**Mission Action Plan 2020
Community Meeting #3 Summary
April 18, 2018**

Over 100 residents, representatives from community nonprofits, and city staff met on April 18th, 2018 to discuss the Mission Action Plan 2020. The meeting took place at the Women’s Building on 18th Street and had several objectives:

* Update attendees on MAP2020 accomplishments to date, including resources to protect tenants, and to promote and preserve affordable housing and the businesses and community resources that serve the working class families of the Mission
* Present proposed Mission commercial regulations
* Gather feedback from the community
* Discuss next steps

The meeting started with registration and dinner. After introductions, City staff presented in English and Spanish the MAP2020 background, accomplishments to date, and the proposed new commercial regulations.

The proposed commercial regulations include allowing and limiting certain uses (like limiting restaurants that serve alcohol to preserve a balanced retail mix and allowing light manufacturing on the side streets), or allowing with a Conditional Permit from the Planning Commission, as well as limiting merger along Mission Street in the greater Mission (Mission Alcohol Special Use District). It also addresses light industrial uses in a portion of South Van Ness.

The presentation was followed by an open question and answer session with attendees. Then attendees were invited to speak one-on-one with City and CBO staff on specific topics at “graffiti wall” stations. At the close of the meeting, attendees submitted 29 questionnaires (16 in English and 13 in Spanish).

**Participant Comments**

Participants comments from the “graffiti wall” and the questionnaires is summarized below:

**Housing**

Comments fell into two categories: some comments called for no more construction of market-rate housing and only construction of below market-rate (BMR) units at various income levels in the low to moderate income range, and some comments called for building units at all price points. Comments reflected the wide range of people that need affordable housing, from seniors on fixed incomes to teachers and families.

**SROs**

Seven comments on SROs focused on the need to preserve the affordability of SROs – through master leasing or preventing conversion to tech dorms or moving properties from private to nonprofit ownership.

**Tenant Empowerment & Eviction Prevention**

Comments on tenant empowerment covered a wide range of topics. At the State level, comments called for the repeal of Prop 13 and Costa Hawkins. At the local level, comments focused on the need for more access to legal counsel, limiting landlords’ ability to pass through capital and property tax costs, and clarity for tenants on laws for illegal ADUs. Some tenants expressed they need more information on their tenant rights, where to go for help, and where to apply for BMR units – both the English-speaking and non-English speaking group.

**Economic Development**

Comments reflected the challenges of sustaining neighborhood retail in a rapidly shifting retail environment. Most commenters wanted fewer fine dining restaurants and boutique stores, while others called for the conversion of vacant retail to other uses. In particular, people lament the loss of inexpensive retail and dining options, like Thrift Town and Burger King. Participants expressed they would like the retention and promotion of shoe stores, laundromats, pet stores and affordable clothing and food options.

Attendees identified 36 unique Mission businesses that they value and patronize. On the top of the list are Dianda’s Bakery, La Reina Bakery, Sun Rise Restaurant, Duc Loi Grocery, Fabric Outlet, Santanela, the Sandwhich Shop, and Torta Gorda. These are representative of the other favorite local establishments identified. They are affordable and cater to a wide range of clientele; many are also businesses that have been in the neighborhood for many years and feel like part of the Mission identity.

A number of people commented on the things that make a business community serving. The answers focused on culture and community – these are businesses rooted in Latino culture and are places for people to gather and meet, whether that’s a family-friendly restaurant or a locally-owned bookstore.

The comments about retail that is needed in the neighborhood centered on thrift stores and affordable clothing. (A number of thrift stores have recently closed, including Goodwill, Thrift Town, Clothes by the Pound, and Clothes Contact; Mission Thrift and Community Thrift remain open.) People would also like to see a hardware store, bookstores and daycare.

**Transportation**

Bikes and BikeShare program – While a fair amount of people who answered the questionnaire support biking and bike-sharing and some would like to see more stations, others felt strongly about a city-owned or another model not owned by big companies (they mentioned Uber, Lyft or Ford). Some also felt it was expensive (they referenced the DC program being cheaper) and lacked information about different price options. None of the participants who filled out the survey in Spanish, had tried the BikeShare program, while the English-speakers were more mixed. One commenter mentioned that some bikers need respect the buses’ right-of-way.

Parking - a number of respondents expressed a need for more parking, because they need to drive to work or due to the size of their families, while others expressed not needing any parking. There was a suggestion for solutions for long-distance transit to get rid of more cars. In general, several commenters want better parking management and some need affordable parking.

Public transit – some expressed that they appreciate the bus runs faster, BART “feels” cleaner, and would like more buses to run as well as more timely service. Some participants expressed concerned that the bus changes have occasionally interfered with ability to shop, have made it challenging for some businesses, and have made it harder for seniors for whom the more spread out stops are hard to walk to.

Comments on transportation at the “graffiti wall” included the following:

Participants at community event were given two questions about transportation in the Mission and were asked to provide their comments (see questions below). Questions were listed in English and Spanish and presented in an open format with staff from the MTA on hand to provide clarifications or answer questions regarding transportation.

1. Question 1: What is working?
2. Question 2: What is not working?

## What is working? Summary

People noted the following two things as working.

1. Red lanes – some attendees like the red lanes and note that it has made traveling faster
2. Bike lanes – some attendees like the upgrade in bicycle facilities in the Mission

## What is NOT working? Summary

Generally, people in attendance had many similar things to list under transportation items not working. The majority of items listed surround transit, bicycle facilities, and parking.

1. Red lanes – many attendees do not like the red lanes along Mission Street. Most comments mentioned the perceived negative impacts they have had on retail-pushing away people who residents feel would normally come shop to the areas, if only they were able to drive along Mission.
2. Parking – many attendees do not like the perceived lack of nearby parking along Mission Street. Most comments mentioned the perceived negative impacts lack of nearby parking has had on retail and overall community vitality.
3. TNC’s – many attendees agree that current TNC practices are not working well in the Mission. Residents would like to see TNC’s be required to drop-off or pick-up in designated area. Their impacts on bicyclists are also a concern.
4. Corporate sponsorship – many attendees agree that public-private sponsorships (FordGo Bikes) should not be pursued. Instead, they would like city owned/operated services or one ran by a non-corporate entity.
5. Bicycling – some attendees do not think bicycling is working well in the Mission due to ack of wayfinding.
6. Operators – multiple attendees listed rude or unhelpful operators
7. Equity – many attendees feel the agency could improve when it comes to applying principles of equity on projects in the Mission.

**Homelessness**

Comments on homelessness called for more supportive services and rapid placement in housing.

**Immigration**

While not an original MAP2020 category, the questionnaire asked a couple of questions on immigration given undocumented immigrants are more vulnerable to issues like harassment (for example, from landlords who may use that to push them out in addition to the broader national anti-immigration trends). While many expressed they know their rights in case of immigration raids (primarily the Spanish speakers) some expressed lack of knowledge as well as want to know what else the City can do to prevent raids.