

Community Advisory Committee of
Market and Octavia Area Plan
City and County of San Francisco
Meeting Minutes

Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 5TH Floor
Monday, November 21, 2016
7:00 PM
Regular Meeting

Committee Members Present: Robin Levitt, Paul Olsen, Krute Singa, Lou Vasquez, Joshua Marker, Ted Olsson, Mohammed Soriano Bilal

Committee Members Absent: Jason Henderson, Kenneth Wingard

City Staff in Attendance: Jacob Bintliff (SF Planning), Paolo Ikezoe (SF Planning), Casey Hildreth (SFMTA), Ariel Espiritu Santo (SFMTA)

1. **Call to order and roll call**

- Krute Singa (Krute) called the meeting to order.

2. **Announcements, upcoming meetings, project updates, and general housekeeping [discussion item]**

- None

3. **Approval of minutes for October 2016 regular meetings [action item]**

- Minutes approved unanimously.

4. **One Oak Plaza**
Build Public [discussion item]

- Michael Yarne – This is an update. Will come back in January for CAC approval.
 - Oak Plaza part of a larger effort (HUB project) to improve public realm in the area
 - Two scenarios for Oak Plaza
 - Baseline (no in-kind agreement)
Pedestrian plaza with furnishings
No shared street, roadway is at same grade as Van Ness

- 25ft wide slow street
- Wind canopies (as part of wind mitigation/EIR)
- On-street parking on Oak west of mid-block crosswalk removed
- Proposed
 - Raised crosswalk on Van Ness
 - Slow-street (4 inch curb) with distinctive paving to mid-block crosswalk
 - Micro-retail kiosks on 25 Van Ness
 - Redesigned MUNI elevator shell
 - Same wind canopies
- Materials
 - In-kind proposes upgraded paving materials
 - Lighting
 - Moveable seating
 - Wind-resistant native plant palette
- Programming & Activation
 - Conversations with nearby institutions on potential for seating elements and planters to serve as temporary stages for small-scale performances (w/ built in sound amplification system)
 - Publicly owned, independently managed kiosks envisioned in 25 Van Ness window/doorway archways
 - Example: flower kiosk
 - Removable kiosks
 - Revenue would be used to fund programming for space
- Improved crosswalk to median BRT station on Van Ness
- MUNI station entry
 - Potential to provide canopy as part of in-kind
 - Repair/refurbish existing stairways
 - Potential art spilling into station itself
- Art canopies
 - Working with Arts Commission, will come back to CAC to present in January
- In-kind would be delivered by 2020
 - 100 years of maintenance funding via CFD special tax
 - Cost overruns borne by One Oak
 - Catalyzes City's HUB program
- Costs
 - Baseline: \$5.05 million
 - Proposed: \$8.26 million
- Fees
 - \$3.21 million project ask of impact fee revenue
 - Leverages up to \$21 million
 - Could be part of Civic Center CBD or proposed new HUB CBD
- Ted: How would you keep graffiti off of elevators, etc? Suggest muralists. With regard to art canopies, suggest collaboration with Exploratorium.
 - MY: Eyes on the street/activation is anti-graffiti strategy
 - Elevator is designed to accommodate replacement in future, and could even be removed if elevator is eventually moved
- Joshua: What exactly is contingent on the fee waiver, in the upgraded design?

- MY: Trying to connect both sides of Oak Plaza by activating 25 VN as well, would like to use high quality materials and catalyze other projects to do similar in-kinds
- Robin: Preferred/proposed option is much better. Many public spaces in SF are forgotten, left-over, don't feel like they have definition. Concerned this design looks like it could become one of those, seems to peter out into the other half of Oak Street.
 - MY: Originally wanted to close street entirely, was shot down. Thinks that preferred scenario will connect two sides of the street and invite people to cross. Thinks of this as a catalyst to redesign the whole block, which SF Planning and HVNA are supportive of.
- Robin: Suggests thinking about defining the space more (edges). Appreciates lighting and elevator design.
 - Snohetta: Canopies missing from the rendering b/c would have obstructed features they were trying to show below. But thinks canopies would help provide more boundaries to space. Rooms always feel best when have 3 sides rather than 2.
- Robin: Like the shared street idea, we need more in SF. Very limited opportunities for open spaces. If this wasn't your in-kind contribution, what would you do instead?
 - MY: In-kind process is very labor intensive, very hard to work out with City. If not this, would probably just pay fee.
- Paul: Where is the loading zone? Would it impact the plaza? How solid are possibilities of the area turning into entertainment zone?
 - MY: One on-site full loading space inside parking garage. Also 100ft+ yellow zone along Market Street, as well as yellow zone along Oak Street in back of 1554 Market Street. Also because building is condo, less move-in and -out vs. a rental building, lots in first year and less later.
 - Jared: Talks with Conservatory of Music to create space that's informal enough for students to just come out and play (with permits and audio hookups already set up).
- Mohammed: Loved the preferred/proposed scenario, in particular the kiosks, which would be very important to enlivening. Is there a third option that has kiosks but not other features?
 - MY: No.
- Mohammed: The more new buildings go up, the more some people feel like spaces are not for them. How does space serve those with different socio-economic backgrounds?
 - MY: We've been thinking a lot about it. Ground floor spaces are super open and transparent. Seating is intended to be public, no requirement to buy something if you want to sit and hang out (a la Mint Plaza)

5. Market and Octavia Impact Fee Expenditure Plan Planning Department [discussion item]

- Jacob Bintliff (Jacob) – we have one hour to do some budgeting. We could prioritize complete street and SFMTA projects first. None of fees the Build in-kind would be requesting are in the Market Octavia Impact Fees. They would be requesting fees from Market Van Ness SUDs.
- Joshua – what was he talking about the 74%?

- He was talking about 74% of the SUD \$\$ in 2019
- Ted: Do they need us to take any action right now?
 - JB: no, it was just informational. They will need CPC approval.
- JB: #62 Light Rail Service Enhancement includes \$5.25 million to add service like Castro Shuttle in Market Street subway. No other changes in transit category.
- Ted: Why is yellow line continuing into FY19?
- Robin: Still many intersections with no pedestrian signal.
 - Casey: Franklin improvements basically done. Any outstanding signals on Gough scheduled to start construction 2017.
 - JB: We can still find and scope out projects that won't be completed as part of planned upgrades on Gough. On line 84 there is a negative 500,000. The project was over-budgeted, so the balance was returned.
- JB: Line 80 Page Street bike project over-budgeted by \$500,000
 - Casey: project goal is to make Page Street primary ped-bike street, but also includes coordination with PUC on green stormwater infrastructure options. 3/4s of way through the process. Maintenance plan is still TBD. Plan to extend center bike lane an additional block, may divert traffic at Webster Street. Cost could change dramatically based on # and scope of bulbouts. Intersection with Buchanan Street is still undecided, many options, plan to work out with Lower Haight Public Realm Plan.
 - Robin: Westbound Page street very backed up with freeway traffic and blocks cyclists, especially between Gough and Octavia.
 - Casey: Planned bulbout at Gough Street to slow westbound car traffic.
- JB: Line 85 Upper Market Pedestrian Improvements and Line 95 Streetscape Enhancement Funds.
 - Casey: Market-Octavia Safety Project (now part of Upper Market Safety Project). Between Guerrero and Octavia, proposes
 - large bulbout on Guerrero/Market
 - One-way Hermann Street with angled parking and bulbout corner
 - Pedestrian improvements on Laguna Street
 - Expand transit island on westbound Market Street
 - Remove left-turn onto Octavia from eastbound Market (planting opportunity)
 - Parking protected bike-lanes WB Market Octavia to Duboce, EB from Guerrero to Octavia
 - Casey: Octavia Boulevard Enhancement Project
 - Widen pedestrian zone on East side of Octavia between Oak and Fell
 - Depends on what will happen with MOH parcels (R+S)
 - Parcel T considering in-kind but will need to coordinate on design
 - Parcel O received \$500k for streetscape improvements (out of \$16 million total grant)
 - Robin: What about extending median on Octavia between Oak and Fell?
 - Casey: Plan to do, less queueing than expected northbound on Octavia waiting to turn onto Fell.
 - Robin: Is it necessary to not have parking eastbound on Oak Street at Octavia? Results in fast traffic.

- Casey: Will consider, but priority is to not negatively impact Haight Street and larger network.
- Josh: Any talk of removing lanes on Otis?
 - Casey: Considering 2-way Otis to Gough Street. Between Gough and Van Ness, might impact Muni Forward. HUB planning process looking at reducing lanes and adding crosswalk at McCoppin.
 - JB: Can send latest from SF Planning. This CAC has been funding transportation study.
- Krute: Has Dolores Street crosswalk been funded?
 - Casey: Yes. Will be re-aligned and may be able to include signal work. Right now Upper Market project seems adequately funded.
- Krute: Any other bike improvements on Upper Market? See many conflicts on Market between 15th Street and Church.
 - Casey: Parking-protected bike lanes not planned for Castro at the moment, weren't prioritized during community process.
- Ted: Do Upper Market plans take into account Bike Share expansion? Particularly on Market Street itself.
 - Casey: Yes, generally improving the whole network and assuming bike traffic will grow. If initial blocks work, could see them being extended the rest of the way to Castro.
- Ted: Any ideas about taking space currently devoted to construction to carshare and bike space rather than reverting to parking?
 - Casey: RPP is coming to surrounding streets. Talking about management strategy/reimagination for Market Street in general.
- JB: Are there other items that this CAC could be funding/talking about over the next year? How can we have an ongoing conversation?
 - Casey: There are number of projects coming (follow-the-paving, etc) that we could keep updated throughout the year.
- JB: Some updates on other items
 - Row 89 is pushed out another year as project details continue to be developed
 - Line 92 has been increased at request of FUF from \$50k->\$100k/yr
 - Lots of \$\$ spent on Greening/Complete Streets in FY18, but will be made up in following years
 - Line 106 Brady Block will be developed through DA, will need to keep an eye
- JB: Turn your attention to Master Project List
 - Page Street Bike Lane Extension
 - Octavia Street Tree replacement to be funded by SFDPW, committed to replacing dying trees by end of 2016
 - Casey: we may want to keep an eye on this, make sure they don't plant anything that would preclude streetscape improvement opportunities on Octavia
 - JB to email Casey and Carla to discuss
 - Mohammed: Other histories of neighborhood (black + queer + etc) not highlighted as much in proposals for signage and education. Important to remember freeway revolt and takedown, but also larger, more holistic history of neighborhood (e.g. children's health impacts from diesel particulate matter from freeway)

- Paul: Is it possible to move items up to this coming FY?
- Joshua: Could we keep in as a more generic line item?
 - JB: Yes, could hold in SF Planning and allocate to Arts Commission if it comes up.
- Mohammed: Anything we end up putting up needs to be inclusive in the type of info and ppl honored, but also the quality needs to be equitable
- Casey: Lots of work happening pretty soon. To the extent that content can be nailed down sooner, would be cheaper and easier to incorporate into streetscape work that's happening.
- Mohammed: I am willing to go out to and help to find some key folks to help include their stories.
- JB: Propose budgeting 50-100k to Planning Department starting in FY18 to get project started
- Lou: DC has very impressive plaques/historical signs program
- JB: Potential for "plaza" spaces at Market and Octavia to host Patricia's Green style rotating art
- Central Freeway Study
 - JB: IPIC staff concerned that removal study is not a capital project (too far removed). At the same time, ConnectSF is underway, a citywide transportation visioning, which could/should/is better equipped to take on the question of whether the Central Freeway should be removed.
 - Lou: How come we can spend \$5 million on a streetcar but not \$100,000 on a study?
 - Robin: Agree.
 - Lou: Suggest including it as a line item on the resolution.
 - Krute: We keep including it as an item and it doesn't work (get approved). So we should try a different approach. ConnectSF is an interesting process through which to have that conversation.
 - Casey: CAC could keep up the pressure on ConnectSF to
 - Lou: Would it be possible to change the perspective/language of the study to be more capital-focused?
 - Krute: Could we put language in this resolution that we'd like to ensure the Central Freeway takedown is included/studied?
- Resolution
 - Paul moves to adopt, seconded by Lou. Unanimously passed.

6. Public Comment

- None.

7. Adjournment

NEXT MEETING: January 23, 2017