

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, June 20, 2016**  
**7:00 PM**  
**Regular Meeting**

Committee Members Present: Jason Henderson, Krute Singa, Robin Levitt, Paul Olsen, Ted Olsson, Lou Vasquez, Mohammed Soriano Bilal, Joshua Marker

Committee Members Absent: Kenneth Wingard

City Staff in Attendance: Andrea Nelson (SF Planning), Jacob Bintliff (SF Planning), Carli Paine (SFMTA), Francesca Napolitan (SFMTA), Alexander Jonlin (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]**

- The group officially welcomed Mohammed Soriano Bilal to the CAC. CAC members provided introductions for Mohammed.
- Andrea Nelson (Andrea) shared that the next meeting is September 19, 2016.
- Jason – I am going on a sabbatical in Copenhagen until January 2017. Krute will take on the leadership role of conducting the MO CAC meetings. I will not be able to vote, but I will be accessible via email.
- Jacob Bintliff (Jacob) – another round of Living Alley grants for August 8th. Anyone interested has five weeks to respond. One of two applications received was accepted for Ivy Alley. The second application was for Rose and the application was denied because there was not a community member that was identified as a steward. There will be a meet and greet on July 19th 6:00-7:00PM for people who are interested in applying. Please let us know if you know anyone interested.
- Robin Levitt (Robin) – Lily residents are going to submit an application. The July 9th block party on Lily will reveal preliminary plans. It will extend a few blocks.
- Jacob – Updates on Parcels M and N: there is a proposal to build 24 units. It has been environmentally cleared and went to Planning Commission for an informational session. Neighbors in adjacent Bridge Housing are concerned

because the development will block their light and view of Octavia. The new development will not block their primary windows. The developers adjusted the design of the building to address concerns by changing the angle of the roof, the stairway will have windows through the building. The revised plan will go to the Planning Commission this week. Planning Department is recommending approval.

- Robin – I am planning to attend the Planning Commission hearing. The windows in the Bridge Housing building are actually illegal. The proposed development does everything right – it engages with the sidewalk, it doesn't have any parking, and it does everything that the Plan calls for. I would lobby the Planning Commission not to make any adjustments.
- Lou Vasquez (Lou) – how many units are affected in the Bridge Housing? It is two parcels, correct? What about the south side?
- Jason – the Bridge Housing is twelve units. There is a Victorian adjacent to the south side of the parcel. I would like to echo what Robin said. The development is sticking with the bedroom mix. It meets all of the Plan's goals and policies. These tenants should have been told a long time ago that the windows were illegal. I think there is a lot of misunderstanding in the community that these are regular developments, but these developments are paying off the bond for the Boulevard. It's been 15 years since we talked about the Plan and new residents don't know about the Plan.
- Ted Olsson (Ted) – do you think it would be useful for the CAC to write out a statement that could be handed out to new tenants and/or people who are opposing new developments.
- Robin – I think the Planning Department needs to take a more leadership role.
- Jacob – the Planning Department is responding to people's concerns and is reinforcing and educating people about the Plan. We maintain the webpage about the Plan.
- Jason – should we convey a sentiment about the project to the Planning Commission? It's not a resolution. He asked for the group's agreement to support the project.
- Jacob – I will convey this to the current planner, Carly Grob.
- Ted – I think we should share this with the Planning Department
- Jacob – if you would like to make an agenda item about sharing this with the Planning Department, please let Andrea know.

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

- Paul – please adjust my comments regarding Patricia's Green.
- Krute – page 6: I did not say these comments, but I think Jason did.
- CAC members approved the minutes with revisions (three abstentions, five ayes).

### **4. SFMTA Commuter Shuttle Program** **SFMTA [discussion item]**

- Jason – I asked SFMTA to come and present an overview of the SFMTA Commuter Shuttle Program.
- Carli Paine (Carli) – from SFMTA, now Land Use Development and Integration Manager; Francesca Napolitan (Francesca) with SFMTA, Curb Access Manager; and, Alex Jonlin (Alex) with SFMTA, staffer with Shuttles Program and handles day-to-day with providers introduced themselves. Commuter shuttles are third-party service that provides transportation from work to home, there is no direct payment system between rider and provider, and they have set routes and schedules. These shuttles started over a decade ago. SFMTA manages the curb and historically responded to issues with shuttles on an ad-hoc basis. At the urging of the County Transportation Authority, SFMTA looked at what regulating the shuttles would look like. This resulted in an 18-month pilot program including a network of designated stop locations, including some of the less frequently used Muni bus stops. They initiated a permit program with terms that the shuttles had to comply with and fees that recovered the costs of the program. One of the most prevalent concerns SFMTA heard from residents during the pilot program was the presence of larger buses on smaller streets.
- Carli - We crafted an on-going permit policy and program as a result of the lessons learned during the pilot program – buses over 35 buses in length would be restricted to the arterial network as designated by Caltrans. Any new vehicle that providers wanted to get permits for would need be from 2012 or later. Decals on the shuttles are larger, consistent, and visible. Providers have to report what they will do if service is disrupted. Enforcement and fees have also been increased. Board changed the program to be one year, maximum of 125 stop locations, asked SFMTA to study the opportunity of stop hubs, the Board asked for a study to look at housing and transport relationships from the Budget and Legislative Analyst's Office. The program launched April 1, 2016. Providers have received penalties for not complying with the program.
- Jason – is the (BLA) study looking at the cost of off-street parking as well as housing and transport?
- Carli – I don't know. They have not contacted us.
- Alex – major revisions affecting MO area: commuter shuttles are no longer allowed on Hayes Street. We see a lot of the shuttles going down Fell and Oak to access the freeway. They tend to do three to four pickups and then get on the freeway. Alex walked the CAC members through the updated map of stop locations and permitted streets in the Market and Octavia Area. Concurrent with this process, shuttles will no longer be able to stop on Van Ness Avenue with the Van Ness BRT. During the construction period, these shuttles will travel down Franklin and Gough. We are working with the community to find the best locations.
- Jason – I do not support private shuttles. I do appreciate that the buses aren't travelling down neighborhood streets. I appreciate SFMTA channeling the shuttles along major corridors. I am relieved that Church Street is not a route. It was blocking the #22. I still have concerns about Divisadero being a shuttle route since it is a transit route. Can we transfer them to a different arterial? I appreciate SFMTA's efforts.
- Ted – I appreciate your efforts. I think the buses are extremely important to achieve Vision Zero goals and to reduce vehicle miles traveled.
- Francesca –We will present findings from the Commuter Shuttle Hub study in the fall and will look to the Board for direction. SFMTA has data to see what is

happening and it is how we issue citations. We would like to share this data with the public. Given that the program has only been authorized for 12 months, it is not within the scope of this year's project to look at infrastructure improvements. We need to think about the nexus between fees and cost of impacts.

- Jason – idea was that SFMTA would charge fees based on impacts and associated cost.
- Mohammed – have you calculated the overhead administrative cost of running the program?
- Carli – we are recovering the cost at this point. The way we create the fee base: we determine how much it costs to run the program and determine the additional need for infrastructure improvements based on shuttle impacts. Potentially, the shuttles that stop more than others would pay more.
- Paul Olsen (Paul) – I have seen a great change in the last few months. I heard complaints about shuttle buses were using red lanes.
- Carli – some red lanes are legislated for buses only (which include shuttle buses) and others are just for Muni.
- Paul – Is UCSF part of the program? People are not happy with where they go and how they stop.
- Carli – No, they are not although they are eligible to participate. So, they don't have access to the network of stops and zones. Yes, they can use City streets as they wish since they are not in the program. We have a limited ability with shaping private buses, but we can regulate access to curb. We have leveraged curb regulations to reduce the size of the vehicles, improve air quality, and other improvements.
- Krute Singa (Krute) – did you look at bike corridors and what was the reasoning behind including choosing Valencia as a major route?
- Alex – safety has been the highest priority. We have been looking to move shuttles off Valencia Street.
- Carli – we have shifted shuttle stops away from bike lanes.
- Robin – Webster Street is still on the shuttle route even though it narrows into a residential street.
- Jason – it is a legacy from the 60s. It is not an arterial street. Can we remove it?
- Francesca – the shuttle network is an ongoing conversation. We are reflecting on what is the right typology and when should SFMTA make exceptions.
- Jason – I would like for a better grasp of the true ridership on each bus. Maybe they could be running shorter buses. Is there anything that you would ask of this committee?
- Carli – several of you expressed your own experiences with the program. Having your testimony would be useful.
- Ted – I would imagine it would be difficult for companies to commit to smaller buses because employee work hours are irregular.

#### **5. Market Street Hub Project Parking Status Update and Discussion** **SF Planning Department [discussion item and potential action item]**

- Jason – Prop C passed which projects are subject to increased affordable housing requirements. Krute, Andrea, Jacob and myself drafted a resolution.
- Jacob – the Planning Department presented an update about pipeline projects and parking. He presented a map of the Market and Octavia zoning map. The

highest density areas have the highest parking maximum down to the lowest density areas have the lowest parking requirements. Jacob passed around a map and referred the CAC members to the table which includes the projects in the pipeline. He summarized that most applicants in the Market Street Hub area are applying for the maximum parking numbers. He then presented a summary of pipeline projects in the entire plan area. He summarized that the majority of projects are proposing a fewer number of parking. The overall parking ratio of the Market and Octavia projects is 0.4.

- Ted – it is discretionary.
- Jason – in 2009, the first project approved after the Market and Octavia Plan (MO Plan) was at the corner of 14th and Valencia. They got a conditional use for excess parking and organizations appealed it to the Planning Commission. The Board of Directors said that they would eliminate CUs for parking. CUs were not issued for the area. Since then, institutional memory has been lost. I think we should express our disappointment with 1601 Mission and the Flax site. You need to think about the magnitude of the projects – regardless of the ratio. This is the place for zero parking. It is going to gridlock the 14 Mission, Market Street, Van Ness Avenue BRT, etc. It is going to take away from greening public realm. I think we need to get a handle on CUs for accessory parking.
- Lou – In a workable City, you need to have parking somewhere even though I am not a big fan of cars. If you look at the existing parking and subtract that from the 0.4, you need to see the differential and the impact is substantially less than you anticipate. The gridlock is overstated. I think we are addressing a problem that doesn't exist.
- Jason – the point is that the gridlock is there now and we need to reduce the gridlock that is there now. The situation is untenable.
- Ted – I agree with Lou, but I think we need to ask the Planning Department to assess what the degree of change has been while there haven't been CUs for a period of time and get a baseline. My concern is with families and children who will live in these buildings and need to get to education opportunities and the transit system is not built for families.
- Jason – in Hayes Valley, the developers are reserving the parking spaces for the two-bedroom apartments. The creation of a complete community, where all of the services are, like Manhattan, work and have very little parking and car ownership. We are asking for Planning Commission and the Planning Department to stop granting CUs for accessory parking. They are not using discretion about it. They just do it. It is not necessary or viable.
- Jacob – the Planning Commission is listening to people who come forward to share their opinions.
- Lou – what was studied in the original EIR for the plan about parking? How were parking ratios determined at that time?
- Jacob – we will have to get back to you.
- Jason – the EIR assessed zero parking and the maximums. The parking ratios were determined by the Planning Department and with the community. The rationale was to keep in line with the existing parking ratios.
- Lou – I am concerned that we are abandoning the plan's years of development and discussion.
- Mohammed – were there any needs assessments of people who live in the neighborhood?

- Jason – there aren't that many people who live in the Market Street Hub now and have historically been underrepresented. This area wasn't residential, it was light industrial.
- Lou – biggest opposition to the removal of parking is from the cultural institutions (Conservatory of Music, etc).
- Robin – I think we do need to decide on this tonight. I support this resolution. I think we need to tweak it. There is no harm in reinforcing the regulations. Especially given that the first two approved projects in the Hub area have received CUs.
- Lou – I think that the number of parking numbers is incorrect.
- Ted – This was not included in the minutes or sent ahead of the meeting to the CAC members.
- Krute – Lou, can you explain your concern with the parking numbers? The Hub is a dense area in the City, so I don't think additional parking makes sense. When we were first approached about the Hub concept it was about affordable housing and parking makes development more expensive.
- Lou – do we know that additional cars will cause traffic? I would like more time to think about it and I am happy to discuss it at the next meeting.
- Jason – this is also for the staff to start to think about working with developers about the parking numbers.
- Paul – If everything that we do is perpetuating how it is now, does not solve the problem. I see no reason not to hit hard at Conditional Use for parking. I don't think the proposed development is rising to the standard of the actual requirements for the CU. I think the resolution needs to be tweaked but I am happy to let it go through.
- Robin – I move we approve this motion. Paul – seconds it.
- Mohammed – There are families with limited resources and do not have a way to get their families places on transit or bicycle. I think it makes sense to keep it to the Hub. How would we implement this? I would like to know the difference in parking numbers – how much will be lost and how much is proposed.
- Jason – this is just a recommendation. We can change the recommendation to just the Hub.
- Paul – the difference is: how much is commuter, residential, and service vehicle parking. I have a few revisions. Do we want to say the actual number of parking spaces?
- Jacob - I can say "at least" x number of parking spaces are proposed or best estimated parking spaces.
- Robin and Paul – accepted the amendments to the resolution.
- Lou - I offer to recuse myself from this item.
- Jason – you can participate in the discussion even if you recuse yourself.
- CAC members approved the resolution with amendments (6 ayes and one abstention).

## 6. Childcare Funds

### SF Planning Department [discussion item]

- Jacob – shared that the Human Services Agency did not receive any proposals for childcare providers in the Market and Octavia Plan area. In the plan, it states

that impact fees could be spent within 200 feet outside of the plan area. There is a legislative suggestion to expand the applicability of childcare fees to areas outside of the plan area if there has been a good faith effort. Essentially, they would like to

- Lou – is there any geographic limitation once it is outside of the plan area?
- Jacob – yes, it is all on the table.
- Mohammed – what was the process to contact childcare centers?
- Jacob – they had a comprehensive process. I am happy to have them come in and share their method.
- Robin – I don't understand why there haven't been more proposals to develop childcare centers in 55 Laguna and the Buchanan Mall.
- Jacob – the space has to be dedicated to the childcare center.
- Paul – was there any provisions that with increased funds above and beyond what we have, would someone be able to do it? I am trying to keep people and children in the neighborhood.
- Jacob – it is possible that if there is any money, but I am conveying what the staff shared. There are other options to increase childcare in the neighborhood. Another program is to include childcare as an In-kind agreement.
- Ted – when you say dedicated space – can it be within certain hours? Perhaps some of the rooftops could work. Could you give a proportion of the childcare spots to children within the neighborhood?
- Jason – John Muir Elementary School is under capacity (on Page and Webster). We had to fight to keep it open. Maybe there are other parcels that are school property that could be used. There are more opportunity sites than we can imagine.
- Jacob – any time there is a new development, I am putting them in touch with the HSA.
- Krute – I think we need childcare city-wide. I am OK with the funds going outside of the plan area.
- Mohammed – can existing institutions that has space qualify for this?
- Jacob – yes.
- Jason – I think it is important to have childcare close to Muni and BART stations.
- Jacob – yes, we are speaking with developers.
- Lou – I suggest looking at the Arch Diosis and the school district.
- Paul – Parcel O – childcare in the development.
- Jason – a few of the units will have a license to provide childcare.

## **7. Public Comment**

- There was no public comment.

## **8. Adjournment**

**NEXT MEETING: September 19, 2016**