

**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, July 28, 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. Pipeline Report—Developments in process; CAC project review [discuss]
5. CAC guest—Dawn _____, Rec & Parks Dpt staff rep to IPIC [discuss]
6. Process to update and augment M/O CIP projects list (Appendix C) over time [discuss/act]
7. Update on “In-Kind” community improvements policy [discuss; possibly act]
8. Review staff’s draft M/O Plan Monitoring Report; prepare for Planning Commission [discuss/act]
9. Review of CAC draft supplement to Monitoring Report [discuss; possibly act]
10. Committee members comments and issues the Committee may consider in future meetings [discuss]
11. Public Comment
12. Adjournment

**Next Meeting: Wednesday, August 25, 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 (June 23, 2010) [**Olsson**]
3. Exhibit 3: Pipeline Report—Developments in process; CAC project review [**Dischinger**]
4. Exhibit 4: 2pp. RPD map of capital improvements planned for MOP [**Kamalanathan**]
5. Exhibit 5: CAC-adopted CIPs (from our May meeting) [**Cohen**]
6. Exhibit 6: In-Kind policy (Draft text of actual policy) [**Dischinger**]
7. Exhibit 7: Planning Department’s draft of 5 year Monitoring Report [**Dischinger**]
8. Exhibit 8: Draft of CAC Supplement to Monitoring Report [**Olsson**]
9. Exhibit 9: Monitoring Report (Draft) [Dischinger]
10. Exhibit 10: Monitoring Report’s Historical surveys [Corrette, Dischinger]
11. Exhibit 11: Monitoring Report—all maps in report [Dischinger]

DECISIONS

1. Decision 1: Minutes of previous meeting (23JUNE2010) adopted
2. Decision 2: Consensus: Dischinger’s draft of In-Kind policy was good.
3. Decision 3:

4. Decision 4:

COMMITMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, INFORMATION DUE

#	WHEN	WHO	WHAT
1.	08/25	ALL	Submit suggestions for CAC's supplement.
2.	08/25	JH/TO	Draft CAC's supplementary report on MOP process; discuss at next meeting.
3.	9/22	PC/KW	Compile list of park requirements in MOP; meet with RPD by end of Aug. update CAC CIP recommendations at September CAC meeting
4.	9/22	PC	Recommend system for public to recommend new CIPs and for CAC to consider them as MOP CIP prioritized recommendations.
5.	9/22	KD	Dischinger distributes draft of Department's 5 Year Monitoring Report to CAC at least one week before CAC September 25 th for it to be considered then.
6.	9/22	CAC	Review 5YMR; draft critique & CAC Supplement Report for adoption at September meeting and presentation before Planning Commission in Sep/Oct.
7.	9/22	PC/JH/TO	Subcommittee to draft/revise CAC Supplement for adoption at 9/25 meeting.
8.	9/25	DR	Provide Olsson & Henderson with comments for inclusion in Supplement.

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
- √ Ken Wingard

Ex Officio Members

- √ Kearstin Dischinger

Others attending: Dawn Kamalanathan, Dir. Capital & Planning, SF Rec. & Park Dpt.
RPD rep to IPIC

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

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

- 2.1 **580 Hayes** (Laguna/Hayes: the property changed hands; will become a parking lot.
- 2.2 **Hayes St. bus:** a \$288m grant will make Hayes St. 2-way for busses; start in 1 year; this will remove the bus from Page St, making it safer for bicycles.
- 2.3 **TEP** (Jason): The Haight predates the MOP in the TEP. Hayes St. will become 2-way by removing the tow-away zone; on Fell St. part of the freeway has been rebuilt.
- 2.4 **Congestion Pricing:** The Planning Department will host community discussions on Aug. 18th and HVNA's next meeting will have the Department speaking on this on Aug.26th (4th Th.) at 7pm at 300 Fell St.
- 2.5 **Temporary Businesses:** Until the Freeway lots are built, temporary businesses (ice cream, beer, bikes, kitchens) will be allowed on these: Lot K (Hayes/Octavia); Lot O (Octavia between Fell and Linden)

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING (JUNE 23, 2010) [act]**Exhibit 2: Minutes of June 23rd CAC meeting** [Olsson/Oropeza]

A motion (Henderson/Brinkman) to approve the minutes from the previous meeting was approved.

**4. Pipeline Report—Developments in process; CAC project review [discuss]
Exhibit 3: Pipeline Report for July**

Updates in the report were noted and accepted without comment.

5. CAC guest—Dawn Kamalanathan, Rec & Parks Dpt, Dir. Plng & Capital; staff rep to IPIC [discuss]

Exhibit 4: (2pp Map) Capital Improvements by Rec&Parks in the MOP

Before introducing our guest, Cohen mentioned that the CAC Recommendations are but preliminary; they will be finalized by the end of the year (EOY).

Kamalanathan of RPD presented her department's map of planned parks in the MOP and made the following comments:

- M/O Fund 5-year contains projections for approximately \$1m to open space/parks and \$1.5m for recreation facilities in the MOP Area
- Duboce Park and Hayward Park are considered by RPD to be "hub" sites with a "broad suite" of programming.
- Smaller park sites in the RPD system ("boutique" parks) have more localized uses.
- There are major capital investment needs at Hayward park.
- There are new emerging needs at other parks in the MOP area.
- RPD does not have a comprehensive and current list of park improvement needs. Kamalanathan provided a list of potential needs by RPD engineering compiled in 2007, but these are not RPD priorities and a needs assessment has not been updated since.
- Kamalanathan suggested a process for CAC to gather information and ideas on each park site, then discuss with RPD to create a comprehensive inventory to evaluate for M/O Community Improvements Program priorities. Cohen appointed himself and Wingard as a subcommittee to compile a list of information on each park and proposed park within the MOP Area.

Levitt explained to her that the art in Patricia's Green is very important; however that funding for it had been cut. HVNA proposes to place a plaque honoring Patricia's opposition to the old freeway and showing how revitalized the area is now that the freeway has been removed. Levitt observed that there is no green space nor recreation facilities in SoMa for its residents, while recommending that there should be a skateboard park at Duboce/Stevenson. The Living Streets proposed in the MOP would become block-long open spaces shared with cars. Cohen remarked that the largest part of the MOP Fund is devoted to Living Alleys/Green Spaces.

Dischinger mentioned that there are 3 SoMa parks scheduled for the MOP Area:

- 1) Brady Park
- 2) Skateboard Park (this is awaiting the sale of a freeway project)
- 3) McCoppin

The Plumbers Union will not sell their building to the City. There is funding for the other two projects.

Following this we learned how the RPD is organized, the size of each of these parks, their functions and service areas. We learned that the RPD prioritizes parks according to the buildings and facilities at each. Now they are leasing smaller facilities to those who can run new programs.

Wingard asked whether there was enough money to convert Hayward Playground into a whole park.

Cohen wondered when IPIC would be meeting on this and learned that they would likely discuss this in September. He reminded CAC that we must keep these suggestions in the capital budgets each year so that when there is enough our projects will be funded. It was noted that more than 20% of all fees are for Deferrals, which considerably reduces the immediate funding of these community improvements. However, when these fees are paid, then by having kept our ideas in the capital budgets they are more likely to be funded. Cohen appointed himself and Wingard as a subcommittee to compile a list of information on each park and proposed park within the MOP Area. They will meet with RPD by the end of August. Then they will update CIP recommendation priorities at CAC's September meeting.

6. Process to update and augment M/O CIP projects list (Appendix C) [discuss/act]

Exhibit 5: CAC-adopted CIPs (from our May meeting)

This topic regards updating and augmenting the CIPs proposed by the Department as Appendix C of the original Market Octavia Plan. We need to refine the “projects” identified for CAC CIP recommendations (per footnotes in May 26, 2010 preliminary recommendations document. In particular, the Open Space/Parks category, the Recreation Facilities category, and the Streetscapes and Transportation categories need to be so refined. In the September/October timeframe, the CAC will establish a system for ongoing input and solicitation for CIP updates over time—for example, the November 2009 "Project Suggestion Form" adopted by the CAC. To help us in this Cohen suggested that we should have the MTA and DPW (both DPW&MTA on streets; MTA also on traffic) join us at our meetings next year. The meetings for the rest of the year are too full.

7. Update “In-Kind” community improvements policy [discuss; possibly act]
Exhibit 6: Department’s draft of “In Kind” Policy

Dischinger led us through her draft of the policy describing the process by which developers could apply and be approved to create one of the CIPs in lieu of paying fees to fund the CIP. This begins with the developer taking the initiative to approach the department and offer to accomplish one of the approved projects. She described the project and assured the CAC that their recommendation on the developer’s plans to accomplish the CIP would have great weight with the Department and the Commission. Cohen noted that the Prado Group’s Whole Foods Store will not qualify as an In-Kind CIP. At this point distinctions were made among deferrals, in-kind policy, and in-lieu projects. Dischinger indicated that the CAC must tell the Department and Commission whether or not they support this In-Kind Policy; further, the CAC can pass a resolution and send it to the Board of Supervisors indicating our recommendations, which will be included in the record. The staff’s working group expects to have finalized this policy within three weeks. At that time it will be distributed to the CAC as homework to prepare for our next meeting for discussion and approval. The concensus of the CAC was that this draft of the policy was good work. Levitt noted the incentive that the developers will be able to obtain reasonable savings through this policy.

8. Review staff’s draft M/O Plan Monitoring Report; prepare for Planning Commission [discuss;act]

Exhibit 7: Planning Department’s draft of 5 year Monitoring Report

It was noted that Cohen’s suggestions had not been incorporated into this draft; Henderson’s had. Dischinger indicated that the revised draft of the Monitoring Report will not be issued by staff until our September meeting. So, CAC will review that draft of the Department’s 5 Year Monitoring Report at our September 22nd meeting, with the subsequent presentation before the Planning Commission now planned for late September or early October. It was agreed that Dischinger and Cohen would discuss the draft in the interim to more fully incorporate the CAC recommendations.

Richards will forward to Olsson his comments for incorporation into the CAC’s Supplementary Report.

9. Review of CAC draft supplement to Monitoring Report [discuss; possibly act]

Exhibit 8: Draft of CAC Supplement to Monitoring Report (distributed by Olsson to CAC)

Theresa on staff received Jason’s comments for inclusion in the report.

Dischinger asked us to consider and agree upon the goal of our report. Henderson reminded us that the legislature in requiring the 5 year monitoring report required that it cover four specific topics.

- 1) Data (both prior to MOP and during its first five years)
- 2) Analysis
- 3) Interpretation
- 4) Recommendations

The Department’s report consists mainly of data. The question was who was responsible for the remaining three topics. Dischinger felt that the CAC was responsible for these three remaining parts and accordingly the Department supplied only the data for the report. The CAC, based upon our experience, does not argue with the quantitative data as with the quality of the data. Cohen believes that Appendix A requires that the Department produce all four parts of the report. However, he felt that whether the Department completes these or not, the CAC will. But how will our

recommendations will be received by the Commission? The Department will tell the Commission which of our conclusions and recommendations they agree with and which they do not. Richards observed that the report should be organized around the policy objectives of the MOP as a “whole neighborhood”. He proposed a fifth topic: explicitly stating the progress toward attaining the MOP principles, noting that we do not “shadow” the Planning Department. Henderson noted that a critique of the process is not a review of the projects. Olsson asked how the topics of Variable Value parking meters and Congestion Pricing, which will be introduced into the MOP Area, will effect the values of the MOP. Richardson also noted that we keep adding retain space to the MOP. Cohen noted that only the staff have the expertise to perform the last three required topics. They alone know such things as the vacancy rates and rents in this area; so, they alone are able to analyze the significance of such trends. Brinkman reminded the CAC that because our members live in the area, we are the keen observers and the first to notice the gentrification of the area as the MOP proceeds. Finally Cohen stated that we would not be finalizing the CAC’s Supplementary Report at our next (Aug. 25th) meeting. Instead we have asked for another presentation by Michael Yarney of the city’s Economic Development agency.

Cohen, Henderson and Olsson are the subcommittee charged with revising the CAC’s Supplement. The CAC will continue revising the draft of its supplement to the Monitoring Report with comments from members sent to the subcommittee or which arise in discussion of it during our meetings. The subcommittee hopes to circulate a revised draft to the CAC at least three days before our August 25th meeting [this was subsequently postponed by the Chair]. Since the CAC’s Supplement is in part a response to the Department’s Monitoring Report, the CAC Supplement will continue to be revised once the staff’s latest draft of the Monitoring Report is provided to the CAC in September. The CAC’s Supplement report will be reviewed for final adoption at the September 22nd meeting.

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

Levitt made several requests or recommendations: 1) that the minutes be distributed with adequate time to review them before the next meeting, rather than the night before [NOTE: the Secretary apologizes to the CAC, because he was out of state and delayed in returning, he was not able to meet this sensible request; he will try better in the future.]; 2) that we discuss Conditional Use Parking Permits; 3) that we discuss the effect of Congestion Pricing on the MOP; 4) that we discuss the effect of San Francisco GO [variable, demand-driven pricing of parking meters] in the MOP; 5) that we create a cumulative list of the attendance of members at CAC meetings for the year. Finally, all on the CAC wished our colleague Cheryl Brinkman well in her future civic participation: she has been nominated for the MTA Board; if approved, she will have to resign from the CAC because of the anticipated workload in this new assignment. Further, if she resigns, then there will be another vacancy on the CAC to fill.

11. Public Comment

No members of the public having attended the meeting, this item was closed.

12. Adjournment The meeting adjourned at 8:52pm.

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

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

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

Respectfully submitted,
~TED OLSSON
Secretary

MOP-CAC
Attendance
 4th Wednesday monthly

Legend

Y = attended

N = unexcused absence

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

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

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

January 27February 24

- Working session on CIP evaluation and prioritization
 - Explanations and updates on CIP Appendix C projects list
 - Projects evaluation and individual scoring
 - Review and discuss preliminary scoring results
 - Prep for next meeting: finalize 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.