

Meeting Notes
Eastern Neighborhoods Citizen Advisory Committee
March 18 2019

Attended: Don Bragg, Keith Goldstein, Bruce Kin Huie, Ryan Jackson, Irma Lewis, Tony Meneghetti, Dan Murphy, Kevin Ortiz, Heather Philips, Sara Souza, Jolene Yee
Absent: Walker Bass, Sara Bahat, Marcia Contreras, Henry Karnilowitz,

Staff Present: Robin Abad, May Snyder, Lisa Chen

1. Announcements
 - a. Bruce leaving EN CAC, April 2019 is his last meeting

2. Overview
 - a. August / September Lisa presented central soma
 - b. Lisa Chen presented on the difference between the current EN CAC, proposed SoMa CAC (proposed by Kim before end of 2018), and the recommendations of Planning and MOHCD staff for new legislation
 - c. Dan Murphy:
 - i. What are the percentages used to divide fees between complete streets and open space for EN CAC?
 1. Planning Code Section 423.5
 - ii. These have handcuffed the EN CAC in terms
 - iii. Mat Snyder: New nexus study may develop new percentage recommendations.

3. Discussion with Supervisor Haney
 - a. Supervisor Haney gave some opening remarks
 - b. Invited the CAC to provide feedback
 - c. Timeline:
 - i. At SOMA Stabilization CAC
 - ii. Substitute legislation in April
 - iii. Time after legislation is submitted for CAC to provide feedback
 - iv. Planning Commission
 - v. Potential Vote at the Board in May or June
 - d. Keith: the legislation to establish a new CAC will go to Board for vote in June?
 - i. MH: Yes
 - ii. Intention to introduce substitute legislation sooner than then
 - iii. In front of board committee in May or June
 - e. Dan Murphy: Do you have specific questions for us to reaction?
 - i. MH: is what we have now a good idea?
 - f. Keith: Existing EN CAC: Someone will propose legislation to change composition of EN CAC
 - i. Abby and Lisa: So one ordinance would address this

- ii. MH: we will include EN CAC reconfiguration in this legislation
- g. Irma: why keep a legacy D6 on the new EN CAC, but not an EN CAC in the Soma CAC?
 - i. Lisa showed the map of the EN CAC Area Plans and District
 - ii. MH: Showplace and Portrero plan area would still have representation through the Mayoral appointment...
- h. Irma: the role of the EN CAC: when the EN CAC makes a decision, there is a difference of opinion about how much we advise... agency doesn't listen to EN CAC
 - i. What does advise mean?
 - ii. Heather Philips – this body has no teeth
 - iii. This is a rubber stamp, not something the agencies take seriously
 - iv. Strength to CAC to give it teeth with agencies
 - v. Your voice does not matter with the Agency
 - vi. D Murphy: The CAC was never supposed to make decisions, but advise
 - 1. The Interagency MOU created IPIC
 - 2. Over the years, staff knows what to do now
- i. Haney:
 - i. If there are things in the actual listed responsibilities, or processes that you want to change, then please suggest. I am open to that.
 - ii. We also want to address that in the SoMa CAC.
- j. Keith: Our last Monitoring report showed we didn't deliver on PDR, residential
- k. Bruce: Percentage of revenue going into which geographic areas?
 - i. Some areas are taking the brunt of development, but not seeing the fees
- l. Haney:
 - i. Does it still make sense to have a legacy EN CAC with those three areas?
- m. Ryan: What about functions of soma stabilization fund
 - i. Chen: This does not change too much;
 - ii. Expands funding dramatically
- n. Ryan: what was the community argument for keeping the SOMA Stabilization and SOMA CAC's separate?
 - i. There are different skill sets, different goals, different funding
- o. Public Comment:
 - i. John Elberling:
 - 1. The stabilization fund CAC does grantmaking, that's why it's in MOHCD vs. Planning. Has been working very well for 10 years
 - 2. John hadn't seen this before tonight
 - 3. Differences btw EN CAC and SoMa duties:
 - a. There is more funding coming from SoMa than in EN CAC
 - b. (CFD)
 - c. Community wants to monitor implementation of Soma Plan – more specific promises from development projects
 - i. Ex: good jobs ordinance for employment program goals

- d. MOH – needs to come to the Stabilization CAC to explain what they want to spend \$ on.
 - 4. Wants to advise on projects outside the SoMa boundary
 - a. Hall of justice
 - b. Moscone Hotel

- 4. SOMA CAC Expenditures
 - a. Mat Snyder provided a presentation regarding the methodology for dividing revenues from projects currently being tracked by the EN CAC
 - b. All the projects that have paid fees
 - c. Irma: there needs to be broader analysis. Some projects in one area may cost more in one area vs. another.
 - d. We want more analysis:
 - e. Dan Murphy: Run the true up when SoMa gets created
 - f. **Mat will run a neighborhood-by-neighborhood version of the analysis (originally done one 01/09/2019 for SoMa/NonSoMa) for all five of the EN Neighborhoods**
 - i. **Neighborhood by neighborhood Revenue vs. Expenditures**
 - g. **December 2019 we would reconcile the expenditure vs. revenue**
 - i. **Kevin: Please include Jackson Park in the sheet**
 - h. **The city agency has not taken into account the EN CAC's unanimous**

- 5. Election of Offices
 - a. Chair: Keith Goldstein
 - b. Vice-Chair: Sarah Bahat
 - c. Secretary: Irma Lewis
 - d. All present Aye (unanimous)

- 6. Public Comment
 - a. Jude: the EN CAC's resolution to allocate \$6m to Jackson Park is not represented in the spreadsheet
 - b.

- 7. Vote on November 2018 Minutes
 - a.