

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, February 22, 2016

7:00 PM
Regular Meeting

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

Committee Members Absent: None.

City Staff in Attendance: Andrea Nelson (SF Planning), Lily Langlois (SF Planning), Wade Wietgreffe (SF Planning)

1. Call to order and roll call

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

- Jason shared that Page Street improvements are close to completion and that the Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association meeting is on February 25 and that City will be presenting the Living Alleys program.
- Lou introduced a guest, Mohammed Soriano-Bilal, Executive Director of the African American Cultural Center Board President of Freedom West co-op. He grew up in the Western Addition.

3. Approval of minutes for November 2015 and January 2016 regular meetings [action item]

Members approved the minutes for the November 16, 2015 (one member abstained from the approval) and January 25, 2015 (three members abstained from the approval) regular meetings.

**4. The Hub Update
SF Planning Department [discussion item]**

- Lily Langlois, SF Planning Department, introduced herself, provided overview of The Hub project including the origins of the project and the project goals which are to

increase affordable housing, support transit improvements, encourage the arts, improve urban design, and enhance the public realm. She asked if CAC members had any comments on these goals. She provided an overview of the project deliverables. She shared a map of the existing zoning and existing height controls in The Hub area. Ms. Langlois asked if there are other opportunities to modify current land use controls to meet project goals. She presented a map of the sites slated for development. She expressed interest in hearing from CAC members their priorities for public benefits. She shared the next steps: develop height options, explore land use modifications, develop revenue projections and public benefits, and public engagement. The first public workshop is on April 13, 2016.

CAC Questions and Comments regarding Project Goals:

- One CAC member asked if The Hub is a word or in an acronym?
 - SF Planning staff explained that the name of the project is a reference to the history of the area; it is not an acronym.
- One CAC member shared that he believes the project scope should focus on affordable housing. He believes that the Project is a variation of the Affordable Housing Density Program (AHBP). He expressed that initial studies of the projects projected the range of affordable units that the projects could produce. He suggested presenting the affordable housing unit numbers during the first workshop and focusing the first workshop on housing, rather than land use. He thinks the neighboring communities will be interested in hearing about affordable housing estimates. He asked how the project will dovetail with the 25% inclusionary housing requirement proposal. How does this relate to the density bonus discussion?
 - SF Planning staff responded that the projected housing unit numbers from Strategic Economics still stands. The team is working to refine the estimates. Current thinking is Citywide affordable housing requirements will apply here.
- One CAC members asked if SF Planning staff has a sense of what developments are farther along. It would help to answer the MO CAC members' questions about the number of affordable units.
- One CAC member is happy to see this project going forward. The Hub neighborhood needs attention and it is finally getting that attention. The intersections are terrible (Van Ness and Market), which is the gateway to the neighborhood. There is no open space in this neighborhood. He suggested zero parking in new developments. There are high-rise buildings planned and he thinks whatever buildings are built need to go through design review. The Central Freeway is key to a lot of what is wrong with this neighborhood. We have been pushing for a study of taking down the Central Freeway. We push for you to take this on as part of the project.
- One CAC member shared that the pedestrian and bicycle experience needs to be addressed. If we are going to put residential on Otis and other streets, we need to improve the sidewalk experience and expand the sidewalks. There should be a study of the traffic of Otis Street. It doesn't need to be four lanes. What would be the southern edge of the neighborhood if there was no Central Freeway?
- When is the CEQA review?
 - SF Planning staff shared that it will begin in early October 2016.
- Where will the workshops be held?
 - SF Planning staff shared that the 1st workshop will be held at One South Van Ness in the Atrium conference room on the 2nd Floor.
- One CAC member shared that the City needs to be stringent about water reuse and use, wastewater and recycling as part of these projects. There is an opportunity to

- increase these conditions. He shared that water and energy are two major concerns that the MO CAC has and there is an opportunity to include these designs in these new developments. I am also interested in green roofs.
- One CAC member shared that she agrees with what has said before. How will the transit efforts (Muni Forward, BRT, Mission-only transit) be integrated into this? We need to increase transit capacity.
 - What happened to the Better Market Street options?
 - SF Planning staff shared that they are under environmental review. One CAC member would like a mix of affordable housing: incomes and stock. There aren't enough services to support people staying and walking in neighborhood. How will Transportation Sustainability Program (TSP) and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) affect this?
 - SF Planning staff shared that the TDM Ordinance will be applicable to projects within The Hub.
 - When in the scoping meeting?
 - SF Planning staff shared that the Environmental Process will begin in October, 2016. Staff is trying to do this in as short and an as efficient as we can. Staff wants to be inclusive and transparent.
 - One CAC member shared that he has high respect for what the Planning Department has done and wishes that we had this conversation 5 years ago. He expressed concern that some of these projects will push forward ahead of the project timeline.
 - One CAC member suggested focusing the first workshop on getting input on the size, type of units and AMI levels for the Below Market Rate units and how it dovetails with other affordable housing efforts in the city. Other public benefits can have their own meeting.
 - One CAC member suggested looking at McCoppin as a better bike connector and giving Otis a cycle track.
 - SF Planning staff shared that Better Market Street is studying bicycle improvements on Otis.
 - What about incentivizing arts?
 - SF Planning staff shared that the Central SOMA Plan has been tackling this issue. They are looking at ways to perhaps subsidize space for artists

CAC Questions and Comments regarding prioritizing public benefits:

- One CAC member suggested that all public benefits match the categories of the Market and Octavia Plan, with the exception of affordable housing which is a priority.
- One CAC member shared that second to affordable housing is transit capacity. The existing Muni Forward and BRT are not going to be able to meet the demand. He suggested looking at how the City would subsidize transit capacity. We cannot just rely on cars (e.g. Uber).
- One CAC member asked if there is discussion of reconnecting Stevenson in the neighborhood. It dead ends into a parking lot. The Brady block development is currently proposed to use it as a driveway. I think that 12th street could be improved. The alleyways in that area (Colton) are hard to navigate. A plan to deal with disjointed alleyways would be great. I suggest coming back to the group to discuss connections in the neighborhood. As you know as SF Planning employees, it hard to navigate the streets.

5. Transportation Demand Management SF Planning Department [discussion item]

- Wade Wietgreffe, SF Planning Department, introduced himself. The Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program is one program to address growing impacts and ensure developments reduce their impacts on the transportation system. He shared what the City is already doing and provided an update and overview of the Transportation Sustainability Fee (TSF), which was passed by the Board in September, 2015. He explained that CEQA is being reformed to remove Level of Service. The Department is proposing a new TDM ordinance to make sure the City keeps moving as it grows by reducing single occupancy vehicles, as a result of new development. There will be an ordinance and implementation documents. There are three main elements of ordinance: 1) targets – aimed at reducing vehicle miles traveled that are based on the number of parking at new developments; 2) menu of options – 30 measures that developers can select from to meet their targets; 3) implementation strategy – measure and enforce. He explained how this would work as part of the planning process. The team received feedback from the Planning Commission, doing more outreach for feedback, and will revise and send to Planning Commission for approval.

CAC Questions and Comments

- What is the Family TDM measure?
 - SF Planning staff shared that it includes providing car seats, strollers, bigger bicycle parking spaces for families.
- One CAC member expressed three points. 1) How are you going to account for Uber and Lyft in your vehicle miles traveled (VMT)? He thinks the ride share is exploding VMT. 2) Why do you want to exempt 10 units or less? It is on the table to change this for BMR? Especially with the existing AHBP conversation happening. All residential should pay. 3) Why is there 1 point for every 10 additional parking space?
 - SF Planning staff responded regarding the CAC member's first point: We have heard this in other places. VMT is based on household travel surveys before ride share services were prevalent. Taxis are taken into account. The City is studying this as part of the Transportation Element Update and we are studying as a part of VMT. NYC just released a study about this issue.
 - SF Planning staff responded regarding the CAC member's second point: Projects subject to the transportation sustainability fee is more than 20 units. Other Planning Code requirements are often triggered at 10 units or more. We want to be consistent with the other Citywide development transportation demand management measures.
 - SF Planning staff responded regarding the CAC member's third point: it is one point, but it is seven points in reality. The points become harder to get when you have a higher supply of parking. You can go up to what the Planning Code can allow. We are thinking about whether or not a developer could get negative points for providing a certain amount of parking.
- One CA member expressed appreciation that the City is focusing on new development. I think the existing conditions need to be addressed as well to reduce the VMT in the City. We talked about congestion pricing. We need to look at new developments as well as strategies to look at existing conditions and reduce cars on

our streets. Also, the impact of driverless cars. The overall capacity of roads is going to increase. Maybe people will commute for longer if driverless cars make it convenient. I look at the building on Market Street at Buchanan. Can you look at how buildings improve walkability. How will you enforce this?

- SF Planning staff responded regarding enforcement: we are looking to budget two fulltime staff person for TDM and working with partner agencies to enforce these.
- Thank you for your comments about walkability and urban design.
- One CAC member expressed concern regarding families with young children who have to get around the City with children. Do you take that into consideration?
 - SF Planning staff responded that the City hears these concerns and we know parking is needed for various reasons. We also know that numerous families do live without a personal vehicle. We want to provide other measures to implement and support sustainable transportation.
 - Another CAC member followed up that he thinks there are a lot of families who live in the City without a car. I think the City needs to provide more transportation options other than the car.
- Why the waiver points for unbundling parking? I see this is already a lucrative advantage for the developer.
 - SF Planning staff responded that staff is looking at whether these items reduce VMT. Research shows that unbundling does reduce VMT.
- One CAC member discussed current conditions. In this area, we are adding a couple thousand people. Then, there has to be a look at capacity. Transit is at capacity. I think these measures are great, but in order to make a meaningful impact, we need to add more bus lines and need a grander impact.
- One CAC members encouraged the City to look into incentivize charging stations for electric bicycles.
- One CAC member shared that there should be some requirements on buildings of ten units or less (even if it is just information). Why is wayfinding a point? It seems too easy to provide. Enforcement: how will staff go out and how often and for how long?
 - SF Planning staff responded that the City is working out all of these details now.
- On receiving points for providing bike share memberships: how does that work?
 - SF Planning staff responded that the developer needs to offer the tenant the membership and then provide a membership.
- Is any other City doing a similar program?
 - SF Planning staff responded that Cambridge, MA is the closest in terms of number of parking spaces for applicability.

6. One Oak Public Plaza Build Public [discussion item]

- Brooke Rae, introductions, background and overview of One Oak Public Plaza and Build Public and Build Inc.. Michael Yarne., Build Inc., provided a brief overview of the One Oak Residential development project. He referenced Planning Code and the Market and Octavia Area Plan that mentions a plaza at this intersection. He provided an overview of the street design proposal for Oak Street. He shared a break down of the proposed plaza. Jared Press, Build Public, introduced himself

and provided a context of the existing cultural stakeholders around the public plaza and the need for public open space in the neighborhood. He provided an overview of the community engagement process over the past year. Build Public is requesting to come back to the MO CAC in September 2016 to ask for the In-kind Agreement. He shared a rough sketch of the plaza design and programming precedent (including Mint Plaza, Lincoln Center, and Yerba Buena). Build Public is working with MJM who will program the space. The plaza incorporates programming and activation from both sides of the plaza. A representative from Snoghetta provided an overview of the design inspiration.

CAC Questions and Comments:

- One CAC member shared that parallel parking provides a buffer to pedestrians. Did you think about making the section of Oak Street between Octavia and Franklin two-way? You are creating a plaza that cannot be accessed by pedestrians. We need a crosswalk on the north side of Franklin and Oak.
 - Build Public staff shared that yes, we tried every other option for street design and we agree with these suggestions.
- One CAC member suggested making sure Oak Plaza off of Van Ness doesn't become a place for Uber or Lyft to pull over and use the plaza.
 - Build Inc. staff shared that MTA has that authority and a private company doesn't have that authority.
- One CAC member pointed out that housing is approved at 98 and 110 Franklin and asked if .
 - Build Inc. staff shared that yes, we are working with these developments
- What is the In-kind value? What are you seeking? This seems like it is mitigation of the project's impact. I am not sure this is really an In-kind.
- One CAC member shared excitement because he thinks Oak Street could be a center. If we could design some successful shared spaces. We would like this to be an alleyway as a shared space. I think there has been a lot of thought about how a user would be in the space. But, I think it is important to think about how traffic will experience the space. The wind elements could also be a gateway. I suggest thinking about the people who are traveling past.
 - Build Inc. staff shared that the intersection will be grand. Looking at the grand, while creating a space that people will want to hang out it.
- One CA member likes incorporating the changes to the entrance to the MUNI. What about the MUNI elevator?
 - Build Inc. staff shared that they are proposing to build them a brand new elevator in the Muni building at 1 South Van Ness. There is a giant vault that is adjacent to the security guard's station in the building.
- One CAC member asked about traffic flow along Van Ness and Market. The plaza does feel exposed. Is there a barrier that you can create as part of the design?
 - The design team shared that they are looking into planters serving as a barrier. They are thinking through this right now. Build Inc. staff added that they will model the sound impacts of the space.
- You should talk to the Exploratorium regarding Yerba Buena's alley design elements in it.

7. Public Comment

There was no public comment.

8. Adjournment

NEXT MEETING: April 18, 2016