

**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>

**Planning Department, 1650 Mission St., Ste.400
Wednesday, March 24, 2010; 6:30pm
Regularly scheduled monthly meeting**

Cheryl Brinkman	Peter Cohen
Carmela Gold	Jason Henderson
Robin Levitt	Ted Olsson
Dennis Richards	Marius Starkey
Kearstin Dischinger (ex officio)	

The Agenda & Minutes of all community meetings, a matter of public record, are available at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor 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 (February 24, 2010 & March 24, 2010) [act]
4. M/O Plan Monitoring Report preparation [discuss; possibly act]
 - a. Review outline of Monitoring Report — presentation by Planning staff
 - b. Discussion of Monitoring Report key topics of interest
5. Continued Working Session on community improvements evaluation and prioritization [discuss]
 - a. Explanations and updates on CIP Appendix C projects list (continued from March 28th meeting)
 - b. Projects evaluation and individual scoring
 - c. Prep for next meeting to finalize first year community improvements program recommendations and continuing process refinements
 - d. Establish a sub group to draft recommendations for review and adoption at May CAC meeting
6. Committee members' comments and issues the committee may consider in future meetings [discuss]
7. Public Comment
8. Adjournment

**Next Meeting: Wednesday, May 26, 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 [Olsson]
3. Exhibit 3: Proposed Outline—Market Octavia Plan Monitoring Report [Dischinger]
4. Exhibit 4: Downtown Plan, Annual Monitoring Report, 2008 (Jan.2010), summary [Teresa Ojeda]
5. Exhibit 5: San Francisco Housing Inventory, 2009—Tables B-1 to B-6 [Teresa Ojeda]
6. Exhibit 6: CAC Brainstorm on topics for MOP Monitoring Report (Jan.27,2010) [Olsson]
7. Exhibit 7: Pipeline Report [Dischinger]
8. Exhibit 8:

DECISIONS

1. Decision 1: Welcome to new CAC member, Marius Starkey (renter within MOP area).
2. Decision 2: Approval of minutes (February 24, 2010 & March 24, 2010) was postponed until next meeting, when we will approve one quarter of this year's meetings).
3. Decision 3:
4. Decision 4:

COMMITMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, INFORMATION DUE

#	WHEN	WHO	WHAT
1.	05/03	All	Finish CIP scorecard and submit to Dischinger & Cohen by Monday 05/01.
2.	05/15	PC/JH/TO	Subcommittee & Dischinger review scorecard rankings and prepare a draft for whole committee to be able to determine committee's priorities at next meeting.
3.	05/03	KD	Dischinger will send IPIC annual report to all members of CAC.
4.	06/26	PC/JH/TO	Subcommittee to draft critique and CAC Supplement to Monitor Report.

MINUTES**1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL****EXHIBIT 1: AGENDA****ROLL CALL** (√=present; 0=absent; X=excused)

- √ Cheryl Brinkman
- √ Peter Cohen (Chair)
- √ Carmela Gold
- √ Jason Henderson (Vice Chair)
- √ Robin Levitt
- √ Ted Olsson (Secretary)
- √ Dennis Richards
- √ Marius Starkey

Ex Officio Members

- √ Kearstin Dischinger

Others attending:

- √ Teresa Ojeda, Sr. Planner, Mgr. Info & Analysis, SF Plng.Dpt.
tel: 415.558.6251; fax: 415.558.6409; em: teresa.ojeda@sfgov.org

A quorum being present, the Chairman opened the meeting at 6:30pm. The Chair next handled Item 4 from the Agenda before proceeding in order with other items.

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, UPCOMING MEETINGS AND GENERAL HOUSEKEEPING [discussion item]**2.1 Marius Starkey—new CAC member**

The committee welcomed Marius Starkey who was appointed by the BOS to fill the seat of the renter within the MOP area.

2.2 CAC Vacancy

The merchant's seat on the CAC (vacated by the death of Brad Villiers) is still open. It was noted that Ken Wingard, a merchant within the MOP area, had applied but the vacancy is open to all applicants until it is filled.

2.3 IPIC Report (Dischinger)

Dischinger indicated that Maria Oropeza had mailed each of us a copy of the IPIC annual report. However, since many CAC members did not seem to have received it, Dischinger indicated that she would email it to us again.

2.4 Sunday Streets

Brinkman indicated that Sunday Streets will be held in the Bay View neighborhood on May 23rd, which is simultaneous with the Third Street Festival.

3. MINUTES**EXHIBIT 2: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 24TH AND MARCH 24TH**

It was determined to postpone approval of the minutes of the last two meetings (Feb 24TH and Mch 24th), until May's meeting—when three months (a full quarter of meetings)—to accommodate both 1) learning how we must produce the CAC supplement to the Department's annual five year report and 2) finishing our overview of all CIPs in Appendix C to permit us rank them on the scorecard.

4. MOP MONITORING REPORT PREPARATION (Teresa Ojeda)

EXHIBIT 3: PROPOSED OUTLINE—MARKET OCTAVIA PLAN MONITORING REPORT

EXHIBIT 4: DOWNTOWN PLAN, ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT, 2008 (JAN.2010), SUMMARY

EXHIBIT 5: SAN FRANCISCO HOUSING INVENTORY, 2009— TABLES B-1 TO B-6

EXHIBIT 6: CAC BRAINSTORM ON TOPICS FOR MOP MONITORING REPORT (JAN. 27, 2010)

The MOP Monitoring Report covers the status of the project for the previous five years (2002-2009), before and after the adoption of the MOP. This report is required to be produced every five years. According to Teresa's report, modeled on the successful monitoring report for the Downtown Plan, the MOP Monitoring Report will consist of the following sections: 1) Housing; 2) Commercial Space & Employment; 3) Transportation & Parking; 4) Historic Preservation; 5) Urban Amenities [CIPs]; 6) Fee Collection; 7) Project Review. She discussed each of these sections.

She passed around several reports to the CAC to help us understand the nature of the monitoring report but took them with her when she left. These were:

- 1) Housing-Inventory Report (full report)
- 2) Commerce and Industry Inventory for 2009 (published Oct. 2009)
- 3) Downtown Plan [the full, bound, initial report covering 5 years]

Teresa indicated that all of these are available online at the Department's website. The model is the Downtown Plan's monitoring report. She did leave the CAC with two summaries of several pages:

- 1) Downtown Plan Annual Monitoring Report, 2008 (SF PlngDept, Jan.2010); and
- 2) San Francisco Housing Inventory, 2009: Tables B-1 through B-6.

Another exhibit for this section, a double-sided paper (Exhibit 3: the detailed Proposed Outline) was distributed to CAC members to keep. Because this outline is so important, it is listed here in the body of the SE minutes:

PROPOSED OUTLINE OF MOP MONITORING REPORT

1) Housing

Introduction

Current inventory (detailed housing characteristics—could be in the Appendix)

Recent Developments (5 years: 2005-2009)

Near Term Development Trends (5-7 years pipeline)

Affordable Housing

Central Freeway Parcels (boxed page or sidebar)

Condo Conversions

OMI/Ellis and Other Evictions

2) Commercial Space & Employment

Introduction

Current Inventory & Characteristics

Recent Developments (5 years, 2005-2009)

Near Term Development Trends (5-7 years pipeline)

Current Job Characteristics

Estimate of New Jobs

3) Transportation & Parking

Transportation

Introduction

Infrastructure

Recent Developments

Parking

Introduction

Inventory of On- and Off-Street Parking

Recent and Pending CUs for Off-Street Parking

Carsharing Inventory

4) Historic Preservation

Introduction

Recent Developments

Next Steps

5) Fee Collection

Introduction
Accounting

6) Project Review

Introduction
Procedure and Recent Activities

[Note that the detailed Proposed Outline exhibit does not include the CAC's Supplement to the Planning Department's monitoring report, which will be included in the report.]

This proposed outline contained the following links (URLs) as models for our monitoring report:

- 1) Downtown Plan Five-Year Monitoring Report
http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Downtown_Monitoring_Report_5-Y&ear_2008_revised.pdf
- 2) Downtown Plan Annual Monitoring Report
http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/Citywide/Downtown_Annual_Report_2009.pdf
- 3) Housing Inventory 2009
http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/2009_Housing_Inventory_Report.pdf

The Department will have completed the first draft of the MOP Monitoring Report for our review by the second week of June. We can review this and prepare our supplement based upon this draft. Further, we may provide Kearstin and Teresa our comments on what we would like to see included in the monitoring report for the MOP.

At this point Cohen passed out a summary (Exhibit 6) of the brainstorming from our CAC January meeting on our recommendations for what we wish to see covered in the MOP Monitoring Report. This exhibit is appended to the end of these minutes.

A discussion followed Teresa presentation:

Henderson wants a list of Conditional Use Permits for Parking within our area as well as a list of curb cutouts in the area, including which curb cuts are "grandfathered". He appreciates the good cartography that is so important to these reports. He also wants included any Traffic Impact Reports within the area as well as the specified the Levels of Service (LOS) to be expected in the area. And the report should include SFCTA's Octavia Boulevard Circulation Study as well as the Parking Nexus Study.

Levitt indicated that he had not heard from SFCTA on this Circulation Study. He was interested in knowing the results of this study relating to several streets: Octavia Boulevard, Linden Alley, and the two-way traffic on Hayes Street.

Cohen mentioned that the horizon covered by this MOP Monitor Report is the five year period 2005-2009 but he asked Teresa if we could include information from 1Q2010 for trends in the near-term developments. She agreed. He would also like to know the status of projects that have been approved but not built.

Carmen stated that the Monitoring Report really a section on Code Enforcement of the developments in this project, providing quantifiable data with dollar amounts of fines. Teresa mentioned that this is not done by the Planning Department but she would try to find the information. Carmen noted that this would be very important as an index showing how closely the implementation was conforming to plan.

Dischinger was also noting these recommendations by transcribing them as the "MO CAC input on Time Series monitoring report" projected onto the screen as we discussed them. (Exhibit?)

Peter assigned a subcommittee consisting of the officers (Cohen, Chair; Henderson, Vice Chair; and Olsson, Secretary) to draft the CAC's critique and supplement to the Department's Monitoring Report by June 26th. Here is the anticipated schedule of events leading to submitting the Monitoring Report:

- Department's draft Monitoring Report to CAC for review by 2nd week of June
- CAC review/comments on draft by June 23rd CAC meeting
- CAC's own supplemental report drafted for review at June 23rd CAC meeting
- Planning Commission hearing on MOP Monitoring Report in July

PIPELINE REPORT (Dischinger)**EXHIBIT 7**

For expediency in order to concentrate this meeting upon only two topics (the Monitoring Report and the Working Session on the CIPs of Appendix C), the Pipeline Report was not presented nor discussed during this meeting. Instead Dischinger indicated that she would email this report to the CAC members for their information. It is noted here as an informational exhibit, even though it was not discussed.

5. CONTINUED WORKING SESSION ON CIP EVALUATION AND PRIORITIZATION**EXHIBIT 7: The Scoring Matrix (based upon CIPs described in MOP Appendix C)**

- a. Explanations & updates on CIP Appx.C projects list (continued from March 28th meeting)
- b. Projects evaluation and individual scoring
- c. Prepare for next meeting to finalize first year CIP recommendations; refine process
- d. Subcommittee draft recommendations for review and adoption at May CAC meeting

NOTE: The cost estimates associated with each CIP item in Appendix C (2002) are in 2002 dollars.

The Chair assigned **homework** to the committee members: to submit the revised and finalized CIP Scorecard to both him and Dischinger by Monday, May 3.

Before discussing each of the CIPs, Dischinger again explained to CAC members how to complete the Scorecard. For general categories of Community Improvement Projects (CIPs) (e.g., Recreation Facilities; Open Space/Parks) the CAC will identify specific projects for funding at a later date (expected for early Fall when the community improvements program recommendations are updated to incorporate recommendations from the public submitted online through our CAC website). It was noted that CAC members must first complete worksheet 1 (Categories) of the scorecard. This will create an individual weighting factor to be multiplied for each of the projects as we evaluate them individually. If anyone does not understand or agree with a category, then that member may leave the category blank or rank it as zero.

The CAC will return to evaluate the Economic Development category in the summer when we discuss the process of the Market/Octavia Fund.

The chair created a subcommittee of the officers of the CAC (Cohen, Chair; Henderson, Vice Chair; Olsson, Secretary) to analyze the CAC's scoring of the Scorecard and draft recommendations for the CAC's review at its next meeting. At that May 28th CAC meeting the whole CAC will review and refine these recommendations with the intent of adopting its own CAC prioritizations of CIPs.

Dischinger led this discussion. The following CIPs from MOP Appx.C and on our Scoresheet were explained:

A20 Widen Hayes Street Sidewalk (\$2,396,134)

This project is mandated by Policy 4.2.6 ("Widen the sidewalk on the northern side of Hayes Street, between Franklin and Laguna Streets, to create a linear pedestrian thoroughfare linking commercial activities along Hayes Street to the new Octavia Boulevard.")

This project is still very much alive but is a long-term project. As with all other CIPs in Appendix C, these costs are in 2002 dollars; so, one needs to double those for today's costs.

A21 Dolores Street Median Extension (\$347,353)

This is to create a pedestrian oasis in front of the Spanish War statue, which is a registered historic resource, and as such has prescriptions which must be followed, such as retaining the beveled pedestal around its perimeter. It was also noted that Clinton Park, the street across from it, is a one-way street, which under this improvement would go from Dolores to Duboce. Cohen suggested that Prado might be induced to provide this plaza as an in-kind fee waiver. Leavitt was concerned with demarcating and providing safety for the new corridor to the Mint.

There are advanced designs to allow pedestrians to cross half the crosswalk and wait at the statue without being vulnerable. Clinton Park is currently a one-way street. The most visionary design would require access from Dolores only by right turn, making the street one-way but the reverse of what it is today. Prado will help with the pedestrian crosswalk across Market Street, eliminating the jog at the median by straightening it to correct the current

pedestrian hazard. There are well-developed designs for 14th & Dolores Streets, since the development will significantly affect the traffic.

A22 Re-establishment of Select Alleyways (\$2,422,638)

This applies to the alley beside Discount Builders and to Stevenson Alley. Reconnecting these as public rights-of-way will make the city better for pedestrians and bicyclists as well as for nearby residents. It is city policy for the city to reclaim these alleys whenever there is any movement or development by the property owner.

A23 Van Ness Bus Rapid Transit Project (no cost estimates provided)

This MTA project was not further described. It is a project that will be entirely funded and implemented by MTA which will further the city's Transit First policy and should help MOP residents. This is the Locally Preferred Alternative.

Dischinger explained that the BRT is focused on providing rapid transit level of service by an alternative to building new rail systems (which are too expensive). This would create dedicated lanes on Van Ness for busses to quickly move from Market to Broadway or Union Streets without having to stop at every corner. Like the subway, one would pay before boarding the bus, therefore the driver does not have to handle fares but merely unload/load passengers and then quickly drive to the next stop. In other words, this would function like the subway without the cost of being underground. These rapid transit lanes are dedicated to busses only, no other traffic is allowed and the boarding stations are isolated either on the sidewalk or on the center where the median is currently.

Several triangular plots around Market and Van Ness are zoned for 400-foot towers with 10,000 sq.ft. floor plates. These buildings would be required to have the first two floors (up to the first four floors) to be non-residential: either commercial/retail or office space or a combination of this. Of the 6,000 residential units planned for MOP, only a small portion of them are going there. We will not be a major funding source for them, since they have their own local, state, and federal monies designated for these. However, when they go in we might become involved in building bulb-outs to beautify and enhance the safety of the area for residents. By 2013 we can look closer at these to see what needs to be done but for now there is no need to dedicate funds to this.

Henderson also noted that with Hayes Street becoming two-way, this will further transform that neighborhood all the way down to Van Ness Avenue. Since this area is such a big cultural and culinary attraction, the BRT will assure both that Muni is the most effective way for people to arrive there and at the same time will assure that pedestrians are safe when crossing Van Ness to get there.

He also alerted the CAC that there will be an opportunity for it to weigh in on the Local Preferred Alternative (LPA), which will facilitate these enhancements. This summer the Environmental Review and the Traffic Study are due. Cohen thought that alerting the CAC to such opportunities was important but reminded member that for us to be able to discuss and take positions on any issue, we must alert the public by publishing it as an item on our agenda.

A24 Transit Preferential Streets (\$8,283,000)

Map 9: Important High Capacity Transit Corridors

A25 Dedicated Transit Lanes (\$4,983,333)

These two projects were discussed together. These are Muni plans approved by IPIC. They are prioritized by need and there are no inconsistencies. Planning called out the routes or problems; Muni recommended the solutions.

This is part of the city's Transit First policy and of Muni's Transit Effectiveness Project to speed Muni along Market Street.

A26 Church Street Improvements (\$4,632,265)

Having been already discussed at our March meeting, this project was passed over now.

A27 Neighborhood Fast Pass (\$4,917,000)

MOP developers would provide 30 years' worth of Muni Fast Passes to tenants in their developments as a city inducement to reduce individual auto travel and to increase use of public transit by the residents.

The concept behind this is that if everyone in the neighborhood had a transit pass, there would be less cars on the road and then they would use the Muni more frequently and this would change the behavior in the city. This is not a program that we would fund, but by advocating it, then developers would be expected to fund it. These programs in other municipalities work by having the developer commit for 30 years to fund the project. She could discuss how this might fit into a citywide program.

A28 Transit User Infrastructure (no cost estimates provided)**A29 Transit Services (no cost estimate provided)**

Dischinger identified these two CIP items as placeholders.

A30 Bicycle Network Improvements (\$881,372)

Starkey noted that item A30 consists of 10 individual projects, which are detailed on the Scorecard but are not individually described nor costed in Appendix C.. The specific projects are listed here for completeness, though they were not individually described by Dischinger nor discussed by the CAC.

- a. **Market Street bicycle lanes between Octavia Boulevard and 17th/Castro Streets (extension of intersections where bicycle lanes are currently dropped).**
- b. **Market and Valencia Streets intersection and traffic signal improvements.**
- c. **McAllister Street bicycle lanes and sharrows between Market Street and Masonic Avenue.**
- d. **McCoppin Street westbound bicycle lane between Gough and Valencia Streets.**
- e. **McCoppin Street pathway improvements between Market and Valencia Streets.**
- f. **Otis Street westbound bicycle lane between South Van Ness Avenue and Gough Street.**
- g. **Polk Street northbound contra flow bicycle lane between Market Street and McAllister Street.**
- h. **Sharrows and signage on key streets.**
- i. **Church Street between Duboce Avenue and Herman Street.**
- j. **Grove Street between Octavia Boulevard and Van Ness Avenue.**

Dischinger had good news and bad news. Good news: MTA has done a lot of work on these projects; however, on some there is a lot of objections from the community. In general bike improvements are relatively inexpensive to achieve. According to Brinkman, who went to various neighborhood groups on behalf of the bike organization, there is now a better understanding and less opposition by the neighborhood groups because there really will be no net loss of parking resulting from these bike improvements along Market Street from Octavia Boulevard to Castro Street. The merchants are now relieved because of the good job that has been done to protect the parking spaces for their customers. She will publish an article on this in the DTNA newsletter as soon as the bike organization is ready to publicize this.

So, all in all, the MOP has very strong bike amenities, which may set a model for the rest of the city. However, Starkey and Olsson mentioned that the Prado development is going to make the heavily used bike path on 14th Street very dangerous because of the Whole Food Market's 65-truck delivery schedule impinging on other traffic. Even without this additional development, this block of 14th Street between Market and Dolores is extremely dangerous now. This deserves its own special bike project analysis and allocation. According to Dischinger there are two possible solutions: 1) the Planning Department can require more space for the bikes; and 2) they may direct Whole Foods delivery schedule to better accommodate this traffic pattern.

Dischinger's bad news to the CAC was to remind us that there is an injunction against these bike improvements. Some thought that this would expire this June, but Dischinger awaits its expiration.

A31 Muni Bike Racks (\$40,000)**A32 On-Street Bike Racks (\$10,000)**

Items A31 and A32 are not listed on the scorecard because they are not as important or likely to be accomplished as the 10 A30 projects. Also these two projects have other city funding.

A33 Page Street Bicycle Boulevard (\$630,000)

This is planned with traffic circles in the middle of Page Street. A resident on this street does not like bike lanes and has obstructed their implementation with an injunction. So, this project at the moment is on hold.

A34 Childcare Facilities (\$17,163,748)

This refers to buildings designated as city-certified daycare centers where childcare services are provided. Due to stringent outdoor and indoor requirements as well as stringent licensing requirements for the daycare providers, 90% of the time, the applicants do not qualify. So, the Department routinely asks every developer if they are planning for such services in hopes of finding a sufficient number of qualified ones.

A35 Library Materials (\$681,375)

This money goes directly to the Library for them to spend only on materials loaned to patrons or on accessories (e.g., computers) which provide the library services to patrons. The only place they really need this is at their new Mission Bay branch. They are renovating other branches but those already have sufficient holdings.

A36 Recreational Facilities (no specific costs provided)

Dischinger mentioned that Hayward Park (behind the Emergency Services building) would be a candidate for this. This goes to construction of public play areas and indoor facilities (e.g., public swimming pools, basketball courts). Park and Rec has indicated that their top choice to use these funds is Hayward Park, behind the Turk Street Emergency Services building.

Cohen mentioned that rather than merely hand over this money, the CAC needs to find out what in our plan area is underfunded or where the money could best be spent.

A37 Duboce Street Museum (\$2,250,000)

This is mandated by Policy 4.3.5. ("Reclaim excess right-of-way around the Muni portal on Duboce Street, west of Market Street, to create a focal point museum that celebrates the reconstruction of historic streetcars.")

This project needs a champion. Olsson mentioned that what the CAC should consider is converting the recycling center located at the end of the Safeway lot, which contributes to the nuisance of people rifling through garbage cans set out by residents and costs the City twice as much as necessary, since first the city pays for the garbage service to collect the segregated garbage and then also pays those who rob this garbage to bring in the recyclable material.

A38 Economic Development Plan (no specific costs estimates provided)

The focus of this program, as described in the Project Scope, is to be on small business retention and development. There is no staff associated with this. Cohen stated that we will be revisiting this topic in the summer.

A39 Historic Survey (\$254,640)

The description in Appendix C indicates that Page & Turnbull are to be paid this amount to survey more than 2,000 properties in the Plan Area by 2007, which will allow the city to determine the historic status of these and to determine which are to be preserved and enhanced. The survey was completed as a first phase, but the actual cost and status of this is not indicated. Presumably all money has been spent and no further money is anticipated?

A40 Plan Area Monitoring (\$200,000)

Four quarterly reports are to be produced at a total cost of \$200,000 for 5 FTE staff from the Department.

A41 Capital Improvements Program Administration (4% of impact fee revenue and CAC staffing)**A42 Operations and Maintenance, existing and new facilities (Cost TBD)**

After the explanation of all CIPs was completed, the CAC discussed the process of the Scorecard.

We all appreciated Dischinger's explanations of the CIPs over three meetings. It was decided to use the Scorecard as well as we could. But Leavitt wanted to discuss the tool; he found it cumbersome.

Dischinger reminded us that the scorecard is merely a tool to let us see individually and corporately the priority of the projects. That in itself will advance us to the next stage at our next meeting of creating a document for the Planning Commission and IPIC of what we believe are the most important projects. We must summarize the CAC's recommendations to inform the city what it should begin working on and when.

Dischinger reviewed using the tool. She first discussed ranking the categories in Worksheet 1 ("Ranking"). These are the criteria which we determined judged against the MOP's designated expenditure categories: 2) Open Space score; 3) Streetscape score; and 4) Transportation score. We do have a lot of criteria.

Next she demonstrated how we score each of the projects within each category. It may be hard to answer each of these questions in the survey. However, if we choose not to rank all of the categories or universally decide not to evaluate a particular criterion across all projects in a category (either by leaving the cell blank or ranking it a zero), our score totals will still indicate our priorities.

Beneath the totals we may explain our decision in ~4 words.

Cohen suggests that we just get all of our numbers on this Scorecard. He suggested, during the interim between now and our next meeting, that Cohen, Henderson, and Olsson (Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary) review Dischinger's compilation of all Scorecards and summarize the priorities of the CAC together with explanations. This will allow the CAC at the next meeting to adopt its recommendations on the prioritization of CIPs.

Returning to Levitt's concerns with the tool, he felt that too much information is missing to make an informed decision. He needs to know in more detail what is possible, what is probable, and where collaborative effort of multiple city agencies could make a difference to accomplish a project. Otherwise he felt that he is merely voting as to whether he would like any project.

To clarify this Cohen reminded us that early on we had two buckets of criteria: one for Needs and one for Feasibility. Because we did not have the requisite expertise, we decided to eliminate the Feasibility category, relying upon staff's expertise to determine this. So, what remains is criteria that we all agreed needed to be met for us to approve a project. Therefore, we will be coming up with a set of priority recommendations from a policy perspective based upon our assessment of Need and Value. Subsequently this set will have to be judged by Feasibility on the basis of such criteria as timing, capital, and agency coordination. But for now we must provide the Planning Commission and IPIC with which projects we believe should have priority.

Gold recommended that the CAC approve the Chair's plan to have a subcommittee summarize the findings and explanations in order to expedite the CAC at its next meeting producing a report of our prioritized findings of these CIPs.

According to Dischinger we are looking for an objective tool so that we don't fall into neighborhood factions but rather look at the entire Plan and its CIPs to benefit the whole city and its citizens.

Because the CAC has spent so much time on this tool, Cohen suggested that we use it but do so consistently, whether one focuses on a few or all of the criteria. With Dischinger, the subcommittee will summarize the findings.

Henderson was confused as to whether there would be individual scores or aggregate scores. Cohen asked each CAC member to complete and return the scorecard to both Dischinger and himself not later than Monday. He explained that Dischinger will compile individual scores and total them for

as aggregate priorities. The subcommittee will review these and summarize the information so that the CAC can produce its own prioritized recommendations by the next meeting. This intermediate step is necessary because we have a heavy agenda next month and only have about ½ hour to spend on creating our CAC recommendations. This is why the subcommittee will meet during the interim to draft recommendations and explanations.

10. COMMITTEE MEMBERS COMMENTS & ISSUES THE COMMITTEE MAY CONSIDER IN FUTURE

MEETINGS

The following issues were noted for discussion at future meetings.

- 1) MTA parking policy proposal
- 2) In-kind community improvements proposal for 2001 Market Street development
- 3) Local Preferred Alternatives in Hayes Valley, particularly in light of Environmental Impact Report, and Traffic Study which are due as well as the Muni's BRT and Transit Effectiveness Program.
- 4) Community Impact Fee Deferral update

Henderson asked if Cohen had any final resolution on the Community Impact Fee Deferral issue which consumed us during our previous two meetings. Cohen did: it has gone through several more reiterations since our last meeting. It is going before the Land Use Committee next Monday, which might vote on it then. The latest revision will require a developer to pay 20% of all fees (with 80% deferral) before being granted a site permit. This policy will apply throughout the entire city for all new construction. All of these 20% fees will be put into an Infrastructure Fund, which would cover pre-development work on the CIPs—this will actually amount to more like 25-30% of the CIP's costs. A significant amount of pre-development money, then, comes from these “down payments” helps CIPs get going. When the project is completed, the developer pays off the remaining 80%, which pays all of the other fees that were owed as well as the remainder of the CIP costs in the Community Improvements Fund. Additionally there are still conversations about finding some way to create a capital source to fund the shovel-ready projects. They are trying to get some monies from fund intermediaries like LISC or Enterprise. There is an agreement that the city will not subsidize any developer in terms of their interest rate on deferred fees. Whatever the City pays in interest on its loan for the project will be repaid in full by the developer. This policy will sunset in three years and will require Board of Supervisors' approval to extend. There are still a number of points to be refined, but assuming that they are, the Chair of the Land Use Committee is disposed to approve it. This is a mild victory for the CAC in terms of the negotiating process.

11. PUBLIC COMMENT

Since there were no visitors at this meeting, there was no public comment.

12. ADJOURNMENT

There being no guests nor further business remaining, we adjourned at 8:35pm.

**The next meeting (fourth Wednesday) will be on May 26th from 6:30-8:30pm
at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 conference room.**

CAC Meetings: (Fourth Wednesday monthly, City Hall, Rm 279, 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
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 1st year CIP recommendations of projects and process

March 24

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

April 24

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

May 28

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

June 23

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

July 28

- Finalize proposed process — potential action

August 25

- 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)
-
-

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

Following on Theresa's presentation of outline, we can have a brief CAC brainstorm on any further suggestions to add to this list. Sound okay with you? Would you please bring copies of this list as a one page handout for the CAC meeting?

Much appreciated,
Peter

**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?