

**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	
<i>Kearstin Dischinger</i>	<i>Alexis Smith</i> (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 May 21st meeting [act]
4. Revision of CAC Bylaws [act]
5. Update on 2012 CAC priority projects—predevelopment for key Market Street intersection improvements [discuss]
6. Primer for developing CAC recommendations for the 2013 Market St. intersection improvements [discuss]
7. Inclusionary Affordable Housing in the MOP area [discuss; act]
8. Follow-up on 2012 CAC goals and work program [discuss]
9. Legislation/Policy Pipeline Report—guide to accessing legislative information in San Francisco [discuss]
10. Development Pipeline Report—developments in process; CAC project reviews [discuss; act]
11. Committee members' comments/issues that may be considered in future meetings
12. Public Comment
13. Adjournment

NEXT MEETING: MONDAY, JULY 16, 2012, 7:00PM AT 1650 MISSION, 5th FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM

(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: May 21, 2012 (**Olsson**)
 Exhibit 3: Development Pipeline Report (**Smith**)

DECISIONS

- Decision 1: Minutes (May 21st) approved with corrections
 Decision 2: Bylaws amended as noted. See Appendix.

COMMITMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, INFORMATION DUE

#	WHEN	WHO	WHAT
1.	07/01	AS	Send "Totals through FY22014 v % investment per category" table
2.	07/01	AS	Prepare new spreadsheet: all numbers & percentages, with and without deferral.
3.	07/01	AS	send CAC her guide to accessing SF legislative information

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

- √ Peter Cohen
- √ Jason Henderson
- X Robin Levitt
- √ Ted Olsson
- X Dennis Richards
- X Michael Simmons
- √ Krute Singa
- X 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:

1. David Nolay, developer (2175 Market St., 76 gas station)

The Chair opened the meeting at 7:00pm.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, UPCOMING MEETINGS, GENERAL HOUSEKEEPING

- 2.1 The developer of 2222 Market St. (motel additions) was filed 15June2012. It currently consists 58 units (19,660sf). They intend to add 556sf, a third story; to upgrade and expand the lobby, and due to that replace the existing sundeck above the lobby. Further contact:
BBeck@BecksMotorLodge.com/415.621.8212.
- 2.2 The Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit hearing will be held tomorrow and next Tuesday before the SFCTA.
- 2.3 On Thursday, June 28th the discussion of Parcel P will come before the Planning Commission.
- 2.4 The discussion of the 55 Laguna St. property (UC Extension campus) will be held before the Planning Commission at the end of June or the beginning of July. A date has not been set for the discussion of the Right of Way before the Supervisors. Waller Street is technically owned by the City and when the campus is demolished, that right-of-way reverts to the City if the property becomes another development project.
- 2.5 There will be a significant issue on the ballot, the housing trust fund. There are increased incentives for developers to build onsite inclusionary units. The issue has been submitted for hearings before the Board of Supervisors and this must be finalized by the end of July.
- 2.6 Regarding the City's housing goals, an ordinance has been submitted by Supervisors Olague, Kim and Campos. This will more regularly monitor our housing diversity for low, moderate, and market rate occupancy. A hearing on this issue will be held before the Planning Commission on June 28th.
- 2.7 Supervisors Wiener and Farrell are now working to create a bypass for condo conversion. It was decided that the Chair could agendize any of these (above) issues and invite experts to address the them.
- 2.8 Smith indicated that the developer of the 2000 Market St. project had agreed to an in-kind agreement.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS [act]

EXHIBIT 2: May 21st minutes.

DECISION: MINUTES APPROVED AS CORRECTED

The minutes were moved and seconded (Wingard/Singa) and approved with only Cohen abstaining (for not having attended the meeting) as corrected as follows:

- 3.1 Henderson speaking of the TSP discussion on page 2 indicated that the comments on the administration of the program should not go to the EIR scoping. The offending statement was removed.
- 3.2 He objected to the adjective in “glossy plan”. The printed version shown to us had a glossy cover but the adjective was removed.
- 3.3 The vote recorded on page 3 was corrected to show that Cohen, Richards, and Simmons were absent.
- 3.4 Cohen emailed his corrections:
 - 4a) Cohen’s was an “excused absence” because he had notified Henderson, Smith, and Singa were notified in advance.
 - 4b) Item 8: Legislation/Policy Pipeline Report refers to Exhibit 6 but that is also included in Exhibit 5, which consists of both pipeline reports, the Legislative/Policy and the Development one. This exhibit is not included. It should be corrected that this was not distributed that night.
- 3.5 Singa had two points to add: a) she was present not absent at this meeting; and b) the meetings are held at 7pm.
Because of the number of corrections, the secretary will correct those minutes and redistribute them to the committee and for posting on our website.

4. REVISION OF THE BYLAWS

DECISION: BYLAWS AMENDED

On a motion by Cohen, seconded by Olsson and unanimously approved the bylaws were amended. The major changes were: 1) the Secretary was added as an officer; 2) the official meeting time was changed to the third Monday each month at 7:00pm in the fifth floor conference room at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission St., San Francisco; 3) the annual meeting will be the April meeting; and 4) our MOP-CAC meetings will not conflict with regular meetings of our constituent neighborhood associations within the MOP area. The new bylaws will be attached as an appendix to these minutes.

5. UPDATE ON 2012 CAC PRIORITY PROJECT —

Predevelopment for Key Market St. intersection improvements (Dischinger/Smith)

Dischinger and Smith informed the CAC that funding would be coming for the following five intersections in FY2014: Laguna/Buchanan/Market, Church/Market, Dolores/Market crosswalk, 16th/Noe/Market, as well as for the Fell/Franklin intersection. However pre-development funds will be needed from our CIP budget. It was noted that the TSP does not take effect for 2 years.

6. PRIMER FOR DEVELOPING CAC RECOMMENDATIONS

FOR THE 2013 MARKET ST. INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS (Smith)

Also see Appendix C: our CAC’s 42 prioritized improvements for 2011

Exhibit 3: MOP-CAC’s 2011 CIP Recommendations with updated comments (see below)

Exhibit 4: Primer for CIP Prioritization

COMMITMENT: SMITH SENDS “TOTALS THROUGH FY2014 TABLE VS % INVESTMENT BY CATEGORY”.

COMMITMENT: SMITH WILL PREPARE NEW SPREADSHEET: BOTH RAW & ABSOLUTE NUMBERS, AND PERCENTAGES, WITH AND WITHOUT DEFERRAL.

COMMITMENT: SMITH INDICATED THAT CAC’S CIP PRIORITIES ARE DUE BY END OF SEPTEMBER.

COMMITMENT: SMITH DISTRIBUTE TO CAC LIST OF OUR PREVIOUS CIP RECOMMENDATIONS.

Since the investment in MOP CIPs is one of the CAC’s primary responsibilities, it is a top priority that all member of this CAC attend our summer meetings:

July 16th: Review updated fee projections; begin prioritization discussion

August 20th: Review draft IPIC recommendations; continue prioritization discussion

September 17th: Finalize CAC recommendations

Smith presented staff with a superb package of exhibits, the “MOP Prioritization Primer” to prepare us for deciding upon CIPs on which to invest our impact fees. This exhibit consisted of the following parts, supplied as a pdf.:

A. MOP Area Pipeline Projects, 2nd Quarter 2012

A map coordinated to the Pipeline Report color coded and with dots sized to show number of units broken into categories: 1) Projects under construction; 2) Projects entitled and permitted; and 3) Projects seeking entitlements and/or permits

B. MOP CIPs (Market Octavia Plan’s Community Improvement Projects)

This table showed all 42 projects categorized by Open Space or Moving People and Goods projects — showing Total Costs and Costs Valid for MOCI Impact Fees for each project.

C. IPIC projects within the MOP Area [maps]

Showing two maps, side by side: 1) IPIC Capital Projects; and 2) Non-impact Fee Funded Projects. These focused graphically upon 1) Transit/bike improvements; 2) Intersection improvements; 3) Open Space and Recreational improvements; and 4) Greening improvements. Other projects not shown on the maps were: 1) Street Tree Planting; 2) Living Alley Program; 3) Childcare Center; and 4) Library materials.

D. IPIC Capital Improvements [map]

This refined the previous capital projects maps by showing the portion of project costs funded by impact fees. This map too indicated that the other projects are not shown on the map.

E. MOP Impact Fee Expenditure Recommendations: FY2012 funded projects

This table highlighted for each project: 1) what had been spent on each project in previous years; 2) what our CAC had previously budgeted for FY2013 and FY2014; 3) what amounts were forecasted for FY2015, FY2016, and FY2017, as well as the total amounts forecasted for those three years. This table categorized the CIPs accordingly, breaking out totals (by FY and cumulative) for each category:

- Open Space and Recreational Facilities (\$2,929,432);
- Greening (\$5,090,511);
- Transportation (\$4,235,203);
- Childcare (\$1,064,859);
- Library (\$115,467);
- Program Administration (\$798,500);
- and Total Impact Fees—
- Projected Impact Fee Revenue (\$14,255,141);
- Projected Impact Fee Expenditures (\$8,396,826);
- Cumulative programmed (\$6,318,316);
- Annual Surplus/Deficit (\$5,858,316);
- Cumulative Surplus/Deficit (\$5,908,288).

F. MOP Impact Fee Expenditure Recommendation: FY2014 budgeted projects

This table was categorized and divided into the same topics as the previous table, for comparison.

G. MOP Impact Fee Expenditure Recommendation

This table was similarly categorized and divided for comparison; however, it contained three additional columns, indicating: 1) the Totals through FY2014; 2) the Percentages of our budget represented by these totals; and 3) the Required Distribution by 2016, indicating the difference which we must correct. Here are those same categories with the information from these final columns:

<u>Category</u>	<u>FY2014</u>	<u>Curr.%</u>	<u>FY2016 Reqd %</u>
Open Space and Recreational Facilities	\$100,000	7%	21%
Greening	\$240,000	17%	36%
Transportation	\$942,000	67%	30%
Childcare	\$0	0%	7%
Library	\$0	0%	1%

It was suggested that we all review these Community Improvement Projects (CIPs).

The CAC asked to know the status of these approved CIPs: what has been done to date during this five year interval. The CAC also wanted to know what percentage of the projects we had invested in and how much for each. It was noted that these CIP funds are a great leveraging tools. According to staff, during these first five years, half of the upper Market Street projects have been funded by CIPs. Are budget consists of one pool of money for the MOP area; however, there are mandated percentages for specified categories.

In our first year we invested half our funds in the Hayes Street project. For 2013 we are investing in

the Haight Street 2-way project and in pre-development infrastructure projects for Upper Market Street intersections.

For 2014, we are invested in all our IPIC partnered agencies' budgets: 1) the Community Challenge grant—local groups to improve parks for open space; 2) the Hayward playground scoping; and 3) several greening projects.

What has been forecasted are IPIC's estimates, not CAC ones. Last year we budgeted for 2013 and 2014. Our CAC makes 2-year recommendations; IPIC makes 5-year recommendations. Smith was asked and agreed to make and distribute to our CAC what we had adopted this last year. She also noted that there are a few more transportation projects and that the Polk Street project will not work out for this timing; so our CAC can reinvest these funds. We do not yet know definitely what is going to happen. Nevertheless we must once again allocate our CIP fees to specify where we will invest them. Smith will email our CAC the table "Totals through FY2014" against the percentage required by the Planning Code.

A lot of our funds have gone to transportation, short-changing our other categories over the period of the MOP. So, now our CAC must adjust our CIP investments to greening and open space within the MOP area.

Cohen indicated that the Fee Deferral process we currently labor under has an expiration date, but Smith's table seem to show this as a perpetual fee. He asked staff to show the CAC what the difference would be if the deferral were eliminated. Smith agreed to prepare this comparison. Henderson asked the new spreadsheet to show us raw numbers, absolute numbers, and the percentages with and without the deferral. We should start our prioritization of CIPs in our July meeting, while seeing IPIC's priorities, and finalize our prioritization by September. Smith agreed to send to us this week these due dates. Chairman Henderson reminded all CAC members, present or absent today, that it is very important that all CAC members attend our August and September meetings. Cohen also asked Smith to distributed to our CAC the previous CAC adopted recommendations.

Exhibit: MOP-CAC's 2011 CIP Recommendations with updated comments

I. Streetscape/Greening/ Public Realm

1. "Living Street" Improvements for select Alleys.

No specific projects for current recommendations. CAC will establish a coordination process with MTA and DPW to review potential projects prior to authorizing use of MO Fund resources.

2. Street Tree Plantings for Key Streets.

No specific projects for current recommendations. CAC will establish a coordination process with MTA and DPW to review potential projects prior to authorizing use of MO Fund resources.

II. Open Space/ Parks

1. Improvements to Existing Parks.

Park & Rec "Hubs"

1a. Duboce Park Youth Play Area – capital project funding approx \$50-100k

1b. Hayward Park – add-on small projects, funding needs TBD (major park renovation to be included in next RPD bond, likely 2013)

Neighborhood Parks

1c. Set-aside from M/O Fund for Small Grants Program (\$50-\$100k grants) (potentially administer through Community Challenge Grant program)

2. Hayes Green Rotating Art Project.

3. McCoppin Plaza Extension—Phase II. Long term project, likely beyond 5 year Program recommendations period.

4. Brady Park—new Open Space Soma West. Long term project, likely beyond 5 year Program recommendations period.

III. Transportation***Transit*****1. Transit Preferential Street Improvements.**

No specific projects for current recommendations. CAC will establish a coordination process with MTA to review potential projects prior to authorizing use of MO Fund resources.

2. Church Street Improvements (portion of).**3. Dedicated Transit Lanes.**

No specific projects for current recommendations. CAC will establish a coordination process with MTA to review potential projects prior to authorizing use of MO Fund resources.

Pedestrian**1. Pedestrian Improvements for Priority Intersections.****Market Street intersections**

1. Market/16th/Noe
2. Market/Church/14th
3. Market/Guerrero/Laguna
4. Market/Franklin/Page
5. Market/VanNess (within VanNess/Market SUD)

Other Plan Area intersections

1. Mission/Duboce
2. S. VanNess/Mission (within VanNess/Market SUD)
3. Franklin/Grove
4. Filmore/Haight
5. Church/16th
6. Octavia/Oak
7. Gough/Fell
8. Franklin/Oak

2. Hayes Street two way Improvements.**3. Widen Hayes Street Sidewalk.*****Bicycles*****1. Page Street Bicycle Boulevard.****2. Market Street bicycle lanes between Octavia Boulevard and 17th/Castro Streets.****3. Grove Street between Octavia Boulevard and Van Ness Avenue.****4. Sharrows and signage on key streets.*****Other Transp*****1. Study further Central Freeway removal.^****2. Parking Supply Survey and Program Recommendations.^**

IV. Recreation Facilities**Park & Rec “Hubs”**

1a. Duboce Park Youth Play Area – capital project funding approx \$50-100k

[^] *These projects included as CAC priorities, but not intended for M/O Fund expenditures.
M/O CAC Community Improvements Program Final Recommendations 2011 2*

1b. Hayward Park – add-on small projects, funding needs TBD (major park renovation to be included in next RPD bond, likely 2013)

Neighborhood Parks

1c. Set-aside from M/O Fund for Small Grants Program (\$50-\$100k grants) (potentially administer through Community Challenge Grant program)

V. Childcare Facilities

No recommendations necessary – standardized expenditure category.

VI. Library Materials

No recommendations necessary – standardized expenditure category.

VII. Local Economic Development

M/O Fund nexus to be determined. To be reflected in subsequent annual Program recommendations.

VIII. Historical/Educational/Cultural

Placeholder category. M/O Fund nexus would need to be determined. To be reflected in subsequent annual Program recommendations

IX. Other/ Community Generated Projects

Placeholder category. M/O Fund nexus would need to be determined. To be reflected in subsequent annual Program recommendations

Final CAC recommendations include an evaluation of the overall Community Improvements Program:

Overall Program Rating**Balance/variety of community improvements (5=high/0=low)**

- 5** Promotes mix of project/community improvement types
- 3** Promotes various scales of projects/community improvements
- 4.5** Promotes geographic mix of projects/community improvements in relation to development
- 2.5** Promotes blend of physical and programmatic projects/community improvements.

Note:

The CAC has established a process for regularly refining and augmenting the list of potential community improvements projects and range of categories for consideration in annual Program expenditure recommendations.

7. **INCLUSIONARY AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN THE MOP AREA [discuss; act]**
see Resolution 2010-9-22: Resolution Advising on Inclusive Affordable Housing in the MOP Area.
EXHIBIT 5: PARCEL P AND AFFORDABLE HOUSING (SEE DISCHINGER’S SUMMARY, BELOW)
EXHIBIT 6: DISCHINGER’S SUMMARY OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN PARCEL P (19June2012 email)

Should we attach riders to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund act?

Henderson wondered whether, rather than allowing developers to “fee out”, they should be required to build onsite or to dedicate land. Dischinger said that there is a soft-cap on density and that developers can get Conditional Use (CU) permits. The Plan Unit Development (PUD) was also mentioned. Dischinger

will provide us the code section which describes this. In any case, the soft cap does not seem to have worked in this case. There was no relationship between affordable housing and CU permits.

Cohen wanted our CAC to push the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors to endorse land dedication as an option for developers. The goal at tonight's meeting is to establish the direction for our CAC, rather than merely passing something on Affordable Housing, because most of what is being built is not addressing the diversity which the MOP was intended to. Cohen believed that we can have someone from the Mayor's Office of Housing come before us to address this issue. He felt that developers do not hear a strong demand. Henderson felt that we could have a special presentation from MOH as well as that we can put a rider onto the Affordable Housing Trust Fund enabling legislation. Cohen stated that developers are already allowed to include onsite affordable housing; however, the developers do not act on this until they get political credit for this. Nothing happens until they are incentivized. Further, there are now limited sites within the MOP area for developers to purchase and dedicate. Perhaps the developers should get more credit for their site dedications.

At this point the developer David Nolay who had been present throughout this discussion offered to work with Cohen and any other CAC members to show us what is necessary to incent developers. It should be noted that Nolay's development includes onsite affordable housing.

Cohen believed that our CAC's commitment to affordable housing is something which must be signaled to developers. They should not be allowed to offload affordable housing and the CAC should explicitly express our displeasure with the process of "feeing out" to the developers and to the Planning Commissioners.

EXHIBIT 6: DISCHINGER'S SUMMARY OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN PARCEL P (19June2012 email)

This summarizes density controls and affordable housing by describing how the RTO density soft-cap is structured.

The RTO soft cap of one unit per 600 sf of lot area can be exceeded by any project of any size with a CU. Parcel P is NOT requesting any special considerations around density. I understand your policy objective of trying to get more onsite affordable housing on parcel P. As you know, due to recent court findings, developers can elect but are not be mandated to provide onsite affordable housing.

RTO soft cap: RTO's density is controlled by a number of code sections including:

1. Section 209.1 Dwellings - this section is a table that lists which densities are principally permitted and which are conditionally permitted. In the RTO column you will note that development up to 1 unit per 600 sf of lot are is principally permitted and density at 1 unit per 400 or 200 sf is conditionally permitted (CU)
2. SEC. 207.1. RULES FOR CALCULATION OF DWELLING UNIT DENSITIES. (which you cited below) provides an exemption from the CU process for affordable housing.
3. Section 207.6 Requires a mix of unit sizes
4. And there are a number of sections that regulate bulk and open space etc.
 - the RTO soft cap does not cap density but requires a CU above a 1 unit per 600 feet.
 - Parcel P is pursuing a PUD which is generally the same as a CU - accordingly they are not requesting exceptions from the code through the PUD around density that they couldn't otherwise request without the PUD. Or put more simply - every RTO project can exceed the principally permitted density by pursuing a CU.

8. FOLLOW-UP ON 2012 CAC GOALS AND WORK PROGRAM [discuss]
COMMITMENT: Staff will present 2012 goals & work program at subsequent meeting.

At Smith's request, this item was postponed for staff to work on it.

9. LEGISLATION/POLICY PIPELINE REPORT —
Guide to accessing legislative information in San Francisco (Dischinger & Smith)

EXHIBIT 7: PRIMER FOR ACCESSING SF LEGISLATION

COMMITMENT: SMITH WILL PRESENT CAC HER GUIDE TO ACCESSING SF LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION.

CONSENSUS: NO ONE VOLUNTEERED TO REPORT REGULARLY ON PARTICULAR ASPECTS OF SUCH INFORMATION.

Staff repeated that they will try to keep us informed on legislation specifically pertinent to the MOP area; however, they are not able to do this for legislation of a citywide nature which might have a secondary impact upon the MOP area. For this reason, Smith provided members of our CAC with a primer on how to discover or keep current on this broader legislation. This presentation (exhibit) is included below.

The staff used this opportunity to empower CAC members to find information for themselves beyond the staff's defined core tasks in supporting the committee. They reviewed for the CAC various parts of the Planning Department's website (www.sfplanning.org) and opportunities to automatically receive email notices on topics in which each member is interested, by scrolling to the bottom of the page, entering one's email address, and then selecting which updates one is interested in (e.g., Planning Commission and Land Use). Another selection from the home page might be Plans and Programs > Legislative Changes. Smith will send the secretary all the options that she demonstrated, so that these minutes will be informative to both the committee and the public. However, Smith did state that the staff will inform the CAC when there are any legislation effecting the MOP area, but not any whose effect is citywide. Smith agreed to send the CAC this guide to finding more SF legislative information.

Cohen explained that the CAC had always been ignorant of or delayed in learning of any such legislation. We wanted to know as early as possible when anything is passed which can affect the MOP area. We need to be proactive in this process. Dischinger replied that the staff is comfortable with bringing us any information regarding the MOP area; however, for anything more, CAC members can now find the information for themselves.

Henderson remarked that because the development pipeline and the legislative/policy pipeline are monthly agendized items, we need to discuss these issues. He asked CAC members whether they would volunteer to receive and report on such topics that we could subscribe to. He also asked how we will monitor land use decisions at the Board of Supervisors. They evidently made this publicly available recently. None of the members volunteered to monitor any topics.

Exhibit 7: Primer—Accessing Information on San Francisco Legislation.

Accessing legislative information: email updates

1. Go to the Planning Department Home Page: sfplanning.org
2. In the center column towards the bottom of the page, there's a blue box that says **Sign up for email updates**. Enter your email address.
3. Complete the requested fields. To get legislative updates, click the **Legislation Updates** box.
4. Click **Subscribe to list** at the bottom of the page. You'll get weekly updates about legislation at the Planning Commission, as well as planning-related legislation at the Board of Supervisors.

Accessing legislative information: website updates

1. Go to the Planning Department Home Page: sfplanning.org
2. Scroll over the **Plans and Programs** header at the top of the page. Click on the **Legislative Changes** link.
3. On the sidebar at the right side of the page, under the Legislative Changes header, click on the **Weekly Board Reports** link.
4. Click on the year you'd like to access, then the week. You'll be linked to a summary of planning-related items at the Land Use Committee and the full Board.

Accessing Planning Commission Information

1. Start with the Planning Department Home Page: **sfplanning.org**
2. Scroll over the **Public Hearings** header at the top of the page. Click on the **Planning Commission** link.
3. In the sidebar at the right side of the page, click on either Agendas or Minutes. Select the year and then the date that you wish to view.

**10. DEVELOPMENT PIPELINE REPORT —
Developments in process; CAC project reviews
EXHIBIT 3: DEVELOPMENT PIPELINE REPORT**

The exhibit was received and discussed. The SFCTA building (old AAA building, 100 Van Ness at Hayes) is being converted from a commercial building to a residential one. They will pay the conversion rate. However, their impact fee is between that of a commercial and of a residential building.

**11. COMMITTEE MEMBERS' COMMENTS/ISSUES
THAT MAY BE CONSIDERED IN FUTURE MEETINGS**

CONCENSUS: All members must attend next 3 meetings on CIP investments

It is important that all CAC members attend the next three meetings to determine our CIP priorities, which are due by the end of September.

July 16: Review updated fee projections, begin prioritization discussion

August 20: Review draft IPIC recommendations, continue prioritization discussion

September 17: Finalize CAC recommendations

The Chair reminded the committee that next month we will begin prioritizing our CIPs, specifically intersections. We hope to meet with a person from the Mayor's Office of Housing, independent of that item on Affordable Housing Trust Fund.

The secretary was instructed to send our Resolution of Sentiment to Alicia JohnBaptiste and the CEQA staff at the Planning Department. Staff will provide the secretary with contact information and the text of the resolution.

Olsson reminded others that in addition to scheduled topics, Appendix 2 contains the list of topics members indicated that they wanted to have scheduled. We have yet to resolve this.

12. PUBLIC COMMENT

Our guest having commented when called upon had no further comment. Mr. Nolay will address us about his development at our next meeting.

13. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the committee 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

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

April 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 18

Scheduled

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

Agenda

- Revision of CAC Bylaws [act]
- Update on 2012 CAC priority projects—predevelopment for key Market Street intersection improvements [discuss]
- Primer for developing CAC recommendations for the 2013 Market St. intersection improvements [discuss]
- Inclusionary Affordable Housing in the MOP area [discuss; act]
- Follow-up on 2012 CAC goals and work program [discuss]
- Legislation/Policy Pipeline Report—guide to accessing legislative information in San Francisco [discuss]
- Development Pipeline Report—developments in process; CAC project reviews [discuss; act]

Decisions

Decision 1: Minutes (May 21st) approved with corrections

Decision 2: Bylaws amended as noted. See Appendix.

Consensus 1: No one volunteered to report regularly on particular aspects of SF legislation.

Consensus 2: CAC members should review our CIPs to prepare to prioritize them.

Commitments

- | | | | |
|-----|-------|----------|---|
| 1. | 07/01 | KD | Send Sec. draft Resolution of Sentiment on Intersection Improvements |
| 2. | 07/01 | AS | Send Secretary her Primer presentation |
| 3. | 07/01 | AS | Send “Totals through FY22014 v % investment per category” table |
| 4. | 07/01 | AS | Prepare new spreadsheet: both raw & absolute numbers, percentages, with and without deferral. |
| 5. | 07/01 | AS | Send CAC due dates for CIP priorities. |
| 6. | 07/01 | AS | Distribute list of CAC’s previous CIP recommendations. |
| 7. | 07/01 | KD | Provide Plng.Code§ describing soft-cap/CU requirement for developers |
| 8. | 07/16 | Staff | Present CAC 2012 goals & work program at subsequent meeting |
| 9. | 07/01 | AS | send CAC her guide to accessing SF legislative information |
| 10. | 06/15 | Staff/TO | Staff provide Sec. contacts; Sec. distribute 5/21 Resolution of Sentiment. |
| 11. | 07/16 | CAC | Review & agendize select items from Appx.2. |

July 16

Scheduled

- Review updated fee projections, begin 2013 project prioritization discussion

Agenda

Decisions

Commitments

August 20

Scheduled

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

Agenda

Decisions

September 17

Scheduled

- Finalize 2013 CAC priority recommendations

Agenda

Decisions

October 15

Scheduled

Agenda

Decisions

November 19

Scheduled

Agenda

Decisions

December 17

Scheduled

Agenda

Decisions

**APPENDIX 3
MOP-CAC BYLAWS**

**City and County of San Francisco
Planning Department
Market and Octavia Citizens Advisory Committee
BYLAWS**

ARTICLE I – Name and Membership

Section 1. Membership. In accordance with the provisions of the San Francisco Planning Code Section 341.5 there is hereby established a Market and Octavia Citizens Advisory Committee.

San Francisco Planning Code Section 341.5

Section 2. Representation. The Board of Supervisors shall appoint 2/3 of the committee members and the Mayor shall appoint 1/3 of the committee members on the CAC, Both the Board and the Mayor shall appoint members that represent the diversity of the plan area. The Citizens Advisory Committee shall be comprised of 7--11 community members from varying geographic, socio-economic, ethnic, racial, gender, and sexual orientations living or working within the plan area. At a minimum, there must be one representative from each of the geographic areas of the Plan Area. The CAC should adequately represent key stakeholders including resident renters, resident homeowners, low-income residents, local merchants, established neighborhood groups within the plan area, and other groups identified through refinement of the CAC process.

San Francisco Planning Code Section 341.5

Section 3. Terms. Each member shall be appointed by the Board and will serve for two-year terms. The Board of Supervisors may renew a member's term. If no appointment is made after the completion of a first, second, or third term, that member shall continue as a voting member until such time as that person is re-appointed or replaced.

San Francisco Planning Code Section 341.5

Section 4. Attendance. Members must notify the chair of the Committee in advance of a scheduled meeting if they are unable to attend. The Chair shall determine if an absence is excusable for reasons such as illness, emergency, or schedule business or personal travel. If a member is absent more than three (3) scheduled meetings in a twelve month period, the Chair of the Committee shall notify the appointing authority.

Section 5. Vacancies. When a vacancy or failure to appoint or reappoint occurs for any reason, the Chairperson shall notify the appropriate appointing authority.

Article II. Duties

Section 1. Purpose. The CAC will be advisory, as appropriate, to the Planning Director, the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors. The CAC may perform the following functions as needed;

(A) Collaborate with the Planning Department and the Inter-Agency Plan Implementation Committee on prioritizing the community improvement projects and identifying implementation details as part of annual expenditure program that is adopted by the Board of Supervisors;

(B) Provide an advisory a role in a report-back process from the Planning Department on enforcement of individual projects' compliance with the Market and Octavia Area Plan standards and specific conditions of project approvals, including the specific first-source hiring requirements for the Plan Area such that those agreements will be more effectively implemented;

(C) Collaborate with the Planning Department in updating the community improvements program at a minimum of every fifth year in coordination with relevant City agencies; Providing input to Plan area monitoring efforts for required time-series reporting.

San Francisco Planning Code Section 341.5

Section 2. Mission Statement

The Market/Octavia Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC) is a representative body that provides advice to the Planning Director, the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee, the Planning Commission, and the Board of Supervisors regarding implementation of the Market/Octavia Plan and the plan's community improvements. In consultation with the San Francisco Planning Department staff and other relevant professional staff, and informed by criteria established by the committee, the Market/Octavia CAC will prioritize projects in the Plan for community improvements funding. The Committee will also provide advice on the dispersal of project funding to ensure that it is consistent with those criteria. Projects eligible for funding must be ones that are identified in the MOP, that are consistent with the Plan's goals, objectives and philosophy, and that can be clearly evaluated. The CAC provides continuity over the life of the plan and long term oversight and guidance on developments in the plan area consistent with the MOP's spirit and objectives.

Section 3. Duration of the CAC. The CAC shall be established upon the Board's and Mayor's appointment of members. Terms of membership of the CAC shall be for the terms described in Article I of these Bylaws. The CAC shall remain established for the first 10 years of the Market and Octavia Plan (the "Plan") and subject thereafter to extensions by the Board, but no longer than the plan period of 20 years.

Section 4. Conflict of Interest. No member of the CAC shall participate in any decision, which directly or indirectly affects his or her property or economic interests in a manner that is distinguishable from the manner in which the decision affects all other persons or a significant segment of all other persons in the Plan Area.

Section 5. Termination of Membership. Membership in the CAC shall terminate in the event that:

- a. The member shall not be, or shall no longer be, a Residential Owner-Occupant, a Residential Tenant, or a Business Owner, or a Representative of an Existing Community Organization within the Project Area; or
- b. The member shall not be, or shall no longer be, a member of that membership category from and for which he or she was elected or designated unless it due to circumstances beyond their control would be displaced or removed from the CAC. These affected members will be allowed to finish their elected terms; or
- c. The member does not attend two consecutive meetings or less than 80 percent of annual meetings; or
- d. The member shall have acts are inconsistent with these Bylaws.

Section 6. Removal of a Member

- a. A member may be removed from the membership of the CAC by a majority vote of the members of the CAC present at a regular meeting of the CAC at which a quorum is present if, after a hearing, it is found and determined that any one of the grounds for termination specified in Section 5 of this Article II exists. Prior to taking any action to remove a member, the CAC shall give advance written notice to the member of the proposed grounds for termination and the date of the hearing.
- b. A member may be sanctioned by a majority vote of the members of the CAC when: A member disrupts a CAC meeting and/or Committee meeting by not following the procedures as established for the conduct of CAC Business. Each occurrence will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting and after the third occurrence the CAC will determine an appropriate action.

Section 7. Resignation. Any member of the CAC may resign at any time by giving written notice to the Chairperson, who shall forward such notice to the CAC members, the Planning Department, and the appointing body. Any such resignation will take effect upon receipt or upon any date specified therein. The acceptance of such resignation at a CAC meeting shall not be necessary to make it effective.

ARTICLE III – OFFICERS

Section 1. Officers. The officers of the CAC shall consist of a Chairperson, Vice Chairperson, and Secretary, who shall be elected by the Committee annually.

Section 2. Chairperson Duties. The Chairperson shall preside at all meetings of the CAC, and shall submit such agenda, recommendations and information at such meetings as are reasonable and proper for the conduct of the business affairs and policies of the CAC. The Chairperson shall sign all correspondence, resolutions, and such other official documents necessary to carry out the business of the CAC.

Further, unless another member is otherwise designated, the Chairperson shall be the official spokesperson for the CAC.

Section 3. Vice Chairperson Duties. The Vice-Chairperson shall perform the duties of the Chairperson in the absence or incapacity of the Chairperson. In the event of the death, resignation or removal of the Chairperson, the Vice-Chairperson shall assume the Chairperson's duties until such time as the CAC shall elect a new Chairperson.

Section 4. Secretary Duties. The Secretary shall be responsible for keeping minutes of CAC meetings and maintaining records of CAC actions on the Planning Department's MOP-CAC website.

Section 5. Election. The Chairperson and Vice Chairperson, shall be initially elected from among the members of the CAC at a regular meeting of the CAC. Thereafter, the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson shall be elected from among the members of the CAC at each annual meeting of the CAC. Such officers of the CAC shall hold office until the next annual meeting following their election and until their successors are elected and in office. Any such officer shall not be prohibited from succeeding himself/herself.

Section 6. Removal of Officers. Upon a majority vote of the members of the CAC at a regular or special meeting of the CAC at which a quorum is present, any officer may be removed from office after a written notice of intent, followed by a hearing, and his or her successor elected.

ARTICLE IV – MEETINGS

Section 1. Annual Meeting. Annual meetings of the CAC shall be held on the third Monday of April at the hour of 7:00pm, at City Hall or at the City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103, or at such other location or time as may be designated in advance by the CAC; provided, however, that should the said meeting date be a legal holiday, then any such annual meeting shall be held on the next Monday thereafter ensuing which is not a legal holiday. The meeting time shall not conflict with the regularly scheduled meeting of any established neighborhood group within the plan area. At the annual meetings, officers shall be elected, reports of the affairs of the CAC shall be presented for consideration, and any other business may be transacted which is within the purposes of the CAC.

Section 2. Regular Meetings. The regular meetings of the CAC shall be held on the third Monday of every month at the hour of 7:00 p.m., on the fifth floor conference room of the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, or at such other location or time as designated in advance by the Chairperson. In the event that the regular meeting date shall be a legal holiday, on an alternate meeting time will be selected by the chair, or delayed until the next regular meeting date, at the discretion of the Chairperson. If an alternate meeting time is selected, it shall not conflict with the regularly scheduled meetings of any established neighborhood group within the plan area. A meeting agenda and other documents necessary for the

conduct of the business of the CAC shall be delivered to the members, by electronic mail or regular mail, at least 72 hours prior to the meeting.

Section 3. Special Meetings. Special meetings of the CAC may be held upon call of the Chairperson, or of the majority of the members of the CAC, for the purpose of transacting any business designated in the call, after notification of all members of the CAC by written notice delivered personally or by mail at least 24 hours before the time specified in the notice for the special meeting. At such special meeting, no business other than that designated in the call shall be considered.

Section 4. Adjourned Meetings. Any meeting of the CAC may be adjourned to an adjourned meeting without the need for notice requirements of a special meeting, provided said adjournment indicates the date, time and place of the adjourned meeting. CAC members absent from the meeting at which the adjournment decision is made shall be notified by the Chairperson of the adjourned meeting.

Section 5. All Meetings to be Open and Public. All meetings of the CAC shall be open and public to the extent required by law. All persons shall be permitted to attend any such meeting except as otherwise provided by law. At every meeting, members of the public shall have an opportunity to address the CAC on matters within the CAC's subject matter jurisdiction.

Public input and comment on matters on the agenda, as well as public input and comment on matters not otherwise on the agenda, shall be made during a time set aside for public comment: provided, however, that the CAC may direct that public input and comment on matters on the agenda be heard when the matter regularly comes up on the agenda. The Chairperson may limit the total amount of time allocated for public discussion on particular issues and/or the time allocated to each individual speaker.

Section 6. Posting Agendas/Notice. Staff shall post a notice or agenda for each regular or special meeting of the CAC, containing a brief description of each item of business to be transacted or discussed at the meeting together with the time and location of the meeting. Agendas/notices shall be posted at least 72 hours in advance of each regular meeting and at least 24 hours in advance of each special meeting, on the bulletin board of the Planning Department and the Main Public Library.

Section 7. Non-Agenda Items Matters. Such brought before the CAC at a regular meeting which were not placed on the agenda of the meeting shall not be acted upon by the CAC at that meeting unless action on such matters is permissible pursuant to the Ralph M. Brown Act (Gov. Code s 54950 et seq.). Those non-agenda items brought before the CAC, which the CAC determines, will require CAC consideration and action and where CAC action at that meeting is not authorized shall be placed on the agenda for the next regular meeting.

Section 8. Quorum. The powers of the CAC shall be vested in the members thereof in office from time to time. Five of the total members then in office shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting the CAC's business, exercising its powers and for all other purposes, but less than that number may adjourn a meeting from time to time until a quorum is obtained. An affirmative vote by a majority of the members present at a regular or special meeting of the CAC at which a quorum is present shall be required for approval of any question brought before the CAC.

Section 9. Order of Business. All business and matters before the CAC shall be transacted in conformance with Robert's Rules of Order (Newly Revised).

Section 10. Minutes. The minutes of the CAC shall be in writing. Copies of the minutes of each meeting of the CAC shall be made available to each member of the CAC no less than one week before the next meeting. Official minutes of the CAC shall be remain at the offices of the City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, San Francisco, CA 94103, where they will be available to the public and on their website.

ARTICLE V – REPRESENTATION BEFORE PUBLIC BODIES. Any official representation on behalf of the CAC before the Commission, The Board, or any other public body, shall be made by the Chairperson, the Vice Chairperson in the Chairperson’s absence, or a member of the CAC specifically so designated by the CAC.

ARTICLE VI – AMENDMENTS. These Bylaws may be amended upon the affirmative vote of a majority of the total membership of the CAC at any meeting, provided, however, that (1) no amendment shall be adopted unless at least seven (7) days written notice thereof has previously been given to all members of the CAC. Notice of amendment shall identify the section or sections of the Bylaws proposed for amendment and, if applicable, shall include the proposed replacement wording of the section or sections to be amended.

**Originally approved and adopted
This 20th day of May 2009.**

**Ammended, approved and adopted
18 June 2012**

APPENDIX 4
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 Neighborhoods — 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%3Aalplywsoxu>
 + 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%3Aalpglywsox>
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%3Aalpglywsox>
- **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%3Aalpglywsox>
- **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%3Aalpglywsox>

**APPENDIX 5
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 ON TSP TO INFORM SCOPING OF EIR.

TITLE: Resolution of Sentiment on TSP to inform scoping of EIR.

DATE: May 21, 2012

SUMMARY: The transportation portion of the developer's impact fee will be transferred to the citywide transportation impact fee. The MOP anticipates about 6,000 new housing units over the next 20 years. Currently transit within the area is inadequate. Successful implementation of the MOP requires that investment in transit within this area be coordinated with new development. MOP-CAC requests that the environmental analysis consider which infrastructure projects can best serve the projected increased transportation demands of new developments in the MOP area.

MOTION: Vasquez
SECOND: Leavitt
YES (unanimous): Henderson, Leavitt, Olsson, Singa, 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)		50,000
Hayes Green rotating art project		20,000
Market Street (10th to Octavia)		170,000
Transportation		
Haight Street two-way dedicated transit lanes and pedestrian improvements	120,000	210,000
Predevelopment for Market Street intersection improvements, including Dolores/Market	50,000	
Market/16th/Noe pedestrian improvements		250,000
Market/14th/Church pedestrian improvements		130,000
Market/Duboce/Buchanan pedestrian improvements		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 RESOLUTION OF SENTIMENT ON TSP TO INFORM SCOPING OF EIR (21May2012)
[Resolution of Sentiment]

RESOLUTION:**Be it Resolved by the Market Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC):**

When the Transportation Sustainability Program (TSP) is adopted, the Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) generated from development projects in the Market and Octavia Plan (MOP) area will be collected and expended on the TSP infrastructure program.

The MOP anticipates roughly 6,000 new housing units over the next 20 years, and the transit within the plan area is at or exceeding capacity.

The MOP-CAC believes that successful implementation of the MOP requires adequate investment in transportation in coordination with new development.

Accordingly, the MOP-CAC requests that environmental analysis of the proposed TSP program, especially the proposed infrastructure plan, consider which infrastructure projects will best service the projected increased transportation demands from new development within the MOP area.

ABSTRACT:**RESOLUTION #12:** 2012-05-21**TITLE:** **Resolution of Sentiment on TSP to inform scoping of EIR****DATE:** May 21, 2012**EXTRACT:** The transportation portion of the developer's impact fee will be transferred to the citywide transportation impact fee. The MOP anticipates about 6,000 new housing units over the next 20 years. Currently transit within the area is inadequate. Successful implementation of the MOP requires that investment in transit within this area be coordinated with new development. MOP-CAC requests that the environmental analysis consider which infrastructure projects can best serve the projected increased transportation demands of new developments in the MOP area.**MOVED/SECOND:** Moved by Vasquez; Seconded by Levitt**YES (unanimous):** Henderson, Leavitt, Olsson, Singa, Vasquez, Wingard**NO:** none**ABSTAIN:** none**ABSENT:** Cohen, Richards, Simmons

APPENDIX 6
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)

PUD Planned Urban Development**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