


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

 The linked image cannot be displayed. The file may have been moved, renamed, or deleted. Verify that the link points to the correct file and location.

## Meeting Notes

### Monday, September 21, 2020

### 7:00 PM

#### Regular Meeting

*Hearing will be held remotely  
Refer to the "Remote Access to Information and Participation"  
section below for instructions.*

Attendees: Olsen, Chambers, Tolentino, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Singa  
San Francisco Staff Attendees: Ambati, Ahmed, Miller

- Call to order and roll call 7:00-7:05
  - Singa called the meeting to order.
- Announcements, upcoming meetings, project updates, and general housekeeping [discussion item] 7:05-7:15
  - Henderson – Hayes street is a pilot for outdoor seating. There needs to be volunteers for moving parking cones, so it'd be good to consider to take a shift or spreading word about it.
- Approval of minutes for August 2020 regular meeting 7:15-7:20  
MO CAC Members [action item]
  - Henderson – will review August and September minutes for next meeting
- Election of CAC Chair and Vice-Chair 7:20-7:30  
MO CAC Members [action item]
  - Nomination for Vice-Chair
    - Henderson nominated
  - Nomination for Chair
    - Singa nominated
  - Olsen motion to approve, Levitt seconded
  - All votes unanimously approved
- Market Octavia CAC Bylaws Resolution 7:30-7:40  
MO CAC Members [action item]
  - Olsen – extended period of time needs to be defined
  - Singa – makes sense to remove notification
  - Henderson – keep notification but include more specifics

- Olsen – motion to accept resolution with amendments
- Olsson – seconded
  
- Octavia Improvements Study 7:40-8:10  
SFCTA [discussion item]
  - Ahmed presented on the study for improvements on Octavia Blvd
  - Olsson - brought up some questions about the secondary area in the study. Wondering about the patterns of commuting with public transportation.
  - Levitt – still waiting on central freeway study, feeling like we keep moving around priorities and removing the central freeway would solve a lot of these problems. We talk about trying to relieve congestion, but as a bicyclist, it's great when there isn't much motor traffic but now as traffic picks up and speeding has become a real problem. Laguna has a lot of issues too, which has become a through street for people accessing the freeway. With the closure of Page St, a lot of people are running the stop sign at Page and Laguna because there's no cross traffic even though there are many cyclists. On Lily Street, often people use it as a cut through to get to Octavia since Page Street no longer has access to Octavia. Making adjustments in other places often leads to issues elsewhere.
  - Henderson – asked if the resolution was sent to SFCTA. Brought up the past vision from Jacobs on a grid with permeability for the Market Octavia area. Might be a good idea to think about how this changes with our current economy. Would think to include Franklin in the core study area, and two blocks of Market street are basically Franklin's flow. Second Robin's point about Laguna and that it's not meant to be a bypass. The edges of many car free spaces end up having a lot of traffic. We need to get more people on bikes, and get more delivery folks on bikes so that they are not blocking streets to pick up food delivery for services.
  - Olsen – no comments
  - Tolentino – no comments
  - Chambers – second extending the second study area to Duboce.
  - Singa – question about the boundary of the secondary study area. The telecommute rate is pretty high, and there's a lot of movement outside of SF and it would be interesting to have some type of prediction of how much traffic will return if people are going to either telecommute or change commuting patterns. It would be interesting to show why the trips within the city are by car.
  - Ahmed – will be looking into how trends may change.
  - Henderson – feels like between a certain number of streets there's a lot of local traffic and that the volume didn't go down that much more other than the times that school drop offs or pick ups occur.
  - Singa – but that trend might be because people don't feel comfortable riding public transportation. Would like to second Jason's comment on local delivery trends and that it will most likely keep going up.
  
- SF Downtown Congestion Pricing Study 8:10-8:40

SFCTA [discussion item]

- Ahmed – presented on the congestion pricing study which will also be an update. Congestion affected trends for the downtown, do not know how the pandemic will affect the pricing. Provided map of the downtown congestion levels.
- Henderson – this is very exciting, important to point out that the congestion revenue can go to the operation of Muni. Paying for operations is where we've been hurt my state and federal government, and that could be a strong argument for the revenue.
- Olsen – there will be a lot of pushback to have Laguna be a dividing line, but we should keep it as a dividing line since the congestion that backs up on Fell or Oak Streets have a horrible effect on the neighborhood. Even if they're going onto Octavia Boulevard, they're still causing a great deal of congestion and health and safety issues.
- Levitt – want to second what Paul said, and would like to see the boundary moved west to Divisadero. If we free up space on the streets, it should be for pedestrian, bicycle, or Muni improvements, not so that motor vehicles can go faster. It's the speed that determines the safety. Congestion pricing can be a tool to reduce driving during Spare the Air days or during air emergencies such as what we experienced last week. Do London and Stockholm have breaks for low-income households in their programs?
  - Ahmed – no they do not, but their social net is wider and deeper than ours. Even though we try to learn from other cities, our reality is a little bit more different including our baseline of equity. We are really trying to understand what this means for SF with a focused lens on equity.
- Levitt – don't really feel comfortable encouraging people, no matter what their income, to drive. The outcome is still a very negative outcome.
- Olsen – with TNCs and taxis, what happens if those services go in and out? Most of the report focuses on people commuting into SF and staying there, but the transit services cross back and forth often and it should be a problem considered in this study. I would prefer the difference in the fee for low-income households if it was a once-a-day trip.
- Tolentino – Will the study also include the economic impacts on restaurants and other small businesses? I could see a lot of people saying that this may work in other cities with more robust transportation systems, but may not work here. I would strongly recommend when this is raised to clearly indicate what types of projects would benefit from the revenue generated from congestion pricing.
- Olsson – a follow up on this boundary area, the solution of much of that will come with very rapid shuttles confined to that boundary area. The shuttles should be cheap and free made up by the congestion fee.
- Chambers – would like to follow up with some thoughts, considering that running a delivery service within that boundary could create additional impacts on businesses. It would depend on volume of delivery and would

change the way we operate our business within that area or even stop all delivery activity within that area.

- Olsen – what would the hours be for the congestion pricing? Might open up the ability to do delivery or go to restaurants.
    - Ahmend – 6am-9am and then 6:30pm in the evening
  - Levitt – how would it change patterns if people were able to park right at the boundary and then take public transportation in?
    - Ahmed – will be studying how parking behaviors may change and what would be some solutions to that
  - Singa – Enforcing parking permits may help prevent parking behaviors near the boundary area. Also support the boundary at Laguna, but it would be interesting to study the traffic impacts in the rest of the city. How traffic patterns might shift and affect safety in other neighborhoods. In the presentation, making the connections to better walking, transit, stronger and even talking about how the revenue will be invested in these modes. Maybe considering extending the PM hours.
  - Olsson – seeing cafes on curbed parking, it would be something to consider in the plan.
- 
- IPIC Update 8:40-9:00  
SF Planning [discussion item]
    - Ambati presented on IPIC expenditure plan changes
    - Singa – why was revenue reduced 20%
      - Ambati – to anticipate a reduction in development in reflection of current trends
  - Public Comment 9:00-9:15
    - None
  - Adjournment 9:15

## **NEXT MEETING: October 19, 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/yxm7z4mv>

- 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: 142 958 300#

**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.sooohoo@sfgov.org](mailto:candace.sooohoo@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.sooohoo@sfgov.org](mailto:candace.sooohoo@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)