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, February 5, 2013; 7:00pm
Regularly scheduled monthly meeting

Jason Henderson	Robin Levitt	
Ted Olsson	Dennis Richards	
Michael Simmons	Krute Singa	
Lou Vasquez	Ken Wingard	
Nick Wolf	*Alexis Smith*	(*ex officio*)

The Agenda & Minutes of all community meetings, a matter of public record, are available at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 5th Floor or on our website (above).

SUMMARY

ATTENDEES

PRESENT:	Jason Henderson (Chair), Krute Singa (Vice Chair), Robin Levitt, Ted Olsson, Lou Vasquez
ABSENT:	Dennis Richards, Michael Simmons, Kenneth Wingard, Nick Wolf
STAFF:	Alexis Smith (Planning)
GUESTS:	Claudi Flores, staff, SF Planning Department (designer of Living Alley)
	Don Savoie, ED, Civic Center CBD. savoie@sfciviccenter.org; 415.626.1819
	234 Van Ness Ave., Ste.1, San Francisco, CA 94102; www.SFCivicCenter.org

AGENDA (Exhibit 1: Agenda)

1.	7:00-7:05	**Call to order and roll call** [act]
2.		**Announcements, upcoming meetings, and general housekeeping** [discuss]
3.		**Approval of Minutes for December 17th regular meeting** [act]
4.	7:15-7:40	**Update on non-capital projects by Planning Department staff** [discuss]
5.	7:40-8:35	**Discussion of former freeway parcels with OEWD staff** [discuss; possibly act]
6.	8:35-8:50	**Gough St. intersections repaving update** [discuss]
7.	8:50-9:00	**Legislation/Policy Pipeline Report** [discuss]
8.		**Development Pipeline Report—CAC review of projects** [discuss; act]
9.		**Committee comments & issues the Committee may consider in future meetings** [discuss]
10.		**Public Comment**
11.		**Adjournment & announcement of next meeting —** The meeting adjourned at 9:05pm.

NEXT MEETING: TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 2012, 7:00PM AT 1650 Mission, 5th floor (Note different date)
(2013—NO Jan mtg; Feb05, Mch18; Apr15, May20, Jun17, Jul15, Aug19, Sep16, Oct21, Nov18, Dec16)
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: December 17, 2012 CAC minutes (**Olsson**) unanimously approved.
Exhibit 3: "Market-Octavia: Community & Economic Development" (**Flores**)
Exhibit 4: True-Up Process (**MOH**)
Exhibit 5: Development Pipeline Report (**Smith**)

DECISIONS

Decision 1: December 17, 2012 Minutes unanimously approved.

COMMITMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, INFORMATION DUE — NONE

#	WHEN	WHO	WHAT
1.	3/18	JH	Draft resolution commending Peter Cohen
2.	3/18	JH/AS	Invite Jay Prince (MTA) to address CAC on car-sharing
3.	3/18	JH/RL	Draft & distribute to CAC: Expression of Sentiment re: True-Up
4.	3/18	JH	Arrange joint meeting with EN-CAC re: removal of I-280 (cf, CtlFwy)
5.	3/18	AS	Distribute to CAC: Props.E&I + SB798 to review wording
6.	3/18	JH	Explain expansion of ancillary projects and consequences
7.	3/18	JH	Must the CAC approve repayment of Prop.B for bulbouts?
8.	3/18	RL	Invite Hannah & Michael re Green Benefit District

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

Present: Jason Henderson (Chair), Kruti Singa (Vice-Chair), Robin Levitt, Ted Olsson (Sec.), Lou Vasquez; Alexis Smith

Absent: Dennis Richards, Michael Simmons, Ken Wingard, Nick Wolf.

Ex Officio Members

- Alexis Smith, staff liaison; Planner/Urban Designer, SF Plng.Dept.; 415.558.6409; Alexis.Smith@sfgov.org

Guests:

- Claudia Flores, staff, SF Planning Department
- Tamsen Drew, staff, Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH)
- Ken Rich, , staff, Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH)
- Don Savoie, ED, Civic Center CBD. savoie@sfciviccenter.org 415.626.1819
  234 Van Ness Ave., Ste.1, San Francisco, CA 94102

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:05pm, when a quorum was present.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, UPCOMING MEETINGS, AND GENERAL HOUSEKEEPING

2.1 The Chair wished all members a Happy New Year and happiness in this Year of the Snake.

2.2 The CAC announced its newest member, Nick Wolf, who was absent. He works on Economic Development and small business issues at the LBGBT Center. He works, not lives, in the MOP area.

2.3 DTNA is concerned with formula retail in its area and throughout the MOP Area. They sent a letter to the Department, which is now reviewing their formula.

2.4 Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit (VNBRT) continues to move forward. It will be certified on April 13th.

2.5 HVNA proposed to waive its Formula Retail policy for a grocery store.

2.6 HVNA liked the new design of the Boys & Girls Club.

2.7 SFJazz celebrated its opening in the Civic Center.

3. APPROVAL OF DECEMBER 17th MINUTES [act]

EXHIBIT 2: MOP-CAC minutes for December 17, 2012 meeting.

DECISION: These minutes were unanimously approved on a motion by Levitt seconded by Singha.

4. UPDATE ON NON-CAPITAL PROJECTS BY PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF

(Claudia Flores)

Exhibit 3: "Market-Octavia: Community & Economic Development ('non-capital') Implementation Programs Update"

The Community and Economic Development (CED) Programs Implementation are at Step 3: Summarizing and presenting to the CAC. Most of the projects are being taken care of by other agencies or projects. There is now a new effort in the Mayor's Office regarding the new Market Street (i.e., Central Market Street).

Under Economic Development, the Upper Market CBD has a plan for the area and is receiving funds. Business Development Planning is becoming a new business.

Under the heading Transportation they are supporting car-sharing and will manage on-street parking more efficiently by pricing and improving parking management. The Congestion Pricing project is a TA project.

Under the heading of Arts & Culture, she announced that there was a new trust fund and ongoing programs.

Under Housing, she reminded all that the Housing Element is part of the City Plan and that Market & Octavia is part of the General Plan.

The final category is Preservation, under which they adopted historic preservation and that they will designate specific buildings in the area. It was noted that neighbors are seeking landmark designation for Duboce Triangle Park

This presentation was followed by CAC questions. Henderson inquired about residential parking programs. He felt that by now we would have reformed the **Residential Parking Program (RPP).** He asked why this is so difficult to accomplish for the MTA (MDA?). We get 1800 new housing units plus a lot approved. The property at 55 Laguna (old UC Extension campus) will be off-limits because of the construction around the neighborhood. It was also noted that there is a tremendous opportunity to do curbside carsharing at construction sites. Perhaps we could even reach a 1:1 ratio for lost car-sharing spaces due to construction at sites that had accommodated car-sharing. Now this proven system is forced out to find other spaces within the neighborhoods to serve residents. To be successful, car-sharing must be visible within the neighborhoods.

We do not know if MTA has considered this. Perhaps we should schedule Jay Prince of MTA to speak to us soon on this topic. It was mentioned that Prince had recently spoken on this topic to the Eastern Neighborhoods CAC. Olsson suggested that we announce a public program to celebrate this car-sharing concept on upper Market Street. Parking and Transportation issues, along with Safety (especially bike and pedestrian) and Housing, are some of the highest issues on our list. We should get someone to speak to us on these topics, particularly upon bike parking requirements within the plan area. Noting that bike parking is typically being provided now by new residential and commercial property owners, Singa asked whether existing commercial owners are in compliance.

5. DISCUSSION OF FORMER FREEWAY PARCELS WITH OEWD STAFF.
Exhibit 3: History & Update of True-Up Process (MOH: Drew & Rich)
Tamsen Drew,
Ken Rich

Octavia Boulevard Project was approved by voters through Proposition E (1998) and Proposition I (1999), to remove the Central Freeway and to develop Octavia Boulevard, respectively. By Senate Bill SB798 (Burton), the state gave CalTrans permission to deed the land of these freeway parcels to San Francisco. These were the initial Transfer and Options agreements, and ancillary ones were agreed to by Proposition I, specifically Transportation and Housing issues. All of these obligations have been fulfilled, except for the Van Ness corridor, which is separately handled under the **Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit (VNBRT)** program.

The **Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH)** handled these land issues through a process known as **"True-Up"**. Seven lots for affordable housing were purchased by the former **Redevelopment Housing Authority (RDA)**, and the City sold the remaining 15 lots in order to gain the necessary capital to implement the plan. According to the True-Up plan, the estimated shortfall would return to the MOH. A refund of the SFCTA would pay for the construction of Octavia Boulevard. Not all of the redevelopment of Van Ness would be paid for; however, that portion required to link Van Ness to CA101 (El Camino Real) highway, with the removal of the freeway from Turk Street down would be subsidized in this way. This amounted to $44.7M (this 2013 amount includes inflation.).

What is the **Transportation Development Program**? This assured that Van Ness developments would not block Market Street. To accomplish the necessary diversion, the department passed out fliers to Marin commuters advising them of forthcoming changes and of how to avoid delay. A lot of the money spent in this effort, therefore, might have been for labor costs, to avoid congestion due to redevelopment. All lease revenues evidently are dedicated to staffing or to maintenance. All revenue from Parcel F ($57.5M) goes to MOH.

Under the MOH True-Up, the County Appraiser determines the most valuable use of these properties within that zone. The price of the ownership unit is capped (so, the appreciation on the property is limited) by the City to maintain these units as "affordable".

The RDA was a State Agency acting locally, which is why the State of California was able to abolish them, as a cost-cutting measure. Because San Francisco is both a city and county, all of the RDA's former duties and programs were transferred to the MOH. Now as Octavia Boulevard becomes more developed, the true values of each of these properties becomes better known.

The question was asked: is there any language in the "True-Up" process to say where this money goes? The guests answered that they believe that there are no geographic limits. The MOH's position is that they will spend more than this amount of money in the Octavia neighborhood to subsidize the three parcels. At this time Parcel O

is considered to be Family Rental. This includes 100 Van Ness (former AAA building?), which may have about 1800 units.

Levitt stated that "CB money" usually is invested in the area around a project. And he claimed that residents of the Octavia Blvd. area do not have anything for funding transportation improvements in the neighborhood. It was noted that Community Improvement Projects (CIP) must be used near the development which is funding them. According to the guests, however, legal interpretation looks at the whole area regarding cumulative development and improvements. Levitt confessed that this issue really concerns him: it is not right that the money for the parcels should be paid to the former RDA/now MOH for use elsewhere in the MOP. He stated that he was on various CACs and that none of this money has addressed problems at Oak and Octavia or Gough and Market, nor the bike route on Page Street — all of which are treacherous intersections.

Because the transportation problems directly related to Octavia Boulevard have never been addressed, people are being killed on the north side of Market Street. He claimed that Proposition I was very clear how this money was to be used: the millions of dollars were to be dedicated to transportation projects related to Octavia Boulevard. He noted that one need only consider what the RDA paid for these freeway parcels, for example Parcel O compared with Parcel P. The RDA obtained these below market rate; the appraisals were done at the highest value at the time. The Octavia parcels were bought when they were run down.

The problems still exist. We need to consider funding alternatives. We have 1800 units coming online now, double what exists, yet we cannot take care of our current problems. So, the situation can only deteriorate. Now under Proposition C the Housing Trust Fund gives money for that. It was noted that the CAC's CIP impact fees are not available for transportation, though they may be used for improving safety at intersections. We have been awaiting the MTA's Octavia Transportation Study, which is necessary for us to make our CIP determinations. Although this CAC is finished with what the MTA dropped as "ancillary projects", they are not done.

The problem simply is that no one defined how much more money there is before and after the True-Up. Are we repaying the full loan first and then only get to use what's left? If that's the case, then there won't be any money left to address the residents' issues. As always, the total freeway redevelopment plan and the MOP was far more costly than anticipated.

At this point Vasquez asked to know what are the next steps from our current situation. The Octavia Boulevard project is winding down and the City is selling off the remaining parcels. The surplus was stated to be $12.7M.

Smith interjected to ask whether there were any next steps that the CAC might take to act resolve its frustrations. Were there any actions which the CAC would request of the Planning Department or other agencies (MTP, DPW, MOH, OEWD)? She noted that no Board of Supervisors' action is required for a **Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)** between the five agencies to better address the problem, since the idea of the money being reinvested in the affected neighborhoods is not a foregone conclusion.

It was claimed, however, that the True-Up is "owed" to the MOH

Levitt asked CAC colleagues whether they wanted to take a position on this matter. They asked him what he proposed. He offered the following resolution:

RESOLUTION #__ OF THE MOP-CAC:

Given the history of Proposition I, of SB798 [state pertinent quotations] and of all existing problems related to Octavia Boulevard which require funding — without which we have no means of addressing urgent transportation safety issues in this area — the area will necessarily deteriorate with its current population. Because there are 1800 housing units currently approved, this will only deteriorate the quality of life in the MOP area yet further, particularly in terms of adequate public transportation. Therefore, until such funds are provided to our budget to address these urgent needs, the MOP-CAC is opposed to transferring any more money from these freeway parcels to the Mayor's Office of Housing by means of the True-Up process. This is necessary to fulfill our mandate to monitor the development and funding of the MOP and to anticipate the impact of additional population density proposed by the Plan by using our budget to fund Community Improvement Projects to mitigate the impact of such density *before* that occurs. Only in this way can the MOP-CAC fulfill its role by improving the quality of life in this area both for its current residents and for future residents.

Considering the great increase in the construction of housing developments in the neighborhood, Henderson opined that in light of the fact that $5M is being transferred to MOH by means of the True-Up process — based upon an agreement made in 2002, without public participation — there are still critical needs yet to be addressed in the MOP neighborhood. There is a painstaking consensus by residents of the area about accepting this rate of

growth and that the goals of SB798 should be concomitant with but governed by this rate of growth. He proposed an MOP-CAC Expression of Sentiment stating that because we're absorbing more than 1,800 housing units in this MOP area, the City has obligations to these residents. To accomplish the housing goals envisioned by SB375, there needs to be an anticipatory concomitant investment in transportation (particularly adequate public transportation means and frequency) for this MOP area. The lack of such anticipatory City infrastructure, is reflected in the shortfall of the sale of the freeway parcels. Accordingly we urge the City to promptly find and invest in our MOP-CAC budget the equivalent of the True-Up transfers of money. Unless such money is found to allow us to make anticipatory investments to counter the predictable impact of such addition housing density, the MOP area and this part of the City will continue to deteriorate.

Wingard suggested that it would be more important to consider ways in which we could convert the housing lobby to allies rather than consign them to become our enemies. Singa suggested that we should consider how the city could reinvest this money into transportation improvements rather transferring it to the Mayor's Office of Housing, which would only exacerbate the problem.

It was noted that the lessons learned from removing the Central Freeway should be explicitly stated and considered now, before the City considers removing part of Freeway 280. Consequently, we should inform our colleagues on the EN-CAC of these concerns. Perhaps it would be useful to have one (or more) joint meetings per year, especially since we currently meet on the same night at the Planning Department, only a floor apart.

Levitt and Henderson offered to draft this Expression of Sentiment and then to distribute it to all CAC members. It was suggested that everyone should re-read Proposition I carefully; perhaps the staff could get from the Registrar of voters Props E & I and SB798 to distribute to the committee.

Henderson will explain the expansion of ancillary projects as the way to go, rather than against the MOH. However, Levitt remained adamantly opposed to the transfer of the funds to the MOH from the sale of the freeway parcels.

Vasquez proposed that our CAC review the language of Proposition I and invest in ancillary projects. Is this a case of real neglect? It was suggested that it might be easier to finalize an MOU, if they cannot transfer the money quickly. Wingard questioned our next step, in terms of an MOU and timing.

7. GOUGH STREET REPAVING UPDATE (Smith)

The CAC suggested repaving Gough Street. This has become prioritized now. There is no leeway to designing all the bulbouts we requested. The City is scrambling to get some bulbouts accomplished in the repaving budget and schedule. They would be standard bulbouts. These do not require an EIR do be done. The good news is that the departments have arranged a swap-out. Potentially they can use Prop.B funds and then we would use our CIP funds to reimburse Prop.B. However, they cannot cover all intersections recommended by the CAC: Gough/Fell won't be done — though all agree that intersection needs improvement, it couldn't be done within the deadlines. Smith will keep the CAC updated on this project.

Levitt noted that there is no parking on the east side of Gough between Page and Market, the Living Street on Rose Alley behind the Zuni Café.

8. DEVELOPMENT PIPELINE REPORT—CAC REVIEW PROJECTS (Smith)

Exhibit #5: Development Pipeline Report

Accepted without comment.

9. COMMITTEE COMMENTS & ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN FUTURE MEETINGS [discuss]

9.1 Levitt announced that the Better Market Street CAC would hold a public viewing of current plans at 6pm at 1455 Market Street, the Transportation Authority's offices.

9.2 Olsson referred CAC members to the December 2012 minutes, Appendix 2 (Items tabled or issues dropped from discussion) and Appendix 3 (a cumulative summary of the topics and decisions from each of our meetings during the year). We need to study this to determine 2013's topics and schedule as well as to monitor our own performance for a yearly report to the public.

9.3 Levitt suggested a Green Benefit District in Upper Market. Similar ones are already proposed for Dogpatch and Potrero Hill districts. He asked if Hannah and Michael could report on how this might be appropriate for MOP.

9.4 Olsson suggested that our CAC create a Resolution of Commendation for Peter Cohen, thanking him for his leadership of our CAC during its initial years. Henderson agreed to draft such a resolution and distribute it to the committee for its approval.

10. PUBLIC COMMENT

Don Savoie, who had patiently sat through our entire meeting introduced himself as the Executive Director of the Civic Center CBD (Commercial Benefits District). He proposed that his organization would like to create a community garden by replacing the street at 12th Street and Stevenson. This would be only for interim use on the eastern edge of our MOP area. His organization felt that this would be beneficial to lessen the impact of the substantial redevelopment between Franklin and Van Ness.

11. NEXT MEETING NOTICE & ADJOURNMENT (Henderson)

The next meeting will be held on March 18th at 7pm, Planning Department, 5th Fl. conf.rm.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:12pm

Respectfully submitted,
~ TED OLSSON
Secretary, MOP-CAC

APPENDIX 1
MOP-CAC
2013 Attendance
3rd Monday monthly, 7-9pm

Legend
Y = attended
N = unexcused absence
X = excused absence (i.e., Chairman notified)
RET = retired
Q = no quorum: no official business transacted; no minutes
C = meeting cancelled (typically for lack of a quorum); ~~strikethrough date~~

NOTES: *1. There was no January meeting*.*
2. Full committee consists of 9 members; Quorum is five members.

CAC Member	~~1/*~~	2/05	3/18	4/15	5/20	6/17	7/15	8/19	9/16	10/21	11/18	12/16
Robin Levitt	0	Y										
Jason Henderson	0	Y										
Ted Olsson	0	Y										
Dennis Richards	0	**N**										
Michael Simmons	0	**N**										
Krute Singa	0	Y										
Lou Vasquez	0	Y										
Ken Wingard	0	**N**										
Nick Wolf	0	**N**										
_____												
Ex Officio												
Alexis Smith	0	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)

APPENDIX 3
2013 CAC MEETINGS
Planned/Agendized Topics plus
Annotated Decisions/Commitments resulting from the Meeting

January — no meeting
Agenda
Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions
Commitments

February 05 (changed because of conflict with holiday)
Agenda
- Update on non-capital projects by Planning Department staff
- Discuss former freeway parcels with OEWD staff
- Gough Street intersections repaving update
- Transportation Sustainability Program

Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions
D: CAC 12Dec2012 meeting minutes unanimously approved.
Commitments
- Draft & distribute commendation for Peter Cohen
- Invite Jay Prince (MTA) to speak to CAC about car-sharing
- Draft & distribute Expression of Sentiment re: True-up to MOH & anticipatory impact projects
- Arrange for joint meeting with EN re: removal of I-280 (cf: problems of demolition of CtrlFwy)
- Distribute Props.E&I + SB978 for CAC to review wording
- Explain the consequences of the expansion of ancillary projects
- Must the CAC officially approve the repayment of Prop.B funds for bulbouts?
- Invite Hannah & Michael to speak to CAC re: Green Benefit Districts

March 18 (changed because of conflict with holiday)
Agenda
Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions
Commitments

April 15
Agenda
Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions
Commitments

May 20
Scheduled
Agenda
Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions
Commitments

June 17
Scheduled
Agenda
Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions
Commitments

July 15
Scheduled
Agenda
Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions — **none**
Commitments

August 19
Scheduled
Agenda
Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions
Commitments

September 16
Scheduled
Agenda
Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions
Commitments

October 21
Scheduled
Agenda
Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions
Commitments

November 18
Scheduled
Agenda
Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions
Commitments

December 16
Agenda
Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions
Commitments

#	Date	Who	What

APPENDIX 3
LIST OF RELEVANT DOCUMENTS
TO BE INCLUDED ON MOP-CAC WEBSITE
(other than Exhibits, unless cross-referenced_
http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1700

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

- **Community Improvement Plan (Capital Projects)**
  http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2893

- **Better Neighborhood Plans (including MOP)**
  http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1699

- **Eastern Neighborhoods**
  http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1673

- **Eastern Neighboroods — CAC (Citizens Advisory Committee)**
  http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2224

- **In-Kind Policy**
  Search: http://www.sf-planning.org/Search.aspx?sa.x=9&sa.y=13&sa=Search&cof=FORID%3A11&q=in-kind%20policy&cx=018062627758110761831%3Aalpglywsoxu
  + Application packet for In-Kind Policy: http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8601

- **IPIC 2012 Annual Report [including section on MOP]**
  http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Market_Octavia/CAC/Interagency_Plan_Implementation_Committee_Annual_Report.pdf

- **MOP-CAC Bylaws**
  http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=674

- **Market & Octavia Area Plan**
  http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1713

- **Market & Octavia CAC**
  http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1700

- **MOP-CAC: Criteria for members**
  numbers chosen by Mayor, by Supervisors; description of representation & members' constituencies listing of terms of each member; how and when for public to apply to participate

- **MOP-CAC Board Members** (historical & current)
  bios, constituency/representing, roles & responsibilities; committee assignments

- **MOP-CAC Current Calendar** of scheduled topics
  meets 3d Mon. monthly at Planning Dpt., 4th floor. All meetings are open to the public & include time for public comment.

- **MOP-CAC's Resolutions** (Appendix 4 of CAC monthly minutes; these should be posted separately)

- **CAC's supplementary to the Department's Monitoring Report of MOP**
  http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Market_Octavia/CAC/CAC_supplemental_report.pdf

- Market Octavia Impact Fee report
  http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=2161

- Planning Department's *Fifth Year MOP Monitoring Report*

- CAC's *Supplementary Fifth Year MOP Monitoring Report*
  http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Market_Octavia/CAC/CAC_supplemental_report.pdf

- **NCD — Neighborhood Community District**
  Search: http://www.sf-planning.org/Search.aspx?sa.x=9&sa.y=13&sa=Search&cof=FORID%3A11&q=Neighborhood%20Community%20District&cx=018062627758110761831%3Aalpglywsoxu
  NCD-20 by Dan Sayer was mentioned as a model of a superb government report.

- **Parking Nexus Study**
  Search: http://www.sf-planning.org/Search.aspx?sa.x=9&sa.y=13&sa=Search&cof=FORID%3A11&q=nexus%20study&cx=018062627758110761831%3Aalpglywsoxu

- **San Francisco Planning Department website:**
  http://www.sf-planning.org/

- **San Francisco Planning Department's Complete List of Projects & Programs**
  http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2673

- **San Francisco General Plan**
  http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/index.htm

- **San Francisco Historic Preservation**
  http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1825

- **San Francisco Property Information Map**
  http://ec2-50-17-237-182.compute-1.amazonaws.com/PIM/

- **San Francisco Green Connections Plans**
  http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=3002

- **TEP — Transit Effectiveness Project**
  http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2970
  Search: http://www.sf-planning.org/Search.aspx?sa.x=9&sa.y=13&sa=Search&cof=FORID%3A11&q=TEP&cx=018062627758110761831%3Aalpglywsoxu

- ***Transportation Sustainability Program presentation & report***
  Search: http://www.sf-planning.org/Search.aspx?sa.x=9&sa.y=13&sa=Search&cof=FORID%3A11&q=Transportation%20Sustainability%20Program&cx=018062627758110761831%3Aalpglywsoxu

APPENDIX 4
SUMMARY OF ALL MOP-CAC RESOLUTIONS

SUMMARY

Resolution 01	**(20Oct2009):**	**INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS**
Resolution 02	**(24Mch2010):**	**IN-KIND AGREEMENT, COMMISSION POLICY**
Resolution 03	**(25Aug2010):**	**FEES DEFERRAL PROGRAM**
Resolution 04	**(15Dec2010):**	**INCLUSIONARY AFFORDABLE HOUSING (orig: 09/22/10#1)**
Resolution 05	**(22Sep2010#2):**	**HAYES STREET PROJECT INVESTMENT**
Resolution 06	**(14Dec2011#1):**	**CIP: DOLORES INTERSECTIONS AT MARKET & 14TH STREETS**
Resolution 07	**(14Dec2011#2):**	**PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR PLANNING CODE AMENDMENTS**
Resolution 08	**(14Dec2011#3):**	**FINALIZED 2012 M/O CIP RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CAPITAL PLAN**
Resolution 09	**(24Jan2012):**	**FEE DEFERRAL PROGRAM EVALUATION**
Resolution 10	**(22Feb2012):**	**JOHN BILLOVITS COMMENDATION**
Resolution 11	**(19Mar2012):**	**SUPPORT FOR VNBRT EXPEDITED IMPLEMENTATION**
Resolution 12	**(21Mar2012):**	**TSP MITIGATING IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT IN CAC AREAS**
Resolution 13	**(20Aug2012):**	**SUPPORT FOR HOUSING TRUST FUND**

RESOLUTION ABSTACTS

RESOLUTION #1	**2009-10-20#1**
TITLE	**Infrastucture 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 pay10% 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 progam, 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**
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:	**Resolution …**
DATE:	**month DD, YYYY**
EXTRACT:	Resolution #__ (__Mon____) Extract/Summary
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 Progam (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 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]

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 densitities, 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 (± 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