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

5th Floor Conference Room
Planning Dept., 1650 Mission Street, Room 528
Wednesday, January 19, 2010; 6:30pm
Regularly scheduled monthly meeting

Peter Cohen	Carmela Gold
Jason Henderson	Robin Leavitt
Ted Olsson	Dennis Richards
Marius Starkey	Ken Wingard
David Winslow	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 for February 16, 2011; (no minutes from March 23rd; no quorum) [act]
4. Proposed In-kind Community Improvements Agreement for 2001 Market (Prado) [act]
5. Haight Street two-way proposal [discuss; act]
6. Pipeline Report—developments in process; CAC project reviews [discuss; act]
   - Quarterly pipeline report and mapping
   - 55 Laguna project review
   - Potential new projects for CAC review
7. Trends in Parking CUs within M/O Plan Area [discuss]
8. Progress on inclusionary Housing 'land dedication' option for M/O Area [discuss]
9. Prep for follow-up Planning Commission hearing on June 2nd for M/O Plan Monitoring Report CAC Report recommendations [discussion]
10. Area Plans implementation and next steps on 2011 M/O CIP Recommendations [discuss]
    Prep for May 5th Planning Commission presentation
11. CAC members comments and issues the Committee may wish to consider in the future [discuss]
12. Public Comment
13. Adjournment

NEXT MEETING: WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 2011, 6:30PM, LOCATION 1650 Mission, Rm. 528
(Jan19, Feb23, Mch23, Apr27, May25, Jun22, Jul27, Aug24, Sep28, Oct26, Nov23, Dec28)
NOTE: normal meetings are on the fourth Wednesday of each month (Jan & Feb: exceptions this year)

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

1. Exhibit 1: Agenda [**Oropeza**]
2. Exhibit 2: Minutes (Feb. 16 & Apr. 27, 2011) [**Olsson**]
3. Exhibit 3: Diagram of Market/Dolores potential improvements [**Dischinger**]
4. Exhibit 4: Pipeline Report—Developments in process; CAC project review [**Dischinger**]

DECISIONS

1. Decision 1: Approved CAC Resolution 2011-01 (April 27, 2011)

COMMITMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, INFORMATION DUE

#	WHEN	WHO	WHAT
1.	5/25	Olsson	Ask Cohen: prep for Commission hearing (6/5) on CAC recommendations.

MINUTES

1. **CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**
EXHIBIT 1: AGENDA
ROLL CALL (√=present; 0=absent; X=excused)
X Peter Cohen (Chair)
√ Carmela Gold
√ Jason Henderson (Vice Chair)
√ Robin Leavitt
√ Ted Olsson (Secretary)
√ Dennis Richards
√ Marius Starkey
N Ken Wingard
√ David Winslow
Ex Officio Members
√ Kearstin Dischinger
Others attending:
1. Kate McGee, Planner, SF Planning Dept., (415.558.6367; Kate_McGee@ci.sf.ca.us)
2. Greg Riessen, Planner, SF Planning Dept., (415.575.9023; greg.riessen@sfgov.org)

A quorum being present, Vice-Chair Henderson opened the meeting at 6:30pm.

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

2.1 **Sup. Wiener's Preservation Hearing** (Mon., June 2, 1pm at City Hall)

2.2 **Process for becoming historic districts.** DTNA had the Planning Department address them on this issue earlier. It was asked that Moses and Tim of the Planning Department address our MOP on this issue.

2.3 **Planning Commission hearings:**
- On May 5 IPIC will provide its annual planning report to the commission.
- In June the commission will discuss Inclusionary Housing.
- Also in June the Planning Commission will hear the Planning Department's response to the CAC's recommendations.

2.4 **Development Impact Fees.** The fee has been increased by 3% to $8.43 per square foot.

3. **Approval of Minutes from previous meetings [act] (Olsson)**
EXHIBIT 2: MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2011 CAC MEETING [Olsson]

There having been no official meeting in March for lack of a quorum, there were no minutes to approve for that meeting. There was a question whether the February minutes were approved; however, they were not discussed nor approved at this meeting either. The February minutes are now to be approved at the May meeting together with those of this April meeting.

4. **Whole Foods development — in-kind approval**
EXHIBIT 3: Dolores Street plan and simulation [Dischinger]

Presentation by guests Kate McGee and Greg Riessen on proposed Dolores Street modifications. Because of the extensive comment and the fact that this discussion consumed most of the meeting, the remarks are described in detail.

The SF Planning Department's Planners discussed the proposed modfications to the first block of Dolores Street. McGee began by explaining the rationale for the modifications and how the Department hoped that the developer would be willing to pay for these. This was followed by Riessen's showing a computerized simulation of how traffic would appear on that street and the intersections at Market Street and 14th Street. The simulation was based upon traffic data collected at the intersections and on Dolores Street plus was conservatively enhanced by projections to the year 2030. The simulation was viewed skeptically by each member of the CAC. No one thought that the projected simulation was accurate currently, let alone to the year 2030 when the MOP would be concluded and the neighborhood's density would be much greater.

McGee explained that the new In-Kind Agreement was authorized in December 2010 by the Planning Department and was expected to raise $1.4m. She discussed the four steps in the In-Kind

process, which we knew of when Dischinger had reviewed her draft with us. McGee explained that developers considering such In-Kind Agreements would have to meet with the relevant CAC and then submit to public hearings with the MTA, MTA Board, and with the Board of Supervisors discussing their proposed improvements, costs, and schedules.

This was followed by the computerized simulation by the transportation planner Greg Riessen. This simulation was explained to be based upon the most conservative estimates of what traffic would be in 2030. Specifically, the simulation was based upon 140 vehicles entering and exiting the Whole Foods building's parking lot with 60 spaces. The Department expects low traffic volume on Dolores Street until 2030. They expect minimal problems from the supermarket's loading on 14th Street.

After the presentation by both planners, the CAC members commented in turn on the improvements and the simulation.

Starkey—a resident across the street from the project and directly affected by the demolition, construction, and operation of the supermarket, and thoroughly familiar with current traffic conditions on the street—defined the Department's presentation as unrealistic and unbelievable.

Winslow thought that the simulation did not adequately show how traffic on Dolores would be affected as cars turn or stop while entering or stopping at/for Whole Foods.

Gold questioned the assumptions and simulation, particularly how the Department's proposed bulbouts would worsen the traffic situation.

At this point Riessen pointed out that a new condition of [the Department's] approval of this Community Improvement Project would be that the sidewalks on this first block of Dolores had to be widened. This sidewalk widening was objected to by several of those CAC members living near the development.

Leavitt was generally pleased with the plan but particularly that space was taken away from the cars and given to the pedestrians.

Riessen noted that the purpose of the bulbouts is to reduce the speed of vehicles without contributing to congestion; he guessed that traffic would not be diverted to other streets, affecting congestion on them and throughout the neighborhood.

Richardson questioned how many parking space would be lost? Riessen estimated about 10 car spaces on each side of the first block of Dolores Street; so that 15-20 spaces would be removed to accomplish the Department's design. Richardson followed this up with the request that we postpone any resolution on this plan until next meeting, after the neighborhood associations would have time for McGee and Riessen to explain the plan to these constituents. It was agreed that no vote would be held until then.

In response to Windsor's question of how much it expected the developer to pay for, McGee spoke to the city's opportunity to have this development pay for all of the Department's proposed improvements with their impact fees. This plan is expected to come before the Planning Commission in September.

Richardson thought that because there are not enough parking spaces to accommodate demand, the neighborhood would become a parking lot, greatly exacerbating the problems which the design was supposed to cure.

Olsson expressed great skepticism about the Department's design and simulation.

1) To be useful, the simulation should have included the triangular area bounded by Market/Church/14th Streets, Market/Duboce/Buchanan Streets, not merely Dolores Street with its intersections at Market and at 14th Streets.

2) The development was approved by the Commission on the condition that it be reviewed by the Commission after one year by hearing comments and critiques from the community and deciding what more needed to be done to address the shortcomings of the project which affect the neighborhood. Further, the Department's design appears to force the community to accommodate to the supermarket rather than the supermarket fitting into the neighborhood. The Department should adopt the physician's first rule—Do No Harm while trying to heal or improve the situation. Accordingly, Whole Foods should first be allowed to move in without any of these proposed traffic-mediating community improvements and only after one year of observing the situation should any traffic mediations be proposed after they have been thoroughly heard and critiqued at community workshops. Whole Foods should use technology to regulate parking and overflow. Of course—according to the statement in the CAC's response to the Department's Fifth Year MOP Monitoring

report—the neighborhood most affected by any Community Improvement Project (in this case, the Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association) should have ultimate approval on the project.
3) The Department's dismissal of the supermarket's loading schedule and its effects upon traffic are unrealistic. The intersection of Market and 14th Street is one of the fastest and most dangerous intersections in the City, particularly because it is also designed as a major cycling thoroughfare from DTNA and upper Market down 14th Street to Harrison Street. With 67 trucks unloading daily (including two 18-wheelers), their effect will back up traffic on the critical intersection of Market/Church/14th Streets.
4) The left turn lane from Market Street onto Dolores Street is frequently backed up with two lanes to turn into. Constricting this to one lane is sure to greatly reduce the flow of traffic.
5) The bicycle traffic at both Market/Church/14th Streets and at Market/Dolores/Duboce/Buchanan seems unrealistic today and certainly will be so in two decades if our cycling adoption is growing at 100% every couple or several years.
6) The Department's conditions of approval—i.e., that the sidewalks on the first block of Dolores must be doubled and all four corners must have bulbouts—is unacceptable, regardless of the theoretical rationale that such bulbouts reduce traffic speed without creating traffic congestion.
7) The right turn from Market Street onto Dolores Street by both automobiles and bicycles seemed unrealistic.
8) The trees on both sidewalks did not seem to be the same in the printed design as in the simulation. Complementary planting beside the building, not at curbside, should be considered.

Following the CAC member's critiques, Henderson asked what was the next step in the process, during the 30 days until our CAC's next meeting? The overriding issue should be: What kind of neighborhood do we want?

Dischinger offered to send the simulation to CAC members as a Windows Media Player file; however, members with Macs asked for a way to play this. Dischinger suggested that neighborhood associations after receiving McGee and Riessen's should express what they like and what they do not like about the Dolores Street plan.

It was decided that any resolution on this Department design should be one of the first items on our next CAC's meeting.

5. Haight Street—2-way improvement [discuss]

Dischinger described that the transition of Haight Street for the block before Market St. had been completed from one-way to two-way for Muni. It was mentioned that residential neighbors in the area do not know of these improvements. The committee agreed with that they should be notified. Henderson noted that MTA will hold other forums with the neighbors. Leavitt said that neighbors had raised good points: e.g., for the right turn onto Market, it was suggested that only east-bound busses use the last block of Haight.

Henderson proposed the following CAC Resolution approved by Winslow:

MOP-CAC Resolution 2011-01 (27 April 2011)
Resolution Supporting the Haight Street Two-Way/
Transit & Pedestrian Improvements Proposal

WHEREAS the Haight Street two-way project was ranked as a top transit improvement priority by the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee, amongst the transit improvements that are part of the Market and Octavia Community Benefits Program,

BE IT RESOLVED that the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee urges that the MTA Board approve the Haight Street two-way proposal between Octavia Street and Market Street, and all complementary pedestrian improvements at the intersection of Gough/Haight/Market Streets.

Approved by the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee on April 27th 2011
AYES: Henderson, Leavitt, Olsson, Richards, Starkey, Gold, Winslow (unanimous)
NAYES: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Cohen, Wingard
MOTION: 2011-4-27

6. Pipeline Report.

EXHIBIT 4: Dolores Street plan and simulation [Dischinger]

Dischinger mentioned that UC Berkeley Extension was once again in the report. It was important to know the history of the current structure, the proposed development, and the neighborhood's controversy. HVNA is having a meeting on this topic.

Dischinger mentioned that this pipeline report is the Department's current quarterly Active Cases Report. It is an expanded report with attached map keyed to all of the developments in the report.

Leavitt mentioned that he had been contacted by the architects for the properties at Hayes and Octavia, and at Grove and Gough.

7. Trends in Parking CUs within M/O Plan Area [Henderson].

Leavitt mentioned two projects which he felt exceeded the CU parking permits:

1) 299 Valencia Street
2) 2535 Dolores St.

The real question is when should CU variances be permitted. It was mentioned that units for families, with 2 or 3 bedrooms, SPUR feels should be approved. Richards asked what are the situations under which the CAC proposes to support CUs?

Leavitt suggested that we should invite Tom Radulovich to the CAC to discuss the topic with us.

NOTE: While a quorum was present, the chair asked members what they remembered of Agenda Item 9: "Prep for follow-up for the Planning Commission's hearing on June 2nd on the CAC recommendations to the M/O Plan Monitoring Report". Most of the members did not recall what the item was about. Olsson remembered very well what it was about: namely, that the Department was to reply point-by-point to the CAC's recommendations and critiques in its report presented in conjunction with the Department's Fifth Year Market Octavia Plan Monitoring Report. Dischinger believed that this was wrong: the Commission she felt was waiting to hear from the CAC as to what the Department should do—i.e., the onus was upon the CAC to respond. However, Olsson remembered that the Commission unanimously thanked the CAC for its thorough report (with Commissioners Sugaya and Moore specifically stating that they appreciated the detailed recommendations for improvement of the Department). Consequently, Olsson felt that it would be illogical to hear more from the CAC until the Department had answered each of the recommendations. The Commissioners already had before them the improvements that the CAC recommended needed to be instituted by the Department. In postponing discussion of this topic, the CAC asked Olsson to contact Cohen to see what he remembered of the matter in putting this item on the agenda.

[NOTE: Olsson did contact Cohen the next day. Cohen agreed with Olsson that the Department must respond to the Commissioners on the CAC recommendations point by point.]

At this point a quorum left, so nothing further could be enacted. This left the following items to be postponed to the next meeting.

8. Progress on Inclusionary Housing 'land dedication' option for M/O Area [discuss].

Postponed to next CAC meeting (May 25th).

9. Prepare for June 2nd meeting with Planning Commission on CAC's recommendations on its critique of the Department's Fifth Year MOP Monitoring Report

Postponed to next CAC meeting (May 25th).

10. Area Plans implementation and next steps on 2011 M/O CIP Recommendations—prepare for May 5th? Planning Commission presentation [discuss]

Postponed to next CAC meeting (May 25th).

11. Committee members comments and issues the Committee may consider in the future [discuss]
Postponed to next CAC meeting (May 25th).

12. Public Comment
No public attending the meeting, this item was dispensed with.

10. Adjournment.
There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:38pm.

NEXT MEETING: WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 2010, 6:30PM, CITY HALL, RM. 278
CAC Meetings: (Fourth Wednesday monthly, City Hall, Rm 278, 6:30-8:30pm)
2011 Calendar: 1/19, 2/16, 3/16, 4/20, 5/18, 6/15, 7/20, 8/17, 9/21, 10/19, 11/16, 12/21

Respectfully submitted,
~TED OLSSON, Secretary

MOP-CAC
Attendance
4th Wednesday monthly

Legend
Y = attended
N = unexcused absence
X = excused absence (i.e., Chairman notified)
Q = no quorum: no official business transacted; no minutes

CAC Member	1/19*	2/16*	3/23	4/27	5/26	6/22	7/27	8/24	9/28	10/26	11/23	12/28
Peter Cohen	Y	Y	Y/Q	X								
Carmela Gold	**X**	Y	N	Y								
Jason Henderson	Y	Y	Y/Q	Y								
Robin Leavitt	Y	Y	Y/Q	Y								
Ted Olsson	Y	Y	Y/Q	Y								
Dennis Richard	Y	**N**	N	Y								
Marius Starkey	Y	**N**	N	Y								
Ken Wingard	Y	**N**	N	N								
David Winslow	Y	**N**	**N**	Y								
Ex Officio												
Kearstin Dischinger	Y	Y	Y/Q	Y								

* Jan & Feb meetings held monthly on third Wednesday.

MOP-CAC
2011 Draft Schedule of meeting Topics
(as of 23 FEB 2010)

2010 SCHEDULE OF TOPICS

January 19

February 22
- 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
- Impement Appendix C process
- Discuss MOP Fund expenditure categories; potential action
- Discuss additional funding sources for CIPs

September 22
- Update CAC CIP recommendations

October 27 **CANCELLED: Lack of Quorum**
- Finalize 2011 CAC CIP recommendations; potential action

November 24 Postponed to **November 29**: to avoid Thanksgiving holidays
- As needed; potential action to finalize 2011 CAC recommendations

December 22 Moved up to **December 15** to avoid Holidays
- Approve revised CAC Supplementary report.
- Send resolution to CAC Audiences

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

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

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