

**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
Wednesday, May 25, 2010; 6:30pm
Regularly scheduled monthly meeting**

Peter Cohen	Carmela Gold
Jason Henderson	Robin Leavitt
Ted Olsson	Dennis Richards
Marius Starkey	Ken Wingard
David Winslow	Kearstin Dischinger (<i>ex officio</i>)

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

SUMMARY

AGENDA (Exhibit 1: Agenda)

1. Call to order and roll call
2. Announcements, upcoming meetings and general housekeeping [discuss]
3. Approval of Minutes for meetings of February 16, March 23, & April 27, 2011 [act]
4. Proposed In-kind Community Improvements Agreement for 2001 Market (Prado) [act]
5. Prep for follow-up Planning Commission hearing on June 2nd for M/O Plan Monitoring CAC Report recommendation [discuss]
6. Pipeline Report—developments in process; CAC project reviews [discuss; act]
7. Inclusionary Housing ‘land dedication’ option for Market/Octavia Area [discuss; act]
8. Area Plan implementation and next steps on 2011 M/O Community Improvements Program Recommendations [discuss]
9. Committee members comments and issues which the Committee may consider in future meetings [discussion]
10. Public Comment
11. Adjournment & announcement of next meeting

NEXT MEETING: WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 2011, 6:30PM, LOCATION 1650 Mission, Rm. 528

(Jan19, Feb23, Mch23, Apr27, May25, Jun22, Jul27, Aug24, Sep28, Oct26, Nov23, Dec28)

NOTE: normal meetings are on the fourth Wednesday of each month (Jan & Feb: exceptions this year)

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

1. Exhibit 1: Agenda [**Dischinger**, distributed at meeting]
2. Exhibit 2: Minutes (Feb. 16 & Apr. 27, 2011) [**Olsson**]
3. Exhibit 3: 2 Dolores Street maps [**Dischinger**]
4. Exhibit 4: Letters re: Dolores Street proposed improvements [**Dischinger**; see end of minutes]
5. Exhibit 5: Pipeline Report [**Dischinger**]

DECISIONS

1. Decision 1: Approved CAC Consensus: items for Department to revise Dolores Street proposal
2. Decision 2: Approved CAC Resolution 25May2011-#1 (Land Dedication for Affordable Housing)

COMMITMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, INFORMATION DUE

#	WHEN	WHO	WHAT
1.	6/2	CAC	Attend Commission hearing on 6/2: Dpt’s response to CAC recommendations.

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

EXHIBIT 1: AGENDA

ROLL CALL (√=present; 0=absent; X=excused)

- √ Peter Cohen (Chair)
- √ Carmela Gold
- √ Jason Henderson (Vice Chair)
- √ Robin Leavitt
- √ Ted Olsson (Secretary)
- √ Dennis Richards
- √ Marius Starkey
- N Ken Wingard
- N David Winslow

Ex Officio Members

- √ Kearstin Dischinger

Others attending:

1. Kate McGee, Planner, SF Planning Dept., (415.558.6367; Kate_McGee@ci.sf.ca.us)
2. Greg Riessen, Planner, SF Planning Dept., (415.575.9023; greg.riessen@sfgov.org)
3. Kelly Kosta, Dolores St. neighbor
4. Taylor Jordan, BergDavis Public Affairs (PR firm for strategic communications representing Buchanan/Market Sts. Development), 150 Post Street, Ste.740, San Francisco, CA 94108; tel, 415.788.1000x200; fax, 415.788.0123; email, tjordan@bergdavis.com.
5. James Rosenfeld, from Eureka Valley Neighborhood Association [did not comment]
6. Menish Champse [sp]
7. Thomas Radulovich, neighbor at 19th and Dolores
8. Peter Tannen, neighbor near 14th and Dolores

A quorum being present, Chairman Cohen opened the meeting at 6:30pm.

2. Announcements, upcoming meetings and general housekeeping [discuss] (CAC)

- 2.1 Leavitt announced that he is a member of the Better Market Street Plan (from the Ferry Building to MOP area) CAC. He attended workshops last night. The MTA is seeking the public's vision about Market Street: what they like, dislike, and what they would like Market Street to become in the future. Their website <<http://www.bettermarketstreetsf.org/>> has information and webinars on the issues. He invited all to explore the website and to participate in the deliberations. Go to the website to sign up for their mailing list.

3. Approval of Minutes from previous meetings [act] (Olsson)

EXHIBIT 2: MINUTES OF APRIL 27, 2011 CAC MEETING [Olsson]

The minutes having been distributed too late to be reviewed, their approval was postponed until the next meeting.

4. Whole Foods development — in-kind approval

EXHIBIT 3: Dolores Street plan and simulation [Dischinger]

EXHIBIT 4: Letters re: Dolores Street proposed improvements [Dischinger];

See end of minutes for the letters from the neighborhood associations; others to be submitted

Following last month's presentation by McGee & Riessen of the Department's plan for the first block of Dolores Street, the CAC asked to postpone its comment on the plan until this next meeting in order to give the neighborhood associations time to consider the plan by hearing McGee and Riessen's presentations and then to inform the CAC of their opinions on the plan. This was done and the CAC received comments from both the MDNA and the DTNA, both recommending that the plan not be adopted without changes.

The Chair first asked for comments:

- **Starkey** was against the proposal for a number of reasons: mainly for constricting the flow of traffic on each side of Dolores to one lane and to further impeding traffic with the bulbouts. Because he lives across the street from the Whole Foods development (and near the 25-35 Dolores one), he is the neighbor and CAC member who will be most acutely affected. Like the MDNA in its letter, he remains skeptical of the traffic report and the simulation presented at the previous meeting. He does believe that the Whole Foods market will cause substantially more problems than are anticipated and than are addressed by this proposal. He likes the sidewalks with additional landscaping but not the bulbouts. He agreed with and referred the CAC to the objections enumerated in the MDNA letter. Because there is not a lot of speeding traffic at the Market Street end of Dolores, he does not believe that the crosswalk across Dolores at Market is a large safety issue. So, he felt that the money could be better spent than on these proposed improvements.
- **Henderson**, recognizing that the plan had a lot of opposition, still thought that it set important precedents and provided some lessons. He too felt that this was not a major traffic street but rather that within the MOP area there were a dozen more important intersections where we could better spend our money. He expressed his opinion that Church Street (supposedly the two blocks on either side of Market Street) should be closed to vehicular traffic. He felt that we cannot comprehend what traffic would be backed up onto other streets. He thought that the left turn lane off Market into a single lane of Dolores and the ability for vehicles entering or exiting the market's parking lot without blocking traffic was useful. He thinks that the intersection of Dolores/Market/Clinton Park needs more discussion. These were his preliminary comments.
- **Richards** having reviewed the priorities that we have spent half year discussing, believed that the moneys could be better spent on other improvements. While he liked some of the plan, he felt that this proposal goes too far. He stated that fixing Church Street is more important. In his opinion this Dolores Street proposal is a solution looking for a problem.
- **Olsson** offered numerous objections to the proposal as points in a resolution he would offer disapproving the plan:
 1. Whole Foods Adapt to Community He suggested that the Department would do well to adopt the physicians' oath of first do no harm. Indeed the best course of action would be not to do anything during the first year of probation and see how the traffic adapts to Whole Foods market. After all, Whole Foods is entering the Mission District and should fit into the community and the typical flow on historic El Camino Real by technology and other means, rather than adapting the historic road and neighborhood to the market. However, Olsson did not feel that the Department's proposal solved the problem caused by the store's parking, but will add to the congestion.
 2. Proposal Map As he and others had noted at last month's meeting, the traffic simulations seemed implausibly light (though Riessen had stated that they were highly conservative and based upon traffic volumes estimated for 2030). However, Olsson particularly objected to the very limited scope of the map, which showed only the Market and Dolores intersection, the first block of Dolores, and the Dolores and Fourteenth St. intersection. He felt that for citizens to be able to understand the implications of the proposed plan, the map should at least show Market Street from the Church and 14th Streets intersection, past Dolores, to the Market Street intersection at Duboce and Buchanan Streets. He felt that this most heavily trafficked corridor of Market Street, with significantly speeding cross traffic and heavy Muni public transit and stops, as well as the heavy traffic from Duboce feeding a left turn lane onto Dolores, which is currently backed up (blocking traffic) could only be further exacerbated if Dolores were constricted to a single lane with bulbouts at the entrance, and with both U-turns and traffic entering a Whole Foods parking lot in the middle of the block.
 3. Congestion Spillover He felt that the easily anticipated congestion caused by the proposal would adversely effect many adjoining streets in the neighborhood and that

eliminating street parking on a street where many neighbors already did not have sufficient parking would only worsen the situation.

4. Deliveries Congestion He disagreed with the Department that the 67 daily deliveries (including two 18-wheelers and numerous heavy duty vans) would merely create a series of “temporary” blockages on Fourteenth Street, which is a designated bicycle path with a heavy volume of traffic crossing from the Haight to get to Harrison. This intersection is currently made the more dangerous for bicyclists because most cars cross Market at Fourteenth in excess of 50mph to beat the lights. To allow this delivery situation without considering the scheduling and routing of the market’s delivery vehicles seemed a recipe for confusion and blockage, if not collisions.
5. Heavy Traffic He disagreed with colleagues that this was a lightly trafficked street: it is the main access to Dolores Park and a major thoroughfare into the western Mission District and into the Noe area. This park is one of the city’s most populous parks throughout the week and especially on weekends, when five blocks of traffic are reduced to a single lane by allowing parking along the median during weekends . This is the real simulation of what to expect daily from the plan’s “road diet”.
6. Reducing Speed He felt that the bulbouts were excessive. If the concern is that pedestrians cannot cross the street quickly enough in the crosswalk, then the timing of the signals should accommodate the pedestrians rather than having them accommodate the cars. While he appreciated the straight crosswalk at Market and Dolores replacing the jagged one, he felt that the bulbout would put more bicyclists at risk from cars on Market Street. A much simpler solution would be to create a raised triangular pedestrian plaza at Dolores, Clinton Park and Market. This would have the effect of slowing traffic entering and exiting Dolores, since drivers exceeding the posted speed and their vehicles would experience a jolt on either side of the plaza. The same solution would work at Dolores and Fourteenth Streets, since bicyclists could more easily adapt to these bumps and fast moving cars would be slowed, adding to the safety of the bicyclists.
7. Extra Wide Sidewalks This first block of Dolores in particular, but all of Dolores to the park currently has some of the widest sidewalks in the city, comparable to downtown Market Street; however the proposal unnecessarily and too expensively doubles this and adds additional palm trees on both sides of the street, in order to allow entering or exiting traffic to pull into the driveway without blocking the flow of either pedestrian or vehicular traffic. It would be better to put the landscaping along the wall of the Whole Foods parking lot.
8. Landmarks Preserved He was grateful that the City conceded that the landmark median of Dolores Street as well as the landmark statue at the entrance could not be legally be modified.
9. Defer to Affected Neighborhood Finally Olsson noted that according to our critique of the Department’s Five Year Monitoring of the MOP Plan, it is the CAC’s official position that we would defer to the concerns of the neighborhood association affected when the CAC was considering any course of action [**citation:** CAC Supplemental Report, p.54, “*However, this CAC recognizes that the opinion of the neighborhood association most affected by any development would have decisive weight—the CAC does not intend to take specific “positions” on specific projects, but rather to monitor trends (e.g., “fee-out”) and potentially comment on aspects of major development proposals that have policy implications for the MOP Area as a whole.*”]. To do otherwise would have one or more neighborhoods opining on matters that do not directly affect their neighbors but do directly effect those in another neighborhood.

• **Leavitt** liked the idea citywide of road diets, constricting traffic to deter the use of automobiles while encouraging pedestrians and bicyclists. He commented that he had attended an MDNA meeting and heard the immediate neighbors’ complaints when the Department presented its proposal. He believes that this first block of Dolores is not heavily trafficked; that the sidewalks are already generous; but that bulbouts were generally good. However, he felt that the bulbout on the west side of Dolores at Market would provide significant problems for bicyclists. He mentioned that he had heard at the MDNA meeting that both developers on this first block of Dolores are not in

favor of the Department's proposal (with the implication that they would not provide them as In-Kind projects) but he did not know if this was accurate. He felt that there might be a difference of opinion on bulbouts by the two developers. He has heard the concerns about not being able to change the historic median and statue; however, he noted that as he drove Highway 101 (originally following El Camino Real), this had been greatly modified; so, he is not sure whether some modifications may be permissible and thinks that the matter should be resolved. While he thinks that some improvements to Fourteenth Street are important, there are others that are more important and a better use of the money: such as, the improvements to Church Street at Market; improvements for bicycle connections; improving the safety of crosswalks along Market Street in this area; and he is concerned about landscaping improvements.

- **Gold** felt that while the Department's study was sensible, the proposal based upon this was insufficient because the Department failed to consider the ramifications of how constricting traffic on Dolores would back up traffic and parking on other streets in the neighborhood; however, she too felt that the traffic was light on Dolores Street and that too much money would be spent for these proposed modifications compared with other sites which would better meet our priorities.
- **Cohen** felt that the traffic was not heavy enough on Dolores to warrant extensive modification. He appreciated shortening the crosswalk across Dolores at Market and across Market at Dolores, by means of bulbouts, allowing pedestrians to more easily cross it in the limited time allowed by the signals set for vehicular traffic flow. These are two priorities which the CAC has commented upon. He also felt that shortening the crosswalk across Dolores at Fourteenth was important. Further, widening the sidewalk was an unnecessary expense. But above all, as an In-Kind CIP done by the developer, he felt that this was not the type of In-Kind CIP that the CAC should support. Having the developer pay the Impact Fees, rather than provide this In-Kind modification, would allow that money to be used more widely and for CIPs which the CAC has already prioritized, such as focused pedestrian improvements.

At this point the Chair called upon the **Department** to answer the CAC's concerns. Riessen began by pointing out that there seem to be two principle objections today about the plan: 1) people do not believe the traffic model (however, he assured us that it was accurate and very conservative and also that this constriction would slow traffic but was not expected to further clog adjacent streets); and 2) that the money could be better spent (the point of In-Kind projects is that the developer in demolishing the area during the project can more cheaply create the improvements during construction than can the city, allowing the City to use its funds for other CIPs). He also explained in reference to a question raised by the MDNA that there had been two fatalities on Dolores (one at 15th St.; the other at 23rd) but none in the area of the proposal. McGee added that she believed that Whole Foods is willing to spend \$1.5m on these proposed modifications. This is our opportunity to get something from the development for their impact upon the neighborhood, which the community and neighbors could benefit from. However, Cohen explained that the MOP-CAC does not feel that these proposed modifications sufficiently meet the priorities of the larger area and that therefore it is more valuable to have the developers contribute Impact Fees that we can use to meet our prioritized CIPs throughout the MOP.

Next the Chair called upon remaining members of the public attending the meeting to voice their opinions about the Department's proposal.

- **Kelly Kosta**, a mother with kids living near the Dolores & Clinton Park intersection, wants the money spent to improve safety at this intersection. She said that the market will attract more traffic, making an already dangerous intersection for kids yet more dangerous. She thought that the Department's simulation of traffic flow was too optimistic. She prefers fewer cars on that block. Kelly was undecided about reducing traffic to a single lane on the west side of Dolores; but she wanted the traffic constricted on east side.

• **Tom Radulovich** said that he was involved in the MOP workshops. He advocated for a larger intersection because the medians were built for older cars and traffic. Because of the oblique angle of the Market/Dolores intersection causing it to be a longer crosswalk, he felt that the bulbouts and median extension would be helpful as a refuge. Widening the sidewalk he felt was useful outside the parking lot but did not address U-turns at the mid-median, and would allow asymmetric traffic for two lanes beside the market but only one lane on the other side, feeding into Market Street. Fourteenth Street's fast, one-way traffic recommends bulbouts on all four corners of its intersection at Dolores to shorten pedestrian crossings and to enhance pedestrian visibility by drivers turning right more slowly from Fourteenth onto Dolores. The bulbout before the crosswalk on Dolores at Clinton Park signals to drivers to slow down because they are now in a pedestrian zone. El Camino Real here is designated as a historic resource. However—alluding to the 1960s version of the movie *Breathless*, showing The Avenue des Champs d'Élysée before it was widened in the 1990s into today's boulevard with broad sidewalks—he suggested that the plan's extravagant sidewalks for one block would be similarly attractive, still keeping its essential characters, even with the median extensions and bulbouts. At the end Richardson predicted that drivers going north on Dolores will make a U-turn at the intersection with Market Street in order to get to the market's parking lot, creating additional congestion.

• **Peter Tannin** identified himself as a retired Transportation Planner who has lived on Fourteenth Street just east of Dolores for 27 years. He liked many elements of the plan but particularly favored the bulbouts, citing that he has almost been killed at that intersection more than once. Drivers proceeding on Dolores intending to turn right onto Fourteenth are often speeding and not looking for pedestrians; so, bulbouts would slow them and make pedestrians more prominent. He felt that congestion spill-over would only occur during peak hours and during the weekends. They respond to congestion by finding another route. Misquoting the plaque at Mission Dolores to state that the mission was the northern terminus of El Camino Real [nb—qualified as: “during the life of Father Junipero Serra”], he felt that there should be no problem in changing the median beyond the mission. He also felt that the bulbout at Market and Dolores would adversely affect bicyclists.

• **Menisch Champse** [spelling?] lives near Radulovich. He thought that the proposal contained a lot of good ideas but he didn't think that this meant that they must all be adopted wholesale. He also liked the idea of bulbouts at all of the corners. He liked the idea of the treatment at Market. He liked the idea of the “road diet”; however, this does not have to be by widening the sidewalk; it could be accomplished by adding a bike lane.

Rejecting the Department's plan for community improvements for 2001 Market Street as proposed, the Chair then led the CAC in creating a consensus of ideas which it felt were meaningful, asking the Planning Department to revise its proposal to meet these suggestions:

1. Corner bulbouts at Market and Dolores Streets and the improved crosswalk at those corners.
2. Center median extension at Dolores and Market (the CAC emphasized that this must be sensitively designed to recognize the historic character of the median area, and should be done with feedback from the local neighborhood).
3. Straightened crosswalk on Market between 2001 Market site and the Safeway site.
4. Curb extension on Market side of the Market and Dolores corner (but CAC emphasized that this should not in any way interfere with the bicycle lane or bicycle travel through that intersection).
5. Raised crosswalk at the entrance to Clinton Park street.
6. Bulbouts on all four corners at Dolores and Fourteenth Streets (the CAC emphasized that the bulbouts on the south side corners should not in any way interfere with the bicycle lane or bicycle travel through that intersection).
7. Sidewalk widening along Dolores between Market and 14th Street, while retaining two full vehicle travel lanes on each side of Dolores (the CAC was not definitively supportive of any sidewalk widening on Dolores, and directed staff to specify the marginal cost difference

for the improvements program with this sidewalk widening element versus retaining the existing curbline).

8. The CAC also directed Planning staff to prepare preliminary cost estimates for the proposed in-kind improvements program. Once a revised proposal is prepared, staff will bring it to either the July or August CAC for further review and potential resolution of support prior to Planning Commission consideration.

This consensus was approved by a majority of the CAC, with Olsson and Starkey of the affected neighborhood rejecting the consensus revisions. The Department is to provide preliminary information to the CAC on these suggestions. The consensus having carried, several members were surprised to learn that the model approved did not include any parking on both sides of Dolores; so, the Department was also asked to provide the marginal cost of eliminating this parking (about 20 spaces on both sides of this first block). Even with the Department's same simulation, Olsson requested that the Department enlarge the map of the proposal area to include the following intersections and all connecting streets: Market at Church and Fourteenth; Market at Duboce and Buchanan; Market and Dolores; and Market and Fourteenth. This is critical for citizens to appreciate the implications and impacts of the proposal. The consensus with these additions were all provided to the Department to revise its proposal and return to the CAC with the revised plan.

6. Pipeline Report [Dischinger]

Before the items on the report, CAC members also mentioned concerns with the following:

- The Hayes (55 Page St.)
- 287-291 Page: seems to have variances
- Exterior Entitlements
- garage insertions to historic buildings—Dischinger will ask Aaron Star to address us on this topic.

6.1 55 Laguna.

They are flipping their 49 BMR units into condos — this worrisome trend is becoming typical for developers in the MOP area.

This development is now calendared on the Planning Commission for a hearing on July 7th. The project is now entitled to a new developer. Members at this hearing should speak about the effects on affordable housing and about the trend of developers to eliminate on-site BMR units, paying in-lieu fees instead.

Henderson agreed that this trend is alarming; however, he felt that this project was unique. The Community Benefit consists of 110 Senior Housing Units, which are not part of the 49 Below Market Rate (BMR) Units. The CAC agreed with several members that it is divisive for a Community Benefit to be pitted against Affordable Housing. Henderson indicated that he has communicated with the Mayor's Office of Housing about this.

Leavitt met with the developer about above-ground and underground parking being unnecessary

Taylor Jordan, from the developer's public affairs firm, at this point asked the CAC not to pass any resolution today as he indicated that he was here to listen to the Committee's comments but would appreciate returning to our June 22nd meeting to address our concerns. He was thanked and invited to address our concerns about this development at our next meeting.

At this point Richards, Jordan, and the rest of the public left the meeting.

7. Inclusionary Housing 'land dedication' option for Market/Octavia Area [discuss; act]

The Chair reordered the agenda to next discuss Agenda Item 7 (Land Dedication for Inclusionary Housing). Cohen reviewed the basis for inclusionary housing. The way it is now, developers are required to pay fees for BMR housing. Instead of this they may provide onsite inclusionary affordable housing commensurate with the size of their project, which is a cheaper alternative. Or they can build a separate affordable housing offsite, as Brian Spears is doing at Franklin and Market. We found that the onsite project and the offsite project options have not worked in the upper Market Street portion of the MOP. Instead, developers are opting to merely pay the fee and leave the city to

provide separate offsite affordable housing. So we are proposing a fourth option. The developer can buy a plot of land and deed it to the city for fixed-price, affordable housing. Since land in this area is so expensive, it is too expensive to compete for land. Prado is willing to be the pilot case for this; however, there had been no option for this. So, in the interim, Cohen, Henderson, and many others including market-rate developers beyond this committee, have been working to design such an option. Essentially this gives the Mayor's Office of Housing the option to review a proposal by developers for such land dedication. Approval is not automatic; the deal must be appropriate for such use: a good piece of land which the Mayor's Office of Housing is willing to accept for this purpose, proposing a formula for the size of the land to be dedicated relative to the size of the development, with minimum size and conditions for the land. It also establishes the procedures for the developer and the environmental clearances for the plot which the developer must pay. Finally this must all be approved by the Planning Commission and the dedication of the land must be approved by the Board of Supervisors, and the CAC is recommended to be part of the approval process. It is recommended that the plot be no more than half a mile (with discretion by the Planning Commission to increase the distance by an additional quarter mile from a planned area's boundaries (e.g., MOP). If the developer changes its mind, it would not reopen the entire use of the development but be limited to the land dedication aspect. We are being asked to endorse the draft with the amendments noted, all of which is to go before the Planning Commission on June 23rd. The CAC meets the day before.

The CAC then voted on the Land Dedication Resolution below.

Henderson proposed the following CAC Resolution seconded by Leavitt:

MOP-CAC Resolution 25May2011-#1

Resolution Supporting Developers' Dedication of Land for Affordable Housing

To be sent to the Commission and Supervisors

The MOP-CAC supports the draft ordinance on Land Dedications dated May 4, 2011 with the addition of revisions as proposed by the Mayor's Office of Housing in its May 25, 2011 memo. This current resolution refers specifically to this CAC's earlier resolution of December 2010 regarding inclusionary housing in the Market/Octavia Plan Area.

Approved by the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee on May 25th 2011

AYES: Cohen, Gold, Henderson, Leavitt, Olsson, Starkey (unanimous)

NAYES: none

ABSTAIN: none

ABSENT: Richards, Wingard, Winslow

MOTION: 2011-4-27

5. Prep for follow-up Planning Commission hearing on June 2nd for M/O Plan Monitoring CAC Report recommendation [discuss]

With that decided the Chair returned to Agenda Item #5 (CAC's Preparation for the Commission's hearing on June 2— this hearing concerns the Department's responses to the CAC's recommendations for the Department's Fifth Year Monitoring Report of the Market/Octavia Plan, submitted to the Commission jointly with that Report at the Commission's hearing on the report). Following upon Olsson's request to Cohen by the CAC of his recollection of the substance of this upcoming hearing, Cohen listened to the audio record of the Commission hearing of the report and the CAC's critique. According to Cohen, this upcoming hearing was to hear the Department's responses to the CAC recommendations and for the CAC to inform the Commission of what we were asking the Commission to do. So, he suggested that we should decide what we want to get out of this hearing and what we think our role should be. What are our expectations? Do we reiterate what changes we think are necessary?

Starkey suggested that Dischinger, in speaking for the Department, should respond to the major points mentioned in the Executive Summary of the CAC critique. Dischinger agreed to respond to the topics listed in this introductory summary. Gold wanted the Department particularly to respond to our policy recommendations— i.e., what they can do to support us and address our concerns about: developer's "feeling out", the trend against inclusionary housing, variances for CU permits in transit-rich areas, and the larger trends which impact the infrastructure of this area, which do not keep up with the developers' projects. What are we asking the Commission to specifically direct the Department to do? Henderson wanted the department to respond to our concerns about CU permits, specifically that they indicate the rationales for variances. Dischinger feels that this CU topic is one area where the Commission can give direction.

Cohen agreed that the Commission does not have enough bandwidth to address all suggestions but that it would therefore be most helpful if the Department could suggest manageable improvements that could be done to improve the process. The CAC, as citizens with common sense but without particular expertise, have suggested a large number of improvements, which the Department can support. Leavitt was concerned about Henderson's idea that with the reductions in Muni service, perhaps we had to consider freezing implementation of the Plan. He noted that neighbors are really angry with the 2-way Haight modification and he is concerned about the capacity of the community to support additional cars on Octavia Boulevard. Perhaps it would be helpful to learn from the MTA the results of their study of transportation issues in the MOP Area. Dischinger mentioned that there will be another talk at the MTA office at VanNess and Market on the Muni 2-way modification.

Cohen added that if there are other agencies which should be invited to this hearing to address the problems affecting the MOP Area, then Dischinger should also invite them to appear with the Department to address the Commission, so that they gain a comprehensive perspective on the problems affecting the area and how the infrastructure is not even keeping up with the pace of development. Cohen suggested that Dischinger's remarks should also cover: 1) the modifying criteria in the CIP program; and 2) our recommendations for future monitoring reports on the MOP plan and area, particularly as they would be incorporated into the Department's next annual report on the area.

Olsson was concerned that the Department does not pay sufficient attention to trends affecting the plan area and the city at large, nor how the Plan must be thereafter adapted to these changing conditions. Cohen also suggested that Dischinger's response primarily should be focused on actionable items in the CAC's critique. Above all, Gold wished Dischinger's report: 1) to be pragmatic; 2) to deal with solutions efficiently and economically; and 3) to address the most important general issues. Dischinger expected that the CAC as a body would not be called upon during this hearing to comment upon her report but that any of us could comment as individuals for three minutes each. We will ask to be last item on their June 2 agenda but it appeared that few of the CAC would be able to attend the hearing to listen to Dischinger's response on behalf of the Department.

9 Committee members comments and issues which the Committee may consider in future meetings [discussion]: NONE

10. Public Comment: No further comment beyond what was mentioned on Dolores Street plan.

11. Adjournment & announcement of next meeting

There being no further business and the time having expired, the meeting adjourned at 8:35pm

NEXT MEETING: WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 2010, 6:30PM, PLANNING DEPARTMENT, RM.400.

CAC Meetings: (Fourth Wednesday monthly, City Hall, Rm 278, 6:30-8:30pm)

2011 Calendar: 1/19, 2/16, 3/16, 4/20, 5/18, 6/15, 7/20, 8/17, 9/21, 10/19, 11/16, 12/21

Respectfully submitted,
~TED OLSSON, Secretary

EXHIBITS FROM NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATIONS ON DOLORES STREET PROPOSAL**1. Exhibit 4A: MDNA LETTER** [transcribed]

Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association
72 Landers Street, San Francisco, CA 94114; Ph: 415.863.3950
URL: www.missiondna.org; Email: missiondna@earthlink.net

20 May 2011

Department of City Planning
 1640 Mission Street, 4th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94102
 Attn: Kate McGee

Dear Ms McGee:

Thank you for coming to the board meeting of the Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association on May 11th. At your request, we are writing to convey our position (already presented to you at that meeting, and in various communications before that) on the proposal to narrow Dolores Street to one lane in each direction between Market and 14th.

We continue to oppose your proposal. We feel that the reduction to a single lane is totally inappropriate for Dolores Street because it will create a bottleneck at the gateway of our historic neighborhood and therefore cause additional congestion. We also feel that it would downgrade Dolores Street as a historic resource, since the streetscape is part of El Camino Real, California State Landmark #784. We'll clarify our position below.

1. Inappropriate Treatment of an Historic Resource:
 - a. The changes proposed are not in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Rehabilitation Guidelines for Cultural Landscapes, which lists as "recommended" treatment "... controlling and limiting new curb cuts, driveways and intersections along a historic road." Among the treatments the Guidelines do NOT recommend is "Placing a new feature where it may cause damage, or is incompatible with the historic circulation. For example, adding new driveways, intersections, and 'neck outs' along an historic road."
 - b. The space along Dolores is part of its significance. Among the treatments that the Standards do recommend is "Retaining the historic relationships between the landscape and its buildings, structure, furnishing and objects." The current proposed changes to the street alignment would be counter to this recommendation.
 - c. As for widening the sidewalks and creating bulbouts, please note that the sidewalks are already huge. So, there's plenty of room for Whole Food Stores to create an outside dining area for their customers.
 - d. We're pleased that the Planning Department is no longer considering extending the Dolores Street median into Market Street, since it would improperly alter a landmark that deserves to be preserved.
2. Practical Difficulties with Traffic
 - a. We feel the proposed change would exacerbate congestion at the future Whole Foods parking entrance, which could easily back up onto Market Street.
 - b. The notion that customers queuing can be prevented by imposing penalties on the store for failing to mediate the problem is unworkable, and is unlikely to be enforced in any manner that would alleviate the problem.
 - c. The notion of charging customers to park in the store's parking garage will only create more congestion as people look for other places to park.
 - d. The reduction to one lane will encourage people to take alternate routes such as 14th Street going east, Landers Street (one-way going into 14th Street, 15th Street (a popular commuting route), as well as others. These streets are already

overused and are safety hazards to navigate. Please note that cars often speed down 14th Street coming off Market. This change will make an already dangerous situation worse, especially to the bike lane on the right side of the street.

We'd therefore suggest that the project sponsors instead provide a fund for reconditioning, restoring, and repairing the median and its deteriorating curbs, and provide some appropriate landscaping for the sidewalks.

As a compromise to the bulbouts, we'd suggest creating only one at the corner of Dolores and Market as long as it's reversible in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Resources. Furthermore, we'd like a minimum reduction of on-street parking spaces, since the lack of parking continues to be a serious problem in the Mission Dolores Neighborhood.

In conclusion, please stop asking other neighborhood groups within the Market Octavia Plan to take positions within the Mission Dolores Neighborhood or in any neighborhood other than their own. After all, the participants of the Upper Market Workshop clearly voted that they didn't consider Upper Market to be a neighborhood and asked that the solidarity of their neighborhoods be respected.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
[signed]
Lucia Bogotay and Peter Lewis, Co-Presidents

2. Exhibit 4B: DTNA LETTER

Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association
2261 Market Street, PMB 301, San Francisco, CA 94114
(415) 295-1530 / www.dtna.org

May 20, 2011

Kearstin Dischinger, Market/Octavia CAC staff
San Francisco Planning Department
1660 Mission Street, 5th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94103

RE: 2001 Market Street proposed in-kind community improvements

Dear Ms. Dischinger:

We appreciate that the Planning Department and the Market/Octavia Community Advisory Committee have solicited our response to this initial in-kind community improvements proposal. As you know, DTNA supported the 2001 Market Street project at its entitlements approval and was very actively engaged with the project sponsor Prado Group and department staff throughout the project review process.

DTNA does not support the full scope of work proposed in the draft conceptual plan. Specifically, the sidewalk widening of the entire block length and reducing the roadway to single vehicles is unwarranted. The scale of these "improvements" far exceeds anything identified in the Market/Octavia Community Improvements Program nor is this called out in the Community Advisory Committee's priority projects.

What we do support as a more frugal and beneficial scope of in-kind community improvements for the 2001 Market Street project is:

- Corner pedestrian bulbouts and crosswalk improvement at Dolores and Market
- Crosswalk realignment across Market and paving treatment for improved visibility
- Corner pedestrian bulbouts at Dolores and 14th (the median extension seems unnecessary)

This is also consistent with our understanding of the CAC's initial direction to the department staff a few months ago.

We look forward to continuing to work with the project sponsor and Planning staff to shape an in-kind community improvements proposal for the 2001 Market Street development.

Sincerely,

[signed]

Betty Levitin, co-chair Land Use Committee
Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association

Cc: Prado Group, project sponsor
John Rahaim, Planning Director
Peter Lewis, MDNA
Jason Henderson, HVNA

3. Exhibit 4C: other letters from neighbors

MOP-CAC
Attendance
 4th Wednesday monthly

Legend

Y = attended

N = unexcused absence

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

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

<u>CAC Member</u>	<u>1/19*</u>	<u>2/16*</u>	<u>3/23</u>	<u>4/27</u>	<u>5/26</u>	<u>6/22</u>	<u>7/27</u>	<u>8/24</u>	<u>9/28</u>	<u>10/26</u>	<u>11/23</u>	<u>12/28</u>
Peter Cohen	Y	Y	Y/Q	X	Y							
Carmela Gold	X	Y	N	Y	Y							
Jason Henderson	Y	Y	Y/Q	Y	Y							
Robin Leavitt	Y	Y	Y/Q	Y	Y							
Ted Olsson	Y	Y	Y/Q	Y	Y							
Dennis Richard	Y	N	N	Y	Y							
Marius Starkey	Y	N	N	Y	Y							
Ken Wingard	Y	N	N	N	N							
David Winslow	Y	N	N	Y	N							
<u>Ex Officio</u>												
Kearstin Dischinger	Y	Y	Y/Q	Y	Y							

* Jan & Feb meetings held monthly on third Wednesday.

MOP-CAC
2011 Draft Schedule of meeting Topics
(as of 23 FEB 2010)

2010 SCHEDULE OF TOPICS — THE 2011 SCHEDULE IS YET TO BE DEFINED

January 19

February 22

- Working session on CIP evaluation and prioritization
 - Explanations and updates on CIP Appendix C projects list
 - Projects evaluation and individual scoring
 - Review and discuss preliminary scoring results
 - Prep for next meeting: finalize 1st year CIP recommendations of projects and process

March 24

- Finalize 1st year program recommendations and text defining continuing refinement of the process
- Monitor and report; overview and discussion

April 24

- Neighborhood Planning and MEA staff presentations and discussions
- Discussion of Monitor Report by key topics of interest

May 28

- Review draft Monitor Report and potential action
- Review CAC draft section of Monitor Report; potential action

June 23

- IPIC presentation and discussion with CAC
- Discuss a process to continually refine and augment Appendix C's list of potential CIPs

July 28

- Finalize proposed process — potential action

August 25

- Implement Appendix C process
- Discuss MOP Fund expenditure categories; potential action
- Discuss additional funding sources for CIPs

September 22

- Update CAC CIP recommendations

October 27 **CANCELLED: Lack of Quorum**

- Finalize 2011 CAC CIP recommendations; potential action

November 24 Postponed to **November 29**: to avoid Thanksgiving holidays

- As needed; potential action to finalize 2011 CAC recommendations

December 22 Moved up to **December 15** to avoid Holidays

- Approve revised CAC Supplementary report.
- Send resolution to CAC Audiences

**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 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.

- Parking Nexus Study
- TEP
- NCD-20 (Neighborhood Community District) by Dan Sayer (model of superb government report)
- In-Kind policy
- Department's 5-year Monitoring Report of MOP
- CAC's supplementary to the Department's Monitoring Report of MOP
- List of CAC's Resolutions
- Planning Department's *Fifth Year MOP Monitoring Report*
- CAC's *Supplementary Fifth Year MOP Monitoring Report*