

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

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

**Board of Supervisors — Room 278
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday, June 23, 2010; 6:30pm
Regularly scheduled monthly meeting**

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

The Agenda & Minutes of all community meetings, a matter of public record, are available at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 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 (May 26, 2010) [act]
4. Coordination with Eastern Neighborhoods CAC [discuss; possibly act]
5. Pipeline Report—Developments in process; CAC project review [discuss]
6. “In-Kind” community improvements policy for Planning Commission [discuss; possibly act]
7. Review staff’s draft M/O Plan Monitoring Report; prepare for Planning Commission [discuss;act]
8. Review of CAC draft supplement to Monitoring Report [discuss; possibly act]
9. Update on CAC meetings advance schedule, July through September [discussion]
10. Committee members comments and issues the Committee may consider in future meetings [discuss]
11. Public Comment
12. Adjournment

**Next Meeting: Wednesday, July 28, 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
2. Exhibit 2: Notice of of Public Hearing (July21) [Dischinger]
3. Exhibit 3: Minutes (May 26, 2010) [Olsson]
4. Exhibit 4: Pipeline Report—Developments in process; CAC project review [Dischinger]
5. Exhibit 5: In-Kind policy [PowerPoint slideshow; Dischinger]
6. Exhibit 6: In-Kind policy [11x17” summary chart, “Cliff Notes”; Dischinger]
7. Exhibit 7: In-Kind policy (Draft text of actual policy) [Dischinger]
8. Exhibit 8: In-Kind policy—A Summary of the Steps for In-kind Agreements
9. Exhibit 9: Monitoring Report (Draft) [Dischinger]
10. Exhibit 10: Monitoring Report’s Historical surveys [Corrette, Dischinger]
11. Exhibit 11: Montoring Report—all maps in report [Dischinger]

DECISIONS

1. Decision 1: Minutes of previous meeting (26MAY2010) adopted
2. Decision 2: Consensus: Cohen was unanimously chosen as our delegate to the Finance Committee
3. Decision 3:

4. Decision 4:

COMMITMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, INFORMATION DUE

#	WHEN	WHO	WHAT
1.	07/09	ALL	Submit suggestions for CAC's supplement.
2.	07/21	JH/TO	Draft CAC's supplementary report on MOP process; discuss at next meeting.
3.			

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)
- x Robin Levitt
- √ Ted Olsson (Secretary)
- x Dennis Richards
- √ Marius Starkey
- √ Ken Wingard

Ex Officio Members

- √ Kearstin Dischinger

Others attending: NONE

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

2. Announcements, upcoming meetings and general housekeeping [discuss]

- 2.1 **Ken Wingard.** Wingard was welcomed onto the CAC representing area merchants. He has a furniture store on Market Street near Sanchez, and has lived here for 21 years. CAC members introduced themselves to him.
- 2.2 **Prado development.** (Henderson) HVNA met with Prado regarding their development at Market and Dolores. They mentioned using the In-Kind policy to create a bulb-out as well as the possibility of creating affordable housing offsite. This was noted as an example of not bringing affordable housing into the development and even more seriously the developer deferring 80% of the impact fees until occupancy, at which time the early occupants would essentially be paying the fee. The committee expressed concern at the situation. Cohen will meet with Prado shortly.
- 2.3 **Sunday Streets.** (Brinkman) On Sunday, July 11, the focus will be the Mission District.
- 2.4 **Commission Hearing.** (Dischinger) **Exhibit 2: Notice of Public Hearing.** On July 21 (City Hall, Room 400; 12:30pm) there will be a hearing by the Planning Commission to hear about the MOP Augmented Survey.
- 2.5 **Area Plan Infrastructure.** As part of this discussion, Cohen mentioned the work of the Finance Infrastructure Working Group, which he sits on representing us. The purpose of the committee is to oversee the implementation of a consultant's study of financial tools the city (and we) might use to finance the infrastructure (including CIPs). Currently only 50% of our CIPs are funded. Their deliberations are often rather political and philosophical. All agreed that Cohen should continue to represent us on this important group contributing to its discussions.
- 2.6 **IPIC.** We need to study IPIC's review of our preliminary CIP recommendations. Their meeting has not yet been scheduled. Dischinger will attend on our behalf and report back.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING (MAY 26, 2010) [act]**Exhibit 3: Minutes of May 26th CAC meeting** [Olsson/Oropeza]

A motion (Gold/Starkey) to approve the minutes from the previous meeting was approved with abstentions by Brinkman and Wingard (neither of whom attended the meeting). Cohen's suggestion for edits on several aspects of those minutes (staff explanations of CPE, UPN) was also accepted.

4. COORDINATION WITH EASTERN NEIGHBORHOODS CAC [discuss; possibly act]

Cohen reported that EN-CAC was pursuing its concerns but none had any relation to ours.

5. PIPELINE REPORT—DEVELOPMENTS IN PROCESS; CAC PROJECT REVIEW [spreadsheet; discuss]
Exhibit 4: Pipeline Report

Dischinger presented the Pipeline report, containing four new items: 1) 205 Franklin St., a new Jazz Center in Hayes Valley; 2) 64 Pierce St.; 3) 2 entries for 1800 Market Street Community Center Special Use District for a rooftop restaurant atop the LGBT Center, sponsored by Sup. Dufty.

6. "IN-KIND" COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENTS POLICY FOR PLANNING COMMISSION [discuss; possibly act]

Exhibit 5: In-Kind policy [PowerPoint slideshow; Dischinger] presented last meeting; given to Wingard.

Exhibit 6: In-Kind policy [11x17" summary chart, "Cliff Notes"; Dischinger]

Exhibit 7: In-Kind policy (Draft text of actual policy) [Dischinger]

Exhibit 8: In-Kind policy—A Summary of the Steps for In-kind Agreements

Cohen and Levitt from our CAC plus others from EN-CAC helped Dischinger in drafting this policy.

Dischinger explained by way of example that a project must be designed by a developer to "the 30% level" before CAC and city agencies could assess its feasibility. The question was raised as to when these projects are presented to neighborhood associations. This is the developer's responsibility. It was suggested that we should require developers to meet with neighborhood associations whose area is effected by the Plan. The criteria for determining value is the efficiencies by developers.

Cohen suggested that in item #8 of the outline it should be stated that if a project is not supported by the CAC then the project should not be approved. He noted that the In-Kind policy is merely a delivery mechanism. Henderson suggested that the CAC should simply deliberate to recommend projects after IPIC's information is known, since its experts alone can provide information on the project's feasibility. Cohen also suggested that the summary might be more helpful if the steps were arranged chronologically. Dischinger calmed the committee's concerns by indicating that under no circumstances could a developer claim any required mitigation as an in-kind contribution; any in-kind effort must add value for the public. Therefore, anything identified in the EIR is not permitted to be addressed as an in-kind effort. Since action was not required tonight on this draft of the in-kind policy, it was tabled.

For in-kind projects, the department will audit and pay only approved developer's actual expenses. Since any approved in-kind project deducts from the budget for its category of CIPs, should in-kind projects be limited to a certain percentage of that category's budget? Prado's project is likely the first in-kind project to come before the CAC; we will deliberate further on this issue.

7. REVIEW STAFF'S DRAFT M/O PLAN MONITORING REPORT AND PREP FOR PLANNING COMMISSION [discuss;act]

Exhibit 9: MONITORING REPORT (Draft) [Dischinger]

Exhibit 10: MONITORING REPORT'S HISTORICAL SURVEYS [Corrette, Dischinger]

Exhibit 11: MONITORING REPORT—ALL MAPS IN REPORT

Since so little of the MOP has been implemented, this report sets the baseline for evaluating progress in implementing the plan for the next five years. The CAC should review this report from two perspectives: 1) what is the report missing?; 2) what is the CAC's perspective on how the Plan might be implemented? A hearing date for this report before the commission has not been set, though it is expected to be about mid-August or September. Staff will end their work on this report

within half a month. So, the CAC is asked to immediately share any critique and comments about the report with Dischinger or Teresa Ojeda <teresa.ojeda@sfgov.org> by 5pm on July 9th.

- 8. REVIEW OF CAC DRAFT SUPPLEMENT TO MONITORING REPORT** [discuss; possibly act]
 Because the Department's Monitoring Report was not available before this evening, the deadline for the CAC's own report has been postponed by one month. The deadline for CAC members submitting their comments for the CAC report is July 9th. Members are asked to send their suggestions to Henderson and Olsson as a Word document in an email entitled "CAC Report". Then Henderson will compile these and Olsson will compose the report. The deadline for the sending this draft to all CAC members is July 22nd. At our CAC meeting on July 28th we will revise and approve the CAC supplementary report to submit to the Planning Commission. All CAC members are expected to attend the Commission hearing on the report, whenever that is scheduled (we should know when by our next meeting).
- 9. UPDATE ON CAC MEETINGS ADVANCE SCHEDULE, JULY THROUGH SEPTEMBER** [discussion]
- 9.1 **In-Kind Policy endorsement:** We will endorse the In-Kind policy at our next meeting.
- 9.2 **2001 Market St. (Prado) development:** we will consider the in-kind policy in terms of this development. The question will be the distinction between required mitigations and permitted in-kind efforts. This is expected probably to be presented about July 4th. We must also consider their possible decision to create off-site/in-lieu affordable housing, resulting in impact fee deferral.
- 9.3 **IPIC Feedback:** We will consider IPIC's comments on our preliminary CIP prioritization. Based upon this feedback we will reconsider our priorities and create a final recommendation for MOP CIPs.
- 9.4 **Appendix C additions:** We will consider the recommendations for additional CIPs submitted by the public on our CAC website.
- 9.5 **Invite Agencies to CAC:** Cohen suggested that we invite and learn from the Recreation Department; Olsson recommended that we hear from the Department of the Environment. He is particularly concerned that our CAC does not focus upon sustainable energy (Generation; Conservation; Consumption) and recyclable or conserved waste water both by our developers and in our CIPs.
- 10. COMMITTEE MEMBERS COMMENTS AND ISSUES THE COMMITTEE MAY CONSIDER IN FUTURE MEETINGS** [discuss]: None: considered above
- 11. PUBLIC COMMENT:** No public attended the meeting this time.
- 12. ADJOURNMENT:** 8:36pm
Next Meeting: Wednesday, June 28, 2010, 6:30pm, City Hall, Rm. 278

CAC Meetings: (Fourth Wednesday monthly, City Hall, Rm 278, 6:30-8:30pm)
Calendar: 4/28, 5/26, 6/23, 7/28, 8/25, 9/22, 10/27, 11/24, 12/22

Respectfully submitted,
 ~TED OLSSON
 Secretary

MOP-CAC
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)
- In-Kind policy
- Department's 5-year Monitoring Report of MOP
- CAC's supplementary to the Department's Monitoring Report of MOP

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

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

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

**Suggestions for CAC Supplemental Report
(from May 26th meeting)**

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

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