

**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>

**4<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room  
Planning Dept., 1650 Mission Street  
Wednesday, April 16, 2012; 6:30pm  
Regularly scheduled monthly meeting**

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

*The Agenda & Minutes of all community meetings, a matter of public record, are available at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 4<sup>th</sup> 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 November 2011, December 2011, February 2012, and March 2012 regular meetings [act]
4. Update by Planning Staff on impact for fee deferral program [discuss; act]
5. Transportation Sustainability Program discussion [discuss; act]
6. Review of CAC bylaws, member roles and responsibilities [discuss]
7. CAC goals and schedule for 2012 [discuss]
8. Development Pipeline Report—Developments in process; CAC project reviews [discuss; act]
  - current month's cases
  - potential projects for CAC review
9. Legislation/policy Pipeline Report—Legislation & Planning Commission issues in process [discuss]
10. Committee members comments & issues the Committee may consider in future meetings [discuss]
11. Public Comment
12. Adjournment & announcement of next meeting

**NEXT MEETING: MONDAY, MAY 21, 2011, 6:30PM AT 1650 Mission, Rm. 400**

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

All meetings are on the **THIRD MONDAY, 6:30pm MONTHLY** (Jan & Feb: exceptions this year)

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

- Exhibit 1: Agenda (**Henderson**, distributed at meeting)  
 Exhibit 2: Minutes: Dec'11 approved/revised (**Olsson**)  
 Exhibit 3: Transportation Sustainability Program (**Staff**)  
 Exhibit 4: Development Pipeline Report (**Staff**)  
 Exhibit 5: Legislation Pipeline Report (**Staff**): none submitted

**DECISIONS**

- Decision 1: CAC accepted that there are NO November minutes (tech glitch; notes missing).  
 Decision 2: Tabled to next meeting: bylaws review; commitments; 2012 Goals & Schedule. [Appx.2]

**COMMITMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, INFORMATION DUE**

#	WHEN	WHO	WHAT
1.	04/23	JH	Present our concerns about TSP fee transfer and fee deferral to Board of Supervisors and Commissioners
2.	05/21	JH,KS	Plan bylaws review, commitments, 2012 goals & schedule (see Appx.2)
3.	05/01	KD	Send all members the CAC bylaws
4.	95/21	CAC	Invite TA & MTA spokespersons on how they modelled their goals.
5.	0521	Staff	Explain on our website density standards and effect upon MOP, now & future
6.	05/21	CAC	Solicit CIP proposals from public from website & from neighborhood assocs.
7.	05/01	Staff	Provide CAC preliminary timeline for any decisions effecting MOP area in 2012
8.	05/21	CAC	Address lack of middle-income housing in our area and city in general.
9.	05/21	CAC	Invite Plng.Cmss. sec. to discuss their annual schedule as it effects MOP area.
10.	05/21	CAC	Create history of changes in MOP since CAC began & these effects.
11.	05/14	Staff/CAC	Staff monthly send updates, agenda, exhibits, invites; CAC members respond.
12.	05/21	CAC	Schedule disposing of these topics in future meetings:

Topics to schedule for future meetings

- Create 2012 prioritized CIPs (including those recommended by public)
- CAC solicit CIP proposals from public
- 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)

**MINUTES****LEGEND**

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

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

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

CAC members

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

Ex Officio Members

- √ Kearstin Dischinger, staff liaison; Planner, Citywide Policy, SF Plng.Dept.; 415.558.6284  
Kearstin.Dischinger@sfgov.org
- √ Alexis Smith, staff liaison; Planner/Urban Designer, SF Plng.Dept.; 415.558.6409;  
Alexis.Smith@sfgov.org

Others attending:     **none**

- 1.
- 2.

The Chair opened the meeting at 6:30pm with announcements and matters that did not require action by the committee.

**2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, UPCOMING MEETINGS, GENERAL HOUSEKEEPING**

- 2.1 The Central Freeway presentation made to us recently has been updated for its presentation before the BOS Finance Committee

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS—Nov'11, Dec'11, Feb'12, Mch'12 [act]****EXHIBIT 2: REVISED AND APPROVED DECEMBER 2011 MINUTES.**1) November 2011

As the Secretary has explained at every meeting since December 2011, there are no minutes for the November 2011 meeting. His notes were lost through a technical failure. At every meeting since then, he has offered to create a set of minutes from any other member's notes; however, no one has offered any notes; so there remain no minutes.

2) December 2011

The minutes of the December meeting were approved as corrected: only the first resolution of that meeting was revised (below). This first resolution incorporates Richards' 14<sup>th</sup>/Dolores condition but is reduced to the essential resolution voted upon, by deleting a subsequently proposed preamble and expanded resolution clauses. At the end of the discussion, Dischinger mentioned that most resolutions from other CACs are succinct and contain only the specific action; whereas some of ours have many introductory Whereas paragraphs followed by multiple paragraphs of resolutions. On a motion by Henderson, seconded by Olsson, the December minutes were approved as corrected with Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson and Wingard in favor; with Richards (absence) and both Simmons and Vasquez (not on board at that time) abstaining.

The December minutes are attached to this email distribution. However, since only the first of these three resolutions were discussed and revised at our April meeting, only it is listed here as it was approved:

**1. Proposed In-kind community improvements Agreement for 2001 Market (Prado project) [discussion and action item]**

**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/14<sup>th</sup> 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.

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

**MOTION:** Leavitt  
**SECOND:** Wingard  
**AYE:** Henderson, Leavitt, Wingard  
**NO:** Olsson, Starkey  
**ABSENT:** Gold  
**ABSTAIN:** Cohen, Richards

**MOTION:** 2011-12-14#1

- 3) January 2012  
These minutes having been previously approved were approved yet again.
- 4) February 2012  
These minutes were also approved again.
- 5) March 2012  
These minutes were not presented at tonight's meeting.

**4. UPDATE BY STAFF ON IMPACT FOR FEE DEFERRAL PROGRAM [discuss; act]**

The hearing on fee deferral was not held as planned and has been postponed until April 23<sup>rd</sup>. No action has been taken on this at the BOS. Dischinger and Smith offered no comment on the topic. Cohen reported that this proposal has the strong backing of the Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD). Chairman Henderson will attend the postponed hearing to provide the committee with our perspective on this issue.

**COMMITMENT:** *Chair will attend Fee Deferral hearing at Board of Supervisors meeting to present CAC perspective on this issue and on effect of fee deferral upon MOP and CAC's responsibilities.*

**5. TRANSPORTATION SUSTAINABILITY PROGRAM (TSP)**

**EXHIBIT 3: TRANSPORTATION SUSTAINABILITY PROGRAM**

Dischinger having been working with the MTA on this program helped answer our committee's questions. The question before us was whether we should recommend that \$3 of our MOP fees be diverted to the TSP for the benefit of the city at the expense of our MOP area. Put another way, since this TSP will incorporate our Community Improvement Program (CIP) fees, how much could this CAC expect to retain to create improvements within our area to anticipate and offset the impacts of high density developments in our area — i.e., the purpose of the CIP program and of our CAC?

Dischinger explained the general idea of the TSP: at once we can collect the money from developers and do improvements to transportation in all areas of the city, which should benefit our residents. In her expert opinion, many of the projects that our CAC might propose would not pass the test of traffic congestion improvement. Any project has to pass this threshold to gain confirmation. The TSP is designed to pool all proposals into a citywide transportation program.

At this point Henderson's concern, when looking at all rapid transit bus routes, is that if the MOP bears the brunt of funding all these rapid transit routes for the benefit of others, can we write language into the law so that some of our Bus Rapid Transit plans get priority. He noted that the TSP will have a lot of West-side transit, not on the list. He reminded all that the purpose behind the CIP developer fees was that the area which bears the impact of the development would receive the fees to offset that impact by anticipating it with improvements which could mitigate the effect of the development. His concern was that these fees — specifically, our CIP fee, included as part of the TSP fee — no longer offset the impact in these areas now [nor is anything proposed that would compensate for this]. And with the passage of TSP there will be no appetite among citizens for developers to pay additional fees for CIPs when money will go to other improvements. This matter will be heavily studied during this year as the TSP proposal comes up for Environmental Review.

It was stated that the Planning Department will determine where the monies are invested, since they have the responsibility to implement CEQA. Currently the Van Ness BRT is bogged down between MTA and TA. Dischinger does not know any specifics about Potrero. She did state that every five years the CEQA and Traffic mitigation study will be revised and reviewed. They are still looking at how the MTA plans are consistent with CEQA.

Olsson stated that the City's Transit First policy is designed to significantly increase the population density around selected corridors and that we certainly observe this in every plan that our committee reviews. However, he wondered, has the city any limits to such density? The RTO standard of one person per 650 sq.ft. was cited. Have city planners adequately considered the impact of such densities upon existing neighbors when most buildings along these corridors are forced to these limits? At the very least the Department should fully explain to all neighborhoods and on our website what such densities entail and what to expect. He said that we are primarily concerned with CIPs to mitigate this impact of densification but wondered whether this was sufficient. Certainly the impact of these densities and the anticipatory CIPs were something which he felt could not be traded away. Perhaps those in other parts of the city benefitting from these transit improvements should pay the full fee and those bearing the brunt of the actual density be excused from paying the fee. So, the question before the committee was: do we as the MOP-CAC want to weigh in on the discontinuance of the area transit fee?

***COMMITMENT: On our website the Department should explain to the neighbors/neighborhoods the standards for density in the MOP area and the implications of these densities upon neighbors now and in the future.***

Cohen recommended that by a resolution we state that we do not approve our portion of the TSE fees going to other areas (nevertheless, no resolution was proposed nor approved at this meeting). Henderson proposed that we take their list of bus routes and observe that many of our improvements are not in their transit plans, TEP. The consensus was that all fees which would have come to us originally should stay in our plan area, if they must go to the TSP. We appreciate that the **TEP (Transit Effectiveness Program)**: how to fix what we currently have; not future oriented) and **TSP (Transit Sustainability Program)**: focused on future integrated and coherent transit) are both huge efforts. Further, there are things in the MOP that are in neither the TEP nor TSP. We recognize that we will be still participating in the fee program for the next three years. The TSP will take the transportation portion of our MOP fees and put them into a larger fund to benefit this citywide program. Therefore, we should review our own MOP-prioritized transit CIPs to determine which are/are not TEP-/TSP-oriented. It was noted that this will become a very expensive program because it involves extending electric wires into Mission Bay. With the TEP serving the current population and the TSP, future densities, currently only 17% of San Franciscans use public transit; the goal of both programs is to raise this to 30%.

It was recommended and agreed that we should have Elizabeth Salk of the TA explain to us how they modeled their goals; subsequently we should ask MTA to address us on the same topic.

Richards recalled that last year someone from TA explained how congestion pricing works. Perhaps we need a refresher on this perspective.

**COMMITMENT: TA and MTA spokespersons should be invited to our meeting to explain how they modeled their goals.**

Cohen summarized our discussion. We need to know the source of the money and where/how the money is proposed to be spent. We must recognize that these dollars will be redirected by others. We need to review our Transportation CIPs. We should influence the spending of this impact fee. As our latest prioritized CIPs were flashed on the screen, he asked us to review our CAC recommended transportation expenditures for the next five years. Olsson reminded all that this presumed that the developers were paying their fees into our fund up front; however, the deferral has decimated our budget.

Henderson favored putting all fees into the bus system, since at least this still benefitted our plan area. However, he noted that the MTA's CIPs for transportation do not significantly improve solutions for pedestrians in our area.

A quick calculation suggested that at \$3/sf \* 5 years = ~30% over 15 years = ~\$15m. Cohen wanted to see what this deducted amount could have funded among our original proposed CIPs, while acknowledging that the ultimate decision is out of our hands and will be made by others. The previous CAC distribution ratio was: Residential (22.2%) : Transportation (20.1%). None of the projects for which we had planned would be effected by this, since approved projects recommend where to get their own funding. Here is another way of looking at this: What could we do with 22.2% of \$73m? Must such CIPs be transit-specific? If so, could we dedicate this to Muni stations?

Trying to provide perspective on the purpose of citywide program, Dischinger explained that this is a good deal for us, though we would lose our current ability to make decisions. She also pointed out that most of our most important projects are Pedestrian ones, by which we could complement the Transit ones decided by others from a broader citywide-perspective. The new Market/Octavia fee for existing Residential developments is \$9.57/sf; the TSP, \$7.46/sf; we lose \$3.42/sf. The new MO fee for Commercial = \$3.62/sf; the TSP = \$3.62/sf. It was recommended that we review our own Appendix C (listing our prioritized CIPs) to see what matches and how they are prioritized. We should also review our Pedestrian CIPs.

Henderson concluded the discussion by saying that he is enthusiastic about the **Transit Sustainability Program (TSP)** and discontinuing the **Level of Service (LOS)**. To benefit the city as a whole, our communities have agreed to accept growth.

## 6. REVIEW OF MOP-CAC BYLAWS, MEMBER ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Henderson said that he and Singa met as Chair and Vice-Chair. She wanted to know more about the bylaws and the roles of each member. Unfortunately she was not able to attend this evening because of a commitment prior to her joining the CAC. Reminding all that our bylaws are posted on our website, having been approved at our second meeting, Dischinger stated that essentially there are three goals and three responsibilities. She also recommended that the CAC review and revise as necessary the bylaws annually. She will send each member of the CAC the bylaws for us to review. With that the topic was tabled until the next meeting when Singa could join us.

**COMMITMENT: Staff will send current bylaws to all CAC members for review.**

**COMMITMENT: Chair/ViceChair will prepare and conduct annual review of bylaws, members' commitments/assignments (roles & responsibilities), and CAC's 2012 goals and scheduled items for meetings.**

## 7. CAC's 2012 GOALS AND SCHEDULE

**See Appendix 2, the list in Item #8, and Decision 2 in the Summary § of this meeting**

Similarly this topic was tabled until the next meeting when it was hoped that the full committee could attend to discuss these critical topics.

## 8. DEVELOPMENT PIPELINE REPORT

**EXHIBIT 4: DEVELOPMENT PIPELINE REPORT: received without comment**

## 9. LEGISLATION/POLICY PIPELINE REPORT

### EXHIBIT 5: LEGISLATION PIPELINE REPORT: none submitted nor discussed

Although no reports were submitted nor discussed in detail, a vigorous discussion was held by the committee as to what we needed to schedule and attend to this year in a timely fashion. See the list or recommendations which follows at the end of this section, collected in the meeting summary and in Appendix 2.

Richards reminded us that we should review our Supplement to last year's Planning Department Five Year Review of the Market Octavia Plan. We need to draft an annual review to be submitted at the end of the year. He wanted to be sure that we schedule sufficient time to do this and that this is coordinated with the Department, so that we can receive their annual report in order to comment upon it. He wondered whether there were any other data points from other city agencies that we should refer to for perspective, such as The Housing Inventory or the Commerce and Inventory Report.

Simmons wondered if there is any schedule listing all major decisions enroute to approval of our \$3 fee moving to the TSP. He only wants a high-level timeline to keep this in perspective. Another aspect was preparing for a hearing on the EIR for the TSP. We should schedule to review this so that we can be prepared to participate before the Commissioners. Dischinger added that the EIR is funded. We also need to decide on our CIP recommendations for this year, including any submitted by the public (NOTE: this is the time to promote such submissions on our website and to solicit from our neighborhood associations such CIP proposals). The Department will provide us with a preliminary timeline of decisions for 2012 on any and all topics which effect our MOP-CAC and upon which we may need to comment; so that we will have plenty of time to prepare and discuss these issues.

***COMMITMENT: Staff will provide CAC with list of principal city agencies, departments, and offices affecting our area and decisions as well as a timeline of when we must respond to these with our input regarding MOP on which they are making decisions.***

It was noted that the City's Legislative Analyst did an analysis of Transit Oriented Housing and a possible disconnect between it and some of the city's other goals. In particular it was suggested that we should address the severe problem in our area (and elsewhere in the city) of the lack of middle-income housing.

Another topic to be reviewed and revised was that of Conditional Use (CU) Parking Permits and stricter requirements. Are high transit areas receiving more CUs? We should consult with EN CAC. Note: such collaboration is easier now that both CACs meet at the same date and time at the Department.

The Chair and ViceChair have discussed mapping out a legislative pipeline for us to schedule. It was suggested that perhaps Dischinger could present our CAC with an overview of the legislative process (see last week's planning packet). It was also suggested that we might invite Ann Marie, the secretary to the Planning Commission, to report on what comes before the commissioners. Note that the Legislative Pipeline Report for the last two months has been added as a standing agenda item, so that we now consider this monthly. This should help us pragmatically focus to make our meetings more effective.

Richard's focused our discussion asking for our CAC to learn and study what has changed since our CAC began. This would be a useful historical perspective for new members on our committee this year.

#### Topics to be scheduled onto CAC calendar

- TSP: deduct part of MOP's developer impact fee
- Fee Deferral Extension
- MOP Annual Report: review this year's Dpt. review & revise last year's CAC Supplement
- Create history of what has changed since CAC began & effect of these changes
- Historic Survey Update (where are we with this).
- Housing Inventory
- Commerce & Industry Report
- Parking
- CAC solicit CIP proposals from public

- Address lack of middle-income housing in MOP area and in city in general
- Invite Plng.Cmss. sec. to discuss their 2012 schedule as it effects our MOP area & CAC.

**10. COMMITTEE MEMBERS' COMMENTS & ISSUES: none**

**11. PUBLIC COMMENT: no public attending, there were none**

**12. ADJOURNMENT**

Before adjourning, staff said that they would email the update, agenda & exhibits to us every month on the week before our meeting. They will send us an invitation, our accepting which will help them anticipate attendance.

***COMMITMENT: Staff will notify CAC members one week before meeting with updates, agenda, exhibits, and invite. CAC members must respond to advise if they will attend.***

The meeting adjourned at 8:28pm

**NEXT MEETING: MONDAY, MAY 21, 2012, 6:30PM, PLANNING DEPARTMENT, RM.400.**

CAC Meetings: (*Third Monday monthly, Planning Department, Rm 400, 6:30-8:30pm*)  
2012 Calendar: 1/25, 2/22, 3/19, 4/16, 5/21, 6/18, 7/16, 8/20, 9/17, 10/15, 11/19, 12/17

Respectfully submitted,  
~TED OLSSON, Secretary  
Market/Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee

**APPENDIX 1**  
**MOP-CAC**  
**Attendance**  
3<sup>rd</sup> Monday monthly

Legend

Y = attended

N = unexcused absence

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

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

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

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

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

**APPENDIX 2**  
**MOP-CAC**  
**2012 Schedule of meeting Topics**  
**Annotated by meeting: Planned Items; Unique Agenda Items; Decisions**  
(as of 16 APRIL 2012)

**PURPOSE:** The purpose of this appendix is to provide a quick and easy overview of the CAC's 2012 schedule of monthly meetings, annotated after each meeting with the annual planned items, the unique agenda items for that meeting, and both the decisions and commitments resulting from that meeting. It lists the principal San Francisco offices and agencies which effect the CAC's decisions and the MOP-area as well as a timeline showing all deadlines and other dates which constrain this committee.

**OFFICES/DEPARTMENTS/AGENCIES/COMMISSIONS**

List of all SF government organizations with any effect upon MOP and CAC.

<b>IPIC</b>	Interagency Plan Implementation Committee. This coordinating committee consists of the following principal official departments which effect our area and our committee's role. The IPIC and its constituent organizations independently and together constrain CAC.
<b>PLANNING</b>	Planning Department and its Commission
<b>DPW</b>	Department of Public Works and its Commission
<b>RPD</b>	Recreation and Parks Department and its Commission
<b>MTA</b>	Metropolitan Transit Authority and its Commission
<b>TA</b>	San Francisco County Transit Authority and its Commission (the Board of Supervisor)
<b>OEWD</b>	The Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development

**TIMELINE** Deadlines and other dates on which these official organs decide issues which effect the MOP area and the CAC's own decisions. In particular, these are dates before which the CAC must express itself to effect their decisions upon our area.

January

February

March

April

May

June

July

August

September

October

November

December

**2012 CAC MEETINGS**

Planned/Agendized Topics plus  
Annotated Decisions/Commitments resulting from the Meeting  
**THE 2012 SCHEDULE IS YET TO BE DEFINED**

**January 24**Agenda

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

Decisions

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

Commitments

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

**February 22**Agenda

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

Decisions

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

Commitments

- Prepare for election of 2012 CAC officers

**March 19**Agenda

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

Decisions

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

Commitments

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

**April 16**Agenda

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

Decisions

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

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

Commitments

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

Topics to schedule for future meetings

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

**TO BE SCHEDULED FOR 2012**

2012 Calendar: 1/25, 2/22, 3/19, 4/16, 5/21, 6/18, 7/16, 8/20, 9/17, 10/15, 11/19, 12/17

**May 21**

Scheduled

Agenda

Decisions

Commitments

**June 18**

Scheduled

Agenda

Decisions

Commitments

**July 16**

Scheduled

Agenda

Decisions

Commitments

**August 20**

Scheduled

Agenda

Decisions

**September 17**

Scheduled

Agenda

Decisions

**October 15**

Scheduled

Agenda

Decisions

**November 19**

Scheduled

Agenda

Decisions

**December 17**

Scheduled

Agenda

Decisions

**APPENDIX 3  
LIST OF RELEVANT DOCUMENTS  
TO BE INCLUDED ON MOP-CAC WEBSITE  
(other than Exhibits, unless cross-referenced\_**

**<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1700>**

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

- **Community Improvement Plan (Capital Projects)**  
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2893>
- **Better Neighborhood Plans (including MOP)**  
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1699>
- **Eastern Neighborhoods**  
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1673>
- **Eastern Neighborhoods — CAC (Citizens Advisory Committee)**  
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2224>
- **In-Kind Policy**  
Search: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Search.aspx?sa.x=9&sa.y=13&sa=Search&cof=FORID%3A11&q=in-kind%20policy&cx=018062627758110761831%3Aalpglywsoxu>  
+ Application packet for In-Kind Policy: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8601>
- **IPIC 2012 Annual Report [including section on MOP]**  
[http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Market\\_Octavia/CAC/Interagency\\_Plan\\_Implementation\\_Committee\\_Annual\\_Report.pdf](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., 4<sup>th</sup> 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](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](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](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**

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

**RESOLUTION ABSTRACTS**

<b>RESOLUTION #1</b>	<b>2009-10-20#1</b>
<b>TITLE</b>	<b>Infrastructure Finance Recommendations</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>October 20, 2009</b>
<b>SUMMARY:</b>	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.
<b>MOVED/SECOND:</b>	Moved by Richards, seconded by Levitt
<b>YES (unanimous):</b>	Brinkman, Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards, Villiers
<b>NO:</b>	none
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	none
<b>ABSENT:</b>	none
<b>RESOLUTION #2:</b>	<b>2010-03-24#1</b>
<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>In-Kind Policy</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>March 24, 2010</b>
<b>SUMMARY:</b>	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.
<b>MOVED/SECOND:</b>	Moved by Henderson; Seconded by Levitt
<b>YES:</b>	Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards
<b>NO:</b>	none
<b>ABSTAIN:</b>	none
<b>ABSENT:</b>	Brinkman, Gold, Starkey, Wingard
<b>RESOLUTION #3:</b>	<b>2010-08-25#1</b>
<b>TITLE:</b>	<b>Fees Deferral Program</b>
<b>DATE:</b>	<b>August 25, 2010</b>
<b>SUMMARY:</b>	Support of temporary fee deferral program for developers, requiring them to pay 10% up front; 90% deferral until occupancy. Creates Community Infrastructure Fund, initially capitalized at \$3-5m, to pay for preliminary design, planning, and engineering of "shovel-ready" priority improvement projects. Authorized only for CAC prioritized CIPs. Inclusionary housing of in-lieu payment is not subject to this deferral. This deferral expires in 3 years.
<b>MOVED/SECOND:</b>	Moved by Henderson; Seconded by Levitt
<b>YES (unanimous):</b>	Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards
<b>NO:</b>	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/14<sup>th</sup> Street improvements be those of the November 2011 schematic; the Market/Dolores Street crosswalk and associated improvements shall not be included in this improvements program.  
**MOVED/SECOND:** Moved by Levitt; Seconded by Wingard  
**YES:** Henderson, Levitt, Wingard  
**NO:** Olsson, Starkey  
**ABSTAIN:** Cohen, Richards  
**ABSENT:** Gold

**RESOLUTION #7:** **2011-12-14#2**  
**TITLE:** **Proposed Legislation for Planning Code Amendments**  
**DATE:** **December 14, 2011**  
**SUMMARY:** Support Planning Department recommendations pertaining to Limited Corner Commercial Users (LCCUs) and Limited Commercial Uses (LCUs), as specifically articulated in Recommendations #8 & #9 of the staff report for December 15, 2011 Planning Commission hearing.  
**MOVED/SECOND:** Moved by Richards; Seconded by Starkey

**YES:** Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Richards, Starkey, Wingard  
**NO:** none  
**ABSTAIN:** none  
**ABSENT:** Gold, Olsson

**RESOLUTION #8:** **2011-12-14#3**  
**TITLE:** **Finalized 2012 M/O CIP Recommendations for Capital Plan**  
**DATE:** **December 14, 2011**  
**SUMMARY:** Recommendations to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for use of Market/Octavia Fund revenues in FY13 and FY14 for community improvements projects in the Plan Area. Fiscal years beyond FY13 and FY14 were not considered.

**MOVED/SECOND:** Moved by Richards; Seconded by Wingard  
**YES:** Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Richards, Wingard  
**NO:** none  
**ABSTAIN:** none  
**ABSENT:** Gold, Olsson, Starkey

**RESOLUTION #9:** **2012-01-24**  
**TITLE:** **Evaluate Fee Deferral Policy**  
**DATE:** **January 24, 2012**  
**SUMMARY:** CAC requests City to analyze and report on effectiveness of existing development impact fee deferral program, particularly in stimulating development projects that would not have otherwise occurred. This report should be completed before the May 2013 expiration of the policy.

**MOVED/SECOND:** Moved by Olsson; Seconded by Richards  
**YES:** Henderson, Olsson, Richards, Vasquez  
**NO:** none  
**ABSTAIN:** Levitt  
**ABSENT:** Simmons, Singa; Wingard had left by this time

**RESOLUTION #10:** **2012-02-22**  
**TITLE:** **John Billovits Commendation**  
**DATE:** **February 22, 2012**  
**SUMMARY:** Commend Billovits on his retirement from SF Planning Dpt. for invaluable contributions to the concept of the Market/Octavia Plan.

**MOVED/SECOND:** Moved by Olsson; Seconded by Cohen  
**YES (unanimous):** Cohen, Henderson, Olsson, Simmons, Singa, Vasquez, Wingard  
**NO:** None  
**ABSTAIN:** None  
**ABSENT:** Richards

**RESOLUTION #11:** **SUPPORT FOR VNBRT (19Mar2012)**  
**TITLE:** Support for VNBRT  
**DATE:** March 19, 2012  
**SUMMARY:** RESOLUTION #10 (19Mar2012)  
 The Market Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC) ) supports the concept of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) along the main transit corridors of the City. Specifically we approve the Van Ness Ave. BRT (VNBRT) and urge its expedited completion, without taking a position on any of the considered alternative methods.

**MOTION:** Leavitt  
**SECOND:** Vasquez

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

**ABSTRACT TEMPLATE**

**RESOLUTION #\_\_:** [YYYY-MM-DD#\_\_]

**TITLE:**

**DATE:**

**EXTRACT:**

**MOVED/SECOND:** Moved by \_\_\_\_\_; Seconded by \_\_\_\_\_

**YES:**

**NO:**

**ABSTAIN:**

**ABSENT:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 2.3 RESOLUTION #3

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Approved by the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee on March 24<sup>th</sup> 2010

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

#### 2.4 RESOLUTION #4

**22 Sep10 RESOLUTION 4: INCLUSIONARY AFFORDABLE HOUSING**  
**Resolution Advising Inclusionary Affordable Housing in the Market & Octavia Plan Area**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

*This revision included all text regarding the land dedication alternative.*

**RESOLUTION #4: Inclusionary Affordable Housing (22Sep2010)**

**DATE:** September 22, 2010

**MOTION:** Moved by Henderson, seconded by Richards

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

**NO:** none

**ABSTAIN:** none

**ABSENT:** Gold

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

**MOTION:** Moved by Henderson, Seconded by Gold

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

**NO:** none

**ABSTAIN:** none

**ABSENT:** Richards

**2.5 RESOLUTION #5**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Approved by the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee on September 22<sup>nd</sup>, 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/14<sup>th</sup> 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/14<sup>th</sup> 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 Users (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.

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

	<b>Prior Years</b>	<b>FY2013</b>	<b>FY2014</b>
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

**APPENDIX 5**  
**MOP-CAC GLOSSARY**  
**EXTRACTS FROM MINUTES**

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

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

**BRT Bus Rapid Transit**

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

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

**CAC Community Advisory Committee**

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

**CIP Community Improvement Program (or –Projects)**

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

**Central Freeway**

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

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

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

**CEQA California Environmental Quality Act**

**COLA Cost Of Living Assessment**

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

**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/aboutvna.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**