

**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, May 21, 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 [act]
2. Announcements, upcoming meetings and general housekeeping [discuss]
3. Approval of Minutes for March 19th & April 16th meetings [act]
4. Transportation Sustainability Program (TSP) [discuss; act]
5. Review of MOP-CAC bylaws, member roles and responsibilities [discuss]
6. CAC goals and schedule for 2012 [discuss] [discuss]
7. Development Pipeline Report [discuss; act]
8. Legislation/Policy Pipeline Report [discuss]
9. Committee members comments & issues the Committee may consider in future meetings [discuss]
10. Public Comment
11. Adjournment & announcement of next meeting

NEXT MEETING: MONDAY, JUNE 18, 2012, 7:00PM AT 1650 Mission, 5th floor

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

All meetings are on the **THIRD MONDAY, 7:00pm MONTHLY** (Jan & Feb: exceptions this year)

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

- Exhibit 1: Agenda (**Smith**)
 Exhibit 2: Minutes: March19,2012 & April 16, 2012 (**Olsson**)
 Exhibit 3: Resolution of Sentiment: reinvest TIP fees in CAC areas to mitigate growth (**Olsson**)
 Exhibit 4: Development Pipeline Report (**Smith**)
 Exhibit 5: Legislation Pipeline Report (**Smith**)

DECISIONS

- Decision 1: Minutes (March & April) approved unanimously
 Decision 2: Resolution #12 (of Sentiment)
 Consensus 1: Add Secretary as officer in Bylaws; RSVP to each meeting; staff only works on CAC purposes.
 Consensus 2: Approved Calendar; discuss at next meeting list of suggestions from April meeting (see Appx.C);
 avoid meetings that conflict with regularly scheduled meetings of neighborhood associations
 Consensus 3: Postpone December meeting

COMMITMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, INFORMATION DUE

- | # | <u>WHEN</u> | <u>WHO</u> | <u>WHAT</u> |
|----|-------------|------------|---|
| 1. | 06/18 | JH | Chr. to notify BOS of vacant seat on CAC. |

MINUTES**LEGEND**

1. New terms/abbreviations: **bold**; iteratively collected & defined in Glossary (Appendix 5).
2. Decisions: **bold**; collected in summary; iteratively collected in CAC Schedule (Appendix 2).
3. Commitments: **bold, italic, indented** in text; collected in summary; iteratively in Appendix 2.

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

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

CAC members

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

Ex Officio Members

- ✓ 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: **none**

1.

The Chair opened the meeting at 7:00pm with announcements and matters that did not require action by the committee.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, UPCOMING MEETINGS, GENERAL HOUSEKEEPING

- 2.1 Smith announced that the in-kind agreement for 2001 Market St. has not yet been scheduled to come before the Planning Commission. The developers are currently calculating their costs.
- 2.2 Levitt announced that a meeting with the MTA will be held for all neighbors on May 31st from 6:30-830pm at the Harvey Milk Community Center at Duboce Park for all neighbors affected by the MTA transit projects in this corridor. They are particularly concerned with the traffic, safety, and pedestrian issues involved in these projects
- 2.3 The project at the corner of Noe/16th/Market Streets has begun construction in a very deep pit with lots of steel and cement and workers .

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS [act]

EXHIBIT 2: March 19th and April 16th minutes.

The minutes of both meetings were independently moved and seconded for approval by Vasquez and Levitt; and both were unanimously approved.

DECISION: March & April minutes approved unanimously.

4. REVIEW OF TRANSPORTATION SUSTAINABILITY PROGRAM (TSP) (Dischinger)

Dischinger answered questions the CAC had about TSP when it was first presented to us. There will be a full EIR this summer. The state mandates such analysis and required an opportunity for public comment. This summer the public will be able to weigh in on the analysis, on particular streets or modes. In contrast this CAC should not comment on the process. The publication of the EIR will be announced.

Henderson asked if the Planning Department, the MTA and other agencies will be showing their public transportation projects to be analyzed. Dischinger was not sure that all potential projects which could be funded by the program. For this program to work as construction begins, the CIP improvements must mitigate future travel plans. All of these improvements would be modeled and analyzed. Henderson reminded us that the TEP is under environmental review right now; so, it seems that parts of the TSP EIR

are already underway. Dischinger agreed that the TSP EIR would use the findings from the earlier TEP EIR work to inform and expedite the TSP; however, since it is a separate process, this may not be the most efficient way to do things. Both the TEP and TSP projects will nudge each other along, as well as all transportation projects throughout the city.

Dischinger commented that these are insightful questions about the program administration of a 20-year program. In the process we will learn how to determine which projects to expedite and where to spend the money initially. The Planning Department will annually decide on these allocations as leader of an interagency group determining priorities. Geographical equity will also play a role in informing these annual allocations.

Henderson wondered whether our CAC could ask for an exception to avoid the CAC fee or to consider a scenario by which our CAC's impact fee is passed through the TSP to allocate it specifically to where the fee originates. Dischinger suggested that the group's analysis will account for where the largest growth will occur in the city when recommending its allocations. The EIR analysis would not normally consider financial constraints. Since this determination will happen in June, Henderson felt that it would be useful if our CAC voted that alternatives be analyzed in the CEQA process. This could be a consideration rather than an alternative. Singha asked what the annual analysis would entail: and how would neighborhood equity be determined every five years. Dischinger indicated that every year the interagency group would update the fifth year report. Funding will also rely on grants and other sources. Any vote would be considered part of the "possible action".

Henderson stated his proposed Resolution of CAC sentiment to be voted upon: "When the TSP is adopted, the **\$3 Transportation Impact Fee (TIP)** from MOP will be rescinded and folded into TSP. Our concern during our last several meetings, is that parts of our city which are experiencing thousands of housing units may deserve more emphasis than those parts of the city which are not experiencing such growth. Right now public transit in the MOP area is stressed and overwhelmed (busses pass waiting passengers). We do not have transit capacity today. We wish to strengthen the guidance of how to most equitably invest in city transit."

Vasquez suggested that we broaden this recommendation to all areas of the city experiencing growth. It was noted that three city development plans — the Eastern Neighborhoods, Balboa Park, and Market/Octavia plans — have established impact fees. The TSP would generate \$620 million through its Transit Impact Fee over 20 years for comprehensive urban transit projects. Dischinger proposed that our CAC should want confidence that the city will spend the impact fees where growth will happen. She also suggested that our resolution of sentiment should want to know what are the key transit projects proposed in the TSP that would mitigate growth specifically in the city's designated growth areas. As a background on the fees, she showed our CAC the 2005 plan: describing the impact fees for transportation. A city simulation considered a citywide childcare fee. It was mentioned that we cannot move six thousand housing units into our MOP area and postpone the impact fees until later. Everytime that a citywide fee is created, it will have to accommodate to the area plan fees. [OR, As in the case before us, the area plan fees will accommodate to the citywide fee.] Dischinger provided us perspective by saying that she does not see many other citywide fees in the queue and that, while our MOP-CAC is losing some authority to allocate impact fees (\$2.11 formerly was the transit portion of our impact fees), yet as a result of the new TSP, we will get \$1.30 more; so, this TSP is a net win for us and for the city, with contributions from all neighborhoods in the city. That is, \$2.11 of the \$9.57 TIF goes to transit. Under this new policy, all neighborhoods will be subject to the TSP and will pay \$12.99 of which MOP gets \$7.46 and TSP gets \$5.53. The net change is that developers will pay an additional \$3.42/sq.ft. in this new impact fee.

Dischinger advised our CAC that our best comment on the scoping exercise, if all anticipated growth in the city occurs, is to ask which projects would mitigate the density of growth in the city and neighborhoods. Vasquez wondered where the growth and its impact will be greatest? Wingard wondered whether under the new TSP if there were any controls to link to the impact of growth. Another concern was whether the CIP mitigations could be in place before the developments' density occurred. Dischinger responded that Planning guarantees that rather than doing an EIR in each specific area, Planning will waive the EIR for specific developments in order to put that fee into the larger program so as to mitigate the impacts of new growth. Every five years the Department is required by the state to update its analysis. These projects and the comprehensive citywide TSP are linked. We in each of our CACs need to be confident that decision makers will make appropriate

decisions. We need to focus our attention on how to word our resolution.

Olsson notified the CAC that while we are concerned with getting our fair share of transit investment for our area, we are far from having the greatest growth impacts upon the city. The growth of Treasure Island (~10k people) and of the Transbay Center (~8-10k people) neighborhood far exceed ours; the latter alone is anticipated to have almost 20% of San Francisco's growth. And just because it is at the hub of our metropolitan transit, we should not think that all of its transit needs will be met. Those living in this area, will want good transit to all other parts of the city, particularly from downtown to the furthest reaches of the city.

Henderson, returning to the resolution of sentiment, asked that in the TSP's EIR analysis, they define the key transit projects and indicate how they propose to mitigate the impacts of these anticipated increased densities, particularly in defined plan areas with fees attached to them (specifically plan areas which would be losing their own fees for mitigating neighborhood growth — MOP, Eastern Neighborhoods, and Balboa Park planned development areas each with its own CAC). With that, the resolution was moved, seconded and unanimously approved.

RESOLUTION OF SENTIMENT: TSP MITIGATING IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT IN CAC AREAS.

"When the TSP is adopted, the \$3 **Transportation Impact Fee (TIP)** from MOP will be rescinded and folded into TSP. Our concern during our last several meetings, is that parts of our city which are experiencing thousands of housing units may deserve more emphasis that those parts of the city which are not experiencing such growth. We ask the TSP to define the key transit projects and indicate how they propose to mitigate the impacts of these anticipated increased densities, particularly in defined plan areas with fees attached to them (specifically plan areas which would be losing their own fees for mitigating neighborhood growth — MOP, Eastern Neighborhoods, and Balboa Park planned development areas each with its own CAC). As an example we note for the TSP that right now public transit in the MOP area is stressed and overwhelmed (busses pass waiting passengers). We do not have adequate transit capacity today. The purpose of our resolution is to strengthen the TSP's prioritization of how to most equitably invest in city transit."

Moved/Seconded: Vasquez/Levitt

YES (unanimous): Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Singa, Vasquez, Wingard

NO: none

Abstain: none

Absent: Cohen, Richards, Simmons

DECISION: Resolution of Sentiment—TSP to invest transit funds in CAC areas according to impact of growth—approved unanimously.

The committee asked staff how we might improve the resolution. Dischinger said that staff would suggest improvements to our CAC by email. The Secretary will send the resolution to the appropriate entities. Dischinger noted that in this case CEQA law requires that they reply to us; however, they will only comment upon those suggestions which fall within their mandate. The CAC very much appreciated Dischinger's explaining all parts of the TSP to us and for her helping us word our resolution most appropriately.

Henderson suggested that the TSP should consider having a place on their website for FAQs.

Levitt asked if we have any feedback from the developers who want the traffic study? Dischinger replied that other small developments and developers in general appreciate the clarity which the TSP policy brings to the process of developing properties in San Francisco. They feel that this will greatly reduce the number of EIRs required (Vasquez, a developer on our CAC, disagrees with this conclusion). Large projects currently in development are not impacted by this new policy.

5. CAC BYLAWS AND MEMBERS' COMMITMENTS

EXHIBIT 3: CAC BYLAWS

Smith reminded members that they must notify (RSVP) the chair whether they will be attending each meeting so that we can all know whether or not we will be able to have a quorum. Smith highlighted various parts of the bylaws to remind us of our duties. Olsson reminded the CAC that bylaws must be read at two meetings; then voted upon at the second meeting.

Article 2: DUTIES**Section 1: Purpose**

This CAC has three main purposes:

- 1) **Annual community project prioritization** (in collaboration with the IPIC): Olsson said that in previous years we had suggested that we should solicit from the public on our website proposals for CIPs. However, Dischinger taught Olsson and the CAC that this was beyond the scope of this or any CAC. She did mention that the Eastern Neighborhood CAC meets periodically with each of the neighborhoods in their area to report regularly on their decisions and to take suggestions of how to improve their deliberations. Any suggestions can be recommended to the Planning Department. But the actual role of the CAC is to prioritize the CIPs which are already proposed by the Department.
- 2) **Enforcement:** the CAC is to determine whether the projects are built to the MOP goals.
- 3) **Monitoring Report:** The report is only required every five years. The CAC decided that it would comment upon each of the Department's annual reports on our MOP area.

The first and third purposes are common to all CACs.

Section 2: Mission Statement: CAC agreed that our Mission Statement is still relevant.

Section 4: Conflict of Interest

The CAC officers (Chr. and VC) met with staff and scheduled prioritizing CIPs and monitoring developments. It was agreed by all that the CACs are not intended to be a shadow planning committee. Olsson asked whether information on Vasquez's recusal requirements had been received from the District Attorney's office. Vasquez said that he had not received this information. Staff apologized and said they would request this official opinion to be provided to Vasquez and our CAC to guide all in when he must recuse himself.

Article III: OFFICERS

Next month when amending the bylaws we shall include the Secretary as one of the officers.

CONSENSUS: amend the bylaws accordingly.

Article IV: MEETINGS

Olsson proposed that we should also amend the bylaws that, in order to avoid conflicts, the CAC will not meet on the normal meeting dates of any of our constituent neighborhood association meetings. Olsson indicated that this rule was necessary to be made explicit after the November and December meetings were scheduled and held on the normal meeting dates of the Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association.

CONSENSUS: CAC meetings will not conflict with neighborhood association ones.

Section 5: All Meetings to be Open to the Public.

All CAC meetings are open to the public and every meeting includes an agenda item for public comment.

It was noted that all seats for this term have not been assigned. Because of this the incumbent retains his seat. It was also noted that according to the bylaws the Chair is required to notify the appointing body (the Board of Supervisors, in this case) that there is a vacant seat.

Smith specifically called to the attention of the CAC that the staff are here to support the CAC in any and all of our three primary purposes. For any other matters or issues, our assigned staff can connect us with other Department staff, but they cannot spend time for our CAC performing anything that does not pertain to the primary defined three purposes for this CAC. Our CAC thanked Smith for alerting us to this situation.

CONSENSUS: This was the first reading of the bylaws, which will be voted upon at our next meeting.

CONSENSUS: Chair will notify BOS of vacancy on our committee.

6. MOP-CAC GOALS AND CALENDAR FOR 2012

Henderson noted that he is always concerned about our meetings attempting to cover too many topics. Smith stated that at their meeting they tried to follow up on last year's priorities, including recommendations from last year. Among these were:

- 1) MTA prioritization of intersections in our area;
- 2) VNBRT is pushing for early fall certification. Henderson asked staff to apprise our CAC of discussions regarding any mitigations to Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit; perhaps mitigations to some of our area's intersections can be included. The Chair asked staff to track this for our CAC. Dischinger

noted that the Transit Authority (TA) is intimately involved with IPIC in determining such mitigations. She also noted that all proposals in our CIPs are part of their 10-year study. Some are really broad; all agree these need more community projects.

She noted that our CAC is not set up to evaluate new CIP proposals. The Chairs/CACs should focus upon what has already been approved by the community at neighborhood meetings. The solution last year was the **Community Challenge Opportunities for Open Space**. People can propose projects and Living Alleyways. The Eastern Neighborhoods CAC has an interesting example which we might care to follow. They regularly hold community meetings in each of their four neighborhoods.

At this point Olsson asked the officers and staff why the items listed in the minutes from our last meeting for specific consideration to include in our calendar were not completely included. Because the hour was late, the CAC did not have time to discuss this. So, Olsson postponed the discussion this night as long as the items on the list will be specifically considered for inclusion as topics on our calendar for the rest of the year. Olsson asked each CAC member to review this list (Appx.2) which he will include with the list which the officers and staff proposed.

Wingard suggested that we cancel the December meeting; the CAC consensus agreed.

CONSENSUS: December meeting cancelled.

Henderson thought that perhaps we could make the November meeting an hour longer. We will leave it for a future meeting to decide whether we can re-arrange the November meeting, again without interfering with any meeting of our constituent neighborhood associations.

Levitt announced that he will not be here for our June 18th meeting. He is concerned about the Upper Market intersections, but noted that the Better Market CAC, which he also sits on, does not cover this upper Market Street area. Henderson thought that onsite inclusionary housing will be considered at the June meeting. He reminded all that there are four types of affordable housing for developers in our area: 1) onsite; 2) offsite; 3) in-lieu fee; and 4) land dedication. Maintaining income diversity is an important goal of the Market/Octavia Plan.

Henderson wondered what are our possibilities if a developer is willing to do in-lieu affordable housing with conditions. They currently cannot mandate even that. Dischinger will provide our CAC at its June meeting with a primer on what we accomplished last year. Smith agreed to look at the rest of Market around Van Ness — e.g., what is adjacent to our MOP area, such as the new Twitter headquarters.

CONSENSUS: The CAC must avoid scheduling a meeting when it would conflict with a regular meeting of a constituent neighborhood association meeting.

7. **DEVELOPMENT PIPELINE REPORT**
EXHIBIT 5: DEVELOPMENT PIPELINE REPORT: received without comment.
8. **LEGISLATION/POLICY PIPELINE REPORT**
EXHIBIT: DEVELOPMENT PIPELINE REPORT: not distributed this evening.
9. **COMMITTEE MEMBERS' COMMENTS & ISSUES:** none.
10. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** no public attending, there were no public comments.
11. **ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting adjourned at 9:00pm.

NEXT MEETING: MONDAY, JUNE 18, 2012, 7:00PM, PLANNING DEPARTMENT, RM.400.

CAC Meetings: (Third Monday monthly, Planning Department, Rm 400, 7:00-9:00pm)

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

3rd Monday monthly, 7-9pm

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	Y	X							
Jason Henderson	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y							
Robin Levitt	Y	X	Y	Y	Y							
Ted Olsson	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y							
Dennis Richards	Y	X	Y	Y	N							
Michael Simmons	0	Y	N	Y	N							
Krute Singa	0	Y	N	N	Y							
Lou Vasquez	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y							
Ken Wingard	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y							
<u>Ex Officio</u>												
Kearstin Dischinger	0	0	Y	Y	Y							
Alexis Smith	Y	Y	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)

PURPOSE: The purpose of this appendix is to provide a quick and easy overview of the CAC's 2012 schedule of monthly meetings, annotated after each meeting with the annual planned items, the unique agenda items for that meeting, and both the decisions and commitments resulting from that meeting. These principal San Francisco offices and agencies effect the CAC's decisions and the MOP: IPIC, Planning, DPW, RPD, MTA, TA, and OEWD.

Other potential agenda items considered by officers & staff (than those calendared from May on):

- Historic survey update
- Review CAC supplement to monitoring report; update for 2012
- Update on Housing Inventory and Commerce & Industry reports
- Living alleys
- Parking CU
- CAC website
- Streets bond
- Van Ness BRT mitigations
- SOMA west development
- Community challenge grants
- Housing affordability
- Better Market Street
- Next steps for 2012 priority projects
- Non-capital projects update
- Brainstorm additional funding opportunities for priority projects

Topics suggested for future meetings 16APR12 meetingApril Summary

- Create 2012 prioritized CIPs (including those recommended by public)
- CAC solicit CIP proposals from public
- Write CAC supplement to Department's annual report on MOP (rv last year's)
- Propose MOP-CAC resolution about TSP.
- MOP CIP fee transfer to TSP; focus on MOP Pedestrian CIPs
- Fee Deferral Extension: learn antagonists argument; create our own
- Create history of what has changed since CAC began & effect of these changes
- Status of Historic Survey
- Invite Elizabeth Salk (TA) & MTA colleague: explain how they modeled TSP data.
- Invite Plng.Cmss.Sec to discuss their 2012 schedule as it effects MOP & CAC.
- Review City's Legislative Analyst's report on Transit-oriented Housing. Invite him.
- Our website to explain to neighbors the levels & impacts of density planned for MOP.
- Address sustainable middle income housing in MOP area and in city
- Conditional Use parking permits
- Housing Inventory
- Commerce & Industry Report
- Parking
- Historic Survey Update
- MOP: original (as conceived) vs now (updated to current changes)

2012 CAC MEETINGS

Planned/Agendized Topics plus
Annotated Decisions/Commitments resulting from the Meeting

January 24Agenda

- 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 9: City asked to evaluate efficiency of fee deferral policy before expiration date.

Commitments

- CAC provided with Nexus Study & TSP presentation
- Provide SF officials with CAC's resolution & request to evaluate fee deferral policy
- Provide CAC/Vasquez with CAC recusal rules
- Provide CAC with San Francisco's rules for housing density and its impact upon neighbors/-hood

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 10: Commendation of John Billovits upon his retirement

Commitments

- Prepare for election of 2012 CAC officers

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.

Commitments

- CAC Chr. Inform Land Use Cmte. Chr. of CAC concerns about billboards & issues effecting CAC
- Support Caltrans request for grant for Living Alleyways
- ✓ Plan annual bylaws review, commitments, 2012 goals & schedule (Appx.2)

April 16Agenda

4. Impact fee deferral program update by Planning staff
5. Transportation Sustainability Program discussion
6. Review of CAC bylaws, member roles and responsibilities
7. CAC goals and schedule for 2012
8. Development Pipeline Report—none received/discussed
9. Legislation/policy Pipeline Report—none received/discussed

Decisions

Decision 1: CAC approved all previous minutes; there are NO November minutes (notes missing).

Decision 2: Tabled to next meeting: bylaws review (roles/responsibilities); 2012 Goals & Schedule.

Commitments

- Present CAC concerns about TSP fee to Board of Supervisors & Commissioners
- ✓ Plan annual bylaws review, member commitments, 2012 goals and schedule (Appx.2)
- ✓ Staff send all CAC members the current bylaws
- Staff provide CAC with timeline of agencies' decisions effecting MOP area for 2012
- Staff notify all of CAC updates, agenda, exhibits, invites; CAC reply—confirm/deny attendance
- Schedule disposing of these topics in future meetings.

Topics to schedule for future meetings

- Create 2012 prioritized CIPs (including those recommended by public)
- CAC solicit CIP proposals from public & neighborhood associations
- Write CAC supplement to Department's annual report on MOP (rv last year's)
- Propose MOP-CAC resolution about TSP.
- MOP CIP fee transfer to TSP; focus on MOP Pedestrian CIPs
- Fee Deferral Extension: learn antagonists argument; create our own
- Create history of what has changed since CAC began & effect of these changes
- Status of Historic Survey
- Invite Elizabeth Salk (TA) & MTA colleague: explain how they modeled TSP data.
- Invite Plng.Cmss.Sec to discuss their 2012 schedule as it effects MOP & CAC.
- Review City's Legislative Analyst's report on Transit-oriented Housing. Invite him.
- Our website to explain to neighbors the levels & impacts of density planned for MOP.
- Address sustainable middle-income housing in MOP area and in city
- Conditional Use parking permits
- Housing Inventory
- Commerce & Industry Report
- Parking
- Historic Survey Update
- MOP: original (as conceived) vs now (updated to current changes)

May 21Scheduled

- TSP discussion and potential action
- CAC 2012 goals and schedule
- Bylaws review

Agenda

- Review of TSP issues (Transit Sustainability Program)
- Bylaws review
- CAC 2012 goals and schedule

Decisions

Decision 1: Minutes (March & April) approved unanimously

Decision 2: Resolution #12 (of Sentiment)

Consensus 1: Add Secretary as officer in Bylaws; RSVP to each meeting; staff only works on CAC purposes.

Consensus 2: Approved Calendar; discuss at next meeting list of suggestions from April meeting (see Appx.C); avoid meetings that conflict with regularly scheduled meetings of neighborhood associations

Consensus 3: Postpone December meeting

Commitments — none

June 18Scheduled

- Meet with MTA to discuss Market St. intersection prioritization (2012 recommended projects)
- Onsite inclusionary housing discussion and potential action

AgendaDecisionsCommitments**July 16**Scheduled

- Review updated fee projections, begin 2013 project prioritization discussion

AgendaDecisionsCommitments**August 20**Scheduled

- Continue CAC priority recommendations for 2013, review draft IPIC recommendations

AgendaDecisions**September 17**Scheduled

- Finalize 2013 CAC priority recommendations

AgendaDecisions**October 15**ScheduledAgendaDecisions**November 19**ScheduledAgendaDecisions**December 17**ScheduledAgendaDecisions

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 10	(22Feb2012):	JOHN BILLOVITS COMMENDATION
Resolution 11	(19Mar2010):	SUPPORT FOR VNBRT EXPEDITED IMPLEMENTATION

RESOLUTION ABSTRACTS

RESOLUTION #1	2009-10-20#1
TITLE	Infrastructure Finance Recommendations
DATE:	October 20, 2009
SUMMARY:	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
SUMMARY:	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
SUMMARY:	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**
SUMMARY: 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**
SUMMARY: 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**
SUMMARY: Support an In-kind Agreement for streetscape improvements, as defined in the June 2011 schematic, except that the Dolores/14th Street improvements be those of the November 2011 schematic; the Market/Dolores 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

RESOLUTION #7: **2011-12-14#2**
TITLE: **Proposed Legislation for Planning Code Amendments**
DATE: **December 14, 2011**
SUMMARY: 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**
SUMMARY: 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**
SUMMARY: 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: **2012-02-22**
TITLE: **John Billovits Commendation**
DATE: **February 22, 2012**
SUMMARY: 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
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.
MOTION: Leavitt

SECOND: Vasquez
YES (unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Leavitt, Olsson, Richards, Vasquez
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Krute, Simmons

RESOLUTION #12: **RESOLUTION OF SENTIMENT: TSP MITIGATING IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT IN CAC AREAS.**
TITLE: Request to TSP to mitigate impact of development in CAC Areas.
DATE: March 21, 2012
SUMMARY: RESOLUTION #12 (21May2012)
The Market Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC) requests the TSP to consider mitigating the impact of development in CAC areas by dedicating fees from these areas to solve transit problems caused by impact of growth.
MOTION: Vasquez
SECOND: Leavitt
YES (unanimous): Henderson, Krute, Leavitt, Olsson, Vasquez, Wingard
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Cohen, Richards, 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)

SUMMARY: Support an In-kind Agreement for streetscape improvements, as defined in the June 2011 schematic, except that the Dolores/14th Street improvements be those of the November 2011 schematic; the Market/Dolores Street crosswalk and associated improvements shall not be included in these improvements.

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 for the first block of Dolores Street between Market and Fourteenth Streets, as specifically defined in their June 2011 schematic, except that the improvements proposed for the Dolores/14th Street intersection shall be those presented in their November 2011 schematic, 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.

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.

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 John 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)

RESOLUTION: BE IT RESOLVED that the Market Octavia Plan's Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC) supports the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit plan presented to us and encourages its expedited implementation, without taking any position on the alternative modes of BRT.

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

2.12 RESOLUTION #12 REQUEST TO TSP TO USE TRANSIT FUNDS FROM CAC AREAS TO MITIGATE TRANSIT PROBLEMS IN CAC AREA CAUSED BY IMPACT FROM INCREASED DENSITY (21May2012)
[Resolution of Sentiment]

RESOLUTION: **BE IT RESOLVED** that when the TSP is adopted, the \$3 **Transportation Impact Fee (TIP)** from MOP will be rescinded and folded into TSP. Our concern during our last several meetings, is that parts of our city which are experiencing thousands of housing units may deserve more emphasis that those parts of the city which are not experiencing such growth. We ask the TSP to define the key transit projects and indicate how they propose to mitigate the impacts of these anticipated increased densities, particularly in defined plan areas with fees attached to them (specifically plan areas which would be losing their own fees for mitigating neighborhood growth — MOP, Eastern Neighborhoods, and Balboa Park planned development areas each with its own CAC). As an example we note for the TSP that right now public transit in the MOP area is stressed and overwhelmed (busses pass waiting passengers). We do not have adequate transit capacity today. The purpose of our resolution is to strengthen the TSP's prioritization of how to most equitably invest in city transit."

ABSTRACT:

RESOLUTION #10: 2012-05-19
TITLE: Reinvest TIP fees in CAC areas for transit impact
DATE: May 19, 2012
EXTRACT: The Market Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC) requests the TSP committee and IPIC to consider reinvesting the TIP fee in the CAC planned development areas to mitigate anticipated population densities, prioritizing these according to the growth in each area.
MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Vasquez; Seconded by Levitt
YES (unanimous): Henderson, Kruti, Leavitt, Olsson, Vasquez, Wingard
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Cohen, Richards, Simmons

RESOLUTION OF SENTIMENT: TSP MITIGATING IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT IN CAC AREAS.

"When the TSP is adopted, the \$3 **Transportation Impact Fee (TIP)** from MOP will be

rescinded and folded into TSP. Our concern during our last several meetings, is that parts of our city which are experiencing thousands of housing units may deserve more emphasis that those parts of the city which are not experiencing such growth. We ask the TSP to define the key transit projects and indicate how they propose to mitigate the impacts of these anticipated increased densities, particularly in defined plan areas with fees attached to them (specifically plan areas which would be losing their own fees for mitigating neighborhood growth — MOP, Eastern Neighborhoods, and Balboa Park planned development areas each with its own CAC). As an example we note for the TSP that right now public transit in the MOP area is stressed and overwhelmed (busses pass waiting passengers). We do not have adequate transit capacity today. The purpose of our resolution is to strengthen the TSP's prioritization of how to most equitably invest in city transit."

Moved/Seconded: Vasquez/Levitt

YES (unanimous): Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Singa, Vasquez, Wingard

NO: none

Abstain: Cohen, Richards, 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 (e.g., Van Ness, Geary, & Potrero 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.

Community Challenge Opportunities for Open Space**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****FDP 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)****LOS 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 (year)

Prop. K (year)

Prop. AA (year)

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**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