

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, January 25, 2016

7:00 PM

Regular Meeting

Committee Members Present: Jason Henderson, Krute Singa, Robin Levitt, Lou Vasquez, Joshua Marker

Committee Members Absent: Paul Olsen, Kenneth Wingard, Ted Olsson

City Staff in Attendance: Andrea Nelson (SF Planning), Jessica Look (SF Planning), Ben Caldwell (SF Planning)

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

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

- Lou shared that he asked Mohammed Soriano-Bilal, Board President of Freedom West co-op and potential new CAC member, to attend the CAC meeting. He plans to attend the February meeting.
- Robin shared that a curb cut in front of a residential property is going in at Page Street between Gough and Octavia. Initially, he called and the Planning Department said they issued a permit for a new unit, but then they put in a garage. The property owner did not post a permit or provide neighborhood notification. He expressed concern regarding new curb cuts in the Market and Octavia Area Plan area. He doesn't understand how the City approved the new garage. There was another garage permit that was proposed a few years ago and it was denied. He shared that he wrote an email to Tim Frye with the historic resources team at the Planning Department and others. This issue is part of a bigger concern about garages inserted within the plan area (e.g. Libby Avenue). He believes that the garage on Libby Avenue compromises the street and alleys.
- Jason raised concern about this bigger issue as well: curb cuts in historic property. He requested an agenda item for the CAC to vote on putting Page Street in the plan and restricting the street from curb cuts.

- Jason shared about a project at 311 Grove. It looks like the developer is purposefully coming under the inclusionary threshold and building below nine units. He wondered if the Department has discussed the issue of building just below the inclusionary housing threshold? It is putting a garage on Ivy Street, which is an option for the Living Alley program.

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

CAC members decided to approve the November 16, 2015 minutes at the next CAC meeting.

**4. Market & Octavia Community Challenge Grant Outreach
Planning Staff [discussion item]**

- Jessica Look, SF Planning Department, provided an overview of the Community Challenge Grant process. The City is releasing Community Challenge Grant applications and is hosting a meeting on February 5th. The Planning Department sent out a flier to community groups. The City plans to reevaluate the program after this round of grant applications and will take community feedback to improve the next round for Community Challenge Grant.

CAC questions and comments:

- One CAC member is hopeful that new designs for Living Alleys will be generated. The program used to be too daunting for an individual (design development, funding, and permitting). The CAC member expressed that he may apply, but it depends on how much involvement there is from his neighbors.
- One CAC member shared that the plan area includes a lot of renters on the alleys and they don't have the resources to participate in the program. The Planning Department should think of the Living Alleys as the critical open space implementation tool because we are adding density in the plan area, but can't buy land for parks. There should be a broader plan of where Living Alleys should go and they should be installed in these locations. They are not being designed in the residential areas, because only restaurants are implementing them.
 - Planning Department staff recognizes that it is a huge undertaking and revised the scope to make it more accessible for people.
- One CAC member referenced the Linden Avenue Living Alley. It was a nightmare because of underlying issues (different owners and agencies along the block). The block needed to do it programmatically and then involve the neighbors. There was not one business who wanted the responsibility of spearheading the effort.
- One CAC member shared that there are opportunities to implement Living Alleys on streets that are going to be torn up (e.g. 12th Street). He suggested partnering with developers to include Living Alleys as In-kind agreements.
- Has the Living Alleys program worked in other cities?
 - Planning Department staff shared that Portland has an alleys program (activating an alley). Staff is talking to Friends of the Urban Forest to see if they can provide design support.
- One CAC member shared that the upcoming February 25th Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association (HVNA) general meeting is an outreach opportunity. Another opportunity is the Transportation and Planning and Greening Committee.

5. Lower Haight Public Realm Plan Planning Staff [discussion item]

- Jessica Look and Ben Caldwell, SF Planning Department, provided a presentation on the Lower Haight Public Realm Plan. The Lower Haight Public Realm Plan was initiated by Lower Haight Merchants and Neighbors Association (LOHAMNA) and funded by Supervisor Breed. The City team includes MTA and DPW. Staff provided an overview of the project and its elements. The first open house for the project was in November and returning to the community in the Spring 2016 with draft concept designs. There is currently no funding for implementation, but the City will develop a temporary installation in the spring. There are a lot of projects happening in the neighborhood: sewer replacement, walk stops, Muni Forward 7-Haight and Wiggle Green Corridor improvements.

CAC questions and comments:

- One CAC member suggested presenting to HVNA at the upcoming February 25th meeting.
- One CAC member suggested considering a crosswalk mid-block to Koshland Park. He asked about the status of the Muni Forward project in the plan area. The 6 bus is not running on electric because of the delay.
 - Planning Department staff confirmed that the Muni Forward project is delayed. There are utility conflicts related to gas leaks and it is still unresolved. When these issues are resolved, the project will start back up.
- One CAC member referenced the Muni Forward improvements on Buchanan, inbound, there is going to be a right turn pocket and bus stop will be on the other side of Buchanan. There are a lot of concerns about pedestrian safety on this intersection. He suggested that staff incorporate best practices to make it as safe as possible for pedestrians without penalizing the pedestrians (like making them wait for longer). Haight and Buchanan is great intersection for a Bike Share pod. He suggested that staff think about Bike Share pods in Lower Haight. Koshland Park, outside of Tornado Bar. 55 Laguna is currently under construction and no one has parked on the street for two years. There is an opportunity to use the space as something other than street parking. Also at the Haight and Laguna intersection, the red transit lane works well, but there is no bus stop from Buchanan to Gough. How about a transit island at that intersection and get rid of the parking?
- One CAC member observed that at the intersection from Laguna, Herman and Market. Bad visibility and drivers do not stop.
- One CAC member observed that drivers fly northbound on Guerrero.
- One CAC member observed that there are several (e.g. on Germania) alleys that could serve as Living Alleys, but there are no crosswalks at the alleys. If there is a way to implement crosswalks at those alleys that would make them more pedestrian friendly. A good model for developing an identity for the neighborhood is the Hillcrest neighborhood in San Diego. What about a gateway element on Haight Street (maybe at Fillmore, Steiner or Fillmore) to signify Lower Haight?
- Krute – more wayfinding?
 - Planning Department staff mentioned a new walk stop at Fillmore and Haight.
- One CAC member stated that bicyclists who are not familiar with bike routes get into the red transit lane on Haight Street. They should be going down Page. He suggested that bicyclists should be steered away from Haight. Perhaps put a sign on Haight Street?
 - Planning Department staff shared that the Wiggle bicycle route is getting signage.
- One CAC member suggested that Planning staff come to the Transportation and Planning Committee. 7PM on February.

- Planning Department staff shared that there is a Neighborland webpage, which is part of the outreach program.

6. Monitoring Report

Planning staff [discussion item]

- Teresa Ojeda, SF Planning Department staff, thanked CAC members for their patience regarding the Monitoring Report for the Market Octavia Area Plan. She recognized that the report was supposed to be completed in June 2015. There have been other forces that were out of the team's control and they had to push the completion date back. She shared that feedback from CAC on the report is important and the team is also completing the Eastern Neighborhoods Monitoring Report. She shared that the MO CAC members who provided comments had a lot of feedback about the order of topics in the report (housing should follow commercial). The report ordinance and format are derived from the Downtown Plan. The CAC can make a recommendation to the Planning Commission on what to include in future monitoring reports, if desired. Staff can easily revise the report to address a lot of the comments. However, there are comments staff cannot address and have a hard time incorporating such as: the pipeline report (the Monitoring Report is a snapshot of a five year timeframe and the pipeline report captures a three-month window of time). Staff can provide updated and current data in accompanying memo, but cannot include these updates in the actual report because then all of the data would need to be updated. The team needs to conduct further research regarding some comments. Staff could provide some information separately (e.g. figures on unbundling parking). This will be difficult and will not be perfect. Staff can get a start on it and share what data they can retrieve, though it may take time. Demographic updates are also an item staff can provide separately, it is not mandated, but we understand that it is important. Staff could provide demographics for the following years: 2000, 2010, and what is estimated for the last ACS. Staff is considering doing a separate report as an addendum to the monitoring report; a policy evaluation report for the additional items that the CAC is interested in. We have a shortage of staffing to do a policy evaluation. Staff's next step is to incorporate all of the changes that they can do and then final report will be ready in the next couple of weeks. For the last monitoring report, the CAC drafted a supplement. Staff is trying to get on the Planning Commission calendar, but it is booked until April.

CAC questions and comments:

- One CAC member asked about the potential policy monitoring report. Would staff write it in response to the MO CAC comments or was it planned beforehand?
 - Planning staff responded that the Department is realizing that the reports took a long time to produce. After the first monitoring report, there was a recession and now the market has picked up. There are some policies in the plan that need to be revisited. The monitoring report is required to address certain topics and that is it.
- One CAC member shared that the layout, organization and graphics are very useful. He recommended putting housing before commercial in report. There are concerns about both. He understands that a lot of his comments are beyond the scope of the time. The monitoring report should include an addendum that shows that the area is carrying a significant burden of housing.
 - Planning staff responded that an accompanying memo would include data that updates. It would also reference the annual report and the quarterly housing pipeline report.

- One CAC member is interested in understanding how the affordable units are credited. There is a discrepancy between affordable housing on freeway parcels and affordable housing within the plan area. He doesn't want to overestimate that the plan area is holding more affordable units than is correct.
 - Planning staff shared that the report can state that the central freeway parcel housing units preceded the plan.
- One CAC member shared that Plan Bay Area should be looking at this monitoring report as a model.
- One CAC member asked how the Planning Commission should be notified?
 - Planning staff sent a memo and will try to schedule a hearing.
- One CAC member shared that we need to make sure that all interested commissioners are present.
- One CAC member shared that the report could be used to calm the fears about density. The plan area allows a lot of density and it is not in the Eastern Neighborhoods.
- One CAC member shared that the housing pipeline addendum will be really useful, because then you can see the real density that is coming.
- One CAC member shared one of principles of the plan is that the neighborhood is walkable and transit-friendly, but the monitoring report doesn't include bicycle and pedestrian-friendly issues and how these issues are being addressed. Where are the high crash rates and where are the conflict areas? There are some positive projects happening that address these issues.
 - Planning staff can do further research on a piecemeal basis in the future. We can decide on additional items inclusion in the next round of the monitoring report.
- One CAC member mentioned Vision Zero efforts and a detailed outline of these efforts and that they could be included in the monitoring report.

7. Draft MO CAC 2016 Agenda

Planning staff [discussion item]

- Andrea Nelson, Planning Department staff, presented the draft MO CAC agenda for all 2016 meeting.

CAC member questions and comments:

- One CAC member referenced Shuttle Bus Pilot Program, which is on the draft agenda. He shared that there is supposed to be a fee increase and the fee is supposed to go to improving infrastructure where the buses stop. Where does the shuttle bus overlap with the MO plan area? Perhaps the SFMTA representative can bring us a map of this when they present. The shuttle buses are using illegal bus stops and streets. The MO CAC needs to talk about this. Where do the fee increase and infrastructure improvements cross with our discussions about bulb outs and pedestrian improvements?
- One CAC member asked if the fees are actually dedicated to cost recovery only.
- One CAC member clarified that the report redefines how cost recovery is defined. There could be opportunities to figure out better routes, stops and pay for improvements.
- One CAC member is interested in learning about routes and stops of shuttle bus.
- One CAC member suggested moving the Shuttle Bus pilot program presentation into April.
- One CAC member shared that he is happy to see The Hub update on the agenda twice. The Hub touches upon a lot of the plan including: bike parking and public transportation. We need to make sure the impact of population growth is accounted for. There will be 2,000 new units within 2 block radius. How will the developers of these projects

- improve the pedestrian experience? He would like an update on all of these properties. Would like to see a map of current proposals.
- One CAC member mentioned the UC Berkeley project that illustrates potential options to the existing Central Freeway. Can we have a discussion about the student work? How to get the City on board with studying this? Should we invite the professor and maybe a student? Another CAC member shared that Division is unwalkable.
 - One CAC member shared that the CAC doesn't need Better Market Street update before EIR is complete. North of Market and South of Market on-street parking should be different.
 - Planning Department staff will check in with SFMTA to see if they are open to designating a new RFP North of Market.

8. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

9. Adjournment

NEXT MEETING: February 22, 2016