

**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, July 16, 2012; 6:30pm
Regularly scheduled monthly meeting**

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

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

SUMMARY

AGENDA (Exhibit 1: Agenda)

1. Call to order and roll call [act]
Present: Singa, Cohen Levitt, Olsson, Richards Simmons, Vasquez
Absent: Henderson, Wingard
Staff: Dischinger, Smith
Guest: Dan Adams
Public: none
2. Announcements, upcoming meetings and general housekeeping [discuss]
1) Better Market Street workshop; 2) Smith's announcements; 3) need requirements for Better Streets plan.
3. Approval of Minutes for June 18th regular meeting [act]
Postponed until next meeting
4. Overview of San Francisco Housing Trust Fund ballot initiative [discuss; act]
Adams (Mayor's Office of Housing) informed CAC of SFHTF; Cohen will draft resolution of support for it for next meeting.
5. Proposal for in-kind community improvements agreement for 2175 Market Street [discuss]
The 2175 Market St. developer will pay fee rather than sign in-kind agreement.
6. Review updated impact fee projections; discuss MOP-CIP recommendations FY2015-2017 [discuss]
This agenda item was discussed but no action was taken.
7. Legislation/Policy Pipeline Report [discuss; act]: accepted without discussion
8. Development Pipeline Report—developments in process; CAC project reviews [discuss; act]: accepted without discussion.
9. Committee members comments & issues the Committee may consider in future meetings [discuss]
10. Public Comment: none
11. Adjournment & announcement of next meeting: adjourned at ____

NEXT MEETING: MONDAY, AUGUST 20, 2012, 7:00PM AT 1650 Mission, 5th floor

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

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

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

- Exhibit 1: Agenda (**Smith**)
 Exhibit 2: Minutes: June 18, 2012 were not submitted in time by the Secretary. (**Olsson**)
 Exhibit 3: Resolution#12 (of Sentiment): reinvest TIP fees in CAC areas to mitigate growth (**Olsson**)
 Exhibit 4: Legislation Pipeline Report (**Smith**)
 Exhibit 5: Development Pipeline Report (**Smith**)

DECISIONS

Decision 1: Minutes (June 16th) postponed until next meeting

Decision 2: Resolution #12 (of Sentiment): approved unanimously

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

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

Consensus 3: Postpone December meeting

COMMITMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, INFORMATION DUE

#	WHEN	WHO	WHAT
1.	08/20	PC	Draft resolution supporting Housing Trust Fund for Nov. ballot.
2.	08/20	Staff	Provide budget & status of 42 priority items, including with/without fee deferrals.

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** (Members = **9**; Quorum = **5**)

Present: Krute Singa (Vice-Chair), Peter Cohen, Robin Levitt, Ted Olsson, Dennis Richards, Michael Simmons, Lou Vasquez

Absent: Jason Henderson (Chair), 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. Daniel Adams, Mayor's Office of Housing

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, UPCOMING MEETINGS, GENERAL HOUSEKEEPING

2.1 On July 17th, 6:30-8:30pm at the MTA office (VanNess & Market Sts.) there will be a Better Market Street workshop.

2.2 Ted will include Alexis's announcements (get these from her).

2.3 Get a summary of the 2175 in-kind agreement. It was noted that the developer will not pursue an in-kind agreement and David Nolay from the developer was not present with us tonight.

2.4 The committee was not sure what was required by the Better Streets Plan.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS [act]

EXHIBIT 2: no minutes were forwarded to the board.

The Secretary not having distributed last meeting's minutes, approval of the minutes was postponed until the next meeting

DECISION: Approval postponed until next meeting.

4. Overview of San Francisco Housing Trust Fund ballot initiative (Dan Adams)

The Mayor charged his Office of Housing to establish this Housing Trust Fund in order to respond to the loss of the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) and significant cuts in federal funding for its housing. The mayor asked them to create a source for affordable housing. To do so they assembled 50 organizations to confront the challenge and to define the core components. Their second charge was to wrestle with the affordability-gap in San Francisco: people can no longer afford to own their own homes. Their third charge was to preserve this housing because it pays for our city's tax base. We need to house our city's workers in order to compete with other municipalities. To discuss this they broke into a series of focus groups, consisting of bankers, property owners, renters, and other affected constituents. This resulted in the following suite of programs:

1. creating a fund to support affordable housing
2. supporting home ownership and housing stabilization programs
3. creating below-market-rate and market-rate stimulus programs.

They determined to establish a \$3-billion fund for affordable housing (which is not as much as had been established through the RDA). They created a \$15-million for stabilizing home ownership mortgage. The Area Median Income (AMI) is the amount of money for a family of four. Forty-seven percent of San Francisco households have only one person (*see a recent SF Chronicle article on small apartments*). A studio apartment is considered a single-person unit and priced according to the number of bedrooms.

The city will create down payment loan programs.

Another \$15 million is set aside to help keep people in their homes; for supporting green renovations of their house; and for assuring sustainability, accessibility, and sufficient energy. The office is not focused on green policies per se; but rather to maintaining family-owned homes over several generations and to provide low cash flow help to prevent homes from deteriorating, when that home is the family's primary asset. By providing such funds for this purpose, the city allows home owners to improve the condition of their homes and to remain in their homes. Usually restrictions are recorded on the property to prevent its quick resale. The third purpose of this program is to complete neighborhood infrastructure.

In areas zoned for growth, the goal is to make these complete neighborhoods, to protect pedestrian safety, to improve parks and mini-parks. This too is an aspect of the program yet to be designed. For now this is theoretical because nothing like this exists.

However, the program allows the private developer to sign up for grants in order to encourage development. These grants are to be additive. The program requires a set of neighborhood amenities in order to make it a community: this is the basis of the Complete Neighborhoods Program.

Another goal is to set up a set of incentives to spur the development of housing overall, and specifically to develop affordable onsite housing. This requirement for BMR units encourages developers to include affordable onsite housing. This would result in a 20% reduction in the inclusionary requirement. It creates a greater impetus to include an increase in affordable housing by providing incentives to developers. A companion to this 20% reduction is to fix or cap this onsite requirement for 30 years.

An exemption to the fee cap is allowed when the city action increases the value of the development.

Three goals are expected to be achieved by this program:

1. An increase in the production of affordable housing.
2. Home ownership programs
3. Stimulus packages

This inclusionary program went from a 10-unit threshold to only five units by now removing the 5-9 unit requirement. The Office of Housing intends to promote the deferral of fees for high-rise buildings which provide affordable housing.

The last piece of the program is to require that 12% of the units be priced for families earning 90% of the AMI (Annual Median Income). They will provide some flexibility: allowing lower prices for fewer units and more units at a higher price. The typical bracket for AMI is 80%-120%; for ownership, 50-80% for rental.

Richards mentioned that while renters are protected in their units; there are some who cannot stay here to build wealth. He asked for this office to consider greater variety and flexibility in their program. He also asked whether this also applied to Tenancy-In-Common (TIC) housing units. But he complimented the office for designing a program to keep people in their homes and incentivizing them to fix their homes.

Levitt asked if there were any ideas for targeted housing: for example for city workers, such as teachers, fire fighters, symphony musicians. He asked if this proposal will become a charter amendment.

It was noted that Supervisor Farrell proposed that First Responders become a specified group, a targeted population, in this charter amendment.

Cohen noted that this proposal is a significant aspect of his day job, advocating community housing. He has studied the proposal thoroughly and considers it a very big, comprehensive package. He encouraged our CAC to endorse this proposal; he said that it was very relevant to our purpose. He observed that it would probably pick up the Mayor and nine Supervisors as supporters on the November ballot. They think that this will be a popular proposition and expect that the turnout will be large because this is a presidential election.

Revenue and Funding. There are three aspects to this proposition:

1. Recycled Tax Increment. Property Taxes on housing in the expired-RDA zones—as the bonds are retired, the city will take that increment and continue to use it for housing as well as a portion of the former-RDA infrastructure bonds.
2. The City will also use \$5 million from the hotel tax to support this effort.
3. A 0.2% increase to Transfer Tax will generate about \$13 million for all transactions above \$1 million. Perhaps there will also be proposals to move from a payroll tax to a Value Added Tax (VAT). While there is hope for a consensus on this revenue, there is controversy around this revenue measure.

Cohen said that he will draft a resolution of support for adoption at next month's meeting for this proposal from the Mayor's Office of Housing.

COMMITMENT: Cohen will draft resolution for next meeting supporting Housing Trust Fund.

5. Proposal for in-kind community improvements agreement for 2175 Market Street (Smith)

Smith mentioned that David Noyola of the developer did not join us this evening because they will not pursue an in-kind agreement. She mentioned that the development is 18,000sf with 88 units. 15% of them are compliant with onsite requirements. They considered submitting an in-kind agreement but found that the streetscape plan is required by the Better Streets program; so, instead they will pay a CIP fee of \$750,000. They have planned for bike parking, which meets city requirements. Their application is being processed. They planned to come before the Planning Commission on September 6th (now postponed until October 4th).

**6. Review updated CIP Fee projections; discuss MOP-CIP recommendations for FY2015-17 (Smith)
Exhibit __: Prioritization Primer (by Smith from last meeting)**

Every year our CAC is required to update our CIP priorities; we must determine what is yet to be done now. We have almost \$2 million to allocate in FY2015 and even more in FY2016. It was noted by all that the Fee Deferral policy experiment will expire July 1, 2013.

Now we are only concerned with FY2015 and FY2016. We must see how much money we have and determine how best to spend it. There is a large difference between the amount for FY2015 and that for FY2016. Adams mentioned that we will have the opportunity to look at FY2016 next year, since those amounts are not in any agency's budget now; however, that is the year by which we must "true-up" our allocations to match the proportions set by the MOP.

Vasquez asked why the revenues fluctuate so much. This is because development stopped during the recession and is only now returning with attendant fees as revenue for our budget for Community Improvement Projects.

Cohen noted that we proposed additional categories which were not in the 2004 original Market Octavia Plan's categories and projects as proposed by the Planning Department. Smith responded that the categories are derived from the Plan and, therefore, now in the Planning Code. The historic, economic and other categories our CAC recommended were not in the Nexus Study, which is a long term perspective. She suggested that we table that discussion for now. Perhaps in January we could accommodate some of these goals by looking at whether other programs might be included under the stated categories. Cohen suggested that timing would be good to do this in the later part of Fall. He stated that he had explored the feasibility of this with the City Attorney, who indicated that this is something we could consider. Also, there is something in the Planning Code which allows us to use MOP fees to perform another Nexus Study. Because the MOP was created without adequate concern for the history in the area, Olsson had suggested that we needed a category which would preserve and educate neighbors to the history of this area. Again

Smith asked us to focus on prioritizing CIPs for now according to the existing categories and to consider modifications in January.

At this point Cohen showed members our CAC's 2011 priorities list. Levitt reminded all that our budget is from developers' fees, specifically dedicated to mitigate the impact of their developments upon the current and future neighbors — i.e., to retain the community's quality of life. The Planning Code specifies the areas where the fees can be spent because the categories are limited on what the money can be spent. The question was raised: can the money be spent on economic development? It was felt that we should be able to answer this here and now. Before we find new projects, the MOP-CAC should pinpoint what should be done and recognize that most of the CIPs have not yet been done (e.g., resulting in the horrible traffic in Hayes Valley). He felt that there are basic things that must be addressed in all neighborhoods. We certainly have more than enough projects to fund. Our problem is that we do not have a process to begin to modify projects. Cohen added that in our prioritization process last year, we recognized that we do not have any ability to modify the list. Smith replied to this that we can only bring in new projects through the community processes used to develop the original MOP — i.e., any additional categories must be validated by the community providing public input.

To move ahead, Richards suggested that we review the 42 items already on the list to determine the status of each: what has been done? what is left to do? He agreed that our money cannot cover all of the items listed, which is why we need the status of each and then to prioritize them to determine where we will invest the community's money and how much. Smith agreed: that is the task before us tonight. Richards continued that to determine the priorities, we must also know how much additional funds we can leverage for each project. Adam agreed to provide the status of each of the 42 items and which are currently relevant or significant.

Cohen noted that we now have a surplus of \$743,000 of unprogrammed money. Singa asked how we can align our spending to those projects currently under development. For this Cohen suggested that we need to have new conversations with DPW, RPD, MTA, etc. to understand what they are thinking. He noted that in the past we have talked past each other without communicating by exchanging documents. We need to speak with someone who understands their plans and can understand what drives our decisions. Richards also mentioned that last year we did not know that we could spend money on pre-programming. He felt that our meetings with Jonathan and Oliver was time well spent. It was also interesting to him how many of the projects we discussed with other agencies have not begun, let alone completed. He suggested that we should indicate the projects and their amounts on the map distributed earlier by Smith. Richards said that 2-3 years ago we spoke about how good these projects were but also how much needs to be done to maintain each of them, once constructed. However, now we are focused solely upon capital costs. In this regard he noted that we have but one Community Business District (CBD) — for the Castro — in the Upper Market area.

Smith reminded all that the goal this year is that we must have our priorities turned in by September. We will devote the entire August and September meetings to prioritizing our CIPs. Perhaps we should create a smaller working group to create a draft of the priorities? Singa will distribute an email to all asking who will work on this. It was also noted that on July 27th the Planning Department will hold its first meeting with IPIC.

Richardson asked for the source of the information on each chart, as on page 2. On page 1 of the exhibit he asked whether the funds are currently available. And specifically he asked staff to show the impact on these funds with and without the fee deferral in place. Smith agreed to get all of the information for the committee. And Singa reminded all that we must attend these August and September meetings to accomplish this fundamental task of the committee.

7. Legislation/Policy Pipeline Report:

Exhibit 4: Legislation/Policy Pipeline Report

Accepted with thanks but without discussion

8. Development Pipeline Report

Exhibit 5: Development Pipeline Report

The Committee was alerted to an interesting article in the SF Chronicle on the area (sf) of efficient units in apartments.

Cohen asked when we received the last quarterly version of the report, including the map of developments. Smith replied that the department will shortly be sending out the 2Q12 version with map and spreadsheet.

Cohen announced that DTNA and Upper Market Street has a lot (~25-30k sf) of new retail space. The trend is try to place formula retail in these properties at the commercial, street level. He asked how we ensure that the commercial retail is fulfilling the goals of the MOP?

Separately it was noted that Parcel P (of the old Central Freeway) consists of 3500sf.

Adam mentioned that the MOH has a group looking at non-capital projects but that the funding may be different. He suggested that we may want to talk with them, and offered his services to accomplish this.

It was mentioned that the Supervisors are talking about a Neighborhood Leakage Study. It was suggested that we should bring information on this to our next meeting.

Olsson wanted as a topic before the CAC a discussion of the latest green building practices in the city. He noted that we are one of the national leaders in such green construction. He wanted this CAC to spend it resources assuring that all construction in the MOP area furthers this goals. He suggested that this should be noted in all Development Pipeline reports and that we should voice our endorsement or disapproval of each development on this basis as well as others, such as onsite affordable housing. He is particularly interested in how we will invest our money in Green CIPs.

9. **Committee members comments and issues the CAC may consider in future meetings: none**
10. **Public Comment: none**
11. **Adjournment; announcement of next meeting.**
NEXT MEETING: MONDAY, AUGUST 20, 2012, 7:00PM AT 1650 Mission, 5th floor.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:13pm

Respectfully submitted,
~TED OLSSON
Secretary, MOP-CAC

APPENDIX 1
MOP-CAC
Attendance

3rd Monday monthly, 7-9pm

Legend

Y = attended

N = unexcused absence

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

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

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

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

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

Ex Officio

Kearstin Dischinger 0 0 Y Y Y

Alexis Smith Y Y Y Y Y

APPENDIX 2**MOP-CAC****2012 Schedule of meeting Topics****Annotated by meeting: Planned Items; Unique Agenda Items; Decisions**

(as of 16 APRIL 2012)

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

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

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

Topics suggested for future meetings 16APR12 meetingApril Summary

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

2012 CAC MEETINGS

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

January 24Agenda

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

Decisions

- CAC will not meet in conflict with its neighborhood associations' regularly scheduled meetings
- Resolution 9: City asked to evaluate efficiency of fee deferral policy before expiration date.

Commitments

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

February 22Agenda

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

Decisions

- ✓ Decision: in 2012 CAC will meet on 3rd Mon., 6:30pm, Planning Dept., 4th floor
- Consensus: Invite Michael Yarney & someone from Controller's office: discuss fee deferral policy
- Consensus: contact other CACs: effect of TSP on CAC budgets
- Consensus: invite city official opposed to TSP to educate our CAC
- ✓ Resolution 10: Commendation of John Billovits upon his retirement

Commitments

- Prepare for election of 2012 CAC officers

March 19Agenda

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

Decisions

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

Commitments

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

April 16Agenda

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

Decisions

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

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

Commitments

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

Topics to schedule for future meetings

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

May 21Scheduled

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

Agenda

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

Decisions

Decision 1: Minutes (March & April) approved unanimously

Decision 2: Resolution #12 (of Sentiment)

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

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

Consensus 3: Postpone December meeting

Commitments

- Chair to notify BOS of vacant seat on CAC.

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
- Update 2012 CAC priority projects—predevelopment for key Market Street intersection improvements
- Primer for developing CAC recommendations for the 2013 Market St. intersection improvements
- Inclusionary Affordable Housing in the MOP area
- Follow-up on 2012 CAC goals and work program

Decisions

- May 21st minutes approved with corrections
- Bylaws amended as noted (see Appendix)

Commitments

- Send “Totals through FY22014 v % investment per category” table
- Prepare new spreadsheet: all numbers & percentages, with and without deferral.
- Send CAC her guide to accessing SF legislative information

July 16

Scheduled

- Review updated fee projections, begin 2013 project prioritization discussion

Agenda

- Overview of San Francisco Housing Trust Fund ballot initiative
- Proposal for in-kind community improvements agreement for 2175 Market Street
- Review updated impact fee projections; discuss MOP-CIP recommendations FY2015-2017

Decisions — **none**

Commitments

- Staff will provide status of all 42 CIP project
- Cohen will draft resolution supporting Housing Trust Fund

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
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%3Aalpglywsoxu>
 + Application packet for In-Kind Policy: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8601>
- **IPIC 2012 Annual Report [including section on MOP]**
http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Market_Octavia/CAC/Interagency_Plan_Implementation_Committee_Annual_Report.pdf
- **MOP-CAC Bylaws**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=674>
- **Market & Octavia Area Plan**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1713>
- **Market & Octavia CAC**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1700>
- **MOP-CAC: Criteria for members**
 numbers chosen by Mayor, by Supervisors; description of representation & members' constituencies
 listing of terms of each member; how and when for public to apply to participate
- **MOP-CAC Board Members** (historical & current)
 bios, constituency/representing, roles & responsibilities; committee assignments
- **MOP-CAC Current Calendar** of scheduled topics
 meets 3d Mon. monthly at Planning Dpt., 4th floor. All meetings are open to the public & include time for public comment.

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

**APPENDIX 4
SUMMARY OF ALL MOP-CAC RESOLUTIONS**

SUMMARY

Resolution 01	(20Oct2009):	INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS
Resolution 02	(24Mch2010):	IN-KIND AGREEMENT, COMMISSION POLICY
Resolution 03	(25Aug2010):	FEES DEFERRAL PROGRAM
Resolution 04	(15Dec2010):	INCLUSIONARY AFFORDABLE HOUSING (orig: 09/22/10#1)
Resolution 05	(22Sep2010#2):	HAYES STREET PROJECT INVESTMENT
Resolution 06	(14Dec2011#1):	CIP: DOLORES INTERSECTIONS AT MARKET & 14TH STREETS
Resolution 07	(14Dec2011#2):	PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR PLANNING CODE AMENDMENTS
Resolution 08	(14Dec2011#3):	FINALIZED 2012 M/O CIP RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CAPITAL PLAN
Resolution 09	(24Jan2012):	FEE DEFERRAL PROGRAM EVALUATION
Resolution 10	(22Feb2012):	JOHN BILLOVITS COMMENDATION
Resolution 11	(19Mar2010):	SUPPORT FOR VNBRT EXPEDITED IMPLEMENTATION
Resolution 12	(21Mar2010):	REQUEST TSP TO MITIGATE DEVELOPMENT IMPACT IN CAC AREA
Resolution 13	(20Aug2010):	SUPPORT SF HOUSING TRUST FUND

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: **2012-03-19**
TITLE: **Resolution Supporting VNBRT T**
DATE: **March 19, 2012**
SUMMARY: RESOLUTION #11 (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: Singa, Simmons

RESOLUTION #12: **2012-03-21**
TITLE: **Resolution of Sentiment: Request to TSP to mitigate impact of development in CAC Areas.**
DATE: March 21, 2012
SUMMARY: RESOLUTION #12 (21May2012)
 The Market Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC) requests the TSP to consider mitigating the impact of development in CAC areas by dedicating fees from these areas to solve transit problems caused by impact of growth.
MOTION: Vasquez
SECOND: Leavitt
YES (unanimous): Henderson, Singa, Leavitt, Olsson, Vasquez, Wingard
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Cohen, Richards, Simmons

RESOLUTION #13: **2012-08-20**
TITLE: **Resolution Supporting Housing Trust Fund**
DATE: August 20, 2012
EXTRACT: RESOLUTION #13 (20Sep2012)
 The MOP-CAC unanimously supports the Housing Trust Fund proposed by the Mayor's Office of Housing now on the November ballot.
MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Vasquez; Seconded by Levitt
YES (unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Richardson, Singa, Vasquez
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Olsson, Simmons, Wingard

ABSTRACT TEMPLATE

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

TITLE:

DATE:

EXTRACT:

MOVED/SECOND: Moved by ____; Seconded by ____

YES:

NO:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.3 RESOLUTION #3

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.4 RESOLUTION #4

22 Sep10 RESOLUTION 4: INCLUSIONARY AFFORDABLE HOUSING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This revision included all text regarding the land dedication alternative.

RESOLUTION #4: Inclusionary Affordable Housing (22Sep2010)

DATE: September 22, 2010

MOTION: Moved by Henderson, seconded by Richards

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

NO: none

ABSTAIN: none

ABSENT: Gold

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

MOTION: Moved by Henderson, Seconded by Gold

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

NO: none

ABSTAIN: none

ABSENT: Richards

2.5 RESOLUTION #5

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DATE: September 22, 2010

MOTION: Moved by Henderson, seconded by Levitt

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

NO: none

ABSTAIN: none

ABSENT: Gold

2.6 RESOLUTION #6

14Dec11-1: Proposed In-kind community improvements Agreement for 2001 Market (Prado project)

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

RESOLUTION #6 2011-12-14#1

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

DATE: December 14, 2011

RESOLUTION: **Be it Resolved** that the MOP-CAC supports the plan proposed by the SF Planning Department and advocated by Supervisor Wiener for an In-kind Agreement for streetscape improvements for the first block of Dolores Street between Market and Fourteenth Streets, as specifically defined in their June 2011 schematic, except that the improvements proposed for the Dolores/14th Street intersection shall be those presented in their November 2011 schematic, and that the Market Street crosswalk and associated improvements shall not be included in this improvements program.

MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Levitt, seconded by Wingard

YES: Henderson, Levitt, Wingard

NO: Olsson, Starkey

ABSTAIN: Cohen, Richards

ABSENT: Gold

2.7 RESOLUTION #7

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

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

RESOLUTION # 7 2011-12-14#2:

TITLE Proposed Legislation for Planning Code Amendments

DATE: December 14, 2011

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

MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Richards, seconded by Starkey

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

NO: none

ABSTAIN: none

ABSENT: Gold, Olsson

2.8 RESOLUTION #8

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

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

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

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

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

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

ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Gold, Olsson, and Starkey

2.9 RESOLUTION #9

25Jan2012 Evaluate Fee Deferral Policy

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

RESOLUTION #9: Evaluate Fee Deferral Policy (25Jan2012)

DATE: January 25, 2012
MOTION: Moved by Olsson, seconded by Richards
YES: Henderson, Olsson, Richards, Vasquez
NO: none
ABSTAIN: Levitt
ABSENT: Simmons, Singa; Wingard had left by this time.

2.10 RESOLUTION #10

22Feb2012 Billovits Commendation

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

ABSTRACT:

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

2.11 RESOLUTION #11 SUPPORT FOR VNBRT (19Mar2012)

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

ABSTRACT:

RESOLUTION #10: 2012-03-19

TITLE: Support for VNBRT
DATE: March 19, 2012
EXTRACT: The Market Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC) supports the concept of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) along the main transit corridors of the City. Specifically we approve the Van Ness Ave. BRT (VNBRT) and urge its expedited completion, without taking a position on any of the considered alternative methods.
MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Levitt; Seconded by Vasquez
YES (unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Leavitt, Olsson, Richards, Vasquez
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Krute, Simmons

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

[Resolution of Sentiment]

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

ABSTRACT:

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

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

"When the TSP is adopted, the \$3 **Transportation Impact Fee (TIP)** from MOP will be rescinded and folded into TSP. Our concern during our last several meetings, is that parts of our city which are experiencing thousands of housing units may deserve more emphasis that those parts of the city which are not experiencing such growth. We ask the TSP to define the key

transit projects and indicate how they propose to mitigate the impacts of these anticipated increased densities, particularly in defined plan areas with fees attached to them (specifically plan areas which would be losing their own fees for mitigating neighborhood growth — MOP, Eastern Neighborhoods, and Balboa Park planned development areas each with its own CAC). As an example we note for the TSP that right now public transit in the MOP area is stressed and overwhelmed (busses pass waiting passengers). We do not have adequate transit capacity today. The purpose of our resolution is to strengthen the TSP's prioritization of how to most equitably invest in city transit."

Moved/Seconded: Vasquez/Levitt
YES (unanimous): Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Singa, Vasquez, Wingard
NO: none
Abstain: Cohen, Richards, Simmons

**2.13 RESOLUTION #13 RESOLUTION SUPPORTING HOUSING TRUST FUND
 (21Aug2012)**

BE IT RESOLVED that the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee supports the Housing Trust Fund.

ABSTRACT:

RESOLUTION #13: 2012-08-20
TITLE: Resolution Supporting Housing Trust Fund
DATE: August 20, 2012
EXTRACT: RESOLUTION #13 (20Sep2012)
 The MOP-CAC unanimously supports the Housing Trust Fund proposed by the Mayor's Office of Housing now on the November ballot.
MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Vasquez; Seconded by Levitt
YES (unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Richardson, Singa, Vasquez
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Olsson, Simmons, Wingard

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the Market and Octavia Plan necessitates affordable housing and mixed income housing to achieve its goals of complete and diverse communities;

WHEREAS there has been minimal affordable housing development from the Market and Octavia Plan, and there has been minimal on-site inclusionary mixed income housing development from the Plan;

WHEREAS the proposed Housing Trust Fund will provide a reliable stream of annual revenue for affordable housing and will incentivize on-site inclusionary mixed income housing, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee supports the Housing Trust Fund.

Motion—MOP-CAC Resolution #13 (2012-08-20); moved by Vasquez; seconded by Levitt.

YES: Unanimous—Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Richards, Singa, Vasquez
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Olsson, Simmons, Wingard

APPENDIX 5
MOP-CAC GLOSSARY
EXTRACTS FROM MINUTES

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

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

BRT Bus Rapid Transit

This is the city's plan to enhance public mass transit by dedicated bus lanes along major transit corridors (e.g., Van Ness, Geary, & Potrero corridors).

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

CAC Community Advisory Committee

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

CIP Community Improvement Program (or –Projects)

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

Central Freeway

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

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

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

CEQA California Environmental Quality Act

COLA Cost Of Living Assessment

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

Community Challenge Opportunities for Open Space**DTNA Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association**

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

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

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

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

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

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

IPIC Interagency Plan Implementation Committee

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

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

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

MDNA Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association

<http://www.MissionDNA.org>

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

MOP Market Octavia Plan

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

MOP-CAC Market Octavia Plan's Community Advisory Committee

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

MUNI Municipal Transit

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

MTA Municipal Transportation Authority

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

Neighborhood Associations

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

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

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

PIDB Planned Improvements Database

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

Prop. B (year)

Prop. K (year)

Prop. AA (year)

RDA Redevelopment Agency

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

Resolution

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

RPD Recreation and Parks Department

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

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

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

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

This is the successor to San Francisco's Redevelopment Agency. When the RDA was eliminated (Feb. 2, 2012) this board (consisting of many of the RDA's employees) continued the developments undertaken by the RDA. Because San Francisco is both a coterminous county and city, we are able to continue the RDA efforts by fully paying all administrative fees of RDA employees, so that all taxes and fees go directly to the specific area's development projects.

SF Planning Commission

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

SF Planning Department

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

Streets Capital Group**TEDM****TEP Transit Effectiveness Program**

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

TIF Tax Increment Financing

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

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

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

TSP Transportation Sustainability Program

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

Walk First Project