

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

<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1700>

**4th Floor Conference Room
Planning Dept., 1650 Mission Street
Monday, March 19, 2012; 6:30pm
Regularly scheduled monthly meeting**

Peter Cohen	Jason Henderson
Robin Levitt	Ted Olsson
Dennis Richards	Michael Simmons
Krute Singa	Lou Vasquez
Ken Wingard	
Kearstin Dischinger	Alexis Smith (both <i>ex officio</i>)

The Agenda & Minutes of all community meetings, a matter of public record, are available at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor or on our website (above).

SUMMARY

AGENDA (Exhibit 1: Agenda)

1. Call to order and roll call
2. Announcements, upcoming meetings and general housekeeping [discuss]
3. Approval of Minutes for the November and December 2011; February 2012 regular meetings [act]
4. Election of Committee officers [act]
5. Presentation by OWED regarding the former freeway parcels [discuss]
6. Presentation by TA re: Central Fwy & Octavia Blvd Circ. Study [discuss]
7. Presentation by TA regarding Van Ness Ave. Bus Rapid Transit [discuss]
8. Letter of Support—Plng.Dept. applic. for CalTrans Grant for Living Alley Pedestrian Network [act]
9. Development Pipeline Report—Developments in process; CAC project reviews [discuss; act]
 - current month's cases
 - potential projects for CAC review
10. Legislation/policy Pipeline Report—Legislation & Planning Commission issues in process [discuss]
11. Committee members comments & issues the Committee may consider in future meetings [discuss]
12. Public Comment
13. Adjournment & announcement of next meeting

NEXT MEETING: MONDAY, APRIL 16, 2011, 6:30PM AT 1650 Mission, Rm. 400

(2013: Jan16, Feb20, Mch19; Apr16, May21, Jun18, Jul16, Aug20, Sep17, Oct15, Nov19, Dec17)

All meetings are on the **THIRD MONDAY, 6:30pm MONTHLY** (Jan & Feb: exceptions this year)

EXHIBITS (handout documents informing the discussion; name = responsible to provide to Oropeza)

- Exhibit 1: Agenda (**Henderson**, distributed at meeting)
- Exhibit 2: **November 2011 minutes accepted as permanently missing** (technology issue) (**Olsson**).
- Exhibit 3: December 2011 minutes tabled. (**Olsson**).
- Exhibit 4: February 2012 minutes approved (**Olsson**).
- Exhibit 5: **Octavia Boulevard/Central Freeway: Project Update by Kelly Pretzer** (19Mar2012)
- Exhibit 6: **Central Freeway and Octavia Circulation Study** (Draft Circulation Strategy, 03.19.12)
- Exhibit 7: **Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)** [03.19.12]

DECISIONS

- Decision 1: CAC approved February 2012 minutes; tabled December 2012 minutes; accepted that there are NO November minutes (notes missing).
- Decision 2: Election of Officers for 2012: Chair, Henderson; VC, Singa; Secretary, Olsson
- Decision 3: Resolution #10 (Support expediting VNBRT).
- Decision 4: Consensus—Chair will write Dept. supporting request to Caltrans for Living Alleyways grant.

Decision 5: Consensus—Chair will write Chair of Land Use Cmte. re CAC consensus against billboards

COMMITMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, INFORMATION DUE

<u>#</u>	<u>WHEN</u>	<u>WHO</u>	<u>WHAT</u>
1.	04/23	JH	Write Chair, Land Use Cmte. re: our concerns about billboards & notification
2.	0423	JH	Write Planning Dept. supporting Caltrans request for grant for Living Alleyways
3.	04/23	JH,KS	Plan bylaws review, commitments, 2012 goals & schedule (see Appx2)

MINUTES**1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL****EXHIBIT 1: AGENDA**

ROLL CALL (✓=present; 0=absent; X=excused; full membership = 9; Quorum = 5)

Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary to be elected at March meeting.

CAC members

- ✓ Peter Cohen
- ✓ Jason Henderson
- ✓ Robin Levitt
- ✓ Ted Olsson
- ✓ Dennis Richards
- X Michael Simmons
- X Krute Singa
- ✓ Lou Vasquez
- X Ken Wingard

Ex Officio Members

- 0 Kearstin Dischinger, staff liaison; Planner, Citywide Policy, SF Plng.Dept.; 415.558.6284
Kearstin.Dischinger@sfgov.org
- ✓ Alexis Smith, staff liaison; Planner/Urban Designer, SF Plng.Dept.; 415.558.6409;
Alexis.Smith@sfgov.org

Others attending:

1. Kelly Pretzer, Proj.Mgr., Mayor's Ofc. Econ.& Wkfc.Dvlpt;
kelly.pretzer@sfgov.org; (415) 554-6045
2. Jessie Keller, also from Transportation Authority
3. Michael Schwartz, also from Transportation Authority

Public attending:

1. Milo Hankey, 1650 Mission Street.

The Chair opened the meeting at 6:30pm with announcements and then accommodated Ms.Pretzer, who had to leave early. However, the minutes are presented in the order of the agenda above.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, UPCOMING MEETINGS, GENERAL HOUSEKEEPING [discuss]

No announcements were offered in order to hear the three presentations before us this evening.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER 2011; FEBRUARY 2012 [act]

EXHIBIT 2: November 2011 Minutes — accepted as permanently missing [tech problem]

EXHIBIT 3: December 2011 Minutes — tabled

EXHIBIT 4: February 2012 Minutes — approved

4. ELECTION OF COMMITTEE OFFICERS [act]

Henderson stated that he had spoken with Singa, the only member nominated as Vice Chair, since others cannot commit to making most meetings. Cohen also said that he had spoken to Singa about the position. On a motion by Cohen, seconded by Levitt, the committee unanimously voted in three separate elections on Henderson to be Chair; Singa, Vice Chair; and Olsson, Secretary.

5. PRESENTATION BY OEWD REGARDING FORMER FREEWAY PARCELS [discuss]

EXHIBIT 5: Octavia Boulevard/Central Freeway: Project Update by Kelly Pretzer [pdf]

Ms. Pretzer of the Mayor's **Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD)** explained that this Central Freeway was transformed from the seismically impaired blight to the welcoming Octavia Blvd because of Proposition E (1998), Proposition I (1999), and the Cooperative Agreement (2000) between the City and Caltrans, as 22 parcels of property were transferred to the City — which it would sell to pay for improvements — by which it obligated itself to also provide the following Central Freeway Ancillary Projects: 1) streetscape improvements; 2) a skatepark; 3) a dogrun; and 4) the McCoppin Hub, all totaling \$8.7m. She showed a map of the 22 parcels to be

disposed of to pay for all improvements. All parcels have now been sold; with the **San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA)** holding 7 of them. Its obligation is to replenish the housing fund to a specified amount, but to keep any surplus. It was particularly noted that the caliber of the designs on these projects was superb.

Levitt, who was on the Central Freeway CAC, agreed that, while SFRA was allowed to keep any surplus, noted that there is still a lot that needs to be done to solve traffic problems in Hayes Valley. He claims that they really are inundated with traffic and badly need traffic calming, claiming Oak/Octavia as the worst intersection in the City. So, he felt that much needs to be done before any refunds are made and that there is a contractual obligation for such transportation improvements around Octavia Blvd; however SFRA claims that they borrowed the housing money to build the boulevard by buying the parcels at market rates, thereby overpaying for the parcels to accomplish the purpose when the city did not have the cash to pay for the boulevard and could not have raised sufficient cash from developers. This is why there was a policy objective not to sell the parcels until the MOP was adopted in order to maximize revenue and to allow the city time to determine what would be the best use of these parcels.

The following discussion followed her presentation. Levitt asked where the \$6m valuation for the replenishment (“true-up”) came from. He said that the payback could not be more than SFRA paid for the properties, after they had been condemned. It was pointed out that even though the land is condemned, the city or agency must buy it at market rates. Levitt and Henderson, both live in the neighborhood overrun by traffic and feel that they (neighbors) have been ignored; whereas during the fight to remove the freeway they had been courted. In addition to Affordable Housing for their neighborhood, they feel that they need traffic calming as a matter of Quality of Life. Levitt wanted to hear from the City when they will receive relief and believed that there was still some \$4m outstanding to be spent for this purpose.

Henderson followed by saying that he understood that the City needed the money quickly to build the boulevard and that SFRA accordingly bought the properties at very inflated prices because of this urgency. Still, he felt that while the \$6m was actual money borrowed, the SFRA should dedicate the entire \$17m to affordable housing, since, while blaming the previous administration, he did not feel that the affordable housing people had been treated properly and questioned spending any money on a skatepark which could be better spent mitigating the traffic. It was noted that on April 4th information on this Central Freeway project will be presented to the Board of Supervisors. Henderson really felt that they should have torn down the freeway without creating the boulevard. Still, as presiding officer at the meeting, he did appreciate all three of our guests attended our meeting to inform us of their various reports.

When Cohen arrived he spoke to this issue about the SFRA’s “true-up” to \$6m. There was no hearing on this aspect at the April 4th hearing, which was only informational. Cohen complained about the loss of institutional memory by not allowing neighbors to have spoken at such hearings.

Presentation Summary

Ms. Pretzer provided a background on the Central Freeway and its demolition, creating the property parcels, whose sale and use would form the basis for the Market/Octavia developments, as guided by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. Providing us the history of the project, Pretzer showed how Proposition E (1998) created the Freeway Replacement Project Act, replacing the Central Freeway with an elevated structure from Mission to Market Streets, transitioning at Market St. to a ground level boulevard on Octavia Street. In 1999 Proposition I authorized the use of proceeds from the sale of excess Central Freeway parcels for the design, engineering, construction and maintenance of the Octavia Blvd. Plan. And it authorized the use of any remaining proceeds to be used for related transportation improvements in the adjacent area. In other words, this was the foundation of the Market/Octavia Plan and of our committee. These propositions resulted in the cooperative agreement between Caltrans and the City of San Francisco on Nov. 29, 2000 as authorized by Senator Burton’s bill (SB798), which effectuated the transfer of 22 state-owned properties (A-V), formerly supporting the freeway. As a result, the City was responsible for the cost of: 1) preparing and operating interim traffic management; 2) Octavia Blvd.; and 3) restoring Mission, South Van Ness, and Van Ness Ave. to an efficient SR101 thoroughfare.

As a result the City assumed the following obligations—endorsed by the Central Freeway Citizens’ Advisory Committee & San Francisco County’s Transportation Authority (SFCTA) in

2006: 1) streetscape improvements; 2) skatepark; 3) dogrun; and 4) McCoppin Hub, for a total of \$8.7m. The City's Obligations to Date are as follows: 1) preparation & operation of interim traffic management plan; 2) Octavia Blvd.—both completed; 3) restoring city streets to SR101; and 4) Central Freeway Ancillary Projects—totaling \$37.7m (with \$14.2m remaining).

She then explained the disposition of the 22 Central Freeway parcels. According to the transfer agreement of 2002, the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA) purchased two parcels (A&C) at market rates (\$5.75m), which enabled the construction of Octavia Blvd, and included the option to purchase 5 additional parcels (G,K,O,Q,U). SFRA's 2002 purchases totaled \$17.821m. These SFRA Projects resulted in: (A) Parkview Terraces: CCDC, 100 units of low income & senior housing; (C) Mary Helen Rodgers Senior Community: CCDC, 100 units of low income & homeless seniors; and (G) Richardson Apartments: CHP/Mercy Housing, 120 units for formerly homeless individuals; (K, proposed) 20-25 units with ground floor retail for first-time home ownership (80-120% AMI); (O, proposed) 100 units of family rental housing (up to 50% AMI); (Q, Octavia Court) West Bay Housing/Satellite Housing of 15 units for persons with developmental disabilities; and (U, proposed) 32 units for transition-aged youth. As a result of SFRA, Pre-MOP and Post-MOP land sales the city raised almost \$45m; four will be leased for almost \$280k/yr, 2 for \$1/yr each, and two are still unleased. Several other temporary uses of the parcels were also mentioned: 1) Parcels K&L, proxy; 2) Parcels O&P, Hayes Valley Farm; Parcels R&S, Growing Home Community Garden (Project Homeless Connect).

She then showed how the Octavia Boulevard Project used this money. On Pre-MOP sources, the city raised \$23.5m and spent this on: 1) its interim traffic management plan; and 2) the actual construction of Octavia Blvd. Post-MOP sources of another \$23.3m were spent on Ancillary Projects and leases (skatepark & dogrun); repaving Van Ness; replenishing funds to the Affordable Housing Fund.

Yet remaining were: completion of the central freeway ancillary projects; the improvement of Van Ness Ave.; the disposition of Parcels L, R, S and T., as well as replenishing the housing fund. Having previously approved the following items: the disposition of Parcels L, R, S and T at the market rate as well as the execution of the Memo of Understanding with the Mayor's Office of Housing regarding replenishing the housing fund, the Board of Supervisors had yet to consider: skatepark and dog run leases; as well as vacating the area for McCoppin Hub.

**6. PRESENTATION BY TA RE: CENTRAL FWY & OCTAVIA CIRC. STUDY [discuss]
EXHIBIT 6: Central Freeway and the Octavia Circulation Study, Draft Circ. Strategy,
03.19.12 [pdf]**

This presentation was made by Jesse Koehler of the **San Francisco County Transportation Authority (TA)**. This update of the Circulation Study examined the circulation issue in Hayes Valley and its regional corridors. The principal fact was that $\frac{3}{4}$ of the traffic is not from within the neighborhood. This Areawide Circulation Strategy did not limit itself to Van Ness and Market but tried to examine how to create a network of streets for traffic circulation. To do this they did not look at any street in isolation. The travel corridors for North/South west of Van Ness was Church/Fillmore to Gough & Franklin; for North/South east of Van Ness it was Polk St. from 10th-7th Streets to Levenworth. There were modal roles across all types of transport. San Francisco does not have the luxury of making every street a "complete street", except for pedestrians.

At this point Jesse was asked what they were looking for from us. They have informed several CACs and will address the SFCTA/BOS in June. At this time this report to us is merely informational; they do not require any direct action on our part, though Koehler requested people's input on the plan and would welcome any suggestions from us.

Cohen said that the idea of bundling streets together is good, since not every one can be a "complete street"; however, it should be pragmatic that those which are principal car streets, must include pedestrian improvements. While he acknowledged that some streets are key ones, pedestrian safety is a key concept throughout the city.

Levitt stated that Turk & Gough Streets were formerly thought of as connectors to the freeway but now they do not carry much traffic. However, they are important for bicycles. If the TA does not change the direction of these two streets, then at least it should make them shared by bikes and transit in the corridor. On Oak and Fell Streets, there are only bike lanes on Oak Street, which are

not constricted to current use. As for the remainder of the streets under the Central Freeway, the SFCTA/BOS passed a resolution, which will look at replacing this. Such a plan can be useful for lessons for future freeway conversions.

7. PRESENTATION BY TA REGARDING VAN NESS AVE. BUS RAPID TRANSIT [discuss] Exhibit 7: Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), 03.19.12.

This presentation was given by Mr. Michael Schwartz of the **San Francisco County Transportation Authority (TA)**. He provided the background on the **Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)** plan since 2004, which is funded by a half-cent sales tax. Part of the Great Streets Project, this focuses on main transit corridors: Van Ness Ave., Geary Blvd., and Potrero Ave. Because Van Ness is also State Route 101, they hope to be able to get **Federal Transportation Authority (FTA)** funds as well for that portion. The purpose for all of these BRT plans is to improve (a typical bell curve) transit speed and reliability by addressing such factors as signal delay, traffic friction, and the time to load/unload passengers. BRT also addresses pedestrian safety. Van Ness Avenue is a great street, designed as such according to principles of urban design. Because it is State Route 101, there are additional requirements that the city must keep people moving at the same or improved rate. The BRT concept was first used in South America, where there are full-featured examples.

On the EIS/EIR planning activities to date, we are in the home stretch for CEQA on these corridors. Henderson, who is on the CAC for BRT, mentioned that a lot of outreach is currently going on. Prop.K (2003) reauthorized these BRT programs. There are several alternative plans to accommodate busses in dedicated lanes for this **Van Ness BRT (VNBRT)**. In Alt.1: the bus lane is the left lane; in Alt.2: it is the right (curb) lane, for reasons of pedestrian safety, though this also presents conflicts with bikes and it will be difficult to keep traffic out of the lane; in Alt.3: the two opposing BRT lanes are between two medians (the current median must be removed and widened); and in Alt.4: the busses have doors on both sides of the vehicle, to allow passengers to alight on either side, similar to the subway trains. There are two design variations for both Alt. 3 and 4.

The cost and funding for VNBRT ranges from \$90-130m. The City already has \$100m planned from taxes and the FTA has assured the city it will receive \$55m, if the economy and current politics hold.

The benefits of improved speed and reliability are based mainly on eliminating left turns and coordinating street signals to preferentially expedite the flow of busses. Schwartz also presented some findings (Significant and Unavoidable Impacts): the traffic delays and Loss of Service (LOS). CEQA requires a 30 year project (extending this project to 2035). Above all, if we do nothing Van Ness will be gridlocked by 2035. He also presented other key issues: removing left turn lanes; consolidating traffic stops; the inevitable loss of parking spaces along Van Ness; and then the visual effects, including trees and landscaping, must complement the whole plan and maintain it as one of San Francisco's great streets. The next step will be to consider Locally Preferred Alternatives. They will submit EIS/EIR final documents in late summer and expect VNBRT to be certified and adopted in early Fall.

On the conclusion of this presentation, Henderson said that he could not say enough about how important this project is. The real interest will be in how many new lessons we can learn from expediting this project, since VNBRT is the first BRT in a dense urban environment in the US. The TA believes that if this project works, then there will be a public clamor for more public transit. Currently the opposition to this project is from people on Franklin and Gough streets, who fear more traffic diverting to them to avoid delays on Van Ness.

Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) — summary

1. Background

- Key north-south link in SF's BRT network
- Recommended for BRT service in 2004 countywide Transport Plan; Prop K Expenditure Plan; SFMTA Transit Effectiveness Project
- Partnership with SFMTA
- Other collaborations: SFDPAW, Planning, PUC, GG Transit, Caltrans
- Top rated FTA Small Starts Project for cost effectiveness; regional MTC Small Starts Priority.

2. Project Purpose & Need
 - Improve transit reliability, speed, connectivity & comfort
 - separate autos from transit
 - reduce delays associated with loading & unloading, and traffic signals
 - Improve pedestrian comfort, amenities, and safety
 - Enhance urban design & identity of Van Ness Avenue
 - Accommodate safe multimodal circulation and access within the corridor
3. Full-featured BRT
 - dedicated transit lane
 - transit signal priority
 - low floor, all-door boarding
 - high quality stops
 - real-time information
 - pedestrian amenities
4. EIS/EIR Planning Activities to Date
 - formed EIS/EIR CAC in 2007
 - alternatives screening report: approved Apr.2008; 3 alternatives to analyze
 - conducted technical studies in areas with potential environmental impacts
 - significant outreach & coordination: community/stakeholders; Tech.Advy.Cmte.; Authorities
5. Cost & Funding: only Small Starts proj in US to receive “high” cost effectiveness resulting in FTA grants for FY 11/12, 12/13, 13/14
6. Findings: VNBRT Benefits
 - improve transit travel times by up to 32%
 - improve transit reliability up to 50%
 - increase transit boardings by up to 35%
 - Maintain corridor person-throughput & increase transit mode share
 - save up to 30% of daily routing costs
 - improve multimodal safety, including for pedestrians
7. Findings: Significant & Unavoidable Impacts — Traffic Circulation
 - existing conditions (2015): 3 intersections, auto delays; no worse than 2015 No Build alt.
 - long-term (2035): 6-8 intersections have auto delays; assumes significant background growth
8. Next step is selection of LPA—Performance Indicators
 - transit performance
 - passenger experience
 - access & pedestrian safety
 - urban design/landscape
 - system performance
 - environmental & social effects
 - operations & maintenance
 - construction & capital costs

At the conclusion of the presentation and discussion, on a motion for a CAC Resolution by Levitt, seconded by Vasquez and unanimously approved, the committee supported the concept and work on VNBRT, as follows.

RESOLUTION #10 (19Mar2012)

BE IT RESOLVED that the Market Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC) supports the concept of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) corridors along the main transit paths in the City. Specifically we approve of the Van Ness Avenue BRT (VNBRT), as described to us this evening. We urge its expedited completion and do not take a position on any of the considered alternative methods. We believe that this VNBRT will greatly complement transportation in our MOP area.

MOTION: Leavitt
SECOND: Vasquez

YES (unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Leavitt, Olsson, Richards, Vasquez

NO: none
ABSENT: Krute, Simmons
ABSTAIN: none

MOTION: 2012-03-19

SUMMARY: RESOLUTION #10 (19Mar2012)

The Market Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC) supports the concept of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) along the main transit corridors of the City. Specifically we approve the Van Ness Ave. BRT (VNBRT) and urge its expedited completion, without taking a position on any of the considered alternative methods.

8. LETTER OF SUPPORT—PLNG.DPT. APPLC. FOR CALTRANS GRANT FOR LIVING ALLEY PEDESTRIAN NETWORK [act]

Last year the Planning Department applied for a grant from Caltrans for our Livable Streets (e.g., Linden Alley) program. They did not receive the grant. Last year they proposed only to do alleyways; this year they are also proposing to include pedestrian crossways, such as those at mid-block. They are reapplying this year. By consensus it was decided that Chairman Henderson would write a letter on behalf of the CAC to the Department fully endorsing the request for such a grant.

9. DEVELOPMENT PIPELINE REPORT [discuss]: none received nor discussed.

10. LEGISLATION/POLICY PIPELINE REPORT [discuss]: none received nor discussed.

11. COMMITTEE MEMBERS' COMMENTS & ISSUES for future meetings [discuss]: none.

12. PUBLIC COMMENT [comment]:

Mr. Milo Hankey, a neighbor in the area of the Department's headquarters, addressed the committee. He pleaded that we not allow a billboard to be raised on the side of this Planning Department building at 1650 Mission Street. He stated that this would be the only revenue-generating billboard on a city-owned building. He indicated that an earlier billboard had been removed more than a year ago. He asked us to make our voices known when the Real Estate Division meets in this room tomorrow and when the Land Use Committee meets next Monday at 1pm. He indicated that 8 of the 11 Supervisors had forwarded this to the Land Use Committee with their recommendation. He indicated that the 20-year contract would only produce \$63k/year. He further opined that there are common sense costs and that placing these billboards on this building advertises that this neighborhood is marginal and thereby reduces the costs of nearby real estate. Unfortunately although this property fits within the boundaries of our MOP, there are no natural allies nor spokespersons for this neighborhood. Why should we care about this issue he asked? Because this neighborhood needs an advocate during this transition. And our next meeting will be too late for this CAC to lodge any effective objection, since the decisive committee meeting will occur at the Land Use Committee's meeting at 1pm on Monday. He repeated that although this property is within the MOP boundaries, yet we evidently were unaware of this issue until he brought it before us tonight. He asked us why this subject did not show up on either our Development nor our Legislative Pipeline Report. Indeed it was the consensus of the committee that the CAC itself wondered why we had not been notified about this issue when there was sufficient time to do something about it.

Vasquez indicated that this is a case of reuse. Henderson noted that HVNA has opposed billboards when they effect the neighborhood; however, they remain vigilant against billboards in their neighborhood. So, he claimed that there are sufficient precedents and that he agrees with Mr. Hankey. Dischinger pointed out that we are constrained not to take action on any issue that has not

been previously scheduled on our agenda. This only furthered the CAC's concern as to why staff had not informed the committee of this issue while there was time to schedule it on our agenda to make time for discussion and action on the matter, and allowing us sufficient time to create a resolution, if we cared to do so. At this point the committee rhetorically questioned whether any exceptions to this rule were permitted when the matter is urgent, such as this.

Levitt loves the billboards in Times Square, claiming that there are some great billboards there, which Vasquez agreed with. It was noted again that the BOS voted 8-3 to recommend this action to the Land Use Committee. Henderson noted two points: 1) we should have received notice about such an issue; and 2) there is indeed a sentiment of concern on this CAC about this instance, which many felt was typical of the Department's lack of informing us about issues affecting our MOP area, which is why this CAC at the beginning of this year required staff to monthly provide us with the Legislative Pipeline Report, in addition to the Development Pipeline Report, which had been required since the second year of the committee. As a result of the committee's sentiment of concern, it was the consensus of this CAC that Chairman Henderson should express our sentiment to the Chair of the Land Use Committee explaining how, when we were finally notified of this matter, our consensus opposed such billboards and we were very upset that we had not been sufficiently notified of the matter to officially express our opinion on the matter.

13. ADJOURNMENT & ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT MEETING [act]

There being no further business to discuss nor time in which to discuss it, the Chair adjourned this meeting of the CAC, announcing that our next meeting would be on the third Monday of the month, April 16th, at 6:30pm in Room 400 of the Planning Department at 1650 Mission Street.

NEXT MEETING: MONDAY, APRIL 16, 2012, 6:30PM, 1650 MISSION STREET, RM.400.

CAC Meetings: (Third Monday monthly, Planning Department, Rm 400, 6:30-8:30pm)

2012 Calendar: 1/25, 2/22, 3/19, 4/16, 5/21, 6/18, 7/16, 8/20, 9/17, 10/15, 11/19, 12/17

Respectfully submitted,
~TED OLSSON, Secretary
Market/Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee

APPENDIX 1
MOP-CAC
Attendance
 4th Wednesday monthly

Legend

Y = attended

N = unexcused absence

X = excused absence (i.e., Chairman notified)

Q = no quorum: no official business transacted; no minutes

***NOTE:** January & February meetings were held before the new CAC set the year's monthly meeting day.*

Full committee consists of 9 members; Quorum is five members.

<u>CAC Member</u>	<u>1/25</u>	<u>2/22</u>	<u>3/19</u>	<u>4/16</u>	<u>5/21</u>	<u>6/18</u>	<u>7/16</u>	<u>8/20</u>	<u>9/17</u>	<u>10/15</u>	<u>11/19</u>	<u>12/17</u>
Peter Cohen	N	Y	Y									
Jason Henderson	Y	Y	Y									
Robin Levitt	Y	X	Y									
Ted Olsson	Y	Y	Y									
Dennis Richards	Y	X	Y									
Michael Simmons	0	Y	N									
Krute Singa	0	Y	N									
Lou Vasquez	Y	Y	Y									
Ken Wingard	Y	Y	Y									
<u>Ex Officio</u>												
Kearstin Dischinger	0	0	Y									
Alexis Smith	Y	Y	Y									

APPENDIX 2**MOP-CAC****2012 Schedule of meeting Topics**

Annotated by meeting: Planned Items; Unique Agenda Items; Decisions
(as of 16 APRIL 2012)

SUMMARY OF TOPICS PLANNED/DISCUSSED DURING 2012**THE 2012 SCHEDULE IS YET TO BE DEFINED****January 24**Agenda

- Transportation Sustainability Program (staff presentation)
- Review & resolution on IPIC's report to Planning Commission
- Review of Controller's Report on FY2011 Impact Fees
- *Resolution on Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) – postponed*
- Legislation/Policy Pipeline Report

Decisions

- CAC will not meet in conflict with its neighborhood associations' regularly scheduled meetings
- Resolution 1: City asked to evaluate efficiency of fee deferral policy before expiration date.

February 22Agenda

- Review of impact of Fee Deferral Program on CAC's budget for Community Improvement Projects.
- Review of elimination of SF's RDA upon development of MOP's freeway parcels.
- Better Streets Plan
- Transportation Sustainability Program

Decisions

- Decision: in 2012 CAC will meet on 3rd Mon., 6:30pm, Planning Dept., 4th floor
- Consensus: Invite Michael Yarney & someone from Controller's office: discuss fee deferral policy
- Consensus: contact other CACs: effect of TSP on CAC budgets
- Consensus: invite city official opposed to TSP to educate our CAC
- Resolution 9: Commendation of John Billovits upon his retirement

March 19Agenda

- Election: Chair; Vice Chair; Secretary.
- OEWD presentation on former freeway parcels / Octavia Blvd. update
- TA presentation on Central Freeway & Octavia Circulation Study
- TA presentation on Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit project
- Letter to Planning Department supporting their request to Caltrans for grant for Living Alleyways

Decisions

- CAC approved Feb.mins.; tabled Dec.mins; permanently accepted that there are NO Nov.mins.
- Elected Henderson, Chair; Singa, VChair; Olsson, Secretary.
- Resolution #10: support expediting VNBRT
- Consensus: Chair will write Dept. supporting request to Caltrans for Living Alleyways grant.
- Consensus: Chair will write Chair of Land Use Cmte. re: CAC consensus against billboards.

TO BE SCHEDULED FOR 2013 (below are from 2012)

2012 Calendar: 1/25, 2/22, 3/19, 4/16, 5/21, 6/18, 7/16, 8/20, 9/17, 10/15, 11/19, 12/17

Apr 16ScheduledAgendaDecisions**May 21**

[Scheduled](#)
[Agenda](#)
[Decisions](#)

June 18
[Scheduled](#)
[Agenda](#)
[Decisions](#)

July 16
[Scheduled](#)
[Agenda](#)
[Decisions](#)

August 20
[Scheduled](#)
[Agenda](#)
[Decisions](#)

September 17
[Scheduled](#)
[Agenda](#)
[Decisions](#)

October 15
[Scheduled](#)
[Agenda](#)
[Decisions](#)

November 19
[Scheduled](#)
[Agenda](#)
[Decisions](#)

December 17
[Scheduled](#)
[Agenda](#)
[Decisions](#)

**APPENDIX 3
LIST OF RELEVANT DOCUMENTS
TO BE INCLUDED ON MOP-CAC WEBSITE
(other than Exhibits, unless cross-referenced_**

<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1700>

Each member of the CAC should indicate which public documents and websites are relevant to the MOP should be incorporated onto our website or at least linked from it. This page should be annotated to explain the document and its relevance to the MOP. The point is to make everything relevant to MOP transparent in order to inform the citizens about the CAC's decisions.

- **Community Improvement Plan (Capital Projects)**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2893>
- **Better Neighborhood Plans (including MOP)**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1699>
- **Eastern Neighborhoods**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1673>
- **Eastern Neighboroods — CAC (Citizens Advisory Committee)**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2224>
- **In-Kind Policy**
Search: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Search.aspx?sa.x=9&sa.y=13&sa=Search&cof=FORID%3A11&q=in-kind%20policy&cx=018062627758110761831%3Aalpglywsoxu>
+ Application packet for In-Kind Policy: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8601>
- **IPIC 2012 Annual Report [including section on MOP]**
http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Market_Octavia/CAC/Interagency_Plan_Implementation_Committee_Annual_Report.pdf
- **MOP-CAC Bylaws**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=674>
- **Market & Octavia Area Plan**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1713>
- **Market & Octavia CAC**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1700>
- **MOP-CAC: Criteria for members**
numbers chosen by Mayor, by Supervisors; description of representation & members' constituencies
listing of terms of each member; how and when for public to apply to participate
- **MOP-CAC Board Members** (historical & current)
bios, constituency/representing, roles & responsibilities; committee assignments
- **MOP-CAC Current Calendar** of scheduled topics
meets 3d Mon. monthly at Planning Dpt., 4th floor. All meetings are open to the public & include time for public comment.

- **MOP-CAC's Resolutions** (Appendix 4 of CAC monthly minutes; these should be posted separately)
- **CAC's supplementary to the Department's Monitoring Report of MOP**
http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Market_Octavia/CAC/CAC_supplemental_report.pdf
- Market Octavia Impact Fee report
<http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=2161>
- Planning Department's *Fifth Year MOP Monitoring Report*
- CAC's *Supplementary Fifth Year MOP Monitoring Report*
http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Market_Octavia/CAC/CAC_supplemental_report.pdf
- **NCD — Neighborhood Community District**
 Search: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Search.aspx?sa.x=9&sa.y=13&sa=Search&cof=FORID%3A11&q=Neighborhood%20Community%20District&cx=018062627758110761831%3Aalpglywsoxu>
 NCD-20 by Dan Sayer was mentioned as a model of a superb government report.
- **Parking Nexus Study**
 Search: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Search.aspx?sa.x=9&sa.y=13&sa=Search&cof=FORID%3A11&q=nexus%20study&cx=018062627758110761831%3Aalpglywsoxu>
- **San Francisco Planning Department website:**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/>
- **San Francisco Planning Department's Complete List of Projects & Programs**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2673>
- **San Francisco General Plan**
http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/index.htm
- **San Francisco Historic Preservation**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1825>
- **San Francisco Property Information Map**
<http://ec2-50-17-237-182.compute-1.amazonaws.com/PIM/>
- **San Francisco Green Connections Plans**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3002>
- **TEP — Transit Effectiveness Project**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2970>
 Search: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Search.aspx?sa.x=9&sa.y=13&sa=Search&cof=FORID%3A11&q=TEP&cx=018062627758110761831%3Aalpglywsoxu>
- **Transportation Sustainability Program presentation & report**
 Search: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Search.aspx?sa.x=9&sa.y=13&sa=Search&cof=FORID%3A11&q=Transportation%20Sustainability%20Program&cx=018062627758110761831%3Aalpglywsoxu>

APPENDIX 4

SUMMARY OF ALL MOP-CAC RESOLUTIONS**SUMMARY**

Resolution 01	(20Oct2009):	INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS
Resolution 02	(24Mch2010):	IN-KIND AGREEMENT, COMMISSION POLICY
Resolution 03	(25Aug2010):	FEES DEFERRAL PROGRAM
Resolution 04	(15Dec2010):	INCLUSIONARY AFFORDABLE HOUSING (orig: 09/22/10#1)
Resolution 05	(22Sep2010#2):	HAYES STREET PROJECT INVESTMENT
Resolution 06	(14Dec2011#1):	CIP: DOLORES INTERSECTIONS AT MARKET & 14TH STREETS
Resolution 07	(14Dec2011#2):	PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR PLANNING CODE AMENDMENTS
Resolution 08	(14Dec2011#3):	FINALIZED 2012 M/O CIP RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CAPITAL PLAN
Resolution 09	(24Jan2012):	FEE DEFERRAL PROGRAM EVALUATION

RESOLUTION ABSTRACTS

RESOLUTION #1	2009-10-20#1
TITLE	Infrastructure Finance Recommendations
DATE:	October 20, 2009
EXTRACT:	Plan Area impact fees will fund community improvement projects (CIP); however this requires future revenue streams, as stated in the recommendations of the July 2009 Capital Planning Report.
MOVED/SECOND:	Moved by Richards, seconded by Levitt
YES (unanimous):	Brinkman, Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards, Villiers
NO:	none
ABSTAIN:	none
ABSENT:	none
RESOLUTION #2:	2010-03-24#1
TITLE:	In-Kind Policy
DATE:	March 24, 2010
EXTRACT:	Commends Dischinger; conditionally approves Department's latest draft. States policy for developers to apply for In-Kind CIPs rather than paying CIP impact fees. Requires CAC to understand tradeoffs. Developers must understand CAC priorities and choose CIPs from among these.
MOVED/SECOND:	Moved by Henderson; Seconded by Levitt
YES:	Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards
NO:	none
ABSTAIN:	none
ABSENT:	Brinkman, Gold, Starkey, Wingard
RESOLUTION #3:	2010-08-25#1
TITLE:	Fees Deferral Program
DATE:	August 25, 2010
EXTRACT:	Support of temporary fee deferral program for developers, requiring them to pay 10% up front; 90% deferral until occupancy. Creates Community Infrastructure Fund, initially capitalized at \$3-5m, to pay for preliminary design, planning, and engineering of "shovel-ready" priority improvement projects. Authorized only for CAC prioritized CIPs. Inclusionary housing of in-lieu payment is not subject to this deferral. This deferral expires in 3 years.
MOVED/SECOND:	Moved by Henderson; Seconded by Levitt
YES (unanimous):	Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards
NO:	none
ABSTAIN:	none
ABSENT:	Brinkman, Gold, Starkey, Wingard

- RESOLUTION #4:** **2010-12-15**
TITLE: **Inclusionary Affordable Housing**
DATE: **original: September 22, 2010; revised: December 15, 2010**
EXTRACT: CAC's preference is that ALL inclusionary housing for new developments within the Market and Octavia Plan Area be built on-site. If infeasible for the developer such housing must be built offsite but within the Plan Area or ¼ mile beyond, which site must be deeded to the City for affordable housing, and must not include Redevelopment parcels and must be entitlement-ready at the time of ceding. The purpose of this policy is to achieve mixed income housing development at a very localized scale within the various neighborhoods of the plan area.
- MOVED/SECOND:** Moved by Henderson; Seconded by Gold
YES (unanimous): Cohen, Gold, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Starkey, Wingard
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Richards
- RESOLUTION #5:** **2010-09-22#1**
TITLE: **Hayes Street Project Investment**
DATE: **September 22, 2010**
EXTRACT: CAC recommends Planning Department to invest \$52,500 — ½ the community impact funds — in the Hayes Street Two-Way project.
- MOVED/SECOND:** Moved by Henderson; Seconded by Levitt
YES (unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards, Starkey, Wingard
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Gold
- RESOLUTION #6:** **2011-12-14#1**
TITLE: **Support for In-kind CIP Agreement for 2001 Market Street**
DATE: **December 14, 2011**
EXTRACT: Support of In-Kind CIP Agreement to streetscape improvements — constricting first block of historic Dolores Street to one lane each way — as defined in June 2011 schematic plan, except that Dolores/14th Streets intersection must be consistent with November 2011 schematic, and that Market Street crosswalk and associated improvements not be included.
- MOVED/SECOND:** Moved by Levitt; Seconded by Wingard
YES: Henderson, Levitt, Wingard
NO: Olsson, Starkey
ABSTAIN: Cohen, Richards
ABSENT: Gold
- RESOLUTION #7:** **2011-12-14#2**
TITLE: **Proposed Legislation for Planning Code Amendments**
DATE: **December 14, 2011**
EXTRACT: Support Planning Department recommendations pertaining to Limited Corner Commercial Users (LCCUs) and Limited Commercial Uses (LCUs), as specifically articulated in Recommendations #8 & #9 of the staff report for December 15, 2011 Planning Commission hearing.
- MOVED/SECOND:** Moved by Richards; Seconded by Starkey
YES: Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Richards, Starkey, Wingard
NO: none

ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Gold, Olsson

RESOLUTION #8: **2011-12-14#3**
TITLE: **Finalized 2012 M/O CIP Recommendations for Capital Plan**
DATE: **December 14, 2011**
EXTRACT: Recommendations to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for use of Market/Octavia Fund revenues in FY13 and FY14 for community improvements projects in the Plan Area. Fiscal years beyond FY13 and FY14 were not considered.
MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Richards; Seconded by Wingard
YES: Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Richards, Wingard
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Gold, Olsson, Starkey

RESOLUTION #9: **2012-01-24**
TITLE: **Evaluate Fee Deferral Policy**
DATE: **January 24, 2012**
EXTRACT: CAC requests City to analyze and report on effectiveness of existing development impact fee deferral program, particularly in stimulating development projects that would not have otherwise occurred. This report should be completed before the May 2013 expiration of the policy.
MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Olsson; Seconded by Richards
YES: Henderson, Olsson, Richards, Vasquez
NO: none
ABSTAIN: Levitt
ABSENT: Simmons, Singa; Wingard had left by this time

RESOLUTION #10: **Mike Billovits Commendation (22Feb2012)**
TITLE: Mike Billovits Commendation
DATE: February 22, 2012
EXTRACT: Commend Billovits on his retirement from SF Planning Dpt. for invaluable contributions to the concept of the Market/Octavia Plan.
MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Olsson; Seconded by Cohen
YES (unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Olsson, Simmons, Singa, Vasquez, Wingard
NO: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Richards

RESOLUTION #11: **SUPPORT FOR VNBRT (19Mar2012)**
TITLE: Support for VNBRT
DATE: March 19, 2012
EXTRACT: RESOLUTION #10 (19Mar2012)
The Market Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC)) supports the concept of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) along the main transit corridors of the City. Specifically we approve the Van Ness Ave. BRT (VNBRT) and urge its expedited completion, without taking a position on any of the considered alternative methods.
MOTION: Leavitt
SECOND: Vasquez
YES (unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Leavitt, Olsson, Richards, Vasquez

NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Krute, Simmons

ABSTRACT TEMPLATE

RESOLUTION #__: [YYYY-MM-DD#__]

TITLE:

DATE:

EXTRACT:

MOVED/SECOND: Moved by ____; Seconded by ____

YES:

NO:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

FULL TEXT OF ALL MOP-CAC RESOLUTIONS**2.1 RESOLUTION #1****20Oct2009 RESOLUTION 1: INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Market/Octavia Plan's Community Improvements Program lays out a comprehensive set of measures "necessary to accommodate projected growth of residential and commercial development in the Plan Area while maintaining and improving community character." Partial funding for those needed community improvements will come from the Plan Area's impact fees funds. However, as the Plan notes, to fully implement the Community Improvements Program "some future revenue streams must be established, or additional revenue sources must be made available to the program." A recent report by an Infrastructure Finance Working Group and the City's Capital Planning Committee at the direction of the Board of Supervisors recommends a number of financing tools as strategies for funding public improvements, including tax increment financing and community facilities districts. The CAC expects such financing tools to be applied to the Market/Octavia Area, as called for in the adopted Plan and Community Improvements Program Document as future revenue streams. Therefore, the Community Advisory Committee supports the recommendations of the July 2009 Capital Planning Committee report as relevant to the fulfillment of the Market/Octavia Plan's adopted community improvements goals.

RESOLUTION #1: Infrastructure Finance Recommendations (20Oct2009)
DATE: October 20, 2009
MOTION: Moved by Richards, seconded by Levitt
YES (Unanimous): Brinkman, Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards, Villiers
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Gold

2.2 RESOLUTION #2**24Mch2010 RESOLUTION 2: IN-KIND AGREEMENT, COMMISSION POLICY**

The MOP-CAC commends Kearstin Dischinger on a well-expressed policy which incorporates all of the input from the MOP-CAC and EN-CAC delegates. The CAC conditionally approves the Department's latest draft of an In-Kind policy presented by her to the Committee at its August 25, 2010 meeting subject to incorporating the following:

- 1) The policy shall require the developer to report back to the Commission on the status of his project midway through the project's construction, in order for this to be a matter of public record, transparent to the public.
- 2) Since this In-Kind policy and fee deferrals directly reduce the fund of money which the CAC can use to direct community improvements benefitting the larger community, and because it allows developers to more directly influence the direction of CIPs, the CAC must know the tradeoffs (how it would have prioritized CIPs and allocated funds to them if it had the full funds vs how it must now prioritize CIPs with reduced funds). The CAC must also consider whether the developer's proposed In-Kind CIP is truly a priority at this point. The CAC may also wish to rank CIPs according to which it would approve developers constructing.
- 3) Since this policy could allow routine projects to be approved for the sake of expediency—i.e., lower priority CIPs might be completed at the expense of more important CIPs—and since developers are not constrained to propose projects in the CIP list, therefore the CAC can encourage developers to adopt the CAC's prioritized CIPs and if the proposal is misaligned with CAC priorities, the CAC has the right to vigorously disapprove a developer's concept based on this rationale alone.
- 4) The policy is meant to let the developers understand the CAC's top priorities and to allow them to choose to construct an In-Kind CIP from among these.

RESOLUTION #2: In-Kind Policy (24Mch2010)
DATE: March 24, 2010
MOTION: Moved by Henderson, seconded by Levitt
YES (Unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none

ABSENT: **Brinkman, Gold, Starkey, Wingard**

2.3 RESOLUTION #3

25Aug2010 RESOLUTION 3: FEES DEFERRAL PROGRAM
CAC Resolution on Fees Deferral for the Market and Octavia Plan Area

WHEREAS the Market/Octavia Plan encourages "smart growth" development for the many neighborhoods it encompasses, and is predicated upon complementary implementation of a comprehensive set of community and infrastructure improvements "necessary to accommodate projected growth of residential and commercial development in the plan area while maintaining and improving community character";

WHEREAS the Findings of the Better Neighborhoods Area Plan Monitoring Program state that, "Successful fruition of the plan's goals requires a coordinated implementation of land use controls, community and public service delivery, key policies, and community infrastructure improvements";

WHEREAS streets in the Market and Octavia Plan area are already carrying a disproportionate share of the city's mainline through-traffic at a great cost to the public safety, health, and well-being of Market and Octavia residents;

WHEREAS the key bus and rail lines that transverse the Market and Octavia Plan area are already severely strained and at or near capacity during peak hours;

WHEREAS the Market and Octavia Plan area is expected to absorb 6,000 new housing units but already has severely overburdened parks;

WHEREAS a key component of smart growth is affordable housing and mixed income neighborhoods accessible to a range of diverse lifestyles, but the price of housing and retail space in the neighborhood is out of reach for most people;

WHEREAS the Community Advisory Committee strongly supports the Plan's development impact fees on residential and commercial growth in the Plan Area to provide a portion of the funding for those needed infrastructures that include safe transportation, affordable housing, and adequate parks and public spaces;

WHEREAS it is essential that those fees be paid and the funds available in advance of the development itself so that the community improvement projects can be initiated early enough to be in the ground and ready to absorb the increased demands from population growth created by development projects;

WHEREAS there is a logical reason that the building of infrastructure always comes before, or at the same time as, the increased demands created by construction of residential and commercial development;

WHEREAS the ordinances proposed would in combination defer, delay and effectively reduce the development impact fees that help fund this infrastructure;

WHEREAS in effect, the entire premise of the Market/Octavia Plan – to enable increased development coupled with mitigating community improvements – would be seriously tested by these proposed changes in the fee structures;

WHEREAS the one aspect in the package of three proposals that has clear merit is to consolidate fees collection with a single city agency (i.e., a single-point-of-payment system) and that this is perhaps a good "efficiency" measure for collection, management and monitoring of various development fees required on each project but that, however, must be unbundled from the very different idea in this same ordinance proposal of deferring fees to a later point in the entitlements and development process rather than at the front end prior to any construction permits;

WHEREAS the Community Advisory Committee recognizes that current economic conditions and difficult access to financing capital have stalled construction activity throughout the City;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee can support a temporary fees deferral program that incorporates:

1. Requirement of a minimum 10% payment at DBI Permit of all fees (ie, allowing a maximum deferral of 90% of fees due);
2. Creation of a Community Infrastructure Fund to enable the pre-development design, planning and engineering (ie, "shovel ready") for priority improvement projects, and that the initial the size of the Fund be between \$3 million and \$5 million, and that the capitalization of the Fund will further

- grow as the amount of deferred fees from pipeline projects grows, and that the enactment of the Fees Deferral program is explicitly contingent upon creation of the Community Infrastructure Fund;
3. Affirmation that prioritization of improvement projects for use of the Community Infrastructure Fund is done through CACs in plan areas where they exist;
 4. Retention of Sec. 315 inclusionary housing in-lieu fee payment standards (i.e., not subject to deferral);
 5. Sunset of the Fees Deferral program in three years.

Approved by the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee on March 24th 2010

RESOLUTION #3: Fees Deferral Program (25Aug2010)
DATE: August 25, 2010
MOTION: Moved by Henderson, seconded by Levitt
YES (Unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Brinkman, Gold, Starkey, Wingard

2.4 RESOLUTION #4

22 Sep10 RESOLUTION 4: INCLUSIONARY AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Resolution Advising Inclusionary Affordable Housing in the Market & Octavia Plan Area

WHEREAS the spirit and policy intent of the Market and Octavia Plan includes providing low and middle-income affordable housing within new development in the Market and Octavia Plan area;

WHEREAS affordable housing is critical for diversity and economic well-being within the Market and Octavia Plan Area;

WHEREAS affordable housing is part of a complete community, and the goal of the Market and Octavia Plan is to create complete communities;

WHEREAS affordable housing is an investment in the community including the Market and Octavia Plan Area;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee advises the San Francisco Planning Commission, the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office of Housing and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors that the priority is that ALL inclusionary housing for new development within the Market and Octavia Plan Area be built on-site. If a project sponsor considers that infeasible, the inclusionary units should be built offsite within the immediate area of the new development or a developable site of equivalent value within ¼ mile of the new development should be dedicated to the city for affordable housing. For such latter land dedication alternative, eligible sites should not include Redevelopment-owned parcels and must have necessary entitlement-ready zoning established at time of dedication. The CAC encourages creative application of these offsite and land dedication alternatives by the Mayor's Office of Housing to allow project sponsors to pool resources for maximizing local inclusionary housing impact in the Market/Octavia Plan Area.

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that geography matters—the primary importance of the inclusionary housing policy for the Market/Octavia Area is that it be a mechanism to achieve mixed income housing development at a very localized scale within the various neighborhoods of the plan area, whether in the form of on-site below-market-rate units, off-site BMR units or land for future lower income affordable units. Simply paying in-lieu fees to satisfy the inclusionary requirement in the Market/Octavia Area has no value to advancing the inclusionary housing policy.

Approved by the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee on September 22, 2010

Revision approved by M/O-CAC on December 15, 2010

This revision included all text regarding the land dedication alternative.

RESOLUTION #4: Inclusionary Affordable Housing (22Sep2010)

DATE: September 22, 2010

MOTION: Moved by Henderson, seconded by Richards

YES (Unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards, Starkey, Wingard

NO: none

ABSTAIN: none

ABSENT: Gold

REV. RSLN #4: Inclusionary Affordable Housing (15Dec2010)

MOTION: Moved by Henderson, Seconded by Gold

YES (Unanimous): Cohen, Gold, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Starkey, Wingard

NO: none

ABSTAIN: none

ABSENT: Richards

2.5 RESOLUTION #5

**22Sep10-2 RESOLUTION 5: HAYES STREET PROJECT INVESTMENT
Resolution Advising Expenditure of Market & Octavia Community Impact fees
for the Hayes Street Two-Way Project**

WHEREAS the Hayes Street two-way project is a key project identified in the Market/Octavia Plan;

WHEREAS the Hayes Street two-way project has been identified by both the Market and Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee and the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) as a high priority project;

WHEREAS the Hayes Street two-way project is an inexpensive, optimal use of limited available funds;

WHEREAS there are only \$105,000 available for expenditure for community benefits in the Market and Octavia Plan area to date;

WHEREAS anticipated future community benefits funds have been deferred for up to three years and few additional funds are anticipated in the near future;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee advises the San Francisco Planning Department to invest \$52,500, or half of the currently available community impact funds, to the Hayes Street two-way project.

Approved by the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee on September 22nd, 2010

RESOLUTION #5: Hayes Street Project Investment (22Sep2010)

DATE: September 22, 2010

MOTION: Moved by Henderson, seconded by Levitt

YES (Unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards, Starkey, Wingard

NO: none

ABSTAIN: none

ABSENT: Gold

2.6 RESOLUTION #6

14Dec11-1: Proposed In-kind community improvements Agreement for 2001 Market (Prado project) [discussion and action item]

RESOLVED: Support an In-kind Agreement for streetscape improvements, as specifically defined in the schematic plan dated June 2011, with the exceptions being that the improvements proposed for the Dolores/14th Street intersection shall be consistent with the November 2011 schematic plan, and that the Market Street crosswalk and associated improvements shall not be included in this improvements program.

RESOLUTION #6 2011-12-14#1

TITLE Support for In-kind CIP Agreement for 2001 Market Street

DATE: December 14, 2011

RESOLUTION: **Be it Resolved** that the MOP-CAC supports the plan proposed by the SF Planning Department and advocated by Supervisor Wiener for an In-kind Agreement for streetscape improvements, as specifically defined in the schematic plan dated June 2011, with the exceptions being that the improvements proposed for the Dolores/14th Street intersection shall be consistent with the November 2011 schematic plan, and that the Market Street crosswalk and associated improvements shall not be included in this improvements program.

MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Levitt, seconded by Wingard

YES: Henderson, Levitt, Wingard

NO: Olsson, Starkey

ABSTAIN: Cohen, Richards

ABSENT: Gold

2.7 RESOLUTION #7

14Dec2011#2 Resolution on proposed legislation for Planning Code amendments (2011.0532T, introduced 5/3/2011) [action item]

RESOLVED: Support the Planning Department staff's recommendations pertaining to Limited Corner Commercial Uses (LCCUs) and Limited Commercial Uses (LCUs), as specifically articulated in recommendations #8 and #9 of the staff report for December 15, 2011 Planning Commission hearing.

RESOLUTION # 7 2011-12-14#2:

TITLE Proposed Legislation for Planning Code Amendments

DATE: December 14, 2011

MOTION: Support Planning Department recommendations pertaining to Limited Corner Commercial Users (LCCUs) and Limited Commercial Uses (LCUs), as specifically articulated in Recommendations #8 & #9 of the staff report for December 15, 2011 Planning Commission hearing.

MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Richards, seconded by Starkey

YES: Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Richards, Starkey, Wingard

NO: none

ABSTAIN: none

ABSENT: Gold, Olsson

2.8 RESOLUTION #8

14Dec2011 MOP-CAC Final 2012 M/O Community Improvements Program recommendations for Capital Plan (FY13-FY14)

BE IT RESOLVED that the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee, after reviewing the IPIC recommendations presented at its December meeting, makes the following recommendations to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for use of Market/Octavia Fund revenues in FY13 and FY14 for community improvements projects in the Plan Area.

	FY2013	FY2014
Open Space Open Space Community Opportunities Program		50,000
Greening Street Tree Plantings for key streets (ongoing in coordination with City projects) Hayes Green rotating art project Market Street (10th to Octavia)		50,000 20,000 170,000
Transportation Haight Street two-way dedicated transit lanes and pedestrian improvements Predevelopment for Market Street intersection improvements, including Dolores/Market Market/16th/Noe pedestrian improvements Market/14th/Church pedestrian improvements Market/Duboce/Buchanan pedestrian improvements	120,000 50,000	210,000 250,000 130,000 250,009
Program Administration	50,000	50,000
Total	220,000	1,111,200

	Prior Years	FY2013	FY2014
Projected Impact Fee Revenue	130,972	173,144	1,108,501
Projected Impact Fee Expenditures	81,000	220,000	1,111,200
Annual Surplus/(Deficit)	49,972	(46,856)	(2,699)
Cumulative Surplus/(Deficit)	49,972	3,116	417

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee did not consider the IPIC recommendations for fiscal years beyond FY13 and FY14. The CAC will provide updated recommendations to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors in December 2012.

EXTRACT

RESOLUTION # 2011-12-14#3
TITLE Finalized 2012 M/O CIP Recommendations for Capital Plan
DATE: December 14, 2011
ACTION: Recommendations to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for use of Market/Octavia Fund revenues in FY13 and FY14 for community improvements projects in the Plan Area. Fiscal years beyond FY13 and FY14 were not considered.
MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Richards, seconded by Wingard
YES: Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Richards, Wingard
NO: none

ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Gold, Olsson, and Starkey

2.9 RESOLUTION #9

25Jan2012 Evaluate Fee Deferral Policy

RESOLVED: **BE IT RESOLVED** that the Market/Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee requests City officials to analyze and report on the existing development impact fee deferral program and its actual stimulus effect on the development that would not have otherwise occurred. This report should be completed prior to the May 2013 expiration of the policy, so that this evaluation could be included in the record on evaluating the effectiveness of this policy.

EXTRACT

RESOLUTION #9: Evaluate Fee Deferral Policy (25Jan2012)
DATE: January 25, 2012
MOTION: Moved by Olsson, seconded by Richards
YES: Henderson, Olsson, Richards, Vasquez
NO: none
ABSTAIN: Levitt
ABSENT: Simmons, Singa; Wingard had left by this time.

2.10 RESOLUTION #10

22Feb2012 Billovits Commendation

RESOLUTION: **BE IT RESOLVED** that the Market Octavia Plan's Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC) commends and appreciates the service and leadership of Mike Billovits on his retirement from San Francisco's Planning Department, in particular for his citywide and neighborhood perspective in helping create the Market Octavia Plan.

ABSTRACT:

RESOLUTION #10: 2012-02-22
TITLE: **Mike Billovits Commendation**
DATE: February 22, 2012
EXTRACT: Commend Billovits on his retirement for contributing to the concept of the Market/Octavia Plan.
MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Ted Olsson; Seconded by Peter Cohen
YES (unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Olsson, Simmons, Singa, Vasquez, Wingard
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Richards

2.11 RESOLUTION #11 SUPPORT FOR VNBRT (19Mar2012)

19Mar2012 Support of VNBRT

RESOLUTION: **BE IT RESOLVED** that the Market Octavia Plan's Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC) commends and appreciates the service and leadership of Mike Billovits on his retirement from San Francisco's Planning Department, in particular for his citywide and neighborhood perspective in helping create the Market Octavia Plan.

ABSTRACT:

RESOLUTION #10: 2012-03-19
TITLE: Support for VNBRT
DATE: March 19, 2012

EXTRACT:

The Market Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC) supports the concept of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) along the main transit corridors of the City. Specifically we approve the Van Ness Ave. BRT (VNBRT) and urge its expedited completion, without taking a position on any of the considered alternative methods.

MOVED/SECOND:

Moved by Levitt; Seconded by Vasquez

YES (unanimous):

Cohen, Henderson, Leavitt, Olsson, Richards, Vasquez

NO:

none

ABSTAIN:

none

ABSENT:

Krute, Simmons

APPENDIX 5
MOP-CAC GLOSSARY
EXTRACTS FROM MINUTES

Affordable Housing**BNAMP Better Neighborhoods Area Plan Monitoring Program****Better Streets Plan/Policy****BOS Board of Supervisors**

The eleven supervisors are the legislators for the City. Together with the Mayor, they manage the city and are all subject to election. In 2012 the supervisors' districts are being realigned according to the 2010 census and the US Constitution's mandate. The new districts will represent about 72,000 people ($\pm$ 5,000 persons, so as not to disrupt ethnic, cultural or other communities). These new boundaries will also effect the new district's for state and federal legislative office. The city's agencies implement the laws of the city, often at the oversight of their respective commissions.

BRT Bus Rapid Transit

This is the city's plan to enhance public mass transit by dedicated bus lanes along major transit corridors.

Van Ness BRT (VNBRT) is one example of this program which affects our MOP Area.

CAC Community Advisory Committee

This is a committee of citizens (3 selected by the Mayor; 6, by the Supervisors) appointed to provide oversight and represent neighbors' concerns and opinions.

CIP Community Improvement Program (or –Projects)

All developers within our area are assessed a CIP fee according to the gross square footage of their development project. These funds are to be used near the development to mitigate the impact of the development either because of its increase in population density or because of its contribution to the quality of life in the area and near it.

Central Freeway

This was the freeway which, rather than ending at Market and Octavia, continued over toward Chinatown. Seismically damaged by the 1989 earthquake, there were battling propositions for several voting years, until it was finally voted to be demolished, making way for the Octavia Boulevard the parcels under that freeway are now available for development as part of the Market/Octavia Plan.

CMP Central Market Partnership**CIP-IK Community Improvement Project—In Kind**

As an alternative to paying the CIP Fee, developers may choose to contribute by constructing an approved improvement project. They must indicate this to the Department. It will explain to the developer the approved improvement projects near its development. The developer can then choose which ones it wishes to undertake up to the amount of the CIP Fees that it would otherwise owe.

CEQA California Environmental Quality Act

COLA Cost Of Living Assessment

This is an index of the cost of living, determined annually by counties, which is often applied as a surcharge to a specific fee in order to keep it proportional for the citizens to the cost of living and to maintain income from the fee for the appropriate budget.

DTNA Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association

<<http://www.dtna.org/>>

This area has its apex at Duboce and Market Streets. It runs along the western side of Market Street from this apex to Castro Street and over to Scott Street. See map on the website.

DPW Department of Public Works**Department of Public Works: 5 Year Plan****EIR Environmental Impact Review****Fee Deferral Program/Policy****HVNA Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association**

<<http://www.hayesvalleysf.org/html/abouthvna.html>> see also

<<http://hayesvalleysf.org/blog/>>

This neighborhood association at the southern edge of the MOP area is concerned with the neighborhood, resulting from its area particularly with its renovation after demolition of the Central Freeway. See the map on the website

IPIC Interagency Plan Implementation Committee

This committee consists of representatives from the several city agencies which coordinate recommendations to the Planning Commission and to the Board of Supervisors regarding the practicality, scheduling, and budget for municipal improvements.

LCCU Limited Corner Commercial Users (see CAC Resolution #7)**LCU Limited Commercial Uses (see CAC Resolution #7)****LOL Level of Service**

This index gauges the impact upon the city of population density in terms of transportation efficiency.

MDNA Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association

<<http://www.MissionDNA.org>>

This neighborhood association's emphasis is upon historical preservation, diversity, and quality of life within its area, which is the oldest neighborhood in San Francisco, site of Mission Dolores, with numerous historical resources within its area. See map on website.

MOP Market Octavia Plan

This is the area under consideration by this committee. See the MOP Map for the defined area.

MOP-CAC Market Octavia Plan's Community Advisory Committee

This committee of citizens appointed by the Mayor and Supervisors, must be representative of the citizens. Each person on this committee represents a specific constituency within this area. The committee consists of nine members; a quorum consists of five members.

MUNI Municipal Transit

San Francisco's municipal public transit agency (busses, subways, cable cars, streetcars)

MTA Municipal Transportation Authority

This is the city's board of supervisors sitting as the agency supervising planning and execution of comprehensive transportation issues within the city.

Neighborhood Associations

These are independent organizations of neighbors created with various emphases, whose own boundaries lie within or abut the MOP area. Principally these have been: the Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association (HVNA), the Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association (MDNA), the Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association (DTNA).

Nexus Study**OEWD Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development****Pipeline Report**

This is the monthly report compiled by staff for the CAC which shows the status of each development project within the MOP area. Quarterly this report also includes a map, which shows each development in the area.

PIDB Planned Improvements Database

Propositions: Many voter-approved propositions have an effect on the Market/Octavia Plan.

Prop. B

Prop. K

Prop. AA

RDA Redevelopment Agency

Founded in 1949, it funded and managed many citywide major development projects paid for by increment tax funding. In 2012 all RDAs in California were eliminated; however, a county which would pay for all administrative costs of the RDA (so that all funding went directly to the development projects), could continue to use this mechanism. San Francisco was willing to do this, being both a city and county. However, the RDA mechanism was disallowed and city would have to absorb all administrative costs.

Resolution

This is an official decision and statement by this CAC expressing the majority opinion on an important issue relevant to the MOP area.

RPD Recreation and Parks Department

This agency plans and manages all municipal parks and recreational facilities in the city.

Safe Bikes Policy**SF County Metropolitan Transportation Authority****SF Historic Preservation Commission**

The Planning Department is subject to this commission's rulings, as well as to those of the Planning Commission.

SFMTA SF Municipal Transportation Agency**SF Office of Economic and Workforce Development****SF Oversight Board**

This is the successor to San Francisco's Redevelopment Agency. When the RDA was eliminated (Feb. 2, 2012) this board (consisting of many of the RDA's employees) continued the

developments undertaken by the RDA. Because San Francisco is both a coterminous county and city, we are able to continue the RDA efforts by fully paying all administrative fees of RDA employees, so that all taxes and fees go directly to the specific area's development projects.

SF Planning Commission

This commission oversees the Planning Department, establishing policy for the development of the city

SF Planning Department

This agency proposes and executes the laws of the city regarding planning for buildings and other infrastructure implementations. It is under the joint authority of two commissions: the Planning Commission and the Historic Preservation Commission.

Streets Capital Group**TA San Francisco County Transportation Authority**

This is San Francisco's Board of Supervisors (BOS) sitting as a committee to determine county transportation policy.

TEDM**TEP Transit Effectiveness Program**

This is Muni's program to tax developers, both commercial and residential, for all new projects, in order to raise money to pay for Muni's programs that will improve transportation in the city to account for the impact of all future development. It is not known at this time what effect this will have upon the Development Impact Fees, which fund the CAC's budget to create its Community Improvement Projects, to mitigate the impact of population density resulting from approved projects.

TIF Tax Increment Financing

This mechanism was used by RDAs to finance citywide projects, which could not be afforded otherwise.

Transit First Policy**TIDF Transit Impact Development Fee****TSF Transportation Sustainability Fee**

This program adds to the CIP fee and additional fee to fund the city's transportation plans and implementation to mitigate the impacts of increased population growth.

TSP Transportation Sustainability Program

This program proposed in 2012 would raise the fees on all new developments in the city — both commercial and residential (evidently residences had not been subject to development impact fees formerly; now they would be so assessed). This reprioritization of impact fees may have a substantial negative effect upon the MOP-CAC's impact fees, which fund the budget upon which all CAC CIP's are funded.

Walk First Project