



San Francisco Youth Commission
Housing, Environment, and City Services Committee
Minutes ~ Draft
Monday, April 9, 2018
4:45~6:45 PM
City Hall, Room 278
1. Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.
San Francisco, CA 94102

There will be public comment on each item.

Members: Mary Claire Amable, Kristen Tam, Lisa Yu, Lily Marshall-Fricker, Chiara Lind, Mampu Lona, Elsie Lipson

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Amable called the meeting to order at 4:46pm. Commissioners present: Lily Marshall-Fricker, Lisa Yu, Mary Claire Amable, Elsie Lipson, Chiara Lind, and Mampu Lona. Commissioners absent: Kristen Tam. There was quorum. Staff present: Kiely Hosmon.

2. Approval of Agenda (Action Item)

Commissioner Lind, seconded by Commissioner Marshall-Fricker, moved to approve the agenda. There was no public comment. The motion was approved by acclamation.

3. Approval of Minutes (Action Item)

A. March 12, 2018
([Document A](#))

Commissioner Marshall-Fricker, seconded by Commissioner Yu, moved to approve the minutes from the March 12, 2018 committee meeting. There was no public comment. The motion was approved by acclamation.

4. Public Comment on Items not on Agenda (Discussion Only)

There was none.

5. Presentations (All Items to Follow Discussion and Possible Action)

A. Presentation on the Sunlight Ordinance
Presenter: Seema Adina, San Francisco Planning Department

Planning Department staff, Seema and Elizabeth, presented on the Sunlight Ordinance. Youth community members were in attendance from CCDC and YOHANA, 21 youth at least.



Proposition K, passed in 1984, governs shadow and what type it is, how much, and how it affects public spaces. Planning Code Section 295 back in the 80s, says any building over 40 feet that cast shadow over recreation areas or parks, has to be vetted through Planning Commission.

Open spaces and parks are considered under rec and parks department. Why don't we want shade? It obstructs peoples view, we are in a dense city and want folks to enjoy outdoors without everything being shaded, want to preserve open space and enjoy as much sunlight as SF gets. The law says that the shadow has to be insignificant to the areas in question.

How they assess the significance: they look at the character of the park, how it's used, the type of impact the shadow has. "Character of Impact". They see a difference between a shadow on a park at 7am for 5 minutes vs 3 hours that are in afternoon hours when people use the space. They look at what people are doing at the time, are they just using it to cross, are they playing outdoor sports, what is happening in the park? This is what determines the character of the park and when the shadow hits, will it negatively impact the space?

Project examples: 1060 Folsom St, Oceanwide Center, 858 Stanyan Street, 807 Franklin.

1060 Folsom was denied at Planning Commission because of its shadow impact, but is now coming back around being redesigned because of its impact.

Stanyan St is casting shadow on GGP but casting the shadow is on the parking lot. So the impact isn't really impacting the usability of the park.

Looking at what's going on in housing and preservation as well as commercial spaces that could bring the neighborhood alive.

Ex: if there is a small park with already a lot of shade, the likelihood of getting approved with additional shade is low. If it's a large park that could have more shade, it might get approved but Planning Dept will pause and require analyses, visits, observation, etc to determine the shadow impact.

Summary of shadow review:

Design is finalized

Planning Dept reviews the shadow analysis

Rec and parks Dept gives their recommendation

Planning Commission votes on the project

Questions:

Lisa- how is the memo of 1989, which gave a guideline to follow with this ordinance, being utilized. Not sure.

Lisa: when do you decide to raise the shadow budget and how much to raise it? What's the process of doing this? It's hard to raise the shadow budget. The baselines are on the PPT. If a large park already has 20% of the time shaded, what is additionally allowed is 1% until you hit a cap. Cap could be 20-40% and if at 40% then there is no more increase allowed.

They can't just say this building on its own will have a %, but look at all buildings together and the %.



Parks larger than 2 acres, 40% is the cap. Claire-if it's the only park in the area is that factored in? Yes.

If it was 38% shaded and the cumulative buildings push it to 39% it's still under the budget, but it means they will take it more into consideration as a holistic view is taken with everything that is going on in the park and the neighborhood.

Claire-for 1060 Folsom a lot of youth opposed this development and they were hit with "would you rather have more housing or less shadows" and that was their issue with that park. Rede-sign is in the works but said youth had an impact on it being proposed.

Shadow budget and public data available? Examples of what the budget was and what it is now? PD-not every park has a budget. Seema will look into what the numbers are.

How does it get decided on who gets a budget or not? The voters determine it. Zoning can impact what is cast on the parks.

Public comment:

Raymond, SOMCAN tenant organizer-SOMCAN strongly opposes shadows in the park. SOMA only has 3 parks, discussion of shadow is always pitted against housing, city law requires only 18% of affordable housing so it's still fighting for crumbs. It's not for sure if it will even be affordable. Not just talking about the shadow but about our youths way of living. By putting shadow in parks they are displacing youth out of the parks and having less spaces to be outside. Lily-what are you proposing if you oppose it? Ever since Prop K passed, it's always been pitted against housing. Same for Free Muni for youth pinned against jobs. It's not just about shadows, it's more than just shadows. It's our youth who are getting displaced from the parks they grew up with or want to use.

David Wu, SOMCAN, Community Development Coordinator-SOMCAN is opposed to any new shadows in SOMA. Fighting against gentrification and displacement of development that is not for the existing community. View the shadow as an additional layer of these new developments that are further not benefiting existing community members. Strongly opposed to any additional shadowing.

B. Presentation on Privately Owned Public Open Space (POPOS) in San Francisco
Presenter: Kimia Haddadan, Senior Policy and Legislative Planner, San Francisco
Planning Department

Kimia's division deals with policy vs permits. They consider themselves long range planners.

POPOs in 1960s: Bonus System. Required developers to provide open space open to the public and created as part of bonus program. In exchange for providing these spaces the developers got bonuses.

POPOS 1985: Planning code 138 requires open space as part of the development since a lot of development was happening that was adding to volume of workers in downtown with a lack of open space and no new parks being added. So city required builders to create a space open to the public. For the most part it was meant for workers in the downtown area to have space for lunch, break, and short walks, etc.



Types of open space: urban garden, urban park, plaza, view or sun terraces, greenhouse, snippet, atrium, indoor park, public sitting area in a galleria, public sitting area in an arcade, public sitting area in a pedestrian walkway and developers could choose from a list.

SF Planning Dept has map of all POPOS. Some are subject to downtown plan and some that are not subject to downtown plan. Shows at least 72 different POPOs. More straightforward ones that are subject to downtown plan are more enforced. The non-downtown plan POPOS are harder to enforce.

Signage required for all downtown plan. Not very effective and not many had proper signage. In 2012 Supervisor Chiu required POPO signs to be updated. Zoning administrator bulletin has access to all signage and can be downloaded. Required to mention the type, hours, days, and types of amenities in the POPO as well as maintenance contact.

2012 enforcement happened with letter to all owners to comply with new signage law.

Planning Dept has page dedicated to POPOs as well as POPOS and public art. 1% must be geared towards public art and place it on site. Interactive website that is updated should have all POPOS listed. Planning Dept felt the city wasn't providing one spot for all info so they created the webpage and interactive map.

Recent evolution: have adopted more, Rincon Hill in 2005, Transit Center District Plan in 2012. Incentives are that if you provide POPOs will have less fees to pay.

Proposed central soma plan : drafts published 2013/2016: requires POPOS to develop in SOMA and requires for how the space is used, guidelines/incentives for provision of community

Ongoing policy questions for POPOs that they hear:

Usability/attractiveness of indoor/elevated spaces

Provisions of spaces/amenities that are attractive/usable for non-office workers (eg residents) and available outside standard business hours

Too many small spaces and no big public spaces

Erosion of urban fabric

In-lieu/offsite options for physically constrained site, esp for very high density projects on smallish sites.

Lily-what is the fee? \$1400 per square foot

Lisa-is anyone assigned to keep track of POPOS following the guidelines? Who receives the in lieu fee and how does it get decided how it is spent?

Kimia-they review what is given to them regarding the POPO, an inspector goes out and checks to see if it is built according to plans, then after they have a complaint basis enforcement. So have an enforcement team of 7 people who staff enforcement on variety of topics/issues. So complaints go to the enforcement team and they go out and assess. They did do more active enforcement after the signage law was in place but now gone to complaint based evaluation.



In lieu fees are usually attached to the area plan. For instance if transit center, if in lieu fee is paid, it goes to a bucket of open space fund and city decides how it is spent. Goes through capital planning process. So the fees are associated with the area.

SOMCAN youth-you are planning to build more in downtown and SOMA? Development projects that go in are required to have POPOs. So who is this catering to? There are a lot of POPOs and community members don't use it because it's a waste of space because they don't know about it or no use for it. Who are you catering to because it doesn't seem to cater to existing community members? The community is made up of residents, workers, shoppers, etc. It is trying to strike a balance.

Lily-so it's meant for workers? Originally yes in 1985, but now it's geared towards residents and that's why they want to include more amenities.

SOMCAN youth-so you mean tech workers? Lot of different type of workers.

Main concern is that if corporations are getting brought into the community, how does the POPOs cater to the people who already live there their whole lives and how does it better the existing community. Trying to take one piece and be more comprehensive and reach more people.

But if you are targeting workers who are coming into the community it just feels like POPOs are pushing out existing community members. It's just one piece of what they do and if addresses need of workers it also addresses needs of community members.

Claire-what is being addressed to cater to children youth and families? So guidelines evolved, and maybe guidelines need to change for downtown. SOMA guidelines have been changed.

Are there any requirements that signage be required in different languages? No, doesn't think so. Can call the number and get different languages.

Need to change guidelines to make them more accessible to the community, would like to see some sort of review body of the POPOs, employ youth to review POPOs to see if they are youth friendly. The guidelines changing and evolving and making them things that the community needs and what residents will use are important. Kimia, thinks city can do a lot more. Don't have specific staff person on POPOs.

Lisa-will there be an active staff? Not that she knows of.

YC pushes forward BPPs that we give to BOS. A recommendation is for YC to approve POPOs.

NY has non profit org that does monitoring of POPOs. Can SF emulate this? A model to use as an example.

SOMCAN-has there been any discussion on reformulating the guidelines with existing community members so to have a community body to review things? For existing POPOs new requirements can be imposed and can relook at guidelines in the two area plans that have included POPOs in their proposal. Can explore a review body.



Claire-instead of creating a nonprofit seems that guidelines should be stricter on what they should be like. Better guidelines would help and enforcement would be helpful. Active enforcement would help. Just not in their budget for active enforcement.

SOMCAN-in terms of accessibility, gave example of having to give CA IDs, does this still happen? Yes, they can ask you to sign in and show your ID but they can't require you to show your ID. So if you don't have an ID you should still be able to get in. Hard to control what they can/can't do since they are privately owned. File a complaint if this happens again.

SOMCAN-another issue they had was security following youth. Is this still happening? This is a grey area of how they manage the space. They shouldn't be unless they gave a good reason. Uncomfortable and feels like not welcome in public space and encourages filing a complaint.

Lisa-what happens after a complaint and the process of complaint? Once complaint filed, staff looks into it, decide if it is planning dept issue or another dept issue, if valid issue they will create a case and a staff person gets assigned a case. Might be a backlog as only 7 people in the office.

Danny- suggestion, existing community doesn't like using existing POPOs because they don't know they exist or where they are located, and not even having access to signs or the website so it's easy to not notice, so to spread the knowledge create an outreach to specific neighborhoods of where they are and located. That's why trying to incentive the POPOs, if it's inside that's the challenge of trying to get community to know about it. If you don't see signage you should file a complaint. Within the means of the planning dept would welcome outreach suggestions.

Claire-who do we need to bring our ideas to?

BOS for pursuing a lot of these

Connect with Planning Dept on some issues

Central SOMA is going through adoptions so can contact staff or attend the hearings

Unless they get additional funding they wouldn't be able to do any active so would need money allocated to the Planning Dept from the BOS.

C. Presentation on Open Space and Pedestrian Safety in District 6

Presenter: Youth Leaders, South of Market Community Action Network (SOMCAN)

Youth Organizing Home and Neighborhood Action (YOHANA)

Youth presenters, EP, MJ, and Ramon, from YOHANA.

7 YOHANA youth, 3 presenting, in attendance.

In 2000 SOMCAN was born as a response to the gentrification and displacement of SOMA residents and nonprofits. They do Direct Service + Organizing work.

Campaigns-pedestrian safety, youth and family special use district, etc.

YOHANA- Youth Organizing Home and Neighborhood Action, youth led program that works within the neighborhood in issues that they face as a community.



Campaigns-free clipper card, free city college, open mic, bike program, pedestrian safety, night safety

Night Safety-advocating for streetlights in their neighborhood. Want everyone to be safe, especially important for youth and elders.

Three types of lights: pendant luminaire, post top luminaire, LED lights. Operated by PUC and/or PG&E. Advocating for more LED lights. The city has approved them but now it's about implementation of getting the lights up. They have contacted PG&E but not getting a response.

Number of SF Streetlights: total numbers of lights are 46,000 but only 465 of these are LEDS as of June 2005. Scattered across the city and LED lights enhance safety and last 15-20 years vs older ones that are 3-5 years.

The cause of safety is bad/no lights. So the effect is loitering and stalking which leads to darker and more dangerous streets. Showed a video of SOMA residents talking about lack of safety.

Pedestrian Safety: advocate for walking.

Vision Zero: no loss of life is acceptable (end all serious and fatal traffic injuries by 2024)

How to make streets safer in SOMA? Enforcement, engineering, and education. Major issues of why they have lack of pedestrian safety: speeding, running lights, not yielding on a left turn, running stop signs, not yielding at crosswalks.

YOHANA is asking for YC to prioritize both campaigns.

Staff: how much do the lights cost? Who is in charge of putting up the lights? They don't have a number but know that new lights should be put up and it's PG&E that is the stall.

Consider being proactive with ideas regarding pedestrian safety so as to not have a fall back from others trying to bring in more cops to the area.

SOMCA would like to know if lights can be lowered so brightens up the street? SFMTA maybe, PUC, and PG&E.

YC BPP recommendations: get BOS to put pressure on PG&E to enforce, get PUC subset of youth workers or other workers to implement lights.

YOHANA would like to present to the full YC on May 7th.

6. Business (All Items to Follow Discussion and Possible Action)

A. Status of committees Budget and Policy Priorities draft recommendations

All BPPs need to be polished and in paragraph form between Monday the 9th and Wednesday the 11th. On May 3rd, sometime in the afternoon, the YC will be presenting to the Budget and Finance Committee on our BPPs.



B. Scheduling business for upcoming committee agenda

- a. April 23, 2018
- b. May 14, 2018

This item was tabled.

C. Updates on legislation at the Board of Supervisors relevant to the committee.

There was none.

7. Housing, Environment, and City Services Committee Report to Full Commission (Discussion and Possible Action)

Claire will take lead on this.

8. Executive Committee Report (Discussion Only)

They are meeting on Wednesday.

9. Staff Report (Discussion Only)

-Leah is on a leave of absence and won't be returning
-Returning YC apps were due April 6th. Who from HECS is hoping to return? Lily and Kristen.
-Youth Advocacy Day is coming up. Who is on a panel? Lisa for either transportation or youth leadership.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:54pm.