

**Minutes of the
Community Advisory Committee of the
Market and Octavia Area Plan,
City and County of San Francisco**

**Board of Supervisors - Room 479
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday August 19, 2009
6:30 PM
Monthly Meeting**

Cheryl Brinkman	Robin Levitt
Peter Cohen	Ted Olsson
Julian Davis	Dennis Richards
Carmela Gold	Brad Villers
Jason Henderson	Kearstin Dischinger (ex officio)

The Agenda & Minutes of all community meetings, a matter of public record, are available at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 4th floor.

AGENDA

1. Call to order and roll call
2. Announcements, upcoming meetings and general housekeeping [discussion item]
3. Approval of Minutes for the meeting of July 15, 2009 [action item]
4. Pipeline Report—Developments in process & projected Funds [discussion and possible action]
5. Continue to develop criteria for prioritizing community improvements projects [discussion and action]
6. Standards for Planning Department communicating to CAC on proposed M/O Plan improvements [discussion and action]
7. Committee members comments and issues the Committee may consider in future meetings [discussion]
8. Public Comment
9. Adjournment

NEXT MEETING: ~~September 16, 2009, 6:30pm, Room 479, City Hall.~~

Subsequently postponed to Monday, September 28, 2009; 7:00pm; Room 278 or 421, City Hall.

EXHIBITS (handout documents informing the discussion)

1. Notice of Meeting & Agenda (August 19, 2009).
2. SF Planning Department's interim Pipeline Report.
(MOP Pipeline Report (08/18/09) for discussion purposes only)
3. Market Octavia Cases (CAC data request), 8/19/2009—11"x17" 5-page chart
4. List of Categories of Expenditures (TIDF Schedule, 07/31/09email; Adm.Code §38; transcribed from email)
5. RFP for Transportation Nexus Studies (Dischinger, 31JUL09email to CAC)
6. City Improvements Criteria Prioritization—notes from discussion.
7. Examples of other cities' criteria rating lists to determine their improvements

DECISIONS (with reference to § of Minutes)

1. Minutes—Approved: July 15, 2009 Minutes. (§3)
2. Dischinger will distribute revised Pipeline Report to all CAC members before each meeting. (§4)
3. The Department should notify all CAC members of any changes effecting MOP Area. (§6)
4. Next meeting is 9/28, 7pm, City Hall, Rm.278 or 421. (§7.1a)
5. Subsequent meetings changed to 3d Tuesday of each month (§7.1c)

Information Due

6. Dischinger: reply whether Department's website can archive CAC minutes for public access. (§3)
7. Dischinger: supply 8/19 pipeline report as pdf to the secretary for inclusion in the Minutes.
8. Dischinger: list of Categories of Expenditures as pdf to secretary for the Minutes. (TIDF Schedule?)
9. Dischinger: examples from other cities as pdf for weighting/prioritizing criteria for improvements.
10. Dischinger: criteria matrix for us to critique
11. Criteria Prioritization Workforce: proposal

MINUTES**1. Call to order and roll call (Quorum = 5 of 9)**

Present: Cheryl Brinkman, Peter Cohen, Julian Davis, Carmela Gold, Jason Henderson, Robin Levitt, Ted Olsson, Dennis Richards Brad Villers; Kearstin Dischinger (ex officio).

Absent: none.

Public: Andrea Aiello (Castro/Upper Market Community Benefit District.

A quorum being present Chair Peter Cohen called the meeting to order at 6:30pm.

2. Announcements, upcoming meetings and general housekeeping [discussion item]**a. Democrasoft (software)**

This is a new voting software by Bret Flannigan. Brochures will be provided.

b. Sunday Streets

Sunday Streets will be held on Sunday, September 6, 2009: Golden Gate Park and The Great Highway.

c. CAC Liaison

A meeting is planned with the Eastern Neighborhoods group. Possibly they will attend our October meeting. Steve Wertheim is the Department's staff liaison. Western SOMA is considered part of this Eastern Neighborhoods area. So, theirs and ours are adjacent Area Plans.

3. Approval of Minutes for the meeting of June 17, 2009 [action item]

The June 17, 2009 minutes were approved (moved by Gold and seconded by Richards), with five voting for them and others abstaining, due to their being absent at that meeting.

The President asked if the Planning Department's website has sufficient capacity to archive our minutes and exhibits (now that all exhibits will be submitted to the Secretary in pdf format to be included with the minutes) for public access.

4. Pipeline Report—Developments in process & projected Funds [discussion and possible action]

Exhibit 2—MOP Pipeline (SF Planning Department, 08/18/09; 1 page, double-sided (draft for discussion only)

Exhibit 3—Market Octavia Cases (CAC data request), 8/19/2009—11"x17" 5-page chart

Exhibit 4—List of Categories of Expenditures

(TIDF Schedule, 07/31/09email; Adm.Code §38; transcribed from email)

Dischinger indicated that the Residential and Commercial properties are described in this report; however, determining the parking for each property is more difficult. Zoning and APN are not done. She indicated that the Inclusionary Housing proposal changes with the developer's financials; however, Cohen believed that the project sponsor must state specifically at the time of planning entitlement how the Inclusionary Housing requirement will be satisfied.

Has the 2001 Market property reconstruction been approved? The developer's maximum amount of parking seems very large. Also the property at 299 Valencia is approved but not noted on this pipeline report.

The committee wants to know what is allowed for parking, the project's sponsor's proposed parking, and the outcome at the Commission. This will be easier to discuss when the monthly pipeline reports are online in the future. Meanwhile Dischinger indicated that she can generate a report automatically and distribute this to each member of the committee before our meetings and address any changes. Ultimately this report will include a map of all referenced properties; but there is no date yet when that functionality will be available.

5. Update and next steps on pending Market/Octavia Community Improvements Plan items [discussion and possible action]**5.1 Prioritize Community Improvement Projects (CAC Criteria Workforce)**

Exhibit 5—Dischinger's notes on CAC discussion of City Improvements Criteria Prioritization

Exhibit 6—Examples of other cities criteria lists to determine their improvements

The key role of the CAC is to provide preliminary recommendations, to advise the Planning Department about the criteria and evaluations of IPIC's decisions, and to create a resolution process.

Speaking for the subcommittee of our CAC which looked at the IPIC criteria in terms of Cohen's previously mentioned concerns and issues and those raised in discussion at the June meeting, Levitt indicated that the subcommittee had more questions.

They were concerned about distinguishing between short- and long-term projects. They needed to be able to evaluate the legal limits (e.g., what can be funded? Only actual physical improvements). They needed to know what kinds of project funds must be used in a designated area in order to mitigate problems there. For any projects they needed to find consistency between requirements of MOP and IPIC. The over-riding criteria was to develop a weighted checklist to judge how projects met the criteria reflected in the MOP.

The subcommittee agreed upon the three major goals of the Market/Octavia Plan:

- 1) Transit
- 2) Housing people
- 3) Whole Neighborhood

They wondered whether MOP dollars can be used for Nexus Studies.

Cohen suggested that we need to clarify this by Dischinger asking the City Attorney and Department. He mentioned two concerns: 1) the Plan guides the CAC informed thinking about the categories or types of improvements envisioned, which provides a framework at the category level, not at the individual project level. These categories must be legitimized by the Plan; and 2) Nexus Studies do not cover all categories (e.g., economic improvement within the Plan Area).

Dischinger presented the committee with a List of Expenditure Categories. The priorities and percentages are already set and cannot be changed. We must allocate expenditures within this framework. If a Nexus Study is determined to be needed, we must get approval for this and it must be incorporated into the overall MOP; but if necessary, the Nexus Study could be paid for by the Planning Department using monies from the Market/Octavia fund. Currently the City is mired in a Nexus Study about parking and transit.

Henderson recommended that we move on existing nexus studies. He felt that there must be a nexus study before the committee can spend any money. The CAC should provide input to IPIC by October. A nexus study has a responsibility relative to the developers. We should develop quantitative and qualitative criteria for city improvements which leverage other funds.

Dischinger then provided examples of how other city's had weighted and prioritized criteria to help them determine the best improvements for their cities. She also mentioned that our judgements should be informed by recommendations resulting from the Community Workshops. Most importantly the CAC must define its criteria; as a second step we should test our criteria on a handful of projects to refine the criteria. Robin Levitt had a sample list of criteria developed by the subcommittee; however, the subcommittee was asked to take Dischinger's samples from other cities together with the suggestions from tonight's discussion and refine their list, after which they will submit their proposed criteria to the CAC as a whole.

Dischinger also reminded the CAC that we can revise these criteria as the implementation of the Plan proceeds and as the situation changes; this selection of criteria is not immutable. Perhaps we wish to establish a precedent of reviewing our criteria annually and revising them then, if needed. It was decided that our working group (subcommittee) will produce the criteria and format of a selection list, which they will present at our next CAC meeting. Dischinger will distribute to the CAC a matrix for us to critique.

6. Standards for Planning Department communicating to CAC on changes to MOP.

The Department's new Universal Planning Notification system will notify the CAC whenever there is a project proposed in the Plan Area.

There is not, however, a protocol for notification to the CAC of Planning Department proposals to make amendments to the Market/Octavia Plan. The CAC's reaction to this was that the Upper Market Planning proposal caught the CAC off-guard, indicating a communications gap. The Planning department announced that they were changing the height limits along Upper Market Street. The CAC requested the Department to notify all CAC members of any issue which could effect the Plan Area. At our next meeting Dischinger will discuss any other major changes from the Planning Department which may effect our Plan Area.

7. Committee members comments and Issues the Committee may consider in future meetings [discussion item]

7.1 Future Issues

a. *Projection*

Dischinger will present a PowerPoint digital slide show. She will bring her laptop and plug into the projection system. Cohen will notify CAC where we meet: Rm278/421.

b. *Agenda for 9/16 meeting*

- Pipeline Report
- Urban Greening proposal (5 minutes, presented by Davis)
- Tax Increment Financing (funding sources, presented by Cohen & Dischinger)
- Community Improvement Criteria proposal (presented by workforce)

c. *Future meetings*

His new school schedule makes it difficult for Davis to attend on our regular day. The committee was polled and changed all subsequent meetings to the third Tuesday of the month; however, only the next meeting will be changed to Monday, September 28 at 7pm. in Room 278 or 421

9. Public Comment

Andrea Aiello (from the Castro/Upper Market Community Benefit District) was the only person attending the meeting from the public. However, since she left before this point in the agenda, this item was dispensed with.

10. Adjournment

There being nothing further to discuss, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:35pm

NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, September 22, 6:30pm. Room 479, City Hall.

Subsequently this meeting was changed to Monday, September 28; 7:00pm; at City Hall, Rm.278 or 421.

Respectfully submitted,

Ted Olsson
MOP-CAC Secretary

MOP-CAC GLOSSARY

20 September 2009

Annual/5-year Reports

Every Plan area must submit to the Board of Supervisors annually for the first two years and thereafter every five years a report on how the implementation of the Plan is proceeding to meet the goals and objectives of the Plan as well as the budget and schedule. The CAC for the Plan area, working with the Planning Department, prepares this which should demonstrate the citizen monitoring and oversight for which that CAC was created.

APN**Assessment District**

In contrast to a Community Benefits District (see below), this is an area of the city in which residents agree to assess themselves an extra fee for improvements to their neighborhood.

BMR Below Market Rate.

The developer will sell some units as “affordable housing”.

BOS Board of Supervisors

San Francisco City and County’s legislative body, responsible for all laws and for approving the Market/Octavia Plan and the Citizens Advisory Committee.

BRT Bus Rapid Transit

(e.g., Van Ness BRT)

CAC Community Advisory Committee (also referred to as the Committee)

The Committee represents the people living and working within the Plan area. The committee acts on their behalf and must keep them informed of the Plan (any changes to it), monitoring its implementation (budget and schedule), as well as prioritizing community improvement projects.

CBD Community Benefits District

A fee which businesses in a district agree to assess themselves in order to improve their business area; in contrast Assessment Districts are areas where the residents have agreed to assess themselves to pay for community improvements.

Certificate of Occupancy**CIP Community Improvements Program**

The planned and approved improvement projects for the Plan area designed to enhance the community’s quality of life or its cultural and historic heritage.

Commission San Francisco’s Planning Commission

The board responsible for overseeing the Planning Department.

Community Workshop**CU Conditional Use permit**

Granted by a city authority, this permits a developer to have a variance from a specific requirement (e.g., the number of parking spaces)

DBI**Department City and County of San Francisco’s Planning Department**

The agency charged with designing and implementing the Plan, with input from the Citizens Advisory Committee and from suggestions made by citizens of the Plan area at Department workshops designed to keep them periodically informed about the plan and its implementation, as well as any changes to the Plan.

EEA**EIR Environmental Impact Report****GIS Geographical Information System****(Historic) Landmarks Board**

Now a separate commission which approves the historic or cultural significance of buildings and public monuments. Once anything is designated as historical, it has additional restrictions

Historic Preservation Study**Historical Survey****Impact Fee**

This is a fee assessed upon developers (?) for the impact which their development will have upon a neighborhood and upon the city’s services. [?]

IPIC Interagency Plan Implementation Committee.

A committee to coordinate all city agencies to assure that they are implementing this and other Board-approved (BOS) strategic Plans on schedule and budget.

IPIC Capital Planning Committee

All area plans must be submitted to this IPIC committee for five year capital funding. Annually it learns from each department each fall the capital plan projects each has scheduled. It also learns the needs for each area from each area plan's CAC.

LGBT Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender

This community is one of many important ones that characterize the Plan area. Their Market St. headquarters at Octavia is within the Plan area

Market Street Bike Plan

Monitoring Report

MOP Market/Octavia Plan (also referred to as the **Plan**)

MOP-CAC Market/Octavia Plan's Community Advisory Committee

Designed to be a representative body of all citizens living and working in the Plan area which can oversee the Plan and its implementation during the life of the Plan and any changes to the plan. They especially need to keep their constituency informed about the plan and its implementation as well as to assure that the community improvements reflect the will of the people in the area.

MTA Municipal Transportation Authority

This is the board responsible for Muni, the city's transportation agency.

Nexus Study

This is a study of a delineated area [*for what reason/purpose?*]. The fee from the developer for this study must meet two requirements: 1) the benefit resulting from this fee must be directly connected to their own development; and 2) the fee must be proportional to the impact on the development. When the developer is assessed a fee, the authorizing ordinance requires that the percentage and the purpose or use of the fee must be specified.

Parking Nexus Study

Pipeline Report

A currently accurate monthly status report by the Department to the Committee of all projects in the MOP area.

SFCTA San Francisco County Transportation Authority.

Tax Increment Financing/Funding

Time Series Report

VanNess/Market Density Area

Variance