

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

**Monday, August 17, 2020**  
**7:00 PM**  
**Regular Meeting**

*Hearing held remotely*

Committee Members Present:

Jason Henderson, Robin Levitt, Ted  
Olsson, Krute Singa, Tony Tolentino

Committee Members Absent:

Paul Olsen, Chase Chambers

City Staff in Attendance: Svetha Ambati (SF Planning), Dylan Hamilton (SF Planning),  
Andrea Nelson (SF Planning), Arun Bhatia (DPW), Patrick Race (DPW), and Theodore  
Conrad (ECN)

---

The Agenda is available electronically on the Department's website:  
[www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org). *Please note that timing of agenda items is subject to change.*

1. Call to order and roll call 7:00-7:05
  - Singa called order to the meeting.
  
2. Announcements, upcoming meetings, project updates, and general housekeeping [discussion item] 7:05-7:15
  - Commemoration project
    - Henderson - asked to have this on the October agenda
    - Levitt – commented on the progress of the commemoration project and concerns
    - Singa – asked how we could alleviate this concerns
    - Levitt – the website has helped with some of the concerns, commented on the goal of the project
  - Ambati - Appointments update
  
3. Approval of minutes for July 2020 regular meeting MO CAC Members [action item] 7:15-7:20
  - Jason approved, Tony seconded, all in favor.

4. Market and Octavia Area Plan Monitoring Report Updates

7:20-7:50

SF Planning [discussion item]

- Hamilton - The publication of the report has been delayed a little due to staffing capacity related to the pandemic. Big picture takeaways include a major upswing in impact fee revenue, commercial space, and housing production as the market fully came out of the 2008 financial crisis and recession. 1,900 housing units were added, with 515 on Central Freeway parcels. 400 affordable units were added, 190 of them were built on the Central Freeway parcels. Evictions nearly doubled – from 262 to 422 – in the last five years. Commercial development increased, a decline in medical and PDR uses. Collected \$20 million in impact fees, and projected to collect an additional \$80 million in the next five years (pre-COVID estimate). Established two new historic districts in the Market Octavia area.
- Henderson – are you looking for any input. Is there any more work put into this before it's formally done.
  - Hamilton – in final phase right now. The legislation that requires the report is pretty specific, and we've gone back and updated the tables in the report.
  - Henderson – the three huge towers were approved in June and it seems like that's probably going to be it for a while. Seems like it'd be a natural break to stop there.
  - Hamilton – can definitely consider mentioning the big changes ahead.
  - Henderson – cycling remains flat in terms of trends and that's concerning.
  - Hamilton – cycling numbers remain flat in terms of percentage of the population and that could mean that the numbers are higher
  - Henderson – where do TNCs play a part in this? Can we be more specific about this in the report?
  - Hamilton – in terms of the mode-split, it would be under the "other" category.
- Levitt – regarding the evictions, it sounded like it went up in the plan area and is there any sense as to why?
  - Hamilton – not sure, could be a result of an increase in property values
  - Henderson – could also be due to the number of large apartment building purchases, such as the acquisitions by Veritas. Could be helpful to break down eviction notices by the type of apartment.
- Tolentino – does the projected impact fees include special deals from approvals of the parcels in the HUB amendment?
  - Hamilton – it falls out of the reporting period so I don't think so
- Singa – do you know what the breakdown of the affordable housing units are?
  - Hamilton – I do have affordability level breakdown but not the mix of units

- Singa – the mix of units would be interesting to know. If they're affordable, to know who they are affordable for is important

5. Racial and Social Equity Plan Updates

7:50-8:15

SF Planning [discussion item]

- Nelson – RSE initiative is meant to measure disparities, consider how city staff could be more diverse and better represent our communities, and acknowledging that government and planning field historically played a significant role in RSE inequity. Racial Equity is the systemic fair treatment of people of all races resulting in equal outcomes. SF Planning's work prior to 2016 had taken RSE into consideration (Cultural District work, Eastern Neighborhoods, etc.). Office of Racial Equity (ORE) was created in early 2019. Recapped Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the RSE Action Plan. Summary of the Planning Commission Equity Resolution, which was passed in June of 2020. Next steps include release of the Phase 2 plan and implementation of Phase 1.
- Levitt – with regard to the HUB and the RSE study, wanted to ask what sort of outcomes from that study will affect the plan?
  - Nelson – One of the complaints that the advocates in SoMa and Mission had was that there weren't enough protections for local residents and local businesses, so could see more funding and staff towards stabilizing residents and businesses.
- Henderson – who is the consultant that was hired by TODCO? Will they come to the CAC? Is environmental justice going to be included in this analysis?
  - Nelson – Not sure, they are based out of LA. Yes, can suggest that they come to the CAC. Can look into if they can come answer some of the analysis-specific questions.
- Singa – do you have an idea of what could have been done differently with the first analysis? How can we recruit for some of the empty CAC seats?
  - Nelson – we all agreed upon the fact that we should've started the analysis in the beginning and could've accounted for more of the impacts assessment. The city could benefit from having agencies working together as well.
  - Henderson – it would be even more pointed to invite any members of the coalition that challenged the HUB could legally serve on the committee. There's a lot under construction right now, so that could also help to recruit more residents.
  - Singa – would be a good idea to have the IPIC process through an RSE lens but not sure what that means
  - Nelson – responded that it might look like a budgeting tool that Planning uses
- Olsson – what is the plan to publicizing the purpose and the need to SF as a whole?

- Nelson – have some lessons learned from outreach that was done with the Housing Element
- Olsson – how does this tie in with the commemoration part of the project and how we build citizen awareness and activism?
- Henderson – congestion pricing proposal could have a potentially huge impact on Market and Octavia
  - Nelson – can talk to ConnectSF about this

6. Living Alleys Project Updates

8:15-8:40

Public Works [discussion item]

- Bhatia – PM of the Living Alleys project provided an update on the program, including budget and timeline for implementation. Outlining the selection criteria for candidate alleys. Shared a map on the potential living alleys in the Market Octavia area and implementation timeline for the project.
- Race – Provided an overview on the criteria for selection. Shared a map of upcoming infrastructure projects to layer on with additional improvement opportunities. Explained the matrix to provide insight into levels of improvement for alleys. Provided an overview of workshop feedback.
- Bhatia – Confirmed interest in working on Brady or on Ivy. Matrix describes these two as the best fit for this project.
- Henderson – appreciates the measurable criteria, but a little wary that it might become a popularity contest. Potential to look into the parklet requests and how it applies to current criteria.
- Olsson – When you compare the first slide on the potential alleyways to the slide with all of the work and possible other projects were contained, they form a rather nice stack that lead down to Market Street. Nothing is on Upper Market – I find that interesting. Something that should be addressed is calming traffic.
- Levitt – Seems like the process is finished. There isn't really a system of alleys we're looking at which is what the Market Octavia plan called for, so pretty disappointed. There's a whole development going on at Brady, so one would think that living alley improvements might be funded by that development. Most the 15 alleys on the list might have already received traffic calming or living alley treatment, so I don't know why they're so high on the list.
- Bhatia – for this moment, we have selected Ivy as the priority alley, as a secondary ally it would be Brady or Colton. Only really have funding to complete maybe one or two moderate alleys. The list isn't ranked from first priority to last; it is ranked by stakeholder input. Likely to focus more attention on Colton if there's more funding available for Brady.

7. Freeway Parcel Updates

8:40-9:00

Office of Economic and Workforce Development [discussion item]

- Conrad – responsible for overseeing the development of the Market Octavia Freeway parcels. Nearly all Central Freeway surplus parcels have been sold, developed, or under construction. Remaining parcels (K, L, R, and S) don't have currently development plans, and Conrad provided potential residential capacity. Community members have expressed a preference for keeping parts or all of Parcel K and L as an open space/recreational/retail use. Thoughts on interim uses or appropriate affordability level for any housing development on parcels L, R, and S?
- Olsson – is there a height limit?
- Conrad – possibility with state density bonus to go higher than the existing height limit.
- Henderson – With parcel K and L, I would be cautious about framing the commentary received on these parcels. Feels like there's a very strong voice for those parcels to be affordable housing, and rather than pitting open space against residential development the city should think about recreating open space in other locations in Hayes Valley.
- Levitt – these parcels should be used for housing, much of which should be affordable. Parcels being for open space is in violation of Proposition I. From an urban design standpoint, having these appendages of open space connected to Patricia's Green is a bad idea. We can repurpose our streets to provide for the open space and these lots can be used for housing.
- Tolentino – I do think those parcels should be developed as affordable housing
- Singa – I agree and second Levitt's comment.
- Conrad – Developing affordable housing requires funding. Noted that MOHCD does not have any funds identified for these freeway parcels, and that's why the creative middle-income approach would have allowed us to move more quickly. It would require funding that isn't currently identified.
- Olsson – if some of the ground floor retail space of these potential developments could be used to establishing businesses, this could go towards our objective for equity.

8. 555 Fulton / Trader Joe's 8:40-9:00

MO CAC Members [action item]

- Henderson – Trader Joe's has switched staffing and will start reaching out in September to the neighborhood.
- Singa – will consider adding this to our agenda at the next meeting.
- Henderson – Congestion pricing is a good topic to discuss at our next meeting as well

9. Public Comment 9:00-9:15

- None

10. Adjournment 9:10

- Krute adjourned the meeting

## **NEXT MEETING: September 21, 2020**

### **Remote Access to Information and Participation**

In accordance with Governor Newsom's statewide order for all residents to Shelter-in-place - and the numerous preceding local and state proclamations, orders and supplemental directions - aggressive directives have been issued to slow down and reduce the spread of the COVID-19 virus.

On May 29, 2020, the San Francisco Planning Department was authorized to allow policy bodies to hold remote public meetings without advance approval but prohibiting policy bodies other than the Board of Supervisors and its committees from meeting in person at a physical meeting location. Therefore, Citizen Advisory Committees meetings will be held via videoconferencing and allow for remote public comment. Staff strongly encourages interested parties to submit their comments in writing and in advance of the hearing to [jessica.look@sfgov.org](mailto:jessica.look@sfgov.org)

### **How to join the Virtual Meeting Using Microsoft Team using the internet:**

- [Click this link to join.](#)
- If you are having trouble clicking the link, use this url: <https://tinyurl.com/y4sw2vno>
- Click "Join on the web instead" or "Continue on this browser" (dependent on web browser)
- On the next screen, you may sign in with a name and click "Join now"
- Note: Safari does not support Microsoft Teams. Please open in Chrome, Firefox or Internet Explorer.
- A copy of the presentation materials will be made available on [www.sfplanning.org](http://www.sfplanning.org)
- If you would like to have a meeting invite in advance of the meeting, please email [svetha.ambati@sfgov.org](mailto:svetha.ambati@sfgov.org) at least 72 hours before the meeting.

### **How to join the Virtual Meeting Using your phone:**

- Call 1(415) 906-4659
- Enter: Conference ID: 526 062 868#

### **Cell Phone and/or Sound-Producing Electronic Devices Usage at Hearings**

Effective January 21, 2001, the Board of Supervisors amended the Sunshine Ordinance by adding the following provision: The ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic devices (67A.1 Prohibiting the use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices at and during public meetings).

### **San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance**

Attention: Individuals and entities that influence or attempt to influence local legislative or administrative action may be required by the San Francisco Lobbyist Ordinance [SF Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code Section 21.00-2.160] to register and report lobbying activity. For more information about the Lobbyist Ordinance, please contact the Ethics Commission at 30 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 3900, San Francisco, CA 94102; telephone (415) 581-2300; fax (415) 581-2317; and web site <http://www.sfgov.org/ethics>.

### **Accessible Meeting Policy**

Disability Accommodations: To request assistive listening devices, real time captioning, sign language interpreters, readers, large print agendas or other accommodations, please contact the Department's ADA Coordinator, Candace SooHoo, at (415) 575-9157 or [candace.sooHoo@sfgov.org](mailto:candace.sooHoo@sfgov.org) at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to help ensure availability. Accessible seating for persons with disabilities (including those using wheelchairs) will be available at meetings.

Language Assistance: To request an interpreter, please contact the Candace SooHoo, at (415) 575-9157, or [candace.sooHoo@sfgov.org](mailto:candace.sooHoo@sfgov.org) at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.

#### **SPANISH**

Si desea asistir a la audiencia, y quisiera obtener información en Español o solicitar un aparato para asistencia auditiva, llame al (415) 575-9010. Por favor llame por lo menos 72 horas de anticipación a la audiencia.

#### **CHINESE**

聽證會上如需要語言協助或要求輔助設備，請致電(415) 575-9010。請在聽證會舉行之前的至少 72 個小時提出要求。

**FILIPINO**

Para sa tulong sa lengguwahe o para humiling ng Pantulong na Kagamitan para sa Pagdinig (headset), mangyari lamang na tumawag sa (415) 575-9121. Mangyaring tumawag nang maaga (kung maaari ay 72 oras) bago sa araw ng Pagdinig.

**RUSSIAN**

За помощью переводчика или за вспомогательным слуховым устройством на время слушаний обращайтесь по номеру (415) 575-9121. Запросы должны делаться минимум за 72 часов до начала слушания.

**Know Your Rights Under the Sunshine Ordinance**

Government's duty is to serve the public, reaching its decisions in full view of the public. Commissions, boards, councils and other agencies of the City and County exist to conduct the people's business. This ordinance assures that deliberations are conducted before the people and that City operations are open to the people's review.

For more information on your rights under the Sunshine Ordinance (Chapter 67 of the San Francisco Administrative Code) or to report a violation of the ordinance, contact Adele Destro, Interim Administrator, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 409, by phone at (415) 554-7724, by fax at (415) 554-7854 or by E-mail at [sotf@sfgov.org](mailto:sotf@sfgov.org).

Copies of the Sunshine Ordinance can be obtained from the Clerk of the Sunshine Task Force, the San Francisco Library and on the City's website at [www.sfgov.org/bdsupvrs/sunshine..](http://www.sfgov.org/bdsupvrs/sunshine..)

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

At this time, members of the public may address the Committee on items of interest to the public that are within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Committee except agenda items. With respect to agenda items, your opportunity to address the Committee will be afforded when the item is reached in the meeting with one exception. When the agenda item has already been reviewed in a public hearing at which members of the public were allowed to testify and the Committee has closed the public hearing, your opportunity to address the Committee must be exercised during the Public Comment portion of the Calendar. 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, the committee is limited to:

1. responding to statements made or questions posed by members of the public; or
2. requesting staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting; or
3. directing staff to place the item on a future agenda. (Government Code Section 54954.2(a))
4. submitting written public comment to Andi Nelson 1650 Mission Street Ste. 400, San Francisco, CA 94103 or [andrea.nelson@sfgov.org](mailto:andrea.nelson@sfgov.org)