

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, August 17, 2015
7:00 PM
Regular Meeting

Committee Members Present: Jason Henderson, Robin Levitt, Lou Vasquez, Paul Olsen

Committee Members Absent: Gary McCoy, Ted Olsson, Kenneth Wingard, Joshua Marker, Krute Singa

City Staff in Attendance: Menaka Mohan (SF Planning), Marlo Sandler (SF Planning), Maia Small (SF Planning), Adam Varat (SF Planning), Viktoriya Wise (SFMTA)

-
1. Call to order and roll call
 2. Announcements, upcoming meetings, project updates, and general housekeeping
[discussion item]
 3. Approval of minutes for June 15, 2015 regular meeting
[action item]

No quorum; minutes not approved.

4. Transportation Sustainability Program, including discussion of and request for support of proposed Transportation Sustainability Fee Ordinance
SFMTA and Planning Staff [discussion and action item]
 - Planning and SFTMA staff presented the Transportation Sustainability Program (TSP) and the Transportation Sustainability Fee Ordinance (TSF), a long-running multi-agency effort to improve San Francisco's transportation system and accommodate new growth. Please see meeting materials posted on the website.
 - CAC Comments:
 - Better Market Street area should include the portion of Market up to Octavia. This area could benefit from being a part of the Better Market Street project.
 - While the Better Market Street project area could be expanded, let's focus on the TSP rather than specific projects.

- Projects in the Market & Octavia Area Plan will be given priority for TSP funds.
- Can we see the language that encourages the Area Plan to have priority? Does it have any teeth?
- The TSP currently includes policies that prioritize specific projects identified in the Area Plan.
- Area Plans are defined elsewhere in the proposed ordinance.
- TSP reporting would be similar to how the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) for Market & Octavia is reported.
- The proposed \$70-\$100 fee per housing and the \$10,000 additional fees for new residential development hurts affordability. The TSP is looking at new development to clear all evils, but it results in higher costs for housing.
- The TSP ordinance will be updated every five years.
- MUNI usage is increasing and it also feels like it needs more frequent service
- It seems like MUNI is investing funds in restoring services, but not adding more service.
- There will be no mitigation fee and there is not a CEQA fee proposed as part of the TSP. Planning staff responded that the State Governor's Office of Planning & Research is issuing recommendations for a new Transportation Significance Standard to replace Level of Service (LOS), which will be forwarded to the State Secretary of the Interior to be released in 2016, which starts a public comment period and then probably full adoption sometime next year.

5. Market Octavia 2015 Impact Fee Expenditure Plan – discussion of the first working draft. [discussion item]

- Planning staff presented the Market Octavia 2015 Impact Fee Expenditure Plan, walked CAC members through the spreadsheet, and identified the revenue and expenditure amounts for Fiscal Year 2017. Planning staff highlighted revenues from Hub projects and projects slotted for funding in the plan area.
- The CAC will discuss the expenditure plan further at the next meeting on September 21, 2015.

6. Planning for the Van Ness-Market Area (“The Hub”)
[discussion item]

- Planning staff presented the Van Ness-Market Area (“The Hub”) project. Planning staff shared that Strategic Economics is working on a feasibility analysis. Planning staff is also presenting The Hub to the Planning Commission in September.
- Planning staff shared rough estimates of the number of net new affordable and market-rate housing units projected in The Hub: approximately 3,700 units of market-rate in the pipeline and approximately 700 affordable housing units in pipeline. Planning staff also shared rough parking estimates: 1,700 net new in the pipeline. Planning staff emphasized that these numbers are rough estimates and may change with zoning adjustments. For example, with new rezoning, parking requirements would be reduced to 0.25 per unit. So, there would be a reduction in the number of parking spaces currently in the pipeline, especially around Mission and Van Ness, and Market and Van Ness.

– CAC Comments:

- Are you keeping the mix of affordable and market-rate housing units? Planning staff responded that Strategic Economics will explore different percentage scenarios for affordable housing unit mix.
- I am happy you reviewed the parking included in proposed projects and how potential rezoning would reduce the number of parking spaces to 0.25 per unit. If you reduce parking, buildings may not be built.
- Do some proposed projects include 0.25 parking spaces per housing unit? Planning staff responded that they typically include 0.5 parking spaces per housing unit.
- We have been talking abstractly, now we have a starting point of where we want to work.
- How many existing surface parking spots are proposed? Planning staff responded that there are approximately 604, but that is a rough count.
- What about car storage-congestion pricing? Planning staff responded that residents could pay a fee to get their car in and out of the garage.
- What about the plans for the freeway? Planning staff commented that they are potentially exploring long term.
- My concern with this from a process perspective is that we are going to run out of time, we aren't going to capture the development impact fees happening now. Planning staff responded that they are going to do a timeline comparison.
- If each project conducts a separate EIR, it would be a complex process. There is concern about a cumulative environmental review process. If projects conduct separate EIRs, the process could take a long time anyway.
- Strategi
- How long does it take to review proposed projects and what is going to be the impact? Planning staff responded that the Strategic Economics analysis included a scenario with new residential development in the Hub meeting the City goal of 33 percent inclusionary housing in their projects.
- I have concerns about transit impacts and the middle of Market Street being left out. It may or may not help or hurt, but it would be good to move it forward fast enough to have an impact we can see.
- The parking could change right now and the height can be changed later.
- How much can items be baked into the code?
- We can focus on the planning efforts of Better Market Street in The Hub.

7. Public Comment

- Public Comments

- John Swartz from Bay Area Renter's Federation (BARF) stated that affordable housing units should stay within The Hub neighborhood. BARF supports increased height.
- Gail Baugh, Vice President of the Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association expressed concern about the cumulative impacts on Oak Street. With an additional 500 units, there may be cumulative impacts resulting from the proposed 500 new housing units.
- Alexandria Berger from Bay Area Renter's Federation (BARF) supports revitalization efforts in The Hub area and increased heights to accommodate additional affordable housing units. She expressed support for additional affordable and market-rate housing units and supports the fast-paced timeline.
- Julian Marsh from Align Real Estate is the Project Sponsor for 30 Otis. He asked if the project is granted the height increase then what is the timing for the EIR?

Planning staff responded that the Department is currently the process and timeline of the EIR.

8. Adjournment

NEXT MEETING: September 21, 2015