

Community Advisory Committee of  
Market and Octavia Area Plan  
City and County of San Francisco  
**Meeting Minutes**

Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 5<sup>TH</sup> Floor

**Monday, May 16, 2016**

**7:00 PM**

**Regular Meeting**

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

Committee Members Absent: Ted Olsson, Lou Vasquez, Mohammed Soriano Bilal

City Staff in Attendance: Andrea Nelson (SF Planning), Hank Wilson (SFMTA)

---

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

- Jason Henderson (Jason) called the meeting to order.

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

- Andrea Nelson (Andrea) – Mohammed Soriano Bilal is now officially on the Market and Octavia CAC.
- Andrea – Lower Public Realm Plan Meeting was Monday, May 9th.
- Jason – Attended and is very supportive of the Planning Department's schematic designs of Page Street.
- Robin Levitt (Robin) – there were also proposals east of Haight Street to address.
- Andrea – Pipeline project report is printed and there is a copy for each CAC member.
- Jason – 1601 Mission Street, approved by Planning Commission and were given a Conditional Use for excess parking. This is all in the wrong direction of The Hub goals and policies. I have two items to put out there to the CAC for discussion: 1) short term request: adopt a resolution at the next meeting: no projects in the Plan Area will be given a Conditional Use (CU) permit for excess

parking. 2) long term request – CAC to work with the Planning Department and other interested constituencies to draft legislation to have The Market Street Hub have zero parking. Parking is contributing to the cost of housing (in Hayes Valley it is \$200K to each unit).

- Joshua Marker (Josh) – Can the off-site BMR units go outside of the Plan Area?
- Jason – Yes, it goes into a Citywide pot of affordable housing units. We are not getting it in the heart of the City
- Paul Olsen (Paul) – And the Plan Area is a transit-rich area.
- Jason – I can work with Andi to write up a resolution. A bunch of the project proposals want a CU.
- Krute Singa (Krute) – Shouldn't a CU be for extenuating circumstances. Isn't this redundant?
- Jason – The parking ratio is incremental and varies in the Plan Area.
- Kenneth Wingard (Kenneth) – The Planning Department is not taking the CUs seriously.
- Jason – The current planners on these projects are not aware of the Market and Octavia Plan and the parking ratios. Our resolution is a step to increase awareness.
- Krute – We will put together a draft resolution for consideration at the next meeting.
- Robin – April from Supervisor Kim's office offered to have a conversation with the Planning Department. I think this is another good step.
- Jason – I suggest walking up Waller to see 55 Laguna.
- Robin – Gough repaving. I don't see the pedestrian signals that were supposed to be installed. Page and Gough, for example. There are three missing.
- Andrea – I will look into this. Will ask Cathal Hennessy or Casey Hildreth.
- Jason – repaving got delayed so this is from a few years ago.

### **3. Approval of minutes for April 2016 regular meetings** **[action item]**

- CAC Members approved the minutes (four ayes and two abstained).

### **4. On-Street Parking Management** **SFMTA [discussion item]**

- Hank Willson (Hank), Parking Policy Manager at SFMTA, introduced himself and provided his background and has been in the position for the past five months. I am looking forward to your input and your questions and answers. SFPark pilot achieved its goals to be a model for customer-oriented parking, make it easier to finding parking and reduced VMT. We are taking this citywide, but we don't have sensors in every space and we don't have an availability feed. We are looking for ways to acquire more data about availability. In the spirit of SFPark, SFMTA is working to collect and share data more widely (e.g. location of curb cuts, meter payment data feed, parking hour limits, etc.). Another project we are working on is the Permit Parking Reform program. We are taking a comprehensive look at what works and what doesn't. We are hosting a District 5 community meeting at Harvey Milk Elementary on June 8th at 6PM to gather

feedback regarding permit parking reform. Looking at a cap of residential parking permits per unit (currently four per household), excluding new buildings, visitors within permit zone could pay to stay for longer period than the posted time limit, rationalizing permit boundaries, and moving towards a community-focused planning process. The neighborhood parking planning initiative is working to get ahead of the changes that are coming to fast-growing neighborhoods. Vehicle sharing on-street parking – pilot program has been successful and we are looking at the data soon. Piloting new technology – paying by mobile device only instead of parking meters, e.g. the on-street parking management team would like to support more supporting sustainable modes. There is a potential evening metering option to match the hours of nearby businesses.

- Krute – The SFPark application is still active, but the sensors are not active?
  - Hank – correct.
- Jason – One of the frustrations being involved in the Plan: there are a lot of policies to reduce on-street parking. We thought that on-street parking revenue would go into transportation improvements. We would like to expand SFPark and invest revenue back into the Plan Area. What about along Octavia?
  - Hank – Most people do not want parking meters in residential areas. It is the direction that we want to move, but I don't think meters on residential blocks would fly.
  - Jason – what about installing meters after there is a new development?
  - Hank – We did that in Mission Bay and installed meters as part of a construction project.
- Paul – Let's be forward thinking about what should be on the street after construction.
- Jason – I would like to discuss the S Parking Permit boundary on a map. For example, they are just opening 55 Laguna and it is unregulated parking because it is a former public use (a lot of the freeway parcels are that way too). The S zone is fragmented and inefficient. S needs to be broken up – Lower Haight, Hayes Valley, Market Street, Duboce Triangle.
- Krute – I suggest the boundary should follow the commute patterns.
  - Hank – the SFMTA Transportation Code 905 doesn't contemplate breaking up the zones. But that is what we are hoping to do in the near future. This will be a community process. We would have to increase the buffer zones that are a couple of blocks wide. The public is not tied to the exact size and shape of the area.
- Robin – Residential parking permits seem too inexpensive. They should be higher. The charge should be commensurate with the amount of space that the car is taking up.
  - Hank – the price is limited by the State Constitution. So, we can only charge what the cost is of administering and maintaining the program.
- Robin – space on the street for bike share is important. Mission Street – I prefer riding my bicycle on Mission Street. Businesses may appreciate that more people are riding bicycles on Mission Street. To get a parking permit for one day was so difficult – you have to have so much information.
  - Hank – improvements in technology could make the process easier in the future.
- Jason – Evening parking metering would be great in Hayes Valley.
- Krute – I support Sunday parking metering in Hayes Valley.

- Hank – The Upper Market curb management project is a large rethink of metering at Castro to Octavia along Market Street and involves moving some metered parking around the corners to side streets.

## 5. **Bike Share Update**

### **Motivate [discussion item]**

- Emily Stapleton (Emily), General Manager, and Emily Catel, Site Planning Specialist from Motivate introduced themselves – Today, we are sharing a brief presentation about the status of the bike share expansion program. Motivate is about to submit permits to SFMTA next week (which includes 25% of the bicycles). Market and Octavia is a part of Phase 2 of the expansion, which includes 15% of bicycles and permits will be submitted to SFMTA in fall 2016. The community engagement process has been extensive and has involved the Supervisors offices and other cities' decision-makers, community members, among other stakeholders. Engagement techniques include: online map, community meetings, stakeholder meetings, and maps posted in three libraries. Emily shared a map of Phase 1 sites. Emily invited comments and feedback.
- Jason – why didn't Phase 1 include District 5? It looks like you have created a gap on Market Street. I am surprised you don't have a station between Van Ness and Duboce. I think you would find a lot of support it.
  - Emily – we wanted to connect heavily residential with commercial areas. Hayes Valley is a residential neighborhood, but we started with Mission and Castro. Phase 1 will be deployed late this year. Phase 2 is early next year. We were building density out to the south.
- Krute – there are two proposed bike pods on Duboce Park.
  - Emily – Sometimes the stations are denser in some areas than they are in others. This Phase was about filling in SOMA, but we didn't fill in all of the grid squares.
- Krute – Have you thought about relieving bus crowding in Hayes Valley? Specifically siting stations around bus routes?
  - Emily – we are excited about connecting the Caltrain station on 22<sup>nd</sup> Street.
- Krute – Are people of all different incomes going to be able to use the program?
  - Emily – Discount membership is \$5/month to residents who are eligible for MTA's Lifeline. We don't have cash payment capability at the beginning, but we are looking into it. 20% of stations will be located in communities of concern. We are partnering with advocates throughout the Bay Area to go door-to-door to promote the program.
- Krute – In terms of user interface, I took one out on Bike to Work Day. It was very difficult to take a one-day pass out and then I didn't know how to take the bike out. Can you tell on your phone where there are bikes (where stations are full and where you can find bikes)?
  - Emily – We would like to incorporate casual pass zones. It is in development.
- Jason – I have suggestions for specific sites: Western half of Hayes Valley – it is flat, then there is a hill, and then it is flat again. The Wiggle is a natural place for bike pods. 55 Laguna – Laguna and Buchanan Street side – there is a lot of opportunity. Patricia's Green area is another great location. Are you thinking about how in NYC they have a 50-pod bike share? I think Patricia's Green

would have a high demand. It was frustrating in NYC when there weren't any bicycles at bike pods.

- Paul – There is already a bike rental space on Patricia's Green.
  - Emily – There are challenges to selecting a potential bicycle pod location: finding continuous curb space, off street space, and balancing/predicting usage. If you think there is a good location, let us know.
- Jason – at Fell and Laguna, there will be a car free development. The Hickory Alley is the perfect place for this. Civic Center BART is going to be a big demand area for the last mile.
- Robin – on Market and Octavia – there is a leftover piece of land where Elgin Park comes in, also across from the Gay and Lesbian Center on Market. Along Octavia Boulevard, there are opportunities to put them on the side streets where there are parking spaces especially where there are affordable housing developments. In front of all of the cultural institutions in Hayes Valley (e.g. SF Jazz). There is a project at Fulton and Octavia – that is an opportunity. Other opportunities include: the Lower Haight (between Buchanan and Scott) and along Fillmore. Lily Street in front of my house, so I support a bike share pod there.

## **6. Brady Block Public Realm Design Strada Developments [discussion item]**

- William Goodman, Boe Hayward, and Michael Cohen, Strada Development, presented the status of the project to the CAC members. The group recently met with the Brady Block residents and the Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association (HVNA). They provided an overview of the site plan to the CAC. The development includes apartments and the developers are working within the existing zoning requirements (85 feet). The Colton Street affordable housing will include permanently affordable housing for Civic Center Hotel residents. The project will be phased and there are six buildings onsite. The project will include less than 0.5 parking onsite. The public open space is meant to feel public. The core of the block was identified as public open space in the Market and Octavia Plan. There is a BART vent in the middle of the public space. The Brady Street neighbors would like the space to be activated with the intention of activating the space – there are residential balconies and the retail space will be subsidized. There will be a sculpture in the middle of the open space which will be designed to mitigate the BART vent noise. There are three components: space for families and children, multi-use open space, and garden space.
- Jason – Generally supportive of the public realm concept, I like that there are many entrances. Where do you envision parking access for the buildings? I know there is a lot of traffic to the ballet school. With the park, that is going to turn into a traffic nightmare. Colton is not a wide street. Can we make 12th Street more pedestrian friendly? It is duplicative of South Van Ness.
  - Strada – we are working with nearby developers, SFMTA, and the Planning Department. We are coordinating with environmental review (CEQA) and ensuring all of the cumulative impacts are coordinated. We are exploring if we can shrink parking to just be under two of the buildings and ensure it is under a 0.5 ratio. We want the building to be beautiful. We are encouraging MTA and the Planning Department to find

- creative solutions to the traffic problem specifically to the ballet school (the entrance will be on Otis).
- We are keeping the Civic Center Hotel façade and are adding a couple of floors with glass exterior. We want to keep the character and we are preserving a lot of the historic storefronts to preserve the eclectic nature of the buildings.
- Robin – Can you preserve that the sign says “Hot” when it lights up? I like the scale to the plaza. It looks pretty exciting.
  - Strada – Planning is really excited about the development’s design and protection of the existing building facades. We haven’t figured out the exact design yet, but it will be porous and will feel like an outdoor living room.
- Jason – Can you put the retail inside the plaza?
  - Strada – we will have to subsidize the space under the porch to ensure that it is viable. We have the CHP space as a front door. We may be able to do retail in the bottom floor of the Civic Center Hotel.
- Krute – there are a lot of homeless people along the Brady Block. We had the same problem at the Castro Street plaza. And after three years, we had to pull up the street furniture.
  - Strada – we think the key is to bring a number of people to the space, bring all balconies.
- Paul – when we built Patricia’s Green, the Police Department wanted us to fence in, Patricia’s Green (in order to keep out the undesirables). We argued that having it open and accessible would activate the space and it would be safe as a result.
- Krute – I only saw one space for bicycle parking. I recommend including more.
  - Strada – yes, we will have more bicycle parking.
- Jason – Who owns the Brady Plaza?
  - Strada - Half owned by BART and half by Plumber’s Union.
- Jason – In the Market and Octavia Plan, this site was meant to go to Recreation and Parks. But the Department asked earlier for us to invest impact fee funds into the Brady Block open space.
  - Strada – Recreation and Parks would like it to be a Privately-Owned Public Open Space (POPO) at this point. We are having trouble negotiating with BART. They are concerned that terrorism is a risk. You have to get a permit or a lease from BART to use the space. We may be asking from collective community advocacy to support the project.

## **7. Public Comment**

- Viviana with Crescent Heights would like to express concern regarding the CAC’s desire to prohibit parking. Our priority is to make 12<sup>th</sup> Street pedestrian friendly.

## **8. Adjournment**

**NEXT MEETING: June 20, 2016**