

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 26, 2018
7:00 PM
Regular Meeting

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

Committee Members Absent: Lou Vasquez, Mohammed Soriano Bilal

City Staff in Attendance: Ben Caldwell (SF Planning), Tam Tran (SF Planning), Rafe Rabelais (SFMTA)

1. Call to order and roll call

- Jason called the meeting to order

2. Announcements, upcoming meetings, project updates, and general housekeeping

- CAC to connect with Jon Moscone re: possible presentation
- Robin: Lily St living alleys group is moving along, first steps toward becoming a Living Alley. Saturday, June 9th is a Lily St fair for the community, along with community garage sale, starting around 10am. Looking for musicians and performers.

3. Approval of minutes for January 2018 regular meeting

- Ted moves to approve, Chase seconds, 4 in favor, 2 abstains (Krute, Joshua)

4. ConnectSF

- Tam Tran from Planning Department presenting an update on ConnectSF, San Francisco's 50-year long-range transportation planning process. ConnectSF came to you a year ago to encourage participation in Task Force. Tam gave

overview of ConnectSF program and goals, as well as community engagement efforts to date. Draft vision has resulted from months of community outreach as well as engagement with the program's Futures Task Force. Accepting comments on the vision until March 1st, or March 2nd for this CAC.

- Krute: clarifying that looking for comments on Vision. Tam: Yes.
- Jason: Why aren't there measurable performance metrics associated with the Vision? E.g., desirable multi-modal split in long-term. Tam: Performance metrics are in development right now, of which there are around 60, but not available for public review yet.
- Krute: To what degree are you linking with regional or statewide goals? Tam: Timing first two studies to be completed in time for regional transportation plans. Will need to look into statewide goals to be sure those are in alignment. Krute: Be more specific on how you define sustainable transportation; what is sustainable? Tam: We will look into that.
- Josh: ConnectSF will have to take into account broader area and region. Tam: The vision specifically states the City is a regionally-minded entity. Vision that was chosen was very regionally-oriented.
- Robin: No comments, was involved in ConnectSF workshop
- Jason: Would urge ConnectSF to consider that regional goals are already underwhelming and SF already meets the goals. Region's bike modal share goal of 1% is underwhelming, e.g. So SF goals should be ambitious. Also, shouldn't housing be a separate goal? Housing is transportation. How can ConnectSF account for housing? Tam: ConnectSF wants to think expansively, and today's situation has driven the conversation. While affordability and housing is a very urgent issue today, we don't know what will be the big issue the day will be in coming years. Housing is embedded in our goals and the vision text. Planning is involved to the extent we are to make sure land use is a key part of the discussion. Housing is discussed in the Vision document, but if it's not robust enough let us know.
- Ted: Updates and perspectives, need to have metrics for what are the key steps along the way to get us to the 50-year vision. Sea level rise has to be critical. 5- and 10 and earlier year plans should be part of this planning.
- Potential action item; Krute: I would support the Vision, does the Committee feel ready to support the Vision? Jason: would like to have affordable housing be a key part of the Vision.
- Robin: I have been involved and agree with the principles, but it has gotten to a point on SF streets where essential services are less possible than ever. The

elephant in the room is private automobiles, and we need policies that more explicitly make this clear and rein in private automobiles. Tam: On p. 11, text box discusses not having a two-tier transportation system. New funding mechanisms are also explicitly discussed on p. 13. If what is in the Vision now isn't enough, let us know.

Krute: Not ready at the point to support the Vision. Will need to wait for the next meeting, so could be in time for the commission meetings. Krute will take first pass at creating declaration of support, to share with Committee and revise before next meeting.

5. **Gough + Grove SF MTA Public Sites**

- Rafe Rabelais from MTA facilities and real estate division. Property in question is Gough and Grove surface parking lot, owned by MTA. MTA looking to develop surplus property wherever possible, per Mayor's Directive. This site is among the furthest along. MTA's vision report identified surface parking lots like this one as development sites. Study commissioned to look at feasibility of 5 sites, including this one, as well as revenue generation, affordability level. Conclusion was that this site was most feasible. No development concept, but extensive process. Not a large number of units.
- Ted: How would this affect patrons of arts venues nearby? Rafe: Little impact to larger garage.
- Robin: Happy to see parcel being considered for development, as last vestige of Central Freeway. Interesting to see housing on top of the garage, if feasible. Hope this parcel is much better than Hotel Vitale development, especially in the way it engages the street. MTA should start thinking about developing wide streets that could support more housing.
- Jason: MTA is interested in seeing some kind of income – that would become part of operations funding? But also important sites for affordable housing. Rafe: great point, ultimately that decision comes down to site-by-site analysis. What about MTA's TNC strategy for Hayes Valley? Rafe: we are incorporating this site into analysis for this area.
- Krute: Hope that MTA doesn't include parking as part of its developments, and can build smaller units for max development; Rafe: MTA going that direction already.

6. **555 Fulton Grocery store**

- Tim Woloshyn from Z&L Properties. Here to give an overview on the status of the grocery store. Disappointing to lose New Seasons Market, which seemed an ideal tenant for the property. Letter from New Seasons came in December. 555 Fulton was first of several places New Seasons cut as expansion plans

were curtailed. NS concerned about ability to be successful, and were increasingly less engaged. Question is what do we do now. Supervisor's office is keeping a close eye to make sure we do what we say we are going to do. There are some possible tenants, but nothing firm yet. Some operational challenges is any infill market, especially for a grocery store. There will CU process once the prospective tenant is identified.

- Supe Aide: Where are you in the process in terms of securing a letter of intent with one of the grocers? Tim: Hope to be getting a letter soon, heard that interested party is close to commitment but hard to know for sure.
- Jason: Can you say what your asking price is for 30,000 sq. ft. grocer? Tim: Not involved in those discussions on the transactional side. Jason: suspect that a big percentage of that lease is the parking – how can we get to lower asking price with parking removed from lease, to get affordable grocer? Needs to be affordable so how do we get there? What urban planning lessons can we learn from this? Also need to make sure that the benefits of lifting the formula retail ban are considered and taken into account.
- Robin: Is new Whole Foods at Grove affecting negotiations or discussions? Tim: Hard to know what impact or affect this may or may not have.
- Robin: What would become of that space if grocery could not be found? Supe Aide: Entitlements say a grocery store must be part of project. Tim: Other retail services, specialty groceries, PDR also allowed by code.
- Jason: Would caution that the amount of parking in this space doesn't make smaller grocery or retail viable.
- Gayle (public comment): Want to make sure that any potential tenant is aware of the latest community benefits agreement. Tim: Definitely will be, there is legal

7. Living Alleys:

- Jessica: Four rounds of funding, \$330,000 allocated for Hickory and Linden Phase II. We have learned that program is not living up to the intent, per M-O Plan. Permitting issues with DPW are too big a lift for community groups. Because of this, City Administrator is not going to issue another round of funding. Here to get your opinions on what could be done to address the issues. Could the Planning Department step in to support these being more City-led projects?
- David: Projects that are applying don't seem to be giving us enough bang for the buck. Applications are more small-scale and opportunistic, as well as limited.
- Jason: Whole original point of these street spaces was to provide more open space in the absence of major parks.

- David: Unfortunately, the City department with the most control over this issue does not support these kinds of streets.
- Robin: Lily Street effort has been going on for so long, there are so many permitting and insurance processes. When everybody has a say, then nobody has a say. What about doing a guerrilla woonerf?
- David: what if money was provided for parklet-like structures in M-O alleys?
- Krute: Could playstreets model be used?
- David: Request that the CAC look more closely at what this money could be used for that would honor the spirit of the Living Alleys intent.

8. **Public Comment**

- Gayle from HVNA: Thank you for your letter to Muhammed and Carla Short – upgrades to first median on Octavia have started. Freeway removal memorial effort is proceeding, and if funding is available for facilitator that would be much appreciated. Potential facilitators have been identified.

9. **Adjournment**

NEXT MEETING: March 19, 2018