

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

Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 5TH Floor
Monday, October 15, 2015
7:00 PM
Regular Meeting

Committee Members Present: Jason Henderson, Robin Levitt, Lou Vasquez, Paul Olsen, Joshua Marker, Krute Singa, Kenneth Wingard

Committee Members Absent: Ted Olsson

City Staff in Attendance: Andrea Nelson (SF Planning), Jacob Bintliff (SF Planning), Stacey Bradley (Recreation and Parks Department), Jordan Harrison (Recreation and Parks Department), Trudy Garber (Trust for Public Land), Colin Schmidt (America SCORES), Shannon Watts (Green Streets), Sophie Constantinou (Citizen Film)

-
1. Call to order and roll call
 2. Announcements, upcoming meetings, project updates, and general housekeeping [discussion item]
 - There is a lot of opportunity to expand Bay Area Bike Share pods as a part of the construction that is happening now. The 55 Laguna development is a good example.
 - Regarding the CAC vacant seat: we need to communicate with Supervisor Kim's office. The candidate should be familiar with Market & Octavia Rea Plan, the CAC by-laws, etc.
 - The Transportation Sustainability Fund passed and is in effect. Transportation development impact fees will still be dedicated to investment in the Market & Octavia plan area and additional citywide fees will be invested citywide.
 - The Parcel L lease was extended. There is a request to show Parcel L funds (lease and revenue collected) as a line item.
 - The Planning Commission briefly discussed the Hub. Jason watched a video of the hearing online and provided a brief summary to the CAC members. A few Commissioners are interested in developing a satellite garage off of the Central Freeway. Cindy Wu is interested in the amount of affordable housing.

- Is there a land dedication option? Can we stipulate that the money would be spent within a certain area? Planning staff responded that they would check with staff and get back to the CAC.

3. Approval of minutes for September 21, 2015 regular meeting
[action item]

Members approved the minutes for the September 21, 2015 regular meeting with a few comments. One member abstained from the approval.

4. SF Recreation and Parks Department
[discussion item]

- Stacey Bradley from Recreation and Parks Department and Colin Schmidt from America Scores presented the Margaret Hayward project funding needs. Improvements to Margaret Hayward will require \$3.6 million in FY 2018. See presentation online.
- CAC Comments:
 - What is the field going to be made of? Recreation and Parks staff responded that the field will be synthetic turf with organic infill (coconut husks).
 - How does this compare with the contentious turf in Golden Gate Park? Recreation and Parks staff responded that recycled rubber was used in Golden Gate Park. Synthetic turf extends the play time by hours and days.
 - What do the parents think? Do they worry about the turf material? Recreation and Parks staff responded that the park is successful. Some parents may be concerned.
 - Has the decision been made about the synthetic turf? Recreation and Parks staff responded that they are in the pre-planning phase. We will host a community meeting in November to solicit input on the design of the park and go to the Commission for approval in March 2016.
 - A few CAC members commented that there are also issues with grass turf.
 - There was a concern among CAC members regarding the turf material and its permeability. We are supporting the general concept of the project, not the make-up of the turf. The CAC would like to hear about the cost, design, and we would like some input into the design process as the project develops. Recreation and Parks staff responded that they could provide an update to the CAC.
 - Margaret Hayward Park is surrounded by broad streets (Turk and Gough). There has been talk about calming them, but those streets don't have to be one way or so wide. If there is something that could be incorporated into this project to improve connections across the streets, I support that. If I could, I'd close Turk Street there.
 - Are you looking to make improvements anything on the north side of the park? Recreation and Parks staff responded that they are not looking at improvements yet, Margaret Hayward has such a high need.
- Stacey Bradley from Recreation and Parks Department, Trudi Gardner from Trust for Public Land, Shannon Watts from Green Streets, and Sophie Constantinou from Citizen Films presented the Buchanan Street Mall project funding needs: \$75-100K for thorough visioning process. Remaining funds would be used to implement the vision phase.
- CAC Comments:

- Is the north side of Buchanan Mall surrounded by parking lots? Recreation and Parks staff responded that yes, there are a number of parking lots and a number of housing developments surrounding the park.
- Part of Buchanan Mall lies within the area plan boundary. Planning Department staff responded that Buchanan Mall begins just across the street from Grove Street. The MO area plan funds have to be spent on the block between Grove Street and Fulton Street (within 250 feet of the plan area boundary).
- Can we get rid of the parking between the area plan boundary and the Mall? Planning Department staff responded that there are likely a variety of feasible options for reconnecting the Mall to Hayes Valley at Grove (acquisition, easement, in-kind agreement, etc), and it would be appropriate to study these options. Providing for access to the Buchanan Street Mall from Grove is similar to the reconnection of Octavia between Fulton Street and McAllister, and is consistent with the intent of the Area Plan community improvements plan.
- Would establishing this connection be similar to the Brady Park effort? Planning Department staff responded that the Brady park development is all in-kind agreement with the developer. The Planning Department is working with Recreation and Parks to make sure that the Brady Park public space meets their goals. The design of the space will be negotiated with the developer.
- CAC members were concerned that there is not have a connection between the plan area and the Mall. There is interest in inserting language into the resolution to investigate the opportunity to remove the parking. Planning Department staff responded that the group could speak with the Ammel Park Coop Board.
- Is Recreation and Parks seeking funds for the visioning process and for the capital improvements? Recreation and Parks staff responded that having funding to conduct the visioning process would demonstrate that the Department is committed and will help to gain more funds for implementation.
- One CAC member proposed that the resolution include a caveat that the CAC will fund a portion of the visioning process and implementation if Supervisor Breed connect the Buchanan Mall to Grove Street and if that is not achieved, then the Supervisor's office will pay back the Market & Octavia CAC.
- Another CAC member did not think the Supervisor's office would reimburse the CAC. We could state that capital improvements in the Mall are contingent on the connections. In the interim, we would provide money to support visioning.
- Another CAC member supports the improvement project, but did not think CAC funds should be invested in the project since the Mall doesn't touch our plan area. We know that the lot needs to be purchased. Planning Department staff responded that the parking lot may not need to be purchased, but that there could be a use agreement.
- We could fund a study to investigate the feasibility of connecting the Mall instead of funding the visioning and capital improvements project. Establishing the connection is very important.
- One CAC member supports the visioning and would like to look into connecting Buchanan Mall with the plan area. There is a significant need in the community for the park and there are a lot of community members working on this. It is an important effort.
- One CAC member supports installing a bulb out at Grove Street to narrow the distance between the parks. Perhaps we can reorient the parking spaces.

5. Market and Octavia 2015 Impact Fee Expenditure Plan

[discussion item/ action]

- Planning Department staff presented final recommendations for the Market & Octavia CAC expenditure plan. See presentation online.
- Why do we have fewer funds in future years? Planning Department staff responded that the expenditure plan spreadsheet reflects that development is projected to slow down.
- Is the Planning Department going to do a better job of outreach to promote the Community Challenge Grant (CCG) program and keep our CCG funding as it has been? Planning Department staff responded that yes, the staff decided to give the CCG program one more year since the Living Alleyways initiative relies on community groups.
- What are MTA's plans for Page Street? Why don't we move \$500K in FY 2018-2019. Planning Department staff responded that MTA discussed painting, installing bulb outs and bike lane on both sides, but the plan hasn't been settled yet. We are slowing down the project by deappropriating funds. The Planning Department proposes investing funds in Streetscape Enhancement Fund for FY 2017. We know that our funds are getting spent in real time. The amount we invest depends on how much the CAC wants to use its budget and to what extent the CAC wants to encourage MTA to invest in projects that the CAC wants.
- One CAC member suggested pulling Buchanan Street mall as a side discussion. I think we need to ask an attorney about our ability to fund a project that is outside of the plan area.
- One CAC member shared that there is already an effort in the Supervisor's office to purchase other green space.
- One CAC member shared that it is a priority to gain access through the lot to the Mall and then we will green it.
- One CAC member proposed adding future considerations including: pedestrian and bicycle improvements to Otis, 11th and 12th street; and, installing a bike path on McCoppin towards Otis.
- One CAC member made one correction to the spreadsheet: Van Ness BRT improvements is repeated. Planning Department staff thanked the CAC member for the correction.
- One CAC member suggested that McCoppin improvements could be funded by the Better Market Street Plan.
- How much do we have left over for future consideration? Planning Department staff responded that the Department's goal is that no funds are left over.
- Why is the potential crosswalk at Rose and Buchanan so expensive? Will have flashing lights and bulb outs? Planning staff responded that MTA has determined that signalized crosswalks will be the standard moving forward, meaning this project would include a signalized pedestrian crosswalk.
- Planning Department staff explained that all of the dollars were moved up in time. The only net change is for the Streetscape Enhancement Plan per MTA's request.
- One CAC member expressed confusion regarding the Living Alleyways. The CCG Community Challenge Grant is under the City Administrator's Office. Community groups who apply for the grant has to match the grant amount (in some cases this could be \$200K). It's a lot to ask of a community group.
- Has the CCG program always been conducted in this way? A group of neighbors is not going to be able to match the \$200K. Community groups essentially need to find a corporate sponsor.

- One CAC member shared that the CAC talked about turning the CCG funds over to the City to administer with caveats. The City could sponsor a neighborhood project. We want community involvement and there has to be a way to provide opportunities with willing community members that isn't such a burden. Neighbors will present the program and then DPW could make it happen. Planning Department staff suggested inviting the Living Alleyways administrators to a future CAC meeting.
- Lou: should we program revenues from future years as well? Planning Department staff shared that the CAC does not need to wait until the fall of 2016 to discuss the expenditure plan and that the group could discuss it throughout the year.
- Why aren't some of the rows in the spreadsheet summing in the right-hand column? Planning Department staff responded that the column shows the cumulative amount.
- One CAC member suggested endorsing the proposed 2015 Expenditure Plan, but withdraw the Buchanan Mall project until we have legal clarification and figure out some creative ways to help out the project.
- One CAC member suggested telling MTA that the CAC wants to do a road diet on Otis and McCoppin Streets. Another CAC member shared that half of Otis at 12th Street is about to be renovated. Planning Department staff suggested including funds in FY \$19 to share this priority with MTA.
- One CAC member proposed including a Central Freeway Study into the 2015 expenditure plan. The member would like to rethink The Hub project and include an option to remove the freeway and investigate how to use the land underneath it. For example, Van Ness could be more of a public realm in the future. The member suggested taking funds to support Page Street project (\$250k) and put it into the Central Freeway Study. Another CAC member supported this idea. Planning Department staff responded that funds could be included in FY 2018. The CAC member pointed out that The Hub study could be done by 2018.
- One CAC member suggested that, since we have a surplus of funds from The Hub projects. How about we invest in improvements around The Hub? I support meeting the transit needs that will result from The Hub developments. We could introduce a Hub mitigation fund. We have so much money coming in from the Hub and we don't have any projects to mitigate development impacts. Planning Department staff responded that this suggestion could be included in the narrative.
- Are the MUNI Forward FY 2019 for the Rapid Line? Why is it so far out? Planning Department staff responded that the 2015 expenditure plan focuses on FY 2017.
- Can the Brady block funds be moved around? Planning Department staff responded that there is a placeholder so that we can keep track of those funds.
- What about the Van Ness entrance improvements that will be included in the One Oak project? MTA didn't allow for it.
- How about we move the Buchanan Street Mall funds to refurbish the Historic Steps at Duboce Park? They are falling apart. Do we want to move this money into unprogrammed? Planning Department staff responded that this is not in Rec Parks work program and emphasized the need for geographic distribution of parks funds throughout the area.
- One CAC member suggested including a footnote that the Buchanan Mall funds will be used pending a study to look at connecting the Mall to the plan area, and should be used to encourage additional funding for BSM from the Supervisor's office. The community is trying so hard to improve the space. Let's do something to connect the Mall to the plan area.
- One CAC member suggested that the CAC allocate funds to the Buchanan Mall project once the parking lot property is acquired.

- One CAC member shared that the parking lot is owned by the housing co-op, which is a federal entity.
- Can we share the pipeline for the plan area? Planning Department staff responded that the Department is currently updating the 3rd quarter report and will share it with the CAC when it is complete.
- Can we use the Buchanan Street Mall funds for the Rose Street crosswalk. I think this is a critical need. We have discussed that there is a problem at people crossing at alleys.
- One CAC member commented that the Rose Street crosswalk is not greening and so parks funds could not be used for the project
- What if the crosswalk includes a bulb out, which is an extension of Koshland Park?
- Can we count the Rose Street crossing as Koshland Park improvements? Planning Department staff responded that we would have to touch base with Department staff regarding this question.
- Shouldn't there be more revenue in FY 2017? Planning Department staff responded that the revenue is based on numerous proposed projects that will contribute community benefit fees.
- One CAC member suggested moving \$250K to Rose Street crosswalk and put \$250K into the Central Freeway study.
- Another CAC member asked what the CAC is agreeing to provide to the Buchanan Street Mall project.
- One CAC member suggested that access to the parking lot be agreed upon first and then the CAC will provide funds for the Buchanan Street Mall project.
- One CAC member suggested funding a study to determine the feasibility of access through the parking lot.
- One CAC member suggested including a stipulation that, once they take care of the connection, CAC funds will be dedicated to the Buchanan Street Mall project. Include a line item for the mall improvements that is contingent on acquiring the mall. The intention of the CAC is to connect the plan area to the Mall. Planning Department staff responded that a line item could be included.
- Can we also include a recommendation to connect Hayward Playground across Golden Gate Avenue?
- One CAC member suggested including a \$100K line item for Planning for the Connection Study to Buchanan Street Mall and leave the rest of the parks funds unprogrammed.
- CAC Members worked together to draft a resolution. See attached.
- One CAC member moved to approve the 2015 budget recommendations with modifications and another member seconded the motion.

6. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

7. Adjournment

NEXT MEETING: November 16, 2015

Market & Octavia CAC

Fiscal Year 2016-2017 IPIC Expenditure Recommendations – DRAFT

The Market & Octavia Community Advisory Committee endorses the expenditure plan outlined in the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) spreadsheet dated 10/14/2015, with the following modifications, as documented in the attached Expenditure Plan spreadsheet dated 10/19/2015:

Transportation/Transit

- Van Ness and Mission Pedestrian Improvements – with Van Ness BRT
 - Move future spending for this project to the Transportation/Transit category
 - Maintain \$1.5 million allocation in FY19
- Central Freeway Removal Study
 - Establish a new project line item - as consistent with Item A13 Central Freeway Study in Appendix C of the Market & Octavia Plan - to be used for a study by City staff or a designated consultant of the traffic flow impacts and options for a further dismantling of the Central Freeway.
 - Allocated \$250,000 in FY17 for this purpose
- Otis Street Road Diet Study
 - Establish a new project line item – to complement Items A4 Brady Park, A17 Pedestrian Improvements for Priority Intersections, and A30 Bicycle Network Improvements in Appendix C of the Market & Octavia Plan – to be used for a study by City staff or a designated consultant of options for traffic calming, pedestrian and bicycle improvements, and possible lane reductions for Otis Street.
 - Allocate \$100,000 in FY19 for this purpose
 - Note, it is the intent of the CAC that the timeframe and scope for this project be appropriately aligned with the HUB development plan and related public realm/streetscape modifications
- HUB Area Transportation and Pedestrian Impacts Mitigation
 - The CAC expressed that members would like to ensure that future specific projects to mitigate the transportation and pedestrian impacts of HUB area development be identified for use of the Transportation and/or Complete Streets impact fee revenue in future years.
 - No allocation or project line item at this time

Greening/Complete Streets

- Rose Street Crossing to Koshland Park
 - Establish a new project line item – to complement Item A1 Living Street Improvements and improve pedestrian safety and access to Koshland Park – to be used by SFMTA in installing a signalized mid-block crossing at Rose Street across Buchanan Street.

- Allocate \$250,000 in FY17 and \$250,000 in FY18 for this purpose
- Re-Connect Buchanan Street Mall ROW Study
 - Establish a new project line item – as consistent with Item A1 Living Street Improvements and to improve pedestrian safety and access to the Buchanan Street Mall for Market & Octavia residents –
 - \$100K to study the ROW connectivity to Market and Octavia Plan Area
 - All remaining parks funds will go into unprogrammed Recreation and Parks funds