IFD, etc.), current status of such efforts, and dollars dedicated or projected to be dedicated to EN from such efforts. Monitoring should not just be fees and numbers, but what qualitative measures are being taken (or not) to met any gaps, so this can inform the Commission.