

**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, January 25, 2012; 6:30pm
Regularly scheduled monthly meeting**

Peter Cohen	Jason Henderson
Robin Levitt	Ted Olsson
Dennis Richards	Michael Simmons
Krute Singa	Lou Vasquez
Ken Wingard	Kearstin Dischinger (<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]: **3d Mon monthly**
3. Approval of Minutes for meetings of December 14, 2011 and January 24, 2012 meetings [act]
4. Update from Planning Staff on Impact Fee Deferral program [discuss]
5. Briefing by Planning Staff: status of Redevelopment and Former Freeway Parcels [discuss]
6. Briefing by Planning Staff on the Better Streets Plan [discuss]
7. Transportation Sustainability Program—Committee members discussion [discuss; act]
8. Development Pipeline Report—Developments in process; CAC project reviews [discuss; act]
9. Committee members comments & issues the Committee may consider in future meetings [discuss]
10. Public Comment
11. Adjournment & announcement of next meeting

NEXT MEETING: TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 2011, 7:00PM AT 1650 Mission, Rm. 400

(2012: Jan24, Feb22, 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 (**Dischinger**, distributed at meeting)
 Exhibit 2: January Minutes from approved as corrected (**Olsson**; see below).
 Exhibit 3: Better Streets Plan (**Varat**)
 Exhibit 4: Development Pipeline Report (**Smith**)

DECISIONS

- Decision 1: CAC will meet monthly in 2012 on third Monday, 6:30pm, at Planning Dept., 4th Fl.
 Consensus: CAC invite Michael Yarney & someone from Controller's Office to discuss Fee Deferral.
 Consensus: Contact all other CACs for joint-Resolution regarding effect of TSP on CAC budgets.
 Consensus: Invite city official opposed to TSP to educate our CAC to its implications and consequences.
 Resolution 9: Commendation of John Bilivitz upon his retirement for leadership on creating MOP.

COMMITMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, INFORMATION DUE

#	<u>WHEN</u>	<u>WHO</u>	<u>WHAT</u>
---	-------------	------------	-------------

- | | | | |
|----|-------|-----|--|
| 1. | 03/19 | All | Prepare for election of 2012 CAC officers: Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary. |
|----|-------|-----|--|

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

EXHIBIT 1: AGENDA

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

Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary to be elected at March meeting.

CAC members

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

Ex Officio Members

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

Others attending:

1. José Campos, Dir., Citywide Planning, SF Plng.Dept.; 415.575-9115; Jose.Campos@sfgov.org
2. Adam Varat, Planner/Urban Designer, SF Plng.Dept.; 415.558.6405; Adam.Varat@sfgov.org
3. Mr. Simmons
4. Marius Starkey, former member of this CAC and board member of MDNA
5. Maria Mejia, board member of MDNA

A quorum being present, Chair *pro tempore* Henderson opened the meeting at 6:30pm.

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

2.1 Introductions

For the benefit of new members, the continuing members of the CAC and staff introduced themselves:

Ken Wingard, business owner and resident in the MOP area.
 Jason Henderson, Co-Chair of HVNA
 Michael Simmons, Resident of Hayes Valley and property management company in MOP area
 Lou Vasquez, North Beach resident but developer in Hayes Valley
 Ted Olsson, Co-Chair of MDNA & longtime resident of MOP area
 Kruti Singa, member of SF Dept. of Environment; resident near Dolores Park
 Peter Cohen, Fmr Chair of DTNA and past Chair of CAC
 Alexis Smith, CAC liaison, Planning Department
 Adam Varat, Planning Implementation, Planning Department
 Jose Campos, Citywide Planning, Planning Department

2.2 New Meeting time; Election of Officers.

By consensus the CAC unanimously agreed on its **2012 meeting schedule: monthly on the third Monday at 6:30pm, in the 4th Floor conference room at the Planning Department.**

To allow time for new members to assess all others on CAC, election of officers (Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary) will be held at the March meeting.

2.3 John Bilivitz's Retirement

Henderson announced that John Bilivitz was retiring from the department. He had played a very important leadership role in creating good urban design in the MOP. Staff and several others knew of him and agreed that he played an important role. Since he was to be honored

before the Planning Commission the following week, it was decided to honor him with a resolution from this CAC, moved by Olsson seconded by Cohen, and approved unanimously. Olsson will compose this resolution according to the following, voted upon — “We commend and appreciate John Bilivitz’s service and leadership on the Market Octavia Plan from his citywide and neighborhood perspective” — and send it to Smith in time for the Commission meeting.

RESOLUTION #9: 2012Feb22

We the MOP-CAC commend and appreciate the committed service and inspired leadership of John Bilivitz in creating the Market Octavia Plan from his citywide and neighborhood perspectives.

AYES: Campos, Cohen, Henderson, Olsson, Simmons, Singa, Vasquez, Wingard.

NAYS: none

ABSTAIN: none

ABSENT: Levitt, Richards

2.4 MDNA petition (see appended to these minutes)

Olsson presented CAC a petition signed by 200 people objecting to the constriction of the first block of Dolores Street, as proposed by the Planning Department, sponsored by Supervisor Wiener, and approved at the last meeting by the CAC. Olsson stated that our former colleague Marius Starkey had collected the signatures and presented them that day to Kate McGee, advocate for the proposal from the Planning Department. Starkey would continue to collect signatures and present them to the Commission. It was noted that our CAC purpose says that we will not endorse any proposal opposed by the neighbors.

When introducing this petition, Olsson noted: 1) how slim the vote was (3 Yes; 2 No; 2 Abstain; 1 Absent) approving this motion; 2) that it rejected the plea to oppose the motion by a CAC colleague (Starkey) who lived precisely at the intersection effected, who best knew the consequences of this proposal, and who with his neighbors would directly suffer from its implementation; and 3) that Olsson himself the month earlier had proposed a superior solution to that of the Supervisor’s, by suggesting a slightly raised triangular plaza of a unique color, filling the Dolores/Market intersection, which would protect pedestrians by slowing vehicular traffic crossing the little plaza in front of the statue—it would be less expensive, more esthetic, and as effective while complementing the grand entrance to the Mission Dolores neighborhood.

2.5 December Minutes—tabled

Olsson noted that in composing the minutes he had stated the wording of the resolution, confirmed subsequently by staff. However, just before coming to this January CAC meeting, he had received a revised version of the first December resolution. Whereas the original contained merely a couple of sentences, the revised version had a two-page preamble of “whereases”. Because these were never part of what was voted upon (and approved — 3 YES; 2 NO; 2 ABSTAIN), they are not part of the record. The minutes cannot be approved with this preamble but could by reverting to the original wording of the resolution. Instead the Chair consulted Varat and decided to table discussion and approval of the minutes until the next meeting.

3. Approval of Minutes from January meetings [act] (staff)

The minutes of the January meeting were approved as corrected as follows:

- 1) the record at the bottom of the page should read “TSP”
- 2) Henderson expressed his continued concern that a categorical exemption for bike lanes in LOS areas is required.
- 3) Henderson stated that he is enthusiastic about the TSP but still wants to see it tweaked.

With that, the minutes were approved on the motion of Vasquez, seconded by Olsson, and approved by Cohen, Henderson, Olsson, Vasquez and Wingard; Simmons & Singa abstaining because they had not been present at the previous meeting.

4. Update on the Impact of the Fee Deferral (Smith)—see CAC Resolution #3 [discuss]

Smith explained that there was no update because the Land Use Committee meeting at which this was to be discussed was postponed. In an earlier resolution this CAC had endorsed the concept; however, we did not realize how this policy would deplete our budget, making it impossible to create any CIPs before the occupancy of developments.

Cohen noted that an aggressive movement is building to extend this deferral policy beyond its pilot deadline. The extension has strong backing from the Mayor's Office. Proponents intend to pre-emptively update this policy. This month the Legislative Analyst will issue a report on the policy, its implications and impact.

Olsson cautioned that we had already lost \$900k from our CIP fund due to this policy, which has effectively stalled all CIPs in our MOP area. It was suggested that we ask the Controllers Office for an assessment of this policy, its past impact upon our budget and future assessment of the implications for this CAC carrying out its duties if this policy is extended. It was also suggested that we invite Yarney from the Mayor's Office to speak to this point with us, as he had when selling the policy to us last year. Henderson suggested that the soonest Yarney and someone from the Controller's Office could meet with us would be March or April.

5. Briefing on SF Redevelopment (Campos) [discuss]

It was agreed that tonight we would not focus upon specific parcels in the MOP. The City has taken ownership of all MOP parcels since the Redevelopment Agency (RDA) was abolished due to uncoordinated actions of the Governor, the Legislature, a suit by the League of California Cities, and a decision by the California Supreme Court.

San Francisco's RDA was one of the first in the state (1949). It was originally designed to manage and implement federal housing renewal programs (aka "slum clearance"). At this time people in the affected areas were forced to leave their homes and businesses.

In contrast to San Francisco, most other cities used "**tax increment financing**" (TIF) because they did not have the tool of an RDA to manage the process. In the '80s RDAs used TIF to fund their projects. TIF required an increase of the property tax in the designated area and the increase in this tax revenue was designated to be invested in redevelopment only in the area taxed.

The significant difference is that more money came to San Francisco than to other cities because San Francisco is both a City and a County. Elsewhere in California, cities had to compete with other cities in a county and with the county itself for its share of these funds. And always there was the concern as to how many of the dollars went to the agency (RDA) rather than directly to the project.

To pay down the debt and to refill what had been deducted from school districts, Governor Brown, devised this plan to ban RDAs as a tool of development and to dedicate TIF directly for affordable housing in the area. As a result of the Governor's action, the cities could no longer claim money from the counties.

This was effected by a twin pair of legislative bills: SB26 & SB27. The former abolished RDAs; the latter allowed them where the city bears the burden of the cost of the RDA. That is, the RDAs could be a management/implementation tool on developments if cities paid all administrative costs so that all tax revenues were dedicated to be spent only on the project. All revenue should go only to established taxing agencies, such as school districts. In San Francisco, the RDA cost about \$14-15m; so, the city paid this (absorbed this RDA expense).

Unfortunately Proposition 22 was placed on the ballot before the voters at this time. Prior to the attack on the RDAs, it was illegal for the State to take money from the RDAs. The citizens approved the proposition and the legality or independence of the two Senate bills was considered by the California Supreme Court. On SB26 they decided that since the State created the RDAs it could eliminate them; however, they also ruled that SB27 was illegal (so that Cities could not reconstitute and fund the RDAs because only the state had that power). This Solomonic decision was the worst of all effects and everybody lost. On February 2, 2012 all RDAs were disbanded. Our city RDA employees became city employees from then until March 31.

The bottom line is that we now have no direction on the future of these areas (e.g., the parcels in the MOP), nor staff to manage them. Instead the City became "The Oversight Board" for the development of these parcels. The City Administrator has taken over the properties within and without the project areas. The Mayor's Office will manage this — the Department of Real Estate will deal with all plots but the Mayor's Office of Housing assumes the management of all

developments in this area. The Oversight Board was created for those redevelopment projects which are continuing: i.e., all legal, fiscal, contractual agreements relating to these projects.

The areas on the Exhibit map in Purple are those which the agency is studying; they are not redevelopment projects (e.g., the Central Market Partnership). South of Market has already been adopted.

The MOP freeway parcels are not on the map. In the case of these Central Freeway parcels, the agency expired and there is no redevelopment yet. The ownership of the parcels transferred to the City. However, plans should not change for these. There is a CAC (Community Advisory Committee) for each of these RDA areas. The parcels for affordable housing are safer, but other ones, not dedicated to this purpose, are more complicated.

As before, the land sales must pay off the \$28m advanced for Octavia Boulevard. The Mayor's **Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD)** has managed these parcels for some time now. Those parcels with affordable housing and those for persons with special needs do not change. Campos does not know how much money is involved but a large portion of former taxes will be lost by the loss of the TIF. He also noted that in Hayes Valley some lots that are vacant are filling with debris; this is an administrative issue which must be fixed. The OEWD is handling these parcels; essentially this is the same program with the same players. But the real question is how will the loss of TIF housing effect these, since \$45-50m will be lost and the City had formerly used all of its TIF for affordable housing. In the end this affordable housing may take a lot longer to implement.

6. **Better Streets Plan (Varat) [discuss; possibly act]**

EXHIBIT 3: BETTER STREETS PLAN (Department slides)

This plan started in 2007 and was adopted in December 2010 after significant public and agency review and comment. This was designed to be a complete streets approach: i.e., a comprehensive design for all users to safely and conveniently use all city streets. It complemented two other policies: the **Transit First Policy**; and the **Better Streets Policy**. This Plan, however, added several specific elements for consideration in any comprehensive policy: public life; ecological potential; and physical activity. The purpose of this enhancement was to incorporate into the design the pedestrian realm (with all that makes it comfortable, convenient, and safe). Several street types are distinguished in the Plan: commercial, residential, special, small, and other.

These improvements were mapped out as Standard Improvements, with street types meeting specific guidelines, street widths being designated, and standard improvements being specified.. This **Better Streets Plan** provides both policy direction and design guidelines.

Please read the Plan at: www.sfbetterstreets.org

Better Streets Legislation are stated as Code Requirements. This affects all users, private development over a specified size, as well as guidelines for parklets. It states who can build Better Streets improvements; how City-sponsored improvements are distinguished; what constitutes private development; and which are designated as Community Improvements.

Specifically businesses can apply to create parklets.

These Better Streets improvements will be funded by Prop. B—roadway bonds; Prop. K; Prop. AA; Development Impact Fees; as well as by both federal and state grant sources. The Plan also discusses the following components: Community Resources; Signage; the Controller's Office Better Streets Plan Study; the Controller's Recommendations; Coordinating Street Projects (e.g., the monthly coordinating meetings of the Streets Capital Group, the DPW 5-Year Plan, and the Planned Improvements Database).

At this point Henderson asked what kinds of mitigations might we expect from the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit (VN BRT)?

The **Walk First Project** was mentioned at this point, as well as the need to enhance the experience for bikes, pedestrians, and at parks.

For any further questions, readers are referred to the Plan website: www.sfbetterstreets.org, which will explain the process for accomplishing a street project. Wingard asked why Divisadero's sidewalks have not been changed but Valencia Street's have been. The answer was that in 2006 Mayor Newsom ordered the DPW to fix all major corridors; \$11-12m of federal funds supported these projects. Perhaps we should ask Chris/Kris(?) Ochra of DPW to speak to us about this?

Varat will provide Smith with this digital slide show and she will forward this Better Streets Plan slideshow to all members of the CAC and make it available with these minutes at our website.

According to Varat, our funding of some projects in the MOP, together with community-vetted design of the MOP, and the impact fee funding (whenever we receive it) will enable these Better Street Projects to be competitive when the Department is seeking additional grants.

7. **Transportation Sustainability Program (TSP) [act]**

This is a new proposal for all new developments in the city to increase their impact fees with the surcharge going to a program to speedup the Muni's **Transit Effectiveness Program (TEP)**. This would create 12 **Muni Rapid Effects Corridors** throughout the city. It is expected that superficially most would endorse this. However, if this TSP passes as proposed, our CAC Impact Fee will be further reduced by \$3.50 per volume measurement.

Kruti asked if this was similar to **TEP** and **TEDM(?)**. Without explanation it was noted that bike improvements are not subject to this exam process.

Cohen stated that the CAC needs to get in front of this TSP, because it is already very well discussed and preliminarily approved by agencies and officials, since it has been on the streets for at least three months, though this is the first we have heard of it. We need to take a position on this as soon as possible. He warned us to learn from our lesson last year when we approved the Impact Fee Deferral program, without sufficient understanding of the consequences to our budget and, therefore, to funding CIPs in anticipation of the impact from development density. While noting that Transportation is largest of our CAC's required funding categories, we have not planned on these adjustments which will greatly reduce our funds and effectiveness.

Henderson conceptually endorsed Cohen's idea; however, he was concerned that we need high capacity trunk lines and several will run through the MOP area.

It was decided that we will table further discussion of this topic because of the late hour but that it will be discussed at the beginning of our March agenda.

The TIDF will be a larger increase for residential developments than for commercial ones because residents were not formerly taxed.

It was suggested that we contact other CACs to see how they are handling this issue. Perhaps we should consider issuing a joint resolution from all CACs. According to Smith, this is the first they have heard of it too. The others are not considering issuing any resolutions. However, it is correct that money would be taken out of the CAC budget and be deposited into the TSP one, acknowledging this as the city's new priority. Perhaps at the next meeting members of this CAC can bring their ideas of how to address this issue.

The question was asked whether there was anyone in the "City family" (i.e., an expert among the agencies who does not agree with this policy; perhaps someone from the Controller's Office)? If so, we would want that person to educate our CAC to the implications and consequences of this proposal.

See the Department's news review (announced 12/2/2011; effective 1/1/2012):

<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?recordid=70&page=2719>

Effective January 1, 2012, the City's Development Impact Fees will increase by 3.25% in accordance with San Francisco Planning Code Article 4, Section 409(b). Development Impact Fees are adjusted annually by the Controller's Office and are based on Annual Infrastructure Construction Cost Inflation Estimates. Please refer to the Department of Building Inspection's website (<http://sfdbi.org/index.aspx?page=617>) for the Citywide Development Impact Fee Register for all Development Impact Fees and amounts by fee type. For questions on the indexing, please contact Kaitlyn Connors at 415-557-4515

8. **Development Pipeline Report [discuss; possibly act]**

EXHIBIT 4: PIPELINE REPORT

Questions were raised about the Doughnut Shop at Van Ness and Market as well as the empty lot behind this building. Someone thought that they had heard that this was being considered for student housing. The city wants to encourage more affordable housing. If such housing is developed here, that would reduce the impact. They are evidently one year away from getting the permit.

9. Committee members comments/issues for Committee to consider in future meetings [discussion] — NONE

10. Public Comment:

Former committee colleague Marius Starkey was invited to address the group about MDNA's petition. He stated that because this is an In-Kind Project for the developer, now that the neighbors have objected to "mitigation" at this intersection, the developer is backing out of agreeing to create this constriction. It was further noted, as the developer had mentioned at a CAC meeting several months ago, that they could not do this because they would also be held liable for any traffic backup resulting from the Whole Foods Store parking, which interferes with through traffic. Starkey said that the petition submitted had 198 signatures and they were continuing to collect more from neighbors who objected to the proposed constricted "mitigation" at the intersection of Dolores and Market Streets.

Starkey noted that our CAC is bound by our own procedures for In-Kind Projects, which states that the CAC will not approve any project not approved by the adjacent neighbors. Despite the fact that several colleagues voted for the resolution even though it adversely effected Starkey and others who live at this intersection, now that we are further informed by this petition we must follow our own procedures; and so, the resolution is invalid. Finally, Starkey reminded all that the median and Dolores is a state historical landmark (formerly El Camino Real at the time of the Mission). This was complemented by planting the median of palm trees for the 1915 world's fair. Any proposed modification to the road, median, or statue would constitute a damage which could be taken before the California Historical Commission. The MDNA is concerned about altering this historic entrance to its neighborhood.

Finally Cohen remarked that this was a long discussion. He reminded us that we had debated this proposal and it was decided to keep it two lanes in each direction. Then the Supervisor asked us to reconsider the proposal. He did not introduce any new issues which we had not already exhaustively considered. However, in respect to his office we deferred our decision for one month. According to Marius, the developer also wants two lanes each way. Do we need to ask the Department whether this needs to be brought back to the CAC or to the Commission? Cohen believes that the approved November map with four lanes should go ahead. It is imperative for the CAC to support the neighborhood in this. Cohen asked when this issue will go to the Planning Commission. He and the CAC were told that nothing is currently planned to be submitted at this time because they are waiting for the Planner.

11. Adjournment & announcement of next meeting

There being no further business and the time having expired, the meeting adjourned at 9:00pm. All were reminded that we meet in this conference room monthly on the third Monday at 6:30pm. And at our March meeting we will elect officers (Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary)

NEXT MEETING: MONDAY, MARCH 19, 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

**Appended Petition
Referenced in Item 2.4**

[Letterhead]

Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association
P.O.Box 460184, San Francisco, CA 94114; Ph.826-3395
Website: www.missiondna.org; Email: info@missiondna.org

21 February 2012

Kate McGee
Department of City Planning
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

Subject: Dolores Street between Market and 14th

Dear Ms. McGee,

Attached please find a petition with 198 signatures & counting of neighbors in opposition to the proposed narrowing of Dolores Street between Market and 14th Streets. This sample of evidence of local opinion should guide the Planning Department in its recommendations on this issue.

The proposed changes to the Dolores Street lanes from two going north and two going south to a single lane on each side is within the boundaries of the Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association (MDNA). The in-kind agreement states in the section titled Neighborhood Support for the Project: "Project sponsors are encouraged to coordinate with neighbors and the local community in the design and development process of the proposed improvements. A project that is well coordinated with neighbors and supported should receive Planning Department recommendation." Our neighborhood and community is not in support of this project, therefore we will continue to be unanimously opposed to this work and the wrong use of the in-kind contributions.

Furthermore, the use of funds for "improvements" will do something, which will actually result in a degradation of Dolores Street; producing a loss of integrity to a historic resource (El Camino Real, California State Landmark #784) thus exacerbating congestion and intensifying pedestrian/auto conflicts, which will not result in any improvement at all and this in-kind project should be rejected.

Finally, it is a bad precedent that for the first time these in-kind contributions will have been used locally (instead of giving the city the 3.2% for mitigation levied for new construction in the City), should be for something which totally lacks community support.

Yours truly,
Lucia Bogotay, Co-President
Mission Dolores Historical Association

PETITION TO OPPOSE LANE REDUCTION ON DOLORES @ MARKET

Dear Neighbors,

The Planning Department is proposing to reduce the first quarter of Dolores Street at Market to one lane on each side of the Dolores Street median, which is also part of El Camino Real, California, State Landmark #784.

While this proposal will come before the Planning Commission soon (date TBD), we urge you to sign this petition NOW to oppose this unwise move. While their logic is to encourage people to get out of cars and use public transportation more, we're convinced that it will more likely cause a serious bottleneck at this important intersection, particularly in the summer and during holidays when tour buses use Dolores Street almost daily. It will also make it difficult for emergency vehicles to pass through the intersection.

Furthermore, a 31,000 square foot Whole Foods Store has been approved at 2001 Market Street in a new building which will replace the old S&C Ford showroom site. This building will also include 80 condos with only 0.5 parking spaces per condo, meaning that half the units will have no onsite parking.

It also means that in addition to the 40 residential cars and 63 cars for the new store, residents without onsite parking will be creating additional traffic congestion while looking for parking spaces in the area. Therefore, we need the existing lanes more than ever so people who live in the Mission Dolores Neighborhood and beyond can commute without this proposed obstruction.

Please let your voice be heard by signing this petition and possibly testifying before the Planning Commission. If you include your email below, we'll let you know when that meeting is. If you have any questions, please let us know. Thank you. MDNA Board. [attached with 198 signatures]

APPENDIX 1
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

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

APPENDIX 2
MOP-CAC
2012 Draft Schedule of meeting Topics
(as of 22 FEB 2012)

SAMPLE: 2010 SCHEDULE OF TOPICS — THE 2012 SCHEDULE IS YET TO BE DEFINED

SUMMARY OF TOPICS PLANNED/DISCUSSED DURING 2012

January 24

- Proposed Transportation Sustainability Fee
- IPIC Report to Planning Commission — proposed 2-year (2012-14) projects
- Controller's Report on FY2011 Impact Fees
- *Resolution on Van Ness Avenue Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) — postponed*
- Pipeline Report legislation/policy—Legislation & Planning Commission issues in process

February 22

- 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

TO BE SET FOR THE 2012 YEAR

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

- Impement 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

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%3Aalplywsoxu>
+ Application packet for In-Kind Policy: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8601>
- **IPIC 2012 Annual Report [including section on MOP]**
http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Market_Octavia/CAC/Interagency_Plan_Implementation_Committee_Annual_Report.pdf
- **Criteria for members of MOP-CAC**
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 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>
- **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
- List of CAC's Resolutions
- Market Octavia Impact Fee report
<http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=2161>

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

**APPENDIX 4
MOP-CAC RESOLUTIONS**

SUMMARY

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

RESOLUTION ABSTRACTS

RESOLUTION #1	2009-10-20#1
TITLE	Infrastructure Finance Recommendations
DATE:	October 20, 2009
EXTRACT:	Plan Area impact fees will fund community improvement projects (CIP); however this requires future revenue streams, as stated in the recommendations of the July 2009 Capital Planning Report.
MOVED/SECOND:	Moved by Richards, seconded by Levitt
YES (unanimous):	Brinkman, Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards, Villiers
NO:	none
ABSTAIN:	none
ABSENT:	none
RESOLUTION #2:	2010-03-24#1
TITLE:	In-Kind Policy
DATE:	March 24, 2010
EXTRACT:	Commends Dischinger; conditionally approves Department's latest draft. States policy for developers to apply for In-Kind CIPs rather than paying CIP impact fees. Requires CAC to understand tradeoffs. Developers must understand CAC priorities and choose CIPs from among these.
MOVED/SECOND:	Moved by Henderson; Seconded by Levitt
YES:	Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards
NO:	none
ABSTAIN:	none
ABSENT:	Brinkman, Gold, Starkey, Wingard
RESOLUTION #3:	2010-08-25#1
TITLE:	Fees Deferral Program
DATE:	August 25, 2010
EXTRACT:	Support of temporary fee deferral program for developers, requiring them to pay 10% up front; 90% deferral until occupancy. Creates Community Infrastructure Fund, initially capitalized at \$3-5m, to pay for preliminary design, planning, and engineering of "shovel-ready" priority improvement projects. Authorized only for CAC prioritized CIPs. Inclusionary housing of in-lieu payment is not subject to this deferral. This deferral expires in 3 years.
MOVED/SECOND:	Moved by Henderson; Seconded by Levitt
YES (unanimous):	Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards
NO:	none
ABSTAIN:	none
ABSENT:	Brinkman, Gold, Starkey, Wingard

- RESOLUTION #4: 2010-12-15**
TITLE: Inclusionary Affordable Housing
DATE: original: September 22, 2010; revised: December 15, 2010
EXTRACT: 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
EXTRACT: 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
EXTRACT: Support of In-Kind CIP Agreement to streetscape improvements — constricting first block of historic Dolores Street to one lane each way — as defined in June 2011 schematic plan, except that Dolores/14th Streets intersection must be consistent with November 2011 schematic, and that Market Street crosswalk and associated improvements not be included.
- 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
EXTRACT: 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**
EXTRACT: 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**
EXTRACT: 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:
TITLE:
DATE:
EXTRACT:
MOVED/SECOND: Moved by _____; Seconded by _____
YES:
NO:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

2.1 RESOLUTION #1**20Oct2009 RESOLUTION 1: INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Requirement of a minimum 10% payment at DBI Permit of all fees (ie, allowing a maximum deferral of 90% of fees due);
2. Creation of a Community Infrastructure Fund to enable the pre-development design, planning and engineering (ie, "shovel ready") for priority improvement projects, and that the initial the size of the Fund be between \$3 million and \$5 million, and that the capitalization of the Fund will further grow as the amount of deferred fees from pipeline projects grows, and that the enactment of the Fees Deferral program is explicitly contingent upon creation of the Community Infrastructure Fund;

3. Affirmation that prioritization of improvement projects for use of the Community Infrastructure Fund is done through CACs in plan areas where they exist;
4. Retention of Sec. 315 inclusionary housing in-lieu fee payment standards (i.e., not subject to deferral);
5. Sunset of the Fees Deferral program in three years.

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

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

2.4 RESOLUTION #4

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This revision included all text regarding the land dedication alternative.

RESOLUTION #4: Inclusionary Affordable Housing (22Sep2010)
DATE: September 22, 2010
MOTION: Moved by Henderson, seconded by Richards
YES (Unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards, Starkey, Wingard
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Gold

REV. RSLN #4: Inclusionary Affordable Housing (15Dec2010)
MOTION: Moved by Henderson, Seconded by Gold
YES (Unanimous): Cohen, Gold, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Starkey, Wingard
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Richards

2.5 RESOLUTION #5

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLUTION #5: Hayes Street Project Investment (22Sep2010)
DATE: September 22, 2010
MOTION: Moved by Henderson, seconded by Levitt
YES (Unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards, Starkey, Wingard
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Gold

2.6 RESOLUTION #6

14Dec11-1: Proposed In-kind community improvements Agreement for 2001 Market (Prado project) [discussion and action item]

RESOLVED: Support an In-kind Agreement for streetscape improvements, as specifically defined in the schematic plan dated June 2011, with the exceptions being that the improvements proposed for the Dolores/14th Street intersection shall be consistent with the November 2011 schematic plan, and that the Market Street crosswalk and associated improvements shall not be included in this improvements program.

RESOLUTION #6 2011-12-14#1**TITLE Support for In-kind CIP Agreement for 2001 Market Street****DATE: December 14, 2011**

MOTION: Support an In-kind Agreement for streetscape improvements, as specifically defined in the schematic plan dated June 2011, with the exceptions being that the improvements proposed for the Dolores/14th Street intersection shall be consistent with the November 2011 schematic plan, and that the Market Street crosswalk and associated improvements shall not be included in this improvements program.

MOVED/SECONDED: Moved by Levitt, seconded by Wingard**YES:** Henderson, Levitt, Wingard**NO:** Olsson, Starkey**ABSTAIN:** Cohen, Richards**ABSENT:** Gold**2.7 RESOLUTION #7**

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

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

RESOLUTION # 7 2011-12-14#2:**TITLE Proposed Legislation for Planning Code Amendments****DATE: December 14, 2011**

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

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

2.8 RESOLUTION #8**14Dec2011 MOP-CAC Final 2012 M/O Community Improvements Program recommendations for Capital Plan (FY13-FY14)**

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

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

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

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

RESOLUTION # 2011-12-14#3
TITLE Finalized 2012 M/O CIP Recommendations for Capital Plan
DATE: December 14, 2011
ACTION: Recommendations to the Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors for use of Market/Octavia Fund revenues in FY13 and FY14 for community improvements projects in the Plan Area. Fiscal years beyond FY13 and FY14 were not considered.
MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Richards, seconded by Wingard
YES: Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Richards, Wingard

NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Gold, Olsson, and Starkey

2.9 RESOLUTION #9

25Jan2012 Evaluate Fee Deferral Policy

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

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

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

Model Resolution Abstract [FORMAT]

RESOLUTION # yyyy-mm-dd#__
TITLE
DATE:
ACTION: [gist of resolution action; without preamble Whereas clauses]
MOVED/SECOND: Moved by _____, seconded by _____
YES:
NO:
ABSTAIN:
ABSENT:

APPENDIX 5
MOP-CAC GLOSSARY
2012 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.

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****Fee Deferral Program/Policy****HVNA Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association**

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

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

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

IPIC Interagency Plan Implementation Committee

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

LCCU Limited Corner Commercial Users (see CAC Resolution #7)**LCU Limited Commercial Uses (see CAC Resolution #7)****LOL 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

Prop. K

Prop. AA

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