

Citizens Advisory Committee of the
Eastern Neighborhoods Plan,
City and County of San Francisco

Meeting Notes

1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor, Room 528
Monday, August 19, 2019

6:30 PM

Walker Bass

Sara Bahat

Don Bragg

Andrew Cheng

Keith Goldstein

Ryan Jackson

Henry Karnilowitz

Irma Lewis

Tony Meneghetti

Kevin Ortiz

Heather Philips

Sarah Souza

Jane Weil

Jolene Yee

Robin Abad

Mat Snyder

Guests/Presenters: Stacy Bradley

Toks Ajike, Jeremy Shaw

The Agenda is available at the Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, 4th floor and, on our website at encac.sfplanning.org, and at the meeting.

6:36: Keith Goldstein, Chair, Called the Meeting to Order

1. (5m) Announcements and Review of Agenda.
 - a. Andrew Cheng advised that he is awaiting confirmation from Kanishka about official appointment.
2. (10m) Informational: Railyards and Showplace Area Planning. Jeremy Shaw, SF Planning
 - a. Review of the on the Showplace/SoMa Neighborhood Analysis & Coordination Study (SNACS), noting that the study gets going in earnest in September 2019
 - b. Committee request for further clarification about urban design and transit provision
 - c. Committee suggested reaching out to Tenants and Onwers Development Corporation (TODCO)

- d. What is planning's current take on the Recology project, which is not aligned with the EN Plan
 - i. Mayor has indicated that housing is a priority for development projects
 - ii. Targets for the project now include 40% affordable housing, with PDR required under EN Plan
 - e. Do they get special entitlements or dispensation
 - i. Developers have a right to apply to rezone their property. Planning will analyze anything the project sponsor brings forward
 - f. How long will it take to plan and implement the Penn Avenue and Downtown Extension?
 - i. Potential within the next ten years
 - g. Will the study impact all the plan areas?
 - i. Proposed changes to urban form will concentrate on the part of the Western Soma Plan area adjacent to the railyards. But there may be policy changes in the Plan Areas to accommodate new provisions
 - h. Would the SNACS add the policies and codes in the Western SoMa Area Plan?
 - i. Shaw: yes, the SNACS could result in updates to pre-existing Area Plans, including the Western SoMa Area Plan.
 - i. Childcare: are you reaching out to parent groups? SFUSD?
 - i. Not at this moment
 - j. Is recology site in EN?
 - i. yes
 - k. Are you going to take input on 16th Street?
 - i. MTA will be part of the SNACS, and can speak to their outreach approach on the 16th Street TEP
 - l. Schools are very limited in Showplace and Central Soma. Is there a potential site for open schoolyards through this plan?
 - i. Not sure. The mission bay plan has a school site identified
3. Public Comment:
- a. What is the southern border for showplace square
 - i. Cesar Chavez (it's part of the Potrero Hill Area Plan)
3. (10m) Informational: Community Challenge Grant program, budget, and project update. Lanita Henriquez, CCG - Tabled for September as Lanita unable to attend. She sent the following note:
- a. "The cycle opens on Sept. 11th and closes October 16th. Eastern Neighborhoods has \$700K to award this cycle."
4. (10m) Discussion: SOMA CAC Ordinance, final feedback due to Supervisor Haney.
- a. Mat Snyder gave an overview of the new ordinance
 - b. Robin Abad relayed Supervisor Office's suggestions about how to handle the inclusion of the term "Dogpatch" in the "Central Waterfront" place name
 - c. The Committee declined to pursue the use of "Dogpatch" in the name of the Area at this time.

5. (25m) Presentation: Recreation and Parks Department Capital Plan and projects update-Stacy Bradley and Toks Ajike, SF Recreation & Parks Dept, Capital Planning. **Robin - for consistency we should use name and dept. only for RPD, as you've done for the other speakers in the minutes**
6. RPD walked through presentation of SF RPD Capital Plan
 - a. Where did impact fees for Guy Place come from?
 - i. Rincon Hill
 - b. What is the intersection / location?
 - i. Cesar Chavez and 101
 - c. \$1.8 MM EN impact fees allocated for Jose Coronado are no longer needed and will be reallocated to Jury Commons (\$175K) and Jackson (balance).
 - d. Mission Rec Center - additional detail not in presentation
 - i. Planning / feasibility and structural Assessment begins this coming fall 2019. 14-18 mos for structural feasibility and analyses. Then to develop a scope; then a plan.
 - ii. This is a major project expected to run in excess of \$50MM, which will be funded through Bond allocation. It's a 60 yr. old building which may have some historic preservation considerations.
 - e. The Committee will schedule time for RPD to return for a more detailed bond updated.
7. Equity Zones discussion
 - a. Where is the Environmental Assessment? How do you factor historic Environmental Justice inequities?
 - i. Equity Zones take into account the "Disadvantaged Communities". The Equity Zones are the top 20% of census block groups for factors such as: low birth rate, language isolation, lower income.
 - ii. Committee suggests coordinating with Public Health department to address variables not included in the equity zone criteria which impact EN neighborhoods more than others in the city, like pollution and lack of tree cover
 - b. Are you are providing more funding in Equity Zones?
 - i. Yes, it's how the Department sets priorities for where funding should go
 - c. You are aware the EN still has deficiencies per person for open space
 - i. Growth projections are also part of the Department sets priorities for funding. Balancing both equity and growth conditions; as well as physical conditions of sites. There's also a difference between the parks we have and the parks we need.
 - d. Public Comment: how do you look at needs? And are you taking into account the location of children?
 - i. The Department does look at a needs assessments across the entire system. The Department also tries to understand where people are travelling from in order to access sites and resources. This helps inform capital planning and investment as well. And yes, youth and seniors are part of the equity zones we use to set investment priorities
 - e. The Committee reminded RPD of our request to have presentations sent for review in advance of the meeting. Can you do that for the next meeting?
 - i. RPD - Yes
 - f. Committee requests noting the size of bldg and acreage of park in future presentation
 - i. RPD - Yes, we will do that
6. (15m) Question and Answer: Recreation and Parks Department Response to CAC questions.
 - a. **All Bond allocation questions are tabled. Bond fund allocations have not yet been figured out. There are several bodies that need to review and approve. This is an iterative public process, starting in the fall. RPD would like to come back to the EN CAC for a more bond-focused feedback discussion.**
 - b. What are the rules and regulations for project planning and budgeting? Members can find processes for other city agencies, but not RPD.
 - i. There are no rules and process that apply universally across projects. All projects have unique funding streams; so community engagement can vary by project
 - c. How are members of the oversight committee for GO bonds selected?
 - i. By the mayor's office.
 - d. To whom and how often does your dept report? And is it the same for projects funded by impact fees?

- i. There are a multitude of projects and a multitude of funding sources – there are different bodies to report to. Parks and Recreation Open Space Committee (PROZAC) is one.
 - e. The Committee requests that for future presentations, RPD break down programs per neighborhood
 - f. Esprit: Is it on budget? Over budget? The \$8MM budget was derived by the City costing experts using grass as a baseline. How is the project absorbing RPD’s new request for artificial turf, which has a much higher capital cost?
 - i. **Ajike believes the project is still on budget. However he will confirm with the project manager.**
 - g. **What is the RPD cost est. of artificial turf? Absent cost estimates from RPD, volunteers researched and arrived at estimates from \$500-\$800K. This wasn’t in the original costing when the project was estimated at \$8Million**
 - i. **When the scope is finalized, the Department will go through another cost estimating effort**
 - h. The Committee advised a strong reluctance to gap fund project budget overages, in light of construction cost escalations experienced by almost all capital projects. For example, Garfield requested an extra \$575k from the EN CAC
 - i. What is the general cost overruns / cost over original budget amount?
 - i. Of course there are cost overages with implementing projects due to cost escalation. However RPD has never dropped a project.
 - j. What is RPD’s role in the Shared Schoolyard program?
 - i. RPD looks for opportunities for where the needs of schoolyards and RPD overlap
7. Public Comment:
 - a. **Can the Dept help the public understand the reasons for, and cost implications of, schedule overruns?** And how can small projects stay on schedule?
 - i. Jason Sq has been an anomaly in terms of the schedule issues it has faced.
 - b. Thank you for suggesting re-allocation of funds from Jose Coronado to Jackson. Looking forward to seeing that in future presentations / up for vote to approve reallocation by the EN CAC.
 - i. Jackson is a project the community is eager to see realized, especially with more children and families in the neighborhood.
 - ii. RPD recognizes the needs at Jackson.
8. Meeting adjourned at 8:29

7. (15m) Review and Approve Meeting Minutes

- a. March 2019
- b. April 2019
- c. May 2019
- d. June 2019

- 8. Public Comment. At this time, members of the public may address the Citizens Advisory Committee on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee but do not appear on the agenda. With respect to agenda items, the public will be given an opportunity to address the Committee when the item is reached in the meeting. Each member of the public may address the Committee for up to three minutes.

The Brown Act forbids a Committee from taking action or discussing any item not appearing on the posted agenda, including those items raised at Public Comment. In response to public comment on an item that is not on the agenda, the Committee is limited to:

- Briefly responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public, or
- Requesting staff to report back on the matter at a subsequent meeting, or
- Directing staff to place the item on a future agenda. (Government Code Section 54954.2(a)).