

**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>

**Board of Supervisors — Room 278  
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
Wednesday, August 25, 2010; 6:30pm  
Regularly scheduled monthly meeting**

Cheryl Brinkman	Peter Cohen
Carmela Gold	Jason Henderson
Robin Levitt	Ted Olsson
Dennis Richards	Marius Starkey
Ken Wingard	
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, 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 from previous meeting (July 28, 2010) [act]
4. Coordination with Eastern Neighborhoods CAC [discuss; poss.act]
5. Pipeline Report—Developments in process; CAC project reviews [discuss]
6. CAC guests—Ricardo Olea & Oliver Gadjia, Metropolitan Transportation Agency [discuss]
  - a. Update on Hayes Street two-way conversion project
  - b. Continuing series of discussions with key implementing departments/agencies to coordinate defining, refining, augmenting the M/O Community Improvements Program projects lists.
7. CAC guest— Michael Yarne, Development Advisor, Ofc.Econ.& Wkfc.Dvlpt. [discuss/act]
  - a. Melo-ROos Community Facilities District proposal
8. “In-Kind” community improvements policy for Planning Commission [discuss; act]
9. Progress update on draft of CAC supplement to Monitoring Report [discuss; possibly act]
10. Committee members comments and issues the Committee may consider in future meetings [discuss]
11. Public Comment
12. Adjournment

**Next Meeting:** **Wednesday, September 22, 2010, 6:30pm, City Hall, Rm. 278**  
**(Jan27, Feb24, Mch24, Apr26, May26, Jun23, Jul28, Aug25, Sep22, Oct27, Nov24, Dec22)**

**EXHIBITS (handout documents informing the discussion)**

1. Exhibit 1: Agenda [**Oropeza**]
2. Exhibit 2: Minutes (July 25, 2010) [**Olsson**]
3. Exhibit 3: Pipeline Report—Developments in process; CAC project review [**Dischinger**]
4. Exhibit 4: 1p. MTA table of Criteria for ranking projects (untitled, Gadjia, 8/25/10)
5. Exhibit 5: 2pp MTA map showing Hayes 2-way proposal/cross-sections (untitled, Olea, 8/25/10)
6. Exhibit 6: 1p MTA map showing new bus route at Haight/Gough/Market Streets (untitled, Olea)
7. Exhibit 7: Resolution approving In-Kind policy (Draft emailed to CAC) [**Dischinger**]

**DISCUSSIONS**

**1. Street & intersection improvements (MTA; see item 6)**

- The purpose of having MTA Staff as guests is to coordinate on defining and refining the CAC’s preliminary Community Improvements preliminary recommendations, and a continuing process for augmenting the MOP CIP projects list.

- Streets are 25' wide or more; alleys are less. There is an implied crosswalk at the end of every street as an extension of the sidewalk; so, pedestrians may cross with caution and have the right-of-way. This rule does not apply to a street located between arterials (with signals) or which is less than 25' wide, in which case walking across the street is "jaywalking". MTA observes jaywalking patterns, traffic and accident patterns in determining where to mark explicit crosswalks.
- It was suggested that Reservoir St. (the driveway into the Safeway parking lot onto Church Street between 14<sup>th</sup> & Duboce Sts.; this is still a city street) should have an explicit crosswalk.
- A new Haight Street 2-way bus route to begin next year will improve traffic.
- The Planning Department is reviewing and will shortly report on MTA's environmental impact for the Hayes 2-way plan. Right lane traffic will be forced to turn right; busses will have a special left turn lane.
- MTA has limited/inconsistent quality of data currently for evaluating pedestrian safety conditions at intersections. Currently a study underway funded by an OTS Pedestrian Network grant looking at intersections throughout the City, but that is not expected to be complete until October 2011. MTA tends to piggyback pedestrian safety improvements on intersection projects already planned.
- The CAC and MTA staff agreed to work together to come up with an overall plan to focus pedestrian safety priority improvements in the MOP Area that can be leveraged by the Market Octavia Fund (MOF). Cohen will be meeting with MTA in mid-September to discuss this further.

## 2. Community Facilities District (OEWD; see item 7)

- OEWD Proposal: City to request ABAG's Finance Authority for NonProfits to become fiscal agent for a citywide Community Facilities (Mello-Roos) District as an alternative for developers to finance their development impact fees. If approved by ABAG, San Francisco would then create such a district.
- A Community Facilities District (CFD) can only fund public infrastructure and community improvement projects which benefit the public. It can be applied to one or many (innumerable) projects. The more projects, the less the risk, the more attractive the tax-exempt municipal bond is as an investment for large investors (e.g., pension funds).
- Advantages of Mello-Roos as a financial tool: 1) the money loaned to developers is generally at a cheaper interest rate; 2) as a tax lien, this is not a debt, so the developer is also able to get cheaper loans from commercial banks; 3) since most developments are for condos involving 30-year mortgages, buyers are willing to accept this burden because they do not intend to be at that residence for the full term; and 4) the City remains whole and is immediately paid in any case, retaining its full credit-worthiness and having the ability to use the money immediately for community improvements.
- This proposal has been reviewed by the Planning Department, and in general it is positive towards it, and the Planning Commission has also reviewed it. However, in the case of a Fee Deferral paid through CFD, the developer pays only 20% of his full fees up front, which will make it harder for the CAC to do its planning and prioritization; however the Department feels that this provides a more consistent and predictable means of managing its plans and projects. With the average developer's fee being \$10,000 per unit over 30 years and based upon data from a variety of recent developments, it is estimated that the property owner's average annual assessment per thousand square feet would range from \$320-\$1,200 (with a unique outlier at \$2,000); the range of effective tax rates among this same data would be \$1.18% (rather than 1.15%) to 1.31%.
- Four concerns about this solution are: 1) this CFD Fee Deferral policy ultimately shifts the burden for paying the fee from the developer to the new property owner; 2) originally the CFD was proposed as funding tool to help pay for community improvements in addition to the impact fees to be paid for by developers; now rather than having a compound source of fees for these projects, there is but one source; and 3) property owners taxed by this fee might feel reluctant to vote for additional taxes for citywide benefits. As Yarne stated it, the CFD proposal is essentially "another way for developers to finance impact fees." In contrast others felt 1) because this is a development fee (not a developer's fee) and since it is the property owners in creating the increased population density which placed the impact upon the neighbors, then they rightfully should bear the burden of the increased community improvements necessitated by their purchase; 2) no argument was provided against the second point; 3) there is a value in having a developer

- construct a CIP more quickly and efficiently to the same high standards; and 4) the effect of reluctant property owners to vote for further taxes would be negligible or imperceptible among the electorate in a citywide election.
- There is no additional financial burden to a property owner buying a property financed by this Mello-Roos method, since the appraiser only looks at the actual value of the property and the bank only looks at the ability of the property owner to pay the monthly mortgage.
  - Yarne will send the CAC the final draft of his Mello-Roos Community Facilities District proposal for us to critique and would be willing to return to answer any further questions.

### 3. In-Kind Policy (Planning Department; see item 8)

- Changes to this latest draft of the Dischinger's In-Kind Policy: There are three scenarios or routes for the developer to take in proposing and constructing a CIP.
  - 1) As soon as the developer expresses an interest to create an in-kind-CIP, he proposes his concept first to the Department and then to the CAC. The CAC critiques the concept and explains how it fits our prioritized CIPs. This lets the developer know the eligibility and priority of his concept. After this the developer fleshes out his concept, presents it to the neighbors and other agencies for their input. Finally, before presenting his concept to the Commission, the developer returns to the CAC with his developed plan, and the Department's approvals for his estimates and funding, requesting the CAC's approval in its resolution. Finally the developer presents and defends his plan before the Commission together with the CAC's resolution and approvals from the Department and other agencies.
  - 2) In order to obtain a permit from the Department of Building Inspection (DBI) the policy allows the developer to proceed with his development while improving his CIP plan by presenting this and the CAC's initial resolution to the Commission. This ensures the developer's commitment to the CIP.
  - 3) For those developers who decide to construct an in-kind-CIP after having begun construction, the policy allows for them to initiate all of the steps while constructing their development. In all cases the purpose of the policy is to assure transparency and that all parties to the agreement—particularly the Commission and the public—know explicitly in the public record all assumptions underlying the grant of creating an in-kind-CIP.
- EN-CAC's conditions of approval for Department's policy: 1) when a developer offers to construct a CIP, he must specify how he intends to solicit community feedback on the concept; 2) the developer must clarify how his concept fits CAC's prioritized CIPs, to assure that top priorities are completed; and 3) the CAC may (but not required to) provide very detailed comment's on the developer's concept as part of its resolution to the Commission accompanying the developer's proposal.
- MOP-CAC's conditions of approval for Department's policy: 1) midway through constructing the CIP, the developer must return to the Commission and publicly state for the record the status of the CIP; 2)
- This In-Kind policy was drafted to state the procedures necessary to accomplish the permission to developers to propose and with approval construct in-kind CIPs as envisioned by the MOP legislation. The developers are no more constrained to choose projects in the CIP list than is the CAC itself. However, any approved project must be built within the MOP area and benefit the residents of that area, though not exclusively. The concern is to be sure that the top prioritized CIPs are completed.

### DECISIONS

1. Decision 1: Adoption of minutes of previous meeting (28July2010) postponed until next meeting.
2. Decision 2: Pipeline Report accepted without discussion.
3. Decision 3: Request MTA to price cost of creating a crosswalk at Reservoir St.
4. Decision 4: CAC will coordinate with MTA to expedite CAC-priority projects in the following categories: 1) pedestrian safety at key intersections; 2) transit-friendly streets; and 3) Living Alleys.
5. Decision 5: MTA will consider if bicycles can use Market after Hayes is made 2-way.

3. Decision 3: Resolution: unanimous conditional adoption of Dischinger's revised draft of In-Kind policy was good. She will incorporate our conditions & those of EN-CAC before presenting the policy to the Planning Commission.
4. Decision 4: Various items will be added to next month's agenda (see Item 10 below):
  - Approve minutes for July and August.
  - Discuss Pipeline Reports for last quarter (from summer through September)
  - Discuss, critique and adopt Department's 5-Year Monitoring Report.
  - Discuss and adopt subcommittee's proposed CAC Supplemental Report (partially based upon and including a critique of Department's report).
  - Create resolution expressing CAC preference for onsite affordable housing, rather than offsite (in lieu) housing, to achieve the complex mix in the neighborhood.
  - Consider funding \$100k to MTA for painting and signage for Hayes 2-way project.
  - Consider paying for crosswalk at Reservoir St., if MTA provides us with costs.
  - Talk further about CIPs process.
  - At next month or later but during this year, schedule HPC staff member to update us on the status of all historical surveys pertinent to the MOP.

#### COMMITMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, INFORMATION DUE

#	WHEN	WHO	WHAT
1.	08/31	CAC	Submit suggestions for CAC's supplement.
2.	09/02	PC	Request MTA to provide us with the cost to create a crosswalk at Reservoir St.
3.	9/10	KD	Dischinger distributes final draft of Department's 5 Year Monitoring Report to CAC for it to critique and incorporate into CAC Supplementary Report as well as for CAC to discuss at its September meeting.
4.	09/10	JH/TO/PC	Draft CAC's supplementary report on MOP process; discuss at next meeting.
5.	9/22	PC/KW	Compile a list of MOP park requirements; meet with RPD by end of Aug.; update CAC CIP recommendations at September CAC meeting
6.	9/20	KD	Recalculate an estimate of how much in fees is likely to be deferred.
7.	9/20	KD	Calculate how much funds CAC has for CIPs, so that CAC can allocate this.
8.	9/22	PC	Propose a system for public to recommend new CIPs and for CAC to consider them as MOP CIP prioritized recommendations.
9.	9/22	CAC	Review 5YMR; draft critique & CAC Supplement Report for adoption at September meeting and presentation before Planning Commission in Sep/Oct.
10.	9/22	PC/JH/TO	Subcommittee to draft/revise CAC Supplement for adoption at 9/25 meeting.
11.	9/22	Yarne	Send final draft of CFD proposal to CAC.

#### MINUTES

##### 1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

###### EXHIBIT 1: AGENDA

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

- X Cheryl Brinkman—Brinkman resigned; became member of MTA Board.
- √ Peter Cohen (Chair)
- 0 Carmela Gold
- √ Jason Henderson (Vice Chair)
- √ Robin Levitt
- √ Ted Olsson (Secretary)
- √ Dennis Richards
- 0 Marius Starkey
- X Ken Wingard

###### Ex Officio Members

- √ Kearstin Dischinger

###### Others attending:

Ricardo Olea, Engineer, DPT Traffic Engineering Div., MTA  
 Oliver Gadjia, Program Manager, Bicycles & Livable Streets, aMTA  
 Michael Yarne, Development Advisor, OEWD

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

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

- 2.1 **Congestion Pricing:** The Planning Department will speak at HVNA's next meeting on Aug. 26<sup>th</sup> (4<sup>th</sup> Th.) at 7pm at 333 Fell St.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING (JULY 28, 2010) [act] (Olsson)**

**Exhibit 1: Minutes of July 28<sup>th</sup> CAC meeting [Olsson]**

Approval of the minutes from the previous meeting was postponed until the next meeting.

**4. Coordination with Eastern Neighborhoods CAC [discuss; poss.act] (Cohen)**

They conditionally accepted Department's In-Kind policy.

**5. Pipeline Report—Developments in process; CAC project review [discuss] (Dischinger)**

**Exhibit 3: Pipeline Report for August**

Updates in the report were noted and accepted without comment. The Church on Valencia Street will not be demolished; they are merely adding another building.

**6. CAC guests—Ricardo Olea & Oliver Gadja, MTA [discuss]**

**Exhibit 4: MTA Ranking Criteria for Projects [untitled; Gadja, 8/25/10]**

**Exhibit 5: (2pp Map) Hayes two-way proposal cross-sections, Gough to Polk (SFMTA, 9/09)**

**Exhibit 6: (1pg Map) Haight/Gough/Market Streets proposed new bus route (untitled)**

Introducing our guests, Cohen indicated the CAC's three concerns in evaluating our own CIPs and wished to learn from MTA and coordinate with them on our CIPs. In general these are good ideas but what do they mean specifically and how do we evaluate and prioritize among competing projects:

1. Pedestrian safety at key intersections
2. Transit-friendly streets
3. Living Alleys

One project—Hayes Street 2-way— is beginning to happen. How does CAC coordinate with MTA to expedite these CAC-approved projects? After this meeting our CAC will follow up with MTA to coordinate on our top prioritized projects.

Gadja discussed the MTA's general criteria with Olea to follow on specific projects. Gadja passed out an exhibit of their main criteria at the project level. Projects are not ranked against each other; the projects are individually ranked. In response to Henderson's question, Gadja explained that "Continental Crosswalks" are either the "ladders" (stripes bounded by orders) or "keys" (stripes without borders), both defining the crosswalk.

Referring to our Appendix C CIPs, asked in terms of those CIPs having to do with pedestrian intersections if the MTA's criteria could help us prioritize our own CIPs. Gadja explained that in evaluating intersections the MTA discovers what data they have on the specific intersection; and if necessary they obtain more (e.g., counts of pedestrians crossings). Olea noted that MTA also refers to which projects could be done in coordination with other agencies and with shared costs. This too would raise the priority of a project, as would money received as Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) grants for specific intersections. The Pedestrian Safety Advisory Committee (PSAC) recommendations—which coordinate plans for pedestrian safety from all city agencies—are also an important factor.

Henderson asked about connecting alleys into major streets. How do pedestrians walk from one location to another in using alleys as a shortcut. Olea noted that pedestrians have the right-of-way (whether or not the crosswalk is defined) when crossing from a street (25 feet or wider); as long as they do it with care, vehicle drivers must yield to them. Alleys typically are less than 25 feet. According to the state, "jaywalking" only occurs when someone is crossing between two arterials with traffic signals. In SoMa area, where streets are so long, MTA may install crosswalks to accommodate pedestrians as indicated by patterns of jaywalking. Otherwise, there is pedestrian crosswalk as an extension of any street at a 4-way intersection or at a T-crossing. Henderson noted that at Rose Alley, there are a lot of children who dart across the street to get to the children's playground. Another example is the City's Reservoir Street, which is the driveway to Safeway in

the middle of Church Street, where there is plenty of pedestrians crossing in mid-street. The OTS Study hopes to take a more macro-look at pedestrian safety than MTA; however, now MTA is beginning to put out automated pedestrian counters, which will help them determine priority of projects, together with the statistics on vehicular accidents on streets and intersections, to reinforce their calculations.

Our CAC can advise MTA where there are pedestrian-dangerous intersections and to coordinate with MTA using its collision data to prioritize our own CIPs so as to work with MTA in expediting these projects. Cohen is quite concerned about the 6-point intersections lining Market from Octavia to Castro. MTA tries to improve the safety, even before collisions by retiming signals and placing warning signs. Oleas indicated that a couple factors are considered: 1) The City is always looking at Hot Spots for complaints. In this case the City is always looking at solutions which are quick and relatively easy to implement because of limited funds. 2) Then there are projects which are part of a neighborhood plan. In this case they are looking for additional funding which could help them address this situation quickly by raising its priority.

Henderson wondered whether developers ever approach the MTA about an in-kind policy. Olea indicated that everything is coordinated through the Planning Department, so that developers always hear a unified story and are not able to split city staff. On the Muni side, the Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP— <http://www.sfmta.com/cms/mtep/tepaper.htm> ) was a effort to prioritize citywide their key routes, to improve their infrastructure, and to improve reliability of the system. This had not had an environmental review yet but it is a citywide perspective for prioritizing projects. The priority now is to invest first on the transit lines in heaviest demand.

The discussion next focused upon the new Haight Street 2-way bus route (see map). Muni is excited about this project, which will begin next year. This is an example of where cooperation leveraged funds.

Another project within the MOP is the Hayes Street 2-way (see map). Planning Department and MTA have coordinated on this. Planning is currently reviewing the environmental aspects of the plan, expected in a couple of weeks. They remove a traffic lane on Fell and lane is forced to turn right with traffic re-striping. MTA/Planning will hold a public hearing on this at HVNA to alert the community to the changes and schedule. They were able to minimize traffic problems.

Levitt suggested pedestrian crossing at Gough and Fell. MTA is looking at this, though it is not currently part of the package. Levitt also recommended that once Hayes Street is 2-way he envisions a lot of bicyclists would use Haight Street rather than Page, which is backed. He wondered whether bicycles could go on Market Street. MTA thought that Page Street would remain but this is a conversation to have offline. Olea, thought this is interesting and will mention it to the MTA planners.

Henderson asked what MTA needed from CAC to accomplish the Hayes 2-way. Olea said that the painting and signage would cost about \$100K. They are looking for this amount. Since the City has paint crews and signage crews, this does not require an extensive process. As they left, MTA looked forward to meeting and coordinating with CAC on projects. After, Henderson asked without objection to put on next month's agenda consideration of CAC funding this \$100K to expedite the Hayes 2-way project. He also wanted CAC to ask MTA to price out putting an explicit crosswalk across Church Street at Reservoir Street (part of Safeway's parking lot driveway).

Dischinger added that she will try to recalculate how much will be deferred; the CAC may wish to discuss this issue with Supervisor Mirkarimi, an advocate for such deferrals. Cohen wanted to know what we have currently in the MOP Fund (to understand what the CAC can fund) as well as which projects we need to advocate for.

**7. CAC guest— Michael Yarne, Development Advisor, Ofc.Econ.& Wkfc.Dvlpt. [discuss/act] discussing the Melo-Roos Community Facilities District proposal**

Cohen next introduced Yarne's return visit to CAC, this time to explain and advocate for the rationale of creating a Community Facilities District. CAC has sufficiently talked about the Finance Committee and fee deferral program as well as the tax-increment resolution; so, he won't speak on that tonight. Instead this time he will talk about an aspect of San Francisco's Stimulus-2 package which will complete the fee deferral program. This will be a resolution before the Board of Supervisors in the Fall authorizing ABAG's (Association of Bay Area Governments) Finance Authority for nonprofit corporations—the experts with more than three decades of experience in and

creating such assessment districts throughout the nine Bay Area counties—to form a citywide infrastructure impact fee Community Facilities District (aka a Mello-Roos district). As a financing tool/mechanism, this is a way for developers to pay any/all fees for their developments (such as the deferral fees). This resolution does not create the district but is primary to that by allowing such a district to use ABAG's Finance Authority as its fiscal agent for collecting/distributing funds. Under this authority the city could secondly create such a Community Facilities District to administer the funds.

This is an alternative way for developers to pay their impact fees. What are the current ways? 1) They can borrow money from an equity investor; or 2) they can borrow money from a commercial lender. This Mello-Roos district is another way to get that money. This district does not defer fees. When the fee deferral program goes away, this would still be an option for the developer of paying any fees. This is just another option which they don't have now.

Cohen stated that developers don't typically pay for such fees outright/directly, rather they borrow the money at interest to pay for the fees, for which they will be fully reimbursed when they sell the properties. Both equity and commercial lenders usually result in a rather substantial burden/margin (rather like a mortgage) In a property for sale, the developer gradually pays off his construction loans as he sells off the units; rental property is a bit different.

The Mello-Roos district can be applied to one or many developments within the city. It works by creating the fee at such a rate as to not only pay the fee but also to pay the interest due on a 30-year bond obligation by the City to its bondholders. You size the assessment to pay off the bond; then you sell the bond and the bondholders are paid the interest on the bond from these fees. These are tax-exempt bonds because under the Mello-Roos legislation this can only be used for public infrastructure projects. Because it is tax-exempt, investors are willing to pay a premium. So, generally it is cheaper to pay for money this way than it is to pay commercial lenders. There is a whole market for these bonds; because they are so safe and guaranteed by the City, pension funds often invest in these.

This Mello-Roos solution has several distinct advantages: 1) the interest rates are cheaper; 2) this is considered a tax lien, not debt; so this is moved off of the construction debt when the developer is seeking additional (commercial) financing, less equity is required, reducing the additional amount and its interest, which the developer must pay; 3) most of the loans in these assessment districts are for condos and the buyers there do not have to pay the full value, since it is paid off over time (whereas most of the condo owners do not expect to be in that condo for the full 30 year term); so, historically this added tax has not suppressed the sales price (rather it has increased its attractiveness). This is why these districts improve the financial prospects of these projects on the margin.

Now, why wouldn't you [as a developer] wish to choose this alternative? 1) Typically it is a pain in the butt. You have to go through this whole formation process with an army of attorneys. 2) You have to work with ABAG's Financial Authority, which results in a whole series of hearings which may take six to eight months. However, if there are many little projects they can join together and spread the costs across all of them, reducing the impact.

The resolution proposes to use ABAG as financial agent and to create such a district for San Francisco. It can be applied to one project but thereafter many other projects can be rolled into this district. One of the best aspects of this is that as they grow by incorporating more projects they become better investments and the interest rates improve because the mortgages spread out the risk. The more properties covered by an investment district, the more investors are willing to pay, for it becomes a better risk. In contrast, the more fewer the projects, the more riskier the bond is perceived, because the more expensive the contract. So, this vehicle will become more valuable over time.

Next, what are the policy drawbacks? The only one he can see is that if over time you get a wide variety of these projects (e.g., 1-2k out of San Francisco's 320k development projects) — every owner gets full disclosure of the law and the assessment, an audited requirement — then each of these owners being aware of his current tax liability might be less likely to incur future taxes as a citizen.

A final important aspect of such a district is that the City remains whole in all circumstances. The check which the City receives from ABAG—ABAG as bond issuer assumes all risk and hires a corps of lawyers to do the strict scrutiny to assure that the property and developer are what they

claim to be— is cashed by the City whose credit-worthiness remains excellent. Only ABAG in this entire transaction must maintain strict scrutiny, but with thirty-plus years of experience, they are experts in this and exert such scrutiny at every point in the program; thus, in 30+ years they have never had a bad bond; they are very well known by investors for such a sterling record. So, in all cases the City gets the check when owed or paid and is not involved in any way in the transaction other than as recipient of legitimate fees. Any fee which pays for public infrastructure or improvements (i.e., all CIPs which CAC considers) can be paid for by this financial mechanism.

At this point Dischinger provided the Planning Department's rationale for this assessment district proposal, which is still under review by them. The Department envisions the following scenario as being how this will work. The project sponsor will come in and ask for his deferral, which will allow him to pay only 20% of the fees, which is equivalent to the ChildCare Fee component. This will make it a little harder for our CAC to do its programming and planning; however, from the Department's point of view for meeting its nexus and demands, and not being constrained by the number of projects which opt for this Mello-Roos option, the Department feels that this is a more consistent and predictable means of managing its plans and projects. If 100% of the projects in the MOP Area chose this Mello-Roos option, it would become very difficult for the Department to maintain its cash-flow to accomplish all of its projects. Yarne corrected this to say that it was not strictly "cash-flow" but rather how the Department used the money—which is to say that if the City accepts the money under Mello-Roos, then no part of it can be used for private purposes (e.g. private childcare, which the City typically employs).

In response to Dischinger's question — since the average developer's fee is \$10,000 per unit over 30 years, what would this amount to — Yarne indicated that his department had run numerous scenarios based upon recent developments throughout the City for which they had or could acquire all relevant data. The average annual assessment per thousand square feet ranged from \$320 per year (which means that the effective tax rate is 1.18% rather than 1.15%) to a rate of \$2,000 per year (at One Rincon Tower, with an effective tax rate of 1.2% per year, with rates throughout this spectrum). This last is admittedly an outlier. Removing it, the largest assessment is for 1998 Mission Street, which puts this upper range at \$1,200 per 1,000 square feet with an effective tax rate of 1.31%.

Cohen summarized the concerns he had heard about this resolution: 1) The fee deferral and this means to accomplish it shift the legitimate fees to ameliorate the impact of a development from the developer onto the future buyer; and 2) The early rationales for such an assessment district was that they would add to the developer's impact fees to create even more funding from these compound revenue streams for the necessary community improvements and public benefits to modify the impact created by the developments. Now, because the full burden of paying for these Community Improvement Projects is to be borne by the buyers through taxes, they are likely to be less willing to vote for any additional taxes which might improve their neighborhood or the City.

Yarne addressed the first of these by correcting Cohen: these are development impact fees, not developer impact fees. Every nexus study on this topic has been from the perspective of people in this community benefitting from these CIPs, not developers. It's based upon the added cost of those people in these buildings creating the need for the additional parks and libraries in this neighborhood, from which they themselves will directly benefit. There is no nexus for that fee. Interestingly this is a type of amortization by the residents of these buildings paying off the increased burden of the additional improvements caused by their having moved into and increased the population density of this neighborhood. However, in his prior experience in private development (building Mint Plaza), he found that buyers who liked a property and wanted to move into it, considered whether or not they could afford the monthly financial burden; they were not concerned particularly with how that cost was calculated. Indeed, one of the selling factors in deciding to move into a property was not solely the residence but rather the civic amenities, neighbors, and stores in the surrounding community which made it so attractive to them. The real concern is that because these are legitimate taxes, how much will this effect these buyers' willingness in the future to vote to tax themselves additionally for new civic improvements. He subscribed to the idea of other members of CAC that in any such election these specific buyers will most likely be outvoted by others in the electorate who do not have their perspective. He is not worried about the vote on citywide propositions because of a negligible minority in these buildings. In accepting this Mello-Roos district financed through ABAG, the City signs the contract which specifies which



improvements qualify for such funding and which do not. He answered Richards question by explaining that there are no indications on the buyer's mortgage specifying this Mello-Roos financing; rather, the bank financing the buyer's loan would scrutinize the buyer's financial situation to assure that he could afford to buy the property. Nor would the appraiser deduct anything from the potential loan because of this development financing. The bank is only concerned with whether you can afford your mortgage.

Cohen asked Yarne to send our CAC the current resolution proposal so that we can review and discuss the proposal. If necessary, we would invite him back to answer any questions. In answer to a question, Dischinger reported that the Eastern Neighborhoods CAC did not have an action item on this proposal but they were very positive about it. With that Yarne concluded his presentation and left the meeting, appreciated by all on the CAC for explaining this resolution and its implications.

**8. "In-Kind" community improvements policy for Planning Commission [discuss; act]**

**Exhibit 7:** Resolution approving In-Kind policy (Draft emailed to CAC) [Dischinger]

*[Note: Appendix D of this draft contains the summary table we requested.]*

This draft of the policy was presented to the Eastern Neighborhoods CAC which conditionally approved it. Rather than attach their half page resolution of conditional approval for this policy, it is appended here for reference.

**Eastern Neighborhoods CAC: Resolution approving In-Kind Policy**

**ACTION:** Approve draft In-Kind Guidelines with the following amendments (removed text shown with strike-through, and new text is underlined).

Revise Appendix D, Section 1 and commensurate language in the body of the text to read: "Project sponsor states intent to pursue an in-kind improvement to the Department and provides a brief conceptual description of the proposed improvement, as well as a strategy for public outreach regarding the proposed improvement."

Revised Appendix D, Section 3 and commensurate language in the body of the text to read: "Staff ask CAC to provide initial feedback on the proposed in-kind improvement, including its position relative to the CAC's infrastructure priorities and the relative infrastructure needs of the Eastern Neighborhoods as determined by the CAC, and whether the public outreach strategy is sufficient."

Revised Appendix D, Section 4 and commensurate lanague in the body of the text to read: "CAC passes a resolution on the project, which may include detailed comments on design, value and terms of agreement."

**MOTION:** Block; **SECOND:** Doumani

**AYES:** Quezada, Block, Doumani, Gillett, Goldstein, Ho, Lopez, Marti, Murphy, Scully, Sofis

**ABSENT:** Eslick, Huie, Mormino, Shen

**MOTION:** 2010-7-2

Dischinger reminded the CAC that twice earlier she had discussed the policy with our CAC. During the interim she met with Cohen and Levitt as delegates from our CAC and others from EN-CAC to help her revise the policy. This new draft results from all that input.

These are the latest changes1) The process begins very early as soon as the developer is "in the door" (i.e., expressed an interest to the Department to participate by creating an authorized In-Kind CIP. Then the developer comes before the CAC and presents his concept for the CIP. We are not asked to pass a resolution but merely to express to the developer what we think of the idea and how it meets our CIP priorities. This exchange of perspectives allows the developer to understand our concerns as well as to allow the developer not to invest too much energy in a concept that might eventually be doomed. This policy lets the developer immediately know of his concept's eligibility, whether it's a priority, whether it's recommended (in which case the CAC must understand what the neighbors think about the developer's concept and how this in-kind project would fit into their block).

Another big conversation was upon the routes for approval. In the first (preferred) scenario, the developer comes to the Department, to the CAC, and to any other agencies which would be involved in the CIP to learn what are the various ideas for such a CIP. They also consult the community. They then create their conceptual design, propose it to the CAC and gain community support. The CAC next passes its resolution on the developer's plan. Finally the entire package with approvals by the various entities and the CAC resolution is presented to the Planning Commission. (This is Step 5 in the approval process on the chart of Appendix D.)

In Scenario or Route 2, The Department recognizes that there may be instances in which the developer still has some loose ends on the CIP but needs to proceed with his development. So, he needs to receive sufficient approval to proceed with his project at DBI and to maintain his commitment to producing the CIP. So, the policy allows them to go to the Commission with just their development project and the CAC's initial resolution which may indicate that we agree with the concept but we are still negotiating some details of the design of the CIP but that in general the CAC favors (or does not) the developer's concept for the CIP. And then the developer must say to the Commission what they intend to do.

The 3<sup>rd</sup> Route covers the situation in which the developer has begun his development with all approvals without having considered creating an in-kind community improvement but later reconsiders and wishes to do so. While building their development, they then initiate the policy-defined steps to create a CIP.

The point of the policy is to assure that when a recommendation comes before the Commission to approve an In-Kind CIP, the Commission, the public record, and the public are all very clear about the explicit assumptions underlying this grant to the developer to reduce his costs by producing the desired CIP, which specifically meets the needs of the community as its top priority, however it may benefit the developer.

These are the primary changes. She presented the EN-CAC's conditional approval and asked Cohen or Levitt for their comments on the process and the policy. Before they did this, however, she responded to a request for her to summarize the EN-CAC's comments (above). She summarized them as follows:

1. Its 3<sup>rd</sup> revision (referring to p.12 of the policy) indicated that the CAC may include very detailed comments on the project but does not require them to be so extensive. Instead, they could comment on each project as needed.
2. Its 1<sup>st</sup> revision refers to the point at which a developer wants to offer to construct a CIP, they want the sponsor to specify how they intend to solicit feedback on their idea from the affected community—e.g., which neighborhood groups would the developer work with and when; so that we as CAC can recommend to them particular groups to include which they may not know about. In this way the CAC is advising them both at the front and at the end of the project.
3. Its 2<sup>nd</sup> revision is clarifying for the developer how his concept fits with our priorities for CIPs to be sure that the most important ones are fulfilled first or in approximate order.

Cohen commended Dischinger for the fine job she had done to incorporate all input into this policy and to state it well in this draft. He had suggested that the developer report back at a commission hearing on the status of the project. His feeling was that unless it was done at a Commission hearing, it would not be on the public record and would not be transparent to the public. He again asked that this recommendation be included in the final draft of the policy.

Cohen also felt that the EN-CAC's second recommendation also got to his concern that in some respect any In-Kind policy allows developers to more directly influence the direction of CIPs. They may be expected to pick CIPs which directly benefit their own development's residents rather than the community as a whole. This policy directly reduces the fund of money which the CAC can use to direct community improvements which benefit the greater community. This definitely shifts who is directing the public benefits for the community. This is not a minor concern. At the least the CAC should know what we might have spent the money on had we had the money otherwise directed to these In-Kind projects. The CAC must also consider whether the developer's proposed In-Kind CIP is truly a priority at this point, compared with the CAC's own prioritized CIPs. The larger question of the move represented by this In-Kind policy is the delivery system of accomplishing these improvements. Cohen believes that this policy encourages such In-Kind improvements to happen; the conflicting values of this form of CIP contrasted with those prioritized by the CAC representing a wide range of constituents in this community. While Cohen is cool on the idea of In-Kind projects, he feels

that if they are going to happen, then Dischinger's policy is a carefully considered policy for guiding this.

Levitt's recommendations were more specific rather than policy oriented. He feels that the CAC will weigh in on any developer's projects. In contrast he felt that under this policy the MOP and CAC may get things done which otherwise might never happen and that they could be done much quicker and more efficiently. Also, the reason for the fees is to mitigate against impacts which the development may create; and this is a very direct way of accomplishing this. He doesn't think every developer will be doing In-Kind CIPs, particularly smaller developers. He too complimented Dischinger on a fine draft incorporating everyone's contributions. As stated before, he wishes that the policy were more lenient, given all of the auditing oversight, to reward a developer with the extra savings if he were able to accomplish the project at the same level of quality or higher for less cost than had been anticipated by him and the City's agencies reviewing and accepting his initial estimate of costs. Other members of the CAC remembered that we had already resolved this issue when it was brought up earlier and Levitt agreed but wanted us to reconsider it.

In response to Richardson's question of why was this policy drafted, Dischinger explained that although the legislation creating the MOP allowed for developers to offer to construct In-Kind CIPs, the Department realized that there were no detailed procedures for this to occur. This policy corrects that deficiency, specifying several routes to this solution. This assures that the Department, the Commission, the CAC, and Developers all know explicitly the expectations of all parties to this agreement. Richardson's main concern is that with our prioritized list of CIPs we may never get all of them completed. He sees this policy as allowing routine projects to be completed, though perhaps at the expense of more important CIPs. Dischinger also assured Olsson that developers are limited to constructing their CIPs within and to benefit the Plan Area (e.g., MOP); they could not construct a community improvement in some other community. However, Dischinger noted that developers are no more constrained by projects in the CIP list than is our CAC.

Cohen noted that at least this policy is very robust; developers must loop through the CAC at least twice. First we consider whether the developer's proposed project is even eligible and then how it fits with CAC's established priorities. The CAC then measures it against its metrics for such projects and must create a resolution to accompany the developer's proposal before the Commission. All of these discussions and debates are built into the process of this policy. As Dischinger has argued, if nothing else, at least the CAC is empowered to throw all these questions on the table. So, if it is totally misaligned with MOP priorities, then we can vigorously oppose it. The policy is meant to give clear direction to the CACs as to what kind of direction the developers are coming to you for: e.g., 1) what are your CAC priorities? We can then tell them which are our top 25 priorities and our top 5 or 10. Our CAC may wish to arrange our CIPs according to priorities, according to which we wish to see sooner or later, or according to which we consider could be In-Kind projects.

Dischinger asked us for a resolution of approval of her policy since it must go before the Planning Commission on September 16<sup>th</sup>. So, though Cohen couldn't make the motion, he suggested that any motion should 1) require the developer to return at some point to the Commission for a public status report; and 2) that we should reinforce and adopt the EN-CAC's 2d condition (where is the developer's proposed project relative to the CAC's other priorities). Henderson then proposed this as a motion, seconded by Levitt and unanimously approved.

#### **MOP-CAC Resolution 25Aug2010-1:**

**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 the following conditions:**

**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 in contrast to 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/prioritize 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 it is misaligned with CAC priorities, the CAC has the right to vigorously disapprove a developer's concept based on this rationale.

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 — 25Aug2010 #1**

**YES:** Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards (unanimous)

**NO:** none

**ABSTAIN:** none

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

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

It was understood that Dischinger would make all of the revise her draft to accept all of both CACs' recommendations so that the policy presented to the Commission for approval and adoption would contain all of our recommendations.

Dischinger thanked the CAC for its careful review of her policy draft as well as for their recommendations. She will incorporate all of the suggestions of both this CAC and that of EN into her final draft which will be presented to the Commission for its approval.

**9. Progress update on draft of CAC supplement to Monitoring Report [discuss; possibly act]**

This item was eliminated from consideration in regard to the time. However, Olsson will incorporate Richards' recommendations into the draft of our Supplementary report. After Labor Day, Cohen, Henderson, and Olsson will meet to discuss, revise, and compose a new draft of our CAC report to be disseminated to all members which can be approved and presented to the Commission in late September or early October with the Department's Monitoring Report.

**10. Committee members comments and issues the Committee may consider in future meetings [discuss]**

Henderson asked to have placed on our CAC Agenda for either the next meeting or the following one a resolution on 2001 Market Street. All of the other members of the CAC thought it imprudent to set the precedent of the CAC making resolutions on individual developments. So, this suggestion was withdrawn. Instead Henderson proposed that our resolution endorse the parking standards and discuss the issue of onsite affordable housing. He wanted CAC to insist that any such affordable housing be onsite, rather than elsewhere in lieu of onsite; however, he did not want this to be an obstacle for objecting to an entire development. His wondered when the parking issue would come before the Planning Commission and Richards indicated that this would not happen before the Prado Group releases their Traffic and Parking Study for their development at 2001 Market Street. Dischinger offered the CAC expert advice that we could create a resolution from the CAC indicating a preference for onsite affordable housing.

So our agenda for CAC's next meeting will include: 1) the resolution about affordable housing; 2) a discussion of the Department's Monitoring Report; 3) a discussion of the CAC's Supplemental Report (which is based upon a reading of the final draft of the Department's report); 4) we will talk further about CIPs; 5) CAC will review and approve (with corrections if necessary) the minutes of the July and August meetings; 6) a fuller discussion of next month's Pipeline Report; and 7) not necessarily next month but shortly thereafter a staff member of the Historic Preservation Commission will be invited to come to our meeting and talk to us about the status of the historical surveys within the MOP Area. In making this last suggestion, Richards commented that he just received a document from Michael E. Smith on recommended standards of construction for new buildings in historic districts, which was said to be a part of the original survey package. Richards had never seen this

before in said survey package. He only caught this because it was in a staff report; he replied that he had never seen this requirement and that he still had the original survey document.

**11. Public Comment**

No members of the public being present, this item was dispensed with.

**12. Adjournment**

There being no further business, the CAC adjourned at 8:29pm.

**Next Meeting: Wednesday, September 22, 2010, 6:30pm, City Hall, Rm. 278**

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

**Calendar: 4/28, 5/26, 6/23, 7/28, 8/25, 9/22, 10/27, 11/24, 12/22**

Respectfully submitted,  
~TED OLSSON  
Secretary

MOP-CAC  
**Attendance**  
 4<sup>th</sup> Wednesday monthly

Legend

Y = attended

N = unexcused absence

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

<u>CAC Member</u>	<u>1/19</u>	<u>2/24</u>	<u>3/24</u>	<u>4/28</u>	<u>5/26</u>	<u>6/23</u>	<u>7/28</u>	<u>8/25</u>	<u>9/22</u>	<u>10/27</u>	<u>11/24</u>	<u>12/22</u>
Cheryl Brinkman	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	Y	Y	<b>Resigned</b>				
Peter Cohen	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Carmela Gold	Y	X	Y	Y	X	Y	Y	0				
Jason Henderson	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Robin Levitt	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	Y	Y				
Ted Olsson	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Dennis Richard	Y	Y	Y	Y	X	X	Y	Y				
Brad Villiers	Y	X	<b>Dead</b>									
Marius Starkey				Y	Y	Y	Y	0				
Ken Wingard						Y	Y	X				
<u>Ex Officio</u>												
Kearstin Dischinger	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				

**MOP-CAC**  
**2010 Draft Schedule of meeting Topics**  
(as of 24 FEB 2010)

January 27February 24

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

March 24

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

April 24

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

May 28

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

June 23

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

July 28

- Finalize proposed process — potential action

August 25

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

September 22

- Update CAC CIP recommendations

October 27

- Finalize 2011 CAC CIP recommendations; potential action

November 24

- As needed; potential action to finalize 2011 CAC recommendations

December 22 HOLIDAY: NO MEETING

**LIST OF RELEVANT DOCUMENTS  
TO BE INCLUDED ON MOP-CAC WEBSITE  
(other than Exhibits, unless cross-referenced\_  
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1700>**

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

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



**CAC Brainstorm on topics for Planning Department's MOP Monitoring Report  
(CAC meeting, Jan. 27, 2010: Exhibit 6)**

**TOPICS REQUESTED BY CAC MEMBERS  
FOR 2-YEAR MONITOR REPORT TO COVER**

1. What has been done about the historic districts and how they have been incorporated into the MOP?
2. Are there any plans to move forward on the specific CIPs mentioned as Appendix C of the Plan?
3. What is the situation with parking and CU permits in the MOP? This [the Monitor Report] should consider the Parking Nexus Study. How can we accommodate new housing without parking? How can we accomplish the MOP's goal of reforming how parking permits are distributed, given that this requires State enabling?
4. How is the thinking of the Department's project planners informed by the MOP when evaluating projects? This is important for understanding how they apply the Department's requirement for "planning code performance", which is required to be monitored.
5. How do the CAC's decisions effect the properties not within but bordering upon the area of the Plan? In the beginning of the Better Neighborhoods concept it was thought that the positive developments modeled in the Plan area would be so self-evident and attractive that bordering areas would wish to adopt them immediately to meld into the Plan area. Is this assumption still pertinent?
6. The Historical/Educational/Cultural criteria should be incorporated into the process and matrix now.
7. MOP must incorporate urban car sharing into the area. Allowing for both street parking and off-street parking preferences. Plans must include current carsharing organizations and allow for new ones which might join the industry. The Plan's implementation should also consider charging stations (e.g., electric) and the roles that service stations must play even within the district. It is not sufficient to suppose that mass transit will solve or be preferred by citizens.
8. The MOP should discuss specifically how the Plan emphasizes and most effectively encourages green/sustainable construction/operational practices for all buildings—commercial and residential—within the area to continue San Francisco's leadership in this field, which will inform our citizen's practices and attract businesses. Specifically we should assess the role of the recycling center at Buchanan and Market and whether it is effective or counterproductive.
9. The report should describe the MOP zoning and evaluate what was accomplished by the practice of the charettes (Planning Department's community workshops). Specifically, what was changed as a result of these? Were these merely informative, palliative, or transformative? What lessons were learned and how can the practice be improved.
10. Similarly, what lessons and improvements are discovered about the process of CACs?
11. What is the effect of the growth of population density in the Plan area relative to the TEP? What data and lessons does the Department have on enforcement?

**Suggestions for CAC Supplemental Report  
(from May 26<sup>th</sup> meeting)**

1. The CAC's Report should not be merely a critique of the department's Monitoring Report. Rather, we should compile the comments and recommendations from our members and should consider policy and procedures that we've observed during our term and offer our recommendations of how the system can be improved to better implement the MOP.
2. We can recommend funding or recommend that the City begin working on particular projects. We could ask specific agencies to report on the status of specific projects. We don't have to take on work, we can ask MTA, for example, what they think would be required for specific projects. We can state what we believe we should focus on.
3. At some point we need to know what our budget is and how it is prioritized among these categories.
4. There are categories which we have not even considered yet (e.g., Historical/Cultural/Educational criteria), which we promised to include this fall; and other criteria, such as green/sustainable requirements for each project.
5. We were informed that the Planning Department has about 33% of the money needed to fund this Plan. We might want to direct the Department to work out the differences—for example the streetscapes might be something that community groups could undertake, freeing up funds.
6. We might compare how the MOP/CAC and relevant city agencies and commissions work together and recommend any improvements. We must keep our report succinct.
7. Our report is not merely a critique of the Department's report but rather is a committee perspective on the process of implementing the plan. It is not a reaction to the department's report or the data. We can speak as CAC members or as community/neighborhood members, representing our constituents. We will also attend and speak before the Commission when it considers the Monitoring Report.
8. This report is not about how the CAC works, but rather about how the Plan is being implemented. It was suggested that there should be a Process section, a Policy section, and others. First the subcommittee should outline what the sections should be, then members should write the sections, and finally the CAC should consider the whole draft. The report should be succinct: a short description of the problem and a brief description of the solution.
9. Members can offer comments and suggestions, with the emphasis on improving the process of implementing the MOP.

Dischinger will email the Department's Monitoring Report to the CAC by mid-June. [This was presented in hardcopy at the June meeting. Note: the additional sheet by Moses Corrette on the Historical Surveys belongs in Dischinger's report on the page designated for Corrette's report.] After reviewing the printed draft of the Department's Monitoring Report, the CAC members will submit their draft comments/input for the CAC's own supplemental report to Olsson and Henderson (deadline of July 9<sup>th</sup>) to be compiled into an integrated supplementary report to be submitted to the Planning Commission.