

**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
Monday, July 16, 2012; 6:30pm
Regularly scheduled monthly meeting**

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

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

SUMMARY

ATTENDEES

PRESENT: Jason Henderson (Chair), Krute Singa (Vice Chair), Peter Cohen, Robin Levitt, Ted Olsson, Dennis Richards, Michael Simmons, Lou Vasquez, Kenneth Wingard

ABSENT: none

STAFF: Alexis Smith (Planning)

GUESTS: David Winslow, staff, SF Planning Department (designer of Living Alley)
David Noyola, Strada Investment Group, (415.263.9150; dnoyola@stradasf.com)
Ben ?????

AGENDA (Exhibit 1: Agenda)

1. 7:00-7:05 **Call to order and roll call** [act]
2. 7:05-7:10 **Approval of Minutes for June 18th, July 16th, & September 17th regular meetings** [act]
3. 7:10-7:30 **Introduction to Living Alleyways Pedestrian Network project** [discuss]
4. 7:30-8:00 **Presentation: potential in-kind agreement for 344 Fulton Street** (Boys&Girls Club) [discuss]
5. 8:00-8:30 **Discuss CAC's CIP priorities for Gough St. intersections** [discuss]
6. 8:30-8:35 **Announcements, upcoming meetings and general housekeeping** [discuss]
7. 8:35-8:40 **Legislation/Policy Pipeline Report** [discuss]
8. 8:40-8:45 **Development Pipeline Report—CAC review of projects** [discuss; act]
9. 8:45-8:50 **Committee comments & issues the Committee may consider in future meetings** [discuss]
10. 8:50-9:00 **Public Comment**
11. 9:00-9:05 **Adjournment & announcement of next meeting** — The meeting adjourned at 9:05pm.

NEXT MEETING: TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2012, 7:00PM AT 1650 Mission, 5th floor (changed for holiday) (2013—TBD: Jan16, Feb20, Mch19; Apr16, May21, Jun18, Jul16, Aug20, Sep17, Oct15, Nov19, Dec17)
All meetings are on the **THIRD MONDAY, 7:00pm MONTHLY** (Jan & Feb: exceptions this year)

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

- Exhibit 1: Agenda (**Smith**)
Exhibit 2: June 18th 2012 CAC minutes (**Olsson**): resubmitted
Exhibit 3: July 16th 2012 CAC minutes (**Olsson**): resubmitted
Exhibit 4: September 17th 2012 minutes (**Olsson**): resubmitted; August minutes approved last month.
Exhibit 5: 344 Fulton Housing (20Nov2012; front L1.0 & L1.1) (**David Baker + Partners**, developers)
Exhibit 6: Gough Street photo map; p.1 Turk to Grove; p.2 Hayes to Market (**Smith**)
Exhibit 7: Correspondence (Bill&Rhonda Tannenbaum)—re: Living Alleyways (**Olsson**)
Exhibit 8: Development Pipeline Report, 4pp. (12/10/2012, 1:31:42pm) (**Smith**)

DECISIONS

- Decision 1: Minutes (**June 18th, July 16th, September 17th**) approved. **August 20th** already approved.
- Decision 2: Peter Cohen has resigned; the Supervisors will appoint his successor by our next meeting. Our Chair will draft a resolution commending Cohen for his leadership.
- Decision 3: CAC Chair announced that the October and November regular meetings will be postponed.
- Consensus: Consideration of The Sharon Street Neighbors letter was tabled until the next meeting.

COMMITMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, INFORMATION DUE — NONE

#	WHEN	WHO	WHAT
1.	2/5	JH	Draft resolution commending Peter Cohen

SEE PP.11-14 FOR A SUMMARY OF ALL 2012 MEETINGS**Issues Tabled for Next Meeting Demanding CAC Attention (according to A.Smith emails, below)**

1. Freeway Parcels: RFPs issued in 2013; CAC to review.
2. OEWD extending lease of Proxy site.
3. OWED & RecPark relocate Hayes Valley Farm
4. Streetscape/alley improvements ribbon cutting, January 2013
5. CIPs going out to bid in the beginning of 2013
6. TA's Central Freeway circulation study—CAC to coordinate follow-up activities & obtain funding.
7. IPIC included all CAC recommendations: see URL below to discuss
8. Upper Mkt.St. zoning extended 1 block to Castro/17th/Market Sts.: any concerns?
9. Impact of Transit Impact Development Fee on Market/Octavia Development Impact Fee?
10. Architectural students ideas for HVNA on development of freeway parcels.

CAC Issues to Consider in 2013**Issues to have been considered at December 2012 meeting but postponed****SmithA121219e Monday meeting follow up**

In an email dated December 19, 2012, from Alexis Smith to CAC members, she noted the following issues that were postponed from our meeting and need to be considered at our next meeting in 2013.

Hello CAC members!

Thanks for a good meeting on Monday. A few last items before the holidays...

The CAC's regular January meeting falls on a holiday, so I'll get back to you at the beginning of January with an alternate date. Monday night's discussions brought up several interesting topics to visit at future meetings, so I think there'll be a lot of great stuff to discuss in the new year.

A few announcements that we didn't have time to get to at the meeting –

- Parcels, O, R, S, and T are scheduled to have RFPs issued early next year. Parcel O will be for affordable family housing, and parcels R, S, and T will be for mixed use development.
- OEWD is in the process of negotiating an extension of the lease for the Proxy site through 2020.
- OEWD and Rec Park are working on relocating the Hayes Valley Farm to the Buchanan right-of-way.
- Ancillary projects: the streetscape/alley improvements will have a ribbon cutting in January. The skatepark, dog run, and McCoppin Hub are scheduled to go out to bid at the beginning of 2013.
- The TA board approved the Central Freeway circulation study this fall. A copy of the report is attached. Next steps are to coordinate follow-up activities and start working on obtaining funding for specific projects.

That's it for now. Have a great holiday everyone!

Alexis

SmithA121121e MOP-CAC November updates

In an email dated November 21, 2012, upon postponement of that month's meeting, Alexis Smith reminded the CAC members that we had the following updates and issues to be considered at our next meeting.

Greetings CAC members!

Thanks to those of you who responded to the doodle poll. It looks like there are enough people to meet in December on the CAC's regularly scheduled meeting day (December 17, the 3rd Monday of the month). If you can't make it, PLEASE let me know. I'll send out a calendar invite shortly.

In the meanwhile, because the group didn't meet this month or last, here are some updates on items that might be of interest to the CAC:

IPIC report: As you all remember, in September the CAC finalized its recommendations for impact fee expenditures. The IPIC incorporated all of the CAC's recommendations into its final report, which was presented to the Capital Planning Commission last month. Thanks everyone for your hard work and thoughtfulness in developing the CAC's recommendations! A copy of the final IPIC report can be found at http://commissions.sfplanning.org/cpcpackets/IPIC_CPC_case_report.pdf; Market Octavia is discussed on pages 14-18, 36-42, and 50.

Development pipeline report: attached.

Franklin Street: will get a few new bulb-outs this spring! The street is scheduled to be repaved using streets bond funding in spring 2013. To take advantage of the construction crews that will already be onsite, some impact fee funds (budgeted for Pedestrian Improvements to Franklin and Gough intersections in FY2013) can be used to add bulb outs out the SE and SW corners of Franklin/Hayes and at the SE corner of Franklin/Turk. In addition to the repaving, another funding source has been identified for pedestrian countdown signals, which would be installed in 2014. Gough Street will follow a similar schedule, but one year behind Franklin (repaving in 2014, ped signals in 2015).

Duboce Park Landmark District: would designate the 87 buildings located north of Duboce Park as a landmark district. A hearing before the Historic Preservation Commission is scheduled for Wednesday, Dec 5. See attached flyer for more details.

Carshare legislation: A few of you had expressed interest in this legislation when it was first introduced. It allows a property owner to provide a certain number of car share spaces that would not count against the property's maximum amount of permitted parking spaces. It is scheduled to be heard by the Planning Commission on December 6. Andres Power in Supervisor Wiener's office was scheduled to discuss this legislation in Oct/Nov, but since those meeting were cancelled, I've attached a summary of the legislation.

Upper Market Street zoning: *(Note that this does NOT change zoning within the Plan Area, but in the area right next to it; just a heads up in case you hear something and are curious.)* Two pieces of legislation would collectively extend the Upper Market NCT zone one additional block along Market Street to Castro/17th Street (the NCT zone currently exists along Market from Church/14th Street to Noe/16th Street). It would replace the Upper Market NCD zoning that currently exists on that block. The two zones are essentially the same, except some differences in residential density controls. The legislation was introduced by Supervisor Weiner in October and will be at the Planning Commission on November 29. Legislation summary attached.

Transit Impact Development Fee (TIDF): *(Note that this is NOT the Transportation Sustainability Program (TSP) that was presented to the CAC in the spring; that is still undergoing environmental review).* The proposed legislation would expand the new types of development subject to the TIDF, clarify agency roles, and adjust TIDF rates. This legislation would not affect the Market Octavia Development Impact Fee.

Former freeway parcels: I haven't forgotten about this one; I'll have an update for you at the December meeting. On a related note, Jason asked me to let you know that on Dec 6, HVNA will be hosting a groups of architecture students, who will present ideas for the Parcel O site.

We can discuss any/all of these items in December. Until then, have a great Thanksgiving!
Alexis

MINUTES

LEGEND

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

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

EXHIBIT 1: AGENDA

ROLL CALL (9 members; Quorum = 5)

Present: Jason Henderson (Chair), Kruti Singa (Vice-Chair), Robin Levitt, Ted Olsson (Sec.), Dennis Richards, Michael Simmons, Lou Vasquez, Ken Wingard; Alexis Smith

Absent: none

Ex Officio Members

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

Guests:

- David Winslow, staff, SF Planning Department (designer of Living Alley)
- David Noyola, Strada Investment Group, representing Boys & Girls Club
- Ben _____, Boys & Girls Clubs architect

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:10pm.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS (June, July, September) MEETINGS [act]

EXHIBIT 2-4: June 18th, July 16th, and September 17th minutes.

DECISION: The minutes of the June and July meetings were again approved; September's approved.

The minutes for the June 18th, July 16th were approved again and those of the September 17th meeting were approved all on a single motion by Levitt, seconded by Richards, in which vote Richards abstained for being absent at the meetings. The minutes of the August 20th meeting were already approved at the previous (9/17) meeting.

3. INTRODUCTION TO LIVING ALLEYWAYS PEDESTRIAN NETWORK PROJECT [discuss]

[EXHIBIT 6: Gough Street photo map; p.1 Turk to Grove; p.2 Hayes to Market (**Smith**)

Guest David Winslow announced that the Planning Department had received from CalTrans a \$250,000 grant for its Living Alleyways proposal. This two-year grant will be split with MTA and DPW. This is particularly important because the freeway parcels are coming online. The planning for Ivy Alley has been entirely completed. Similarly planning has been done for Ash Alley—where the new Boys & Girls Club will be built—and for Hickory Alley. It is projected that funds will come online by 2016. Winslow's expertise is based upon his having successfully designed, fundraised, and built Linden Alley, from which experience he learned a great deal about getting such living alleyways approved and completed. Among the critical issues to consider were parking, traffic, and accessibility in such alleys.

This grant pushes the boundaries of previously planned Living Alleyways. The essence of the concept is that busy streets bound some quiet alleyways. It is important to maintain the serenity and quality of life on these alleyways as well as to prevent them from becoming dangerous, speedy vehicular shortcuts or detours from one thoroughfare to another. One new concept for these mid-block alleys which cross a major vehicular street is to allow protected crosswalks across the busy street for pedestrians, dogs, disabled and others from one part of the alley to the continuation of the alley across the thoroughfare (e.g., allowing Linden Alley to cross Gough Street).

As criteria for future alleys, the department wants to set up an RFQ/RFP process to encourage competitive, creative new alleys. It is hoped that this will encourage communities of people who want to create such alleys to propose these ideas to the Department. To accomplish this process the department will set parameters and guidelines for such Living Alleyways and then provide these to neighborhood groups to have them produce designs for their own alleys. The goal is to streamline the process and open it to multiple neighborhoods with individualized

designs. The department will oversee the design and review/permit process. But they are concerned about thinking of ways to defray these costs.

At this point Henderson said that he had conversations regarding Rose Alley and Market. He asked about further thinking on Living Alleyways. He also mentioned that the new San Francisco Jazz Center will want to have one. He suggested that the political marketing of these alleys would be enhanced if, like the Dutch, we consider dedicating alleys to particular groups, such as Children. He noted that there is a precedent for this: in traffic calming for children. He suggested that this might be appropriate in one of the public housing developments in the Western Addition, perhaps on Lily Street, behind the International School.

The Market-Octavia Plan (MOP) identifies key streets for alleyways. MTA has allocated \$46,000 for such projects. At this point Olsson reported to the committee that today our CAC received a letter from Sharon Street Neighbors regarding their desire to convert their one-block-long street into a Living Alleyway, as specifically designated by the Market-Octavia Plan. Despite the fact that Living Alleyways was a principal topic scheduled on today's meeting, the CAC decided that they could not consider this request under the current discussion and postponed consideration of the communication until the next meeting.

Levitt informed the CAC that the Netherlands, Germany, England and other European countries are already creating such Living Alleyways. There alleyways treat the paths bounded by buildings on either side as common areas and as gathering places. Therefore cars had to share such spaces with pedestrians and safely pass around them. He noted that such alleyways would be particularly appropriate on Lily Street which connects between the International School and Muir School. It also is close to Kochland Park. Unfortunately currently Octavia Blvd. is a barricade to such tranquil passage. Levitt also thought that Lily Street could divert bike traffic from Page Street, the major bicycle route. However, before such vehicular traffic were allowed on these alleyways we must assure that bicyclists are considerate enough to obey traffic laws. This is particularly important in the case of these alleys connecting school children. It should be noted that Lily Street is used by FAIS/IHS to deliver and pick up elementary school children, since this cannot be done safely on Oak Street during the commute hours. Levitt indicated that he had already drawn designs for making Lily Street a living alleyway, between the school and its playground.

Wingard proposed a similar concern with the streets that deadend into Duboce Park. They too are listed in the Plan. Similarly, the park is used by lots of children and this designation and design would protect them, though there is not as much speeding on them just because they are not through streets but abut the park at the end. He noted that 16 kids under the age of 7 live on Potomac, near the Harvey Milk Club.

Richardson, who lives in the Duboce Triangle neighborhood, mentioned that Otis and McCoppin do not have many residential issues, though a lot of work has been done there.

The committee asked Winslow what he had learned from his Living Alleyway experience, if he could recommend any improvements to the process. He indicated that typically there are no problems with the physical design; that is fine. To make the process easier, Winslow would change it as follows:

1) the group must maintain the alleyway and he recommends having an insurance policy, because this is not standard. Further, in converting the alleyway, the neighbors must sign an agreement with the City to hold harmless forever the City. He questions why the City cannot adopt these proven alleyways as standard. This must be changed, retroactively, for all alleyways.

2) The City has an innumerable number of reviews of these projects. Instead of a series of reviews, the City should bring all appropriate parties to the same meetings. All issues should be laid on the table and once and for all approved by all departments simultaneously.

Winslow indicated that there will be a series of community workshops on such Living Alleyways in 2013 (during March, May, and June). After these, the department will pick several proposals to implement.

Henderson said that our CAC will talk about Gough St later. Franklin Street is being repaired/renovated this spring and Gough Street a year later. Therefore, we should get our recommendations for alleyways included into the design of Gough Street for any alleyways because we will need to speed up our recommendations for any alleyways which cross Gough.

4. PRESENTATION: POTENTIAL IN-KIND AGREEMENT FOR 344 FULTON STREET

Exhibit 5: 344 Fulton Housing (20Nov2012; front L1.0 & L1.1) (David Baker + Partners, developers)

David Noyola & Ben ???, representing respectively Strada Investment Group, the funder representing the Boys & Girls Club, and representing the architect and developer, were introduced to explain their project and how it complemented the MOP area. Ash Alley is behind the proposed development. HVNA has already heard the developer speak about the development. It is located at the northeast corner of Gough and Fulton Streets and

includes a surface parking lot. The Clubhouse itself consists of 50-60,000 square feet. In the sale of the parcel, San Francisco, as owner, asked the Club to provide housing onsite. In this mutually beneficial arrangement, all funds would return to San Francisco for more affordable housing.

They hope to come before the Planning Commission in late February. The exhibit for this item (above) shows two options for the corner: the basic scheme has no bulbout; the enhanced one does.

The question was raised asking what the MOP-CAC is foregoing for fee revenue from the project because of the nature of the special circumstances of the sale. The deadend alley behind the clubhouse is proposed to have significant improvement. It was hoped that the Club could use the blind alley as an emergency exit, if they can square off the existing city-owned parking at the end of the alley to be consistent with the building.

Henderson felt that it was worth considering optimizing the infrastructure costs because of the Better Streets Plan. Levitt thought that the B&GC plan was very good in trying to civilize this corner. He felt comfortable in using a portion of MOP CIP fees for this bulbout. Wingard indicated that the corner is 65 feet long and the building is only 50 feet long. Richardson loved the idea of using the site for the Club. He noted that the parklet in front of Harlequin on Hayes between Franklin and Gough Streets, would also complement this location for B&GC.

Henderson asked if developers were comfortable with the parking? In terms of this project, Henderson reminded us that we must expedite our thinking about Gough Street, since the City is fast-tracking the repaving of Gough Street. The question is whether this development would be the first in-kind agreement, since we are still working on this policy with 2001 Market Street. Olsson suggested that we create a resolution showing our support for the bulb-out and for squaring-off the parking to accommodate the emergency exit for the building into Ash Alley; however, this was not taken up at this time.

Levitt suggested that Ash Street should be converted into a living alley, suggesting that there is an opportunity in this to connect with the park and with a City Hall vista. Others wondered whether it might be possible to develop Ash into an alley for kids from B&GC to use for outdoor activities. In terms of the affordable onsite housing at the B&GC building, it was noted that Richardson Housing is located across Fulton Street and market-rate housing is located across Gough Street. Perhaps when the developer returns with costs for the bulbout, it should also propose any additional costs; for example, perhaps we should pave the whole alley with special pavement at the level of the sidewalk to signify that it has a special use.

5. DISCUSS CAC'S CIP PRIORITIES FOR GOUGH STREET INTERSECTIONS [discuss]

Exhibit 6: Gough Street photo map; p.1 Turk to Grove; p.2 Hayes to Market (Smith)

The Chair next turned the discussion to talking about the effect of repaving Gough Street. He notified us that Franklin Street will be repaved in April 2013. IPIC has the money to do this from monies in the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit program. He mentioned that there would also be bulbouts at the Turk and Franklin intersection. Every intersection is scheduled to have pedestrian countdown signals (a \$40M) project included with repaving bulbouts. Gough will be redone beginning in April 2014.

Smith mentioned that everything on these two projects must be completed within a period of three years; so, everything must proceed immediately with some urgency. In terms of the BRT funding for these bulbouts, she mentioned that this source can only fund bulbouts if they have been identified in the approved EIR mitigation. The Market/Turk/Hayes intersection is clearly identified as are Franklin and Gough intersections at Market and Hayes. Since these projects are ripping up the streets, we should study the plans for these intersections to see how we can include our support for intersections within the MOP area. Our CIP funds may be able to fund these bulbouts and by partnering with IPIC we can accomplish what we want by contributions from multiple agencies. However, it was noted that we have no influence on the Franklin bulbouts, only on the Gough Street ones.

Henderson mentioned that we should pay some attention to the intersection at Page and Gough Streets because Page is a bike boulevard. In this case a bulbout would prevent traffic from turning and then sprinting to Octavia in order to make the light and turn onto Octavia. Levitt mentioned that currently there is no parking east of Gough and Market Streets. Wingard noted that some work has already been done at Gough and Market. The tiny pedestrian islands there sometimes trap pedestrians while trying to cross the intersection. However, a bus coming down Haight Street and turning onto Market will eliminate this island. Smith agreed that the midblock crossings at the intersection of alleys with thoroughfares are important, as is the intersection at Gough and Market Street. Henderson suggested that we should get a cursory look at what MTA is proposing for Page Street. And Richardson noted that people from the commercial district are trying to come down Gough Street. Smith agreed that there is a lot of support for work on Page, Fell and Turk Streets. And Henderson mentioned another project on Grove and Gough. Smith also informed the committee, while we discuss intersections where we would like bulbouts, that each of these bulbouts average about \$250,000 (i.e., \$1M per intersection!). The big cost in recreating these intersections

is in constructing the drainage and in moving the catch basins. Bulbout priorities for Page, Fell, Hayes, and Turk Streets are in Tier-1; Grove intersections are in Tier-2.

6. ANNOUNCEMENTS, UPCOMING MEETINGS, GENERAL HOUSEKEEPING

6.1 **Peter Cohen resignation.** Henderson announced that Peter Cohen resigned from our CAC. Henderson will draft a commendation for Cohen by our next meeting. There are two applicants for his position. The Supervisors will have selected his successor in time for our January meeting. The requirements are that the representative must live or work within the boundaries of the MOP. There was enthusiasm for one of the applicants, who would represent low-income residents.

6.2 **Postpone October & November meetings.** Henderson cancelled the October and November meetings; so, we will try to meet at our regularly scheduled time in December before the holidays.

6.3 **Sharon Street Neighbors letter.**

Exhibit 7: Correspondence (Bill&Rhonda Tannenbaum)—re: Living Alleyways (Olsson)

Staff received a letter from the Sharon Street Neighbors at 4:30pm today. It requested consideration for converting this one-block-long street into a Living Alley, as it had been designated in the Market-Octavia Plan. Olsson was disappointed that we did not include this neighbors' request in today's discussion of the topic, since it was exactly on that topic. He stated that it must be fully considered at our next meeting. Smith also indicated that she will speak with the Tannenbaums (authors of the letter on behalf of the neighbors) before our next meeting to prepare them for that meeting.

7. LEGISLATION/POLICY PIPELINE REPORT— none

8. DEVELOPMENT PIPELINE REPORT—CAC review of projects [discuss; act]

Exhibit 8: DEVELOPMENT PIPELINE REPORT, 4pp. (12/10/2012, 1:31:42pm) (Smith)

The four page report was accepted without discussion.

9. COMMITTEE COMMENTS AND ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN FUTURE MEETINGS [discuss]

9.1 **CEQA modification.** Henderson announced that the Board of Supervisors will weigh in on Supervisor Wiener's proposal to reform CEQA. The Chair announced that this is not relevant to our CAC; however, this could affect developments using the MOP EIR. The Planning Commission unanimously disagreed with the Supervisor's proposal and asked Wiener to revise it.

9.2 **Modification of Parking Ratios.** Henderson stated that the second issue before the BOS is more relevant to our MOP-CAC. Before the BOS now is some legislation that he thought had a strong chance of being adopted. This would modify the parking ratios in neighborhoods to accommodate car-sharing. The proposal would not count car-sharing parking spaces against the residential parking space ratio. Henderson sees a problem with the proposal: namely, that we will run out of car-sharing spaces in our area because the developments cannot offer as many car-sharing parking spaces as those that they are displacing by their development. HVNA is more interested in seeing car-sharing accommodated by reserving increased streetside spaces for them. Henderson believes that the big problem will be enforcing car-sharing inside the private property of the developments. The legislation for this proposal passed the Planning Commission last week. He thought that we should check with MTA to see how their conversion of bus stops is proceeding and what effect, if any, this might have on car-sharing.

9.3 **Sale of Freeway Parcels.** Levitt inquired about the money from the sale of freeway parcels. Originally it was projected that \$10M was to be left from the sale of these parcels. This money was originally designated for traffic improvements within the area. There was a movement to transfer this amount to the **Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH) for Below Market-Rate Housing (BMR)**. He felt that our CAC soon may need to express our opinion as a resolution on this matter.

Smith indicated that the money is going to MOH because the RDA (Redevelopment Agency) originally put up the money and after these were eliminated by the state, the MOH became the successor of the RDA. Especially with the passage of the Housing Trust Fund, they will have more money than they ever had. Transportation certainly does not have any money, particularly because the Central Freeway is not sucking up lots of money from MTA's budget. She noted that the City Attorney had ruled in favor of "truing up" the money to the MOH.

9.4 **Duboce Park Historic District.** Richardson notified the CAC that the second hearing before the Commission on this proposed historic district will be held on this coming Wednesday at 12:30pm. Supervisor Wiener has called for the vote and supports the proposal. Richardson noted that 2/3 of residents around the park support this designation. A discontinuous masonry district was approved by the Historic Preservation Commission.

9.5 **Subway Shuttles.** The Muni must provide greatly improved service along Market Street before next year's developments are completed between Van Ness and Castro. This poor performance is costing companies and commuters hundred of thousands of dollars lost in productivity. Olsson suggested that we must revisit this issue with MTA, since the current situation is deteriorating our MOP quality of life even before the impact of greatly increased population density from the developments lining Market Street alone. Richardson suggested that we should revisit our recommendations in our Supplemental Report of last year to see indicate current measurements.

9.6 **IPIC Coordination.** Smith discussed a chart from IPIC. She stated that IPIC's recommendations are the same as our CIP recommendations, though there is less allowed for the Living Alleyways. MTA has not started studying what must be done in the next couple of months. Our CAC voted to spend \$50,000 to study the intersections in the upper Market Street and propose recommendations for the safety of pedestrians in particular. She also noted that a lot is happening on the freeway parcels. She will email CAC members a summary digest of current issues that we will need to discuss.

10. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public being present, this item was dispensed with.

11. ADJOURNMENT & ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT MEETING

This meeting adjourned at 9:05pm.

Next Meeting (TBD): Because our regularly scheduled committee meeting date/time conflicts with a holiday both in January and February, Smith will send out a Doodle poll to discover when it is best for members to meet and for the committee to have a quorum.

Respectfully submitted,
~TED OLSSON.
Secretary, MOP-CAC

APPENDIX 1
MOP-CAC
Attendance

3rd Monday monthly, 7-9pm

Legend

Y = attended

N = unexcused absence

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

RET = retired

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

C = meeting cancelled (typically for lack of a quorum); ~~strike through date~~

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

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

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

**APPENDIX 2
MOP-CAC**

2012 Schedule of meeting Topics

Annotated by meeting: Planned Items; Unique Agenda Items; Decisions
(as of 16 APRIL 2012)

PURPOSE: The purpose of this appendix is to provide a quick and easy overview of the CAC's 2012 schedule of monthly meetings, annotated after each meeting with the annual planned items, the unique agenda items for that meeting, and both the decisions and commitments resulting from that meeting. These principal San Francisco offices and agencies effect the CAC's decisions and the MOP: IPIC, Planning, DPW, RPD, MTA, TA, and OEWD.

Other potential agenda items considered by officers & staff (than those calendared from May on):

- Historic survey update
- Review CAC supplement to monitoring report; update for 2012
- Update on Housing Inventory and Commerce & Industry reports
- Living alleys
- Parking CU
- CAC website
- Streets bond
- Van Ness BRT mitigations
- SOMA west development
- Community challenge grants
- Housing affordability
- Better Market Street
- Next steps for 2012 priority projects
- Non-capital projects update
- Brainstorm additional funding opportunities for priority projects

Topics suggested for future meetings 16APR12 meeting

April Summary

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

2012 CAC MEETINGS

Planned/Agendized Topics plus
Annotated Decisions/Commitments resulting from the Meeting

January 24Agenda

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

Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions

D: CAC will not meet in conflict with its neighborhood associations' regularly scheduled meetings

R: Resolution 9: City asked to evaluate efficiency of fee deferral policy before expiration date.

Commitments

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

February 22Agenda

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

Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions

D: In 2012 CAC will meet on 3rd Mon., 6:30pm, Planning Dept., 4th floor

C: Invite Michael Yarney & someone from Controller's office: discuss fee deferral policy

C: Contact other CACs: effect of TSP on CAC budgets

C: Invite city official opposed to TSP to educate our CAC

R: Resolution 10: Commendation of John Billovits upon his retirement

Commitments

- Prepare for election of 2012 CAC officers

March 19Agenda

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

Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions

D: CAC approved Feb.mins.; tabled Dec.mins; permanently accepted that there are NO Nov.mins.

D: Elected Henderson, Chair; Singa, VChair; Olsson, Secretary.

R: Resolution #11: support expediting VNBRT

C: Chair will write Dept. supporting request to Caltrans for Living Alleyways grant.

C: Chair will write Chair of Land Use Cmte. re: CAC consensus against billboards.

Commitments

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

April 16Agenda

- Impact fee deferral program update by Planning staff
- Transportation Sustainability Program discussion
- Review of CAC bylaws, member roles and responsibilities
- CAC goals and schedule for 2012

Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions

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

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

Commitments

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

Topics to schedule for future meetings

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

May 21Scheduled

- TSP discussion and potential action
- CAC 2012 goals and schedule
- Bylaws review

Agenda

- Review of TSP issues (Transit Sustainability Program)
- Bylaws review
- CAC 2012 goals and schedule

Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions

D: Minutes (March & April) approved unanimously

R: Resolution #12 (of Sentiment): Request to TSP to mitigate impact of development in CAC Areas.

C: Add Secretary as officer in Bylaws; RSVP to each meeting; staff only works on CAC purposes.

C: Approved Calendar; discuss at next meeting list of suggestions from April meeting (see Appx.C); avoid meetings that conflict with regularly scheduled meetings of neighborhood associations

C: Postpone December meeting

Commitments

- Chair to notify BOS of vacant seat on CAC.

June 18Scheduled

- Meet with MTA to discuss Market St. intersection prioritization (2012 recommended projects)
- Onsite inclusionary housing discussion and potential action

Agenda

- Revision of CAC Bylaws
- Update 2012 CAC priority projects—predevelopment for key Market Street intersection improvements
- Primer for developing CAC recommendations for the 2013 Market St. intersection improvements
- Inclusionary Affordable Housing in the MOP area
- Follow-up on 2012 CAC goals and work program

Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions

D: May 21st minutes approved with corrections

D: Bylaws amended as noted (see Appendix)

Commitments

- Send “Totals through FY2014 v % investment per category” table
- Prepare new spreadsheet: all numbers & percentages, with and without deferral.
- Send CAC her guide to accessing SF legislative information

July 16Scheduled

- Review updated fee projections, begin 2013 project prioritization discussion

Agenda

- Overview of San Francisco Housing Trust Fund ballot initiative
- Proposal for in-kind community improvements agreement for 2175 Market Street
- Review updated impact fee projections; discuss MOP-CIP recommendations FY2015-2017

Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions — **none**Commitments

- Staff will provide status of all 42 CIP project
- Cohen will draft resolution supporting Housing Trust Fund

August 20Scheduled

- Resolution on SF Housing Trust Fund
- Continue CAC priority recommendations for 2013, review draft IPIC recommendations

Agenda

- Resolution on SF Housing Trust Fund
- Develop draft MOP-CIP recommendations for FY2015-16; review draft IPIC recommendations commented upon Transportation; Open Space; Greening

Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions

R: Resolution 13 supporting SF Housing Trust Fund unanimously approved

Commitments — **none****September 17**Scheduled

- Finalize 2013 CAC priority recommendations

Agenda

- Finalize FY2015-16 MOP CIP recommendations; review IPIC recommendations
- Public Comment (Scott Stawicki): concerns with traffic consequences of 2175 Mkt.St.

Decisions/Consensus/Resolutions

D: Minutes (**June 18th**, **July 16th**, **August 20th**) approved unanimously.

D: CAC defined and unanimously approved FY2015-16 CIP recommendations.

C: CAC ask BOS to meet with CAC to inform us of bills that would effect MOP area.

Commitments — **none**

October 15 POSTPONEDScheduledAgendaDecisions/Consensus/ResolutionsCommitments**November 19 POSTPONED**ScheduledAgendaDecisions/Consensus/ResolutionsCommitments**December 17**Agenda

- Introduction to Living Alleyways Pedestrian Network project [discuss]
- Presentation: potential in-kind agreement for 344 Fulton Street (Boys&Girls Club) [discuss]
- Discuss CAC's CIP priorities for Gough St. intersections [discuss]

Decisions/Consensus/ResolutionsD1: Minutes (**June 18th, July 16th, September 17th**) approved. **August 20th** already approved.

D2: Peter Cohen has resigned; the Supervisors will appoint his successor by our next meeting. Our Chair will draft a resolution commending Cohen for his leadership.

D3: CAC Chair announced that the October and November regular meetings will be postponed.

C1: Consideration of The Sharon Street Neighbors letter was tabled until the next meeting.

Commitments

#	Date	Who	What
1.	2/5	JH	Draft resolution commending Peter Cohen

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

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

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

- **Community Improvement Plan (Capital Projects)**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2893>
- **Better Neighborhood Plans (including MOP)**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1699>
- **Eastern Neighborhoods**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1673>
- **Eastern Neighborhoods — CAC (Citizens Advisory Committee)**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=2224>
- **In-Kind Policy**
Search: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Search.aspx?sa.x=9&sa.y=13&sa=Search&cof=FORID%3A11&q=in-kind%20policy&cx=018062627758110761831%3Aalpglywsoxu>
+ Application packet for In-Kind Policy: <http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=8601>
- **IPIC 2012 Annual Report [including section on MOP]**
http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Market_Octavia/CAC/Interagency_Plan_Implementation_Committee_Annual_Report.pdf
- **MOP-CAC Bylaws**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=674>
- **Market & Octavia Area Plan**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1713>
- **Market & Octavia CAC**
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1700>
- **MOP-CAC: Criteria for members**
numbers chosen by Mayor, by Supervisors; description of representation & members' constituencies
listing of terms of each member; how and when for public to apply to participate
- **MOP-CAC Board Members** (historical & current)
bios, constituency/representing, roles & responsibilities; committee assignments
- **MOP-CAC Current Calendar** of scheduled topics
meets 3d Mon. monthly at Planning Dpt., 4th floor. All meetings are open to the public & include time for public comment.

- **MOP-CAC's Resolutions** (Appendix 4 of CAC monthly minutes; these should be posted separately)
- **CAC's supplementary to the Department's Monitoring Report of MOP**
http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Market_Octavia/CAC/CAC_supplemental_report.pdf
- 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%3Aalpglywsox>
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%3Aalpglywsox>
- **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%3Aalpglywsox>
- **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%3Aalpglywsox>

**APPENDIX 4
SUMMARY OF ALL 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 10	(22Feb2012):	JOHN BILLOVITS COMMENDATION
Resolution 11	(19Mar2012):	SUPPORT FOR VNBRT EXPEDITED IMPLEMENTATION
Resolution 12	(21Mar2012):	TSP MITIGATING IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT IN CAC AREAS
Resolution 13	(20Aug2012):	SUPPORT FOR HOUSING TRUST FUND

RESOLUTION ABSTRACTS

RESOLUTION #1	2009-10-20#1
TITLE	Infrastructure Finance Recommendations
DATE:	October 20, 2009
SUMMARY:	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
SUMMARY:	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
SUMMARY:	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**
SUMMARY: CAC's preference is that ALL inclusionary housing for new developments within the Market and Octavia Plan Area be built on-site. If infeasible for the developer such housing must be built offsite but within the Plan Area or ¼ mile beyond, which site must be deeded to the City for affordable housing, and must not include Redevelopment parcels and must be entitlement-ready at the time of ceding. The purpose of this policy is to achieve mixed income housing development at a very localized scale within the various neighborhoods of the plan area.

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

RESOLUTION #5: **2010-09-22#1**
TITLE: **Hayes Street Project Investment**
DATE: **September 22, 2010**
SUMMARY: CAC recommends Planning Department to invest \$52,500 — ½ the community impact funds — in the Hayes Street Two-Way project.

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

RESOLUTION #6: **2011-12-14#1**
TITLE: **Support for In-kind CIP Agreement for 2001 Market Street**
DATE: **December 14, 2011**
SUMMARY: Support an In-kind Agreement for streetscape improvements, as defined in the June 2011 schematic, except that the Dolores/14th Street improvements be those of the November 2011 schematic; the Market/Dolores Street crosswalk and associated improvements shall not be included in this improvements program.

MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Levitt; Seconded by Wingard
YES: Henderson, Levitt, Wingard
NO: Olsson, Starkey
ABSTAIN: Cohen, Richards
ABSENT: Gold

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLUTION #11: **2012-03-19**
TITLE: **Resolution Supporting VNBRT**
DATE: March 19, 2012
SUMMARY: RESOLUTION #11 (19Mar2012)

The Market Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC)) supports the concept of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) along the main transit corridors of the City. Specifically we approve the Van Ness Ave. BRT (VNBRT) and urge its expedited completion, without taking a position on any of the considered alternative methods.

MOTION: Leavitt
SECOND: Vasquez
YES (unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Leavitt, Olsson, Richards, Vasquez
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Singa, Simmons

RESOLUTION #12: **2012-03-21**
TITLE: **Resolution of Sentiment: Request to TSP to mitigate impact of development in CAC Areas.**

DATE: March 21, 2012

SUMMARY: RESOLUTION #12 (21May2012)

The Market Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC) requests the TSP to consider mitigating the impact of development in CAC areas by dedicating fees from these areas to solve transit problems caused by impact of growth.

MOTION: Vasquez
SECOND: Leavitt
YES (unanimous): Henderson, Singa, Leavitt, Olsson, Vasquez, Wingard
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Cohen, Richards, Simmons

RESOLUTION #13: **2012-08-20**
TITLE: **Resolution Supporting Housing Trust Fund**

DATE: August 20, 2012

EXTRACT: RESOLUTION #13 (20Sep2012)

The MOP-CAC unanimously supports the Housing Trust Fund proposed by the Mayor's Office of Housing now on the November ballot.

MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Vasquez; Seconded by Levitt
YES (unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Richardson, Singa, Vasquez
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Olsson, Simmons, Wingard

ABSTRACT TEMPLATE

RESOLUTION # __ : [YYYY-MM-DD# __]

TITLE: **Resolution ...**

DATE: **month DD, YYYY**

EXTRACT: Resolution #__ (__Mon__)

Extract/Summary

MOVED/SECOND: Moved by ____; Seconded by ____

YES:

NO:

ABSTAIN:

ABSENT:

FULL TEXT OF ALL MOP-CAC RESOLUTIONS

2.1 RESOLUTION #1

20Oct2009 RESOLUTION 1: INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS

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

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

2.2 RESOLUTION #2

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

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

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

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

ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Brinkman, Gold, Starkey, Wingard

2.3 RESOLUTION #3

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. Requirement of a minimum 10% payment at DBI Permit of all fees (ie, allowing a maximum deferral of 90% of fees due);

2. Creation of a Community Infrastructure Fund to enable the pre-development design, planning and engineering (ie, “shovel ready”) for priority improvement projects, and that the initial the size of the Fund be between \$3 million and \$5 million, and that the capitalization of the Fund will further grow as the amount of deferred fees from pipeline projects grows, and that the enactment of the Fees Deferral program is explicitly contingent upon creation of the Community Infrastructure Fund;
3. Affirmation that prioritization of improvement projects for use of the Community Infrastructure Fund is done through CACs in plan areas where they exist;
4. Retention of Sec. 315 inclusionary housing in-lieu fee payment standards (i.e., not subject to deferral);
5. Sunset of the Fees Deferral program in three years.

Approved by the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee on March 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)

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

RESOLUTION #6 2011-12-14#1
TITLE Support for In-kind CIP Agreement for 2001 Market Street
DATE: December 14, 2011
RESOLUTION: Be it Resolved that the MOP-CAC supports the plan proposed by the SF Planning Department and advocated by Supervisor Wiener for an In-kind Agreement for streetscape improvements for the first block of Dolores Street between Market and Fourteenth Streets, as specifically defined in their June 2011 schematic, except that the improvements proposed for the Dolores/14th Street intersection shall be those presented in their November 2011 schematic, and that the Market Street crosswalk and associated improvements shall not be included in this improvements program.

MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Levitt, seconded by Wingard
YES: Henderson, Levitt, Wingard
NO: Olsson, Starkey
ABSTAIN: Cohen, Richards
ABSENT: Gold

2.7 RESOLUTION #7

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

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

RESOLUTION # 7 2011-12-14#2:
TITLE Proposed Legislation for Planning Code Amendments
DATE: December 14, 2011
MOTION: Support Planning Department recommendations pertaining to Limited Corner Commercial Users (LCCUs) and Limited Commercial 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

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)		50,000
Hayes Green rotating art project		20,000
Market Street (10th to Octavia)		170,000
Transportation		
Haight Street two-way dedicated transit lanes and pedestrian improvements	120,000	210,000
Predevelopment for Market Street intersection improvements, including Dolores/Market	50,000	
Market/16th/Noe pedestrian improvements		250,000
Market/14th/Church pedestrian improvements		130,000
Market/Duboce/Buchanan pedestrian improvements		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.

2.10 RESOLUTION #10

22Feb2012 Billovits Commendation

RESOLUTION: BE IT RESOLVED that the Market Octavia Plan's Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC) commends and appreciates the service and leadership of John Billovits on his retirement from San Francisco's Planning Department, in particular for his citywide and neighborhood perspective in helping create the Market Octavia Plan.

ABSTRACT:

RESOLUTION #10: 2012-02-22

TITLE: Mike Billovits Commendation

DATE: February 22, 2012

EXTRACT: Commend Billovits on his retirement for contributing to the concept of the Market/Octavia Plan.

MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Ted Olsson; Seconded by Peter Cohen

YES (unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Olsson, Simmons, Singa, Vasquez, Wingard

NO: none

ABSTAIN: none

ABSENT: Richards

2.11 RESOLUTION #11 SUPPORT FOR VNBRT (19Mar2012)RESOLUTION:

BE IT RESOLVED that the Market Octavia Plan's Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC) supports the Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit plan presented to us and encourages its expedited implementation, without taking any position on the alternative modes of BRT.

ABSTRACT:

RESOLUTION #10: 2012-03-19

TITLE: Support for VNBRT

DATE: March 19, 2012

EXTRACT: The Market Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC) supports the concept of Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) along the main transit corridors of the City. Specifically we approve the Van Ness Ave. BRT (VNBRT) and urge its expedited completion, without taking a position on any of the considered alternative methods.

MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Levitt; Seconded by Vasquez

YES (unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Leavitt, Olsson, Richards, Vasquez

NO: none

ABSTAIN: none

ABSENT: Krute, Simmons

2.12 RESOLUTION #12 REQUEST TO TSP TO USE TRANSIT FUNDS FROM CAC AREAS TO MITIGATE TRANSIT PROBLEMS IN CAC AREA CAUSED BY IMPACT FROM INCREASED DENSITY (21May2012)
[Resolution of Sentiment]

BE IT RESOLVED that when the TSP is adopted, the \$3 **Transportation Impact Fee (TIP)** from MOP will be rescinded and folded into TSP. Our concern during our last several meetings, is that parts of our city which are experiencing thousands of housing units may deserve more emphasis that those parts of the city which are not experiencing such growth. We ask the TSP to define the key transit projects and indicate how they propose to mitigate the impacts of these anticipated increased densities, particularly in defined plan areas with fees attached to them (specifically plan areas which would be losing their own fees for mitigating neighborhood growth — MOP, Eastern Neighborhoods, and Balboa Park planned development areas each with its own CAC). As an example we note for the TSP that right now public transit in the MOP area is stressed and overwhelmed (busses pass waiting passengers). We do not have adequate transit capacity today. The purpose of our resolution is to strengthen the TSP's prioritization of how to most equitably invest in city transit."

ABSTRACT:

RESOLUTION #10: 2012-05-19

TITLE: Reinvest TIP fees in CAC areas for transit impact

DATE: May 19, 2012

EXTRACT: The Market Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee (MOP-CAC) requests the TSP committee and IPIC to consider reinvesting the TIP fee in the CAC planned development areas to mitigate anticipated population densities, prioritizing these according to the growth in each area.

MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Vasquez; Seconded by Levitt

YES (unanimous): Henderson, Kruti, Leavitt, Olsson, Vasquez, Wingard

NO: none

ABSTAIN: none

ABSENT: Cohen, Richards, Simmons

RESOLUTION:**RESOLUTION OF SENTIMENT: TSP MITIGATING IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT IN CAC AREAS.**

“When the TSP is adopted, the \$3 **Transportation Impact Fee (TIP)** from MOP will be rescinded and folded into TSP. Our concern during our last several meetings, is that parts of our city which are experiencing thousands of housing units may deserve more emphasis that those parts of the city which are not experiencing such growth. We ask the TSP to define the key transit projects and indicate how they propose to mitigate the impacts of these anticipated increased densities, particularly in defined plan areas with fees attached to them (specifically plan areas which would be losing their own fees for mitigating neighborhood growth — MOP, Eastern Neighborhoods, and Balboa Park planned development areas each with its own CAC). As an example we note for the TSP that right now public transit in the MOP area is stressed and overwhelmed (busses pass waiting passengers). We do not have adequate transit capacity today. The purpose of our resolution is to strengthen the TSP’s prioritization of how to most equitably invest in city transit.”

Moved/Seconded: Vasquez/Levitt

YES (unanimous): Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Singa, Vasquez, Wingard

NO: none

Abstain: Cohen, Richards, Simmons

**2.13 RESOLUTION #13 RESOLUTION SUPPORTING HOUSING TRUST FUND
(21Aug2012)**

BE IT RESOLVED that the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee supports the Housing Trust Fund.

ABSTRACT:

RESOLUTION #13: 2012-08-20

TITLE: Resolution Supporting Housing Trust Fund

DATE: August 20, 2012

EXTRACT: RESOLUTION #13 (20Sep2012)

The MOP-CAC unanimously supports the Housing Trust Fund proposed by the Mayor’s Office of Housing now on the November ballot.

MOVED/SECOND: Moved by Vasquez; Seconded by Levitt

YES (unanimous): Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Richardson, Singa, Vasquez

NO: none

ABSTAIN: none

ABSENT: Olsson, Simmons, Wingard

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS the Market and Octavia Plan necessitates affordable housing and mixed income housing to achieve its goals of complete and diverse communities;

WHEREAS there has been minimal affordable housing development from the Market and Octavia Plan, and there has been minimal on-site inclusionary mixed income housing development from the Plan;

WHEREAS the proposed Housing Trust Fund will provide a reliable stream of annual revenue for affordable housing and will incentivize on-site inclusionary mixed income housing, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee supports the Housing Trust Fund.

Motion—MOP-CAC Resolution #13 (2012-08-20); moved by Vasquez; seconded by Levitt.

YES: Unanimous—Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Richards, Singa, Vasquez

NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Olsson, Simmons, Wingard

CONFIDENTIAL — Draft

APPENDIX 5
MOP-CAC GLOSSARY
EXTRACTS FROM MINUTES

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

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

BRT Bus Rapid Transit

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

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

CAC Community Advisory Committee

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

CIP Community Improvement Program (or –Projects)

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

Central Freeway

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

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

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

CEQA California Environmental Quality Act

COLA Cost Of Living Assessment

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

Community Challenge Opportunities for Open Space**DTNA Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association**

<http://www.dtna.org/>

This area has its apex at Duboce and Market Streets. It runs along the western side of Market Street from this apex to Castro Street and over to Scott Street. See map on the website.

DPW Department of Public Works**Department of Public Works: 5 Year Plan****EIR Environmental Impact Review****FDP Fee Deferral Program/Policy****HVNA Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association**

<http://www.hayesvalleysf.org/html/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)****LOS Level of Service**

This index gauges the impact upon the city of population density in terms of transportation efficiency.

MDNA Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association

<http://www.MissionDNA.org>

This neighborhood association's emphasis is upon historical preservation, diversity, and quality of life within its area, which is the oldest neighborhood in San Francisco, site of Mission Dolores, with numerous historical resources within its area. See map on website.

MOP Market Octavia Plan

This is the area under consideration by this committee. See the MOP Map for the defined area.

MOP-CAC Market Octavia Plan's Community Advisory Committee

This committee of citizens appointed by the Mayor and Supervisors, must be representative of the citizens. Each person on this committee represents a specific constituency within this area. The committee consists of nine members; a quorum consists of five members.

MUNI Municipal Transit

San Francisco's municipal public transit agency (busses, subways, cable cars, streetcars)

MTA Municipal Transportation Authority

This is the city's board of supervisors sitting as the agency supervising planning and execution of comprehensive transportation issues within the city.

Neighborhood Associations

These are independent organizations of neighbors created with various emphases, whose own boundaries lie within or abut the MOP area. Principally these have been: the Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association (HVNA), the Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association (MDNA), the Duboce Triangle Neighborhood Association (DTNA).

Nexus Study**OEWD Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development****Pipeline Report**

This is the monthly report compiled by staff for the CAC which shows the status of each development project within the MOP area. Quarterly this report also includes a map, which shows each development in the area.

PIDB Planned Improvements Database

Propositions: Many voter-approved propositions have an effect on the Market/Octavia Plan.

Prop. B (year)

Prop. K (year)

Prop. AA (year)

RDA Redevelopment Agency

Founded in 1949, it funded and managed many citywide major development projects paid for by increment tax funding. In 2012 all RDAs in California were eliminated; however, a county which would pay for all administrative costs of the RDA (so that all funding went directly to the development projects), could continue to use this mechanism. San Francisco was willing to do this, being both a city and county. However, the RDA mechanism was disallowed and city would have to absorb all administrative costs.

Resolution

This is an official decision and statement by this CAC expressing the majority opinion on an important issue relevant to the MOP area.

RPD Recreation and Parks Department

This agency plans and manages all municipal parks and recreational facilities in the city.

Safe Bikes Policy**SF County Metropolitan Transportation Authority****SF Historic Preservation Commission**

The Planning Department is subject to this commission's rulings, as well as to those of the Planning Commission.

SFMTA SF Municipal Transportation Agency**SF Office of Economic and Workforce Development**

SF Oversight Board

This is the successor to San Francisco's Redevelopment Agency. When the RDA was eliminated (Feb. 2, 2012) this board (consisting of many of the RDA's employees) continued the developments undertaken by the RDA. Because San Francisco is both a coterminous county and city, we are able to continue the RDA efforts by fully paying all administrative fees of RDA employees, so that all taxes and fees go directly to the specific area's development projects.

SF Planning Commission

This commission oversees the Planning Department, establishing policy for the development of the city

SF Planning Department

This agency proposes and executes the laws of the city regarding planning for buildings and other infrastructure implementations. It is under the joint authority of two commissions: the Planning Commission and the Historic Preservation Commission.

Streets Capital Group**TEDM****TEP Transit Effectiveness Program**

This is Muni's program to tax developers, both commercial and residential, for all new projects, in order to raise money to pay for Muni's programs that will improve transportation in the city to account for the impact of all future development. It is not known at this time what effect this will have upon the Development Impact Fees, which fund the CAC's budget to create its Community Improvement Projects, to mitigate the impact of population density resulting from approved projects.

TIF Tax Increment Financing

This mechanism was used by RDAs to finance citywide projects, which could not be afforded otherwise.

Transit First Policy**TIDF Transit Impact Development Fee****TSF Transportation Sustainability Fee**

This program adds to the CIP fee and additional fee to fund the city's transportation plans and implementation to mitigate the impacts of increased population growth.

TSP Transportation Sustainability Program

This program proposed in 2012 would raise the fees on all new developments in the city — both commercial and residential (evidently residences had not been subject to development impact fees formerly; now they would be so assessed). This reprioritization of impact fees may have a substantial negative effect upon the MOP-CAC's impact fees, which fund the budget upon which all CAC CIP's are funded.

Walk First Project