

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

**Board of Supervisors - Room 479
City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
Wednesday July 15, 2009**

6:30 PM

Monthly Meeting

Cheryl Brinkman	Robin Levitt
Peter Cohen	Ted Olsson
Julian Davis	Dennis Richards
Carmela Gold	Brad Villers
Jason Henderson	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.

AGENDA

1. Call to order and roll call
2. Announcements, upcoming meetings and general housekeeping [discussion item]
3. Approval of Minutes for the meeting of June 17, 2009 [action item]
4. Pipeline Report—Developments in process & projected Funds [discussion and possible action]
5. Update and next steps on pending Market/Octavia Community Improvement Plan items {discussion and possible action]
6. Continue to develop criteria for prioritizing community improvements projects [discussion and action]
7. Preparation of Market/Octavia Plan Annual Report to Board of Supervisors [discussion and possible action]
8. Committee members comments and issues the Committee may consider in future meetings [discussion]
9. Public Comment
10. Adjournment

NEXT MEETING: August 19, 2009, 6:30pm, Room 479, City Hall.

EXHIBITS (handout documents informing the discussion)

1. Notice of Meeting & Agenda (July 15, 2009).
2. SF Planning Department's interim Pipeline Report. [Dischinger to provide + legend for letter-codes.]
3. IPIC Evaluation Criteria [Dischinger 090716em to CAC]

DECISIONS (with reference to § of Minutes)

1. **Minutes**—Approved: June 17, 2009 Minutes. (3)
2. **Exhibits (handouts) in pdf format**—Any exhibits (handouts discussed at the meeting) shall be provided to the Secretary in pdf format so that he can include these in the minutes sent to all board members. (8.1.d)
3. **CAC standing agenda item**—How many members can attend next CAC meeting? (8.1.c)
4. **CAC workforce** (Brinkman, Davis, Gold, Levitt) **draft CIP priorities & compare with IPIC criteria.** (6.1)
5. **Why approved buildings in MOP do not conform to design principles—** (7.1)
6. **MOP-CAC should liaison with other CACs—** (8.1)

Information Due (part of Old Business)

7. **Discussion of Community Improvement Projects (MOP document, Appendix C) postponed.** (5.1)
8. **Pipeline Report**—Dischinger will provide us with the pdf for the Planning Department's interim Pipeline Report along with the legend for the codes in one of the columns. (4; see Exhibit 2)
9. **Historic Surveys to be published on Planning Department website.** (2d)
10. **MTA or other agency plans impacting MOP Area.** Dischinger will inform us within a couple of months of other plans which might impact our area. (2e)
11. **City Attorney requested to advise CAC about CIP, Nexus Study, and fees.** The City Attorney will be requested to explain about these items. (6.1)

MINUTES

1. Call to order and roll call (Quorum = 5 of 9)

Present: Cheryl Brinkman, Peter Cohen, Julian Davis, Ted Olsson, Dennis Richards Brad Villers; Kearstin Dischinger (ex officio).

Absent: Carmela Gold, Jason Henderson, Robin Levitt, (all excused).

A quorum being present Chair Peter Cohen called the meeting to order at 6:30pm.

2. Announcements, upcoming meetings and general housekeeping [discussion item]

The following announcements of events in our plan area were shared:

a. *SF Symphony*

SF Symphony will hold a concert in Dolores Park on Sunday, July 19, 2009.

b. *Sunday Streets*

Sunday Streets will be held beginning at Dolores Park on Sunday, July 19, 2009.

c. *West SOMA Transportation Improvement Plan*

West SOMA Transportation Improvement Plan workshop will be held on July 28 at 6pm at Bessie Carmichael School.

d. *Planning Department community workshop on Turnbull Survey*

The Planning Department held its community meeting to share the Paige and Turnbull survey, which together with the three other surveys (Carey & Co.'s of MDNA; Kelly & VerPlanck; another possible one by Kelly & VerPlanck for DTNA, (if necessary) will all be integrated into the Market-Octavia Plan. At this meeting it was announced that a committee of citizens would be formed to select 200 historic sites for further study. It was also agreed that the Planning Department would publish its PowerPoint slideshow, all maps displayed at that meeting, and all of the four historic surveys as well as any other surveys or studies impacting the MOP area on its website as soon as possible so that interested San Francisco citizens would have full access to all information upon which to make decisions. It was also announced that the Planning Department staff was looking at height limits within the Plan Area. During the proposal period it was agreed that the height limits along upper Market would be kept to 55 feet; however, after this the height limit would be reconsidered for increase to 65 feet on Market Street from Church to Noe for those buildings not determined to be "contributors" to the historic character of the street. It was also mentioned that the Planning Department would report on the Market-Octavia Plan to the Historic Landmarks Commission at its August meeting and to the Planning Commission at its September meeting.

e. *Octavia Blvd. Growth Study*

Jason Henderson attended a meeting of this group as a substitute for Robin Levitt, liaison from MOP-CAC. This was the first meeting of the group since the approval of the MOP. Jason provided valuable information on our behalf in terms of traffic and bicycles. The Study Group is trying to get a sense of the traffic needs, both current and future. It was suggested that the MTA should inform MOP-CAC as any of their studies or plans impact MOP area. Instead it was decided that Dischinger will inform us of any impacts at one of our monthly meetings in a couple of months. The Study Group's **Circulation Study** is expected to be completed in a couple of months. The Planning Department's project manager for this is Marge.

f. *SF Chronicle (8July 2009), "Projects begin to emerge for Upper Market" by Roberta Selna, Chron. Staff Writer.*

An article on the Market/Octavia Plan and a couple of current development proposals in the upper Market Area, featuring comments by Dennis Richards and Peter Cohen of our CAC was noted.

3. Approval of Minutes for the meeting of June 17, 2009 [action item]

Approval of the June 17, 2009 minutes, moved by Brinkman and seconded by Davis, was unanimous but for Richards, who had to abstain only because he was not at that meeting and therefore could not judge the accuracy of the minutes.

4. Pipeline Report—Developments in process & projected Funds [discussion and possible action]

Exhibit 2 (8 pg. SF Planning Department.

Dishinger presented this as a Planning Department interim report of all projects on file since 2008., In this exhibit, Dishinger explained some of the letter codes in the project status column of the report and said that she would include a key to these codes in the report which she would send to all CAC members (this exhibit with report + key are to be included in these minutes).

The ideal pipeline report format approved by our CAC at its last meeting will be filled with this kind of data for every development in the MOP area. Kearstin confirmed that projects that have had a formal Pre-Application meeting with the Planning Department will also be included in the pipeline report. The CAC also asked to keep track of projects immediately adjacent to the M/O area, for example the 2299 Market Street development proposal on the south side of Market at Noe Street where the Plan boundary splits the intersection. At the August CAC meeting Dishinger will report more thoroughly on this pipeline report. She was asked if the Planning Department could complement this pipeline report with a map of these developments. She mentioned that the department is working on a GIS online interactive map which would link to pipeline reports but that this GIS map would not be available this summer. In the meantime she will consider the CAC’s request for a simple monthly map as a complement to the pipeline projects report.

She also reported that the Department had received a second development impact fees payment of \$20,000 for the Plan area.

She noted that the Board of Supervisors approved the sale of the freeway parcels.

During this discussion it was noted that there were at least two other CACs: 1) Eastern Neighborhood CAC; and 2) Balboa CAC.

5. Update and next steps on pending Market/Octavia Community Improvements Plan items [discussion and possible action]

5.1 Discussion postponement of MOP Appendix projects

Kearstin was asked about when and how details of some projects in the Community Improvements Program will be fleshed out. She noted that the CAC will be able to refine the specifics of “TBD” items in the CIP when it creates its project prioritization recommendations. Given the minimal attendance at this CAC meeting, Dishinger suggested and the committee agreed that we postpone this discussion on specifications, timelines and capitalization of improvements until the next meetings when more members will be present and the CAC reviews projects with evaluation criteria.

6. Continue to develop criteria for prioritizing community improvement projects [discussion and possible action]

Exhibit 3—Dischinger presented a double-sided four page spreadsheet

6.1 CAC Working group

Dischinger led this discussion informing the committee of our role in advising IPIC: all area plans must be submitted to IPIC for five year capital funding. IPIC then works with the individual City departments to coordinate their participation in implementing the plan. It learns from each department each fall the capital plan projects each has scheduled. She indicated that **IPIC’s Capital Planning Committee** could meet with us to inform us of how we work together and to discuss with us IPIC’s current projects.

Cohen suggested that in the interim a committee working group—consisting of Cheryl Brinkman (for/with Ted Olsson, who would be out of town during the interim), Julian Davis, Carmela Gold, and Robin Levitt—draft a recommendation of the CAC’s community improvements evaluation criteria.

The question was raised how does the CAC recommend where to allocate the funds in the MOP area, or has this been determined already by the Planning Departments and the CAC is merely to rubber stamp its approval. It is a legal requirement that the projects listed in the MOP Appendix must benefit the area and

developments for them to be funded by the developers. The requirements in the CIP for an Economic Development program are not connected to an Assessment District (such as the Castro CBD).

The CAC requests that the City Attorney give the committee clarity on the categories of projects in the Community Improvements Program Appendix, the relevant nexus studies, and how the impact fees are allocated to these projected improvements in the fee ordinance. Cohen will coordinate with Kearstin on follow up to this. A **Nexus Study** is a study of the relationship between development and community impacts and needed improvements. . The fee from the developer for this study must meet two requirements: 1) the benefit resulting from this fee must be directly connected to their own development; and 2) the fee must be proportional to the impact on the development. When the developer is assessed a fee, the ordinance requires that the percentage and the purpose or use of the fee must be specified.

The Planning Department is asking the MOP-CAC for its recommendations for the Impact Fee funding. The CAC should determine its own list of MOP projects. To date the Impact Fee only covers 30% of these listed projects.

San Francisco's **Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC)** was formed to coordinate City agency's efforts needed to implement the board approved large area plan projects: e.g., 1) MOP; 2) Eastern Neighborhoods; 3) Balboa. One of the problems with IPIC is that often the agencies don't wish to support projects which they haven't initiated.

7. **Preparation of Market/Octavia Plan Annual Report to Board of Supervisors [discussion and possible action]**

7.1 Monitoring Reports

Annual Report. The CAC needs to review and help the Planning Department create the annual report to the Board of Supervisors on how the MOP implementation is proceeding. The Department will provide the Strategy and the CAC will review this and monitor the implementation of the plan.

Times Series Report is another report due, describing the current status of the MOP. A Times Series Report is due at the first two year mark and thereafter every five years. As at the Planning Department's community workshop on the latest Turnbull survey, the CAC also felt that we should also question why the approved plans do not look like design principles approved by the Planning Department.

7.2 CAC Reports Schedule

Dischinger will bring all the objectives for this report to the CAC and we will review this. We need to monitor how well the implementation meets the Plan's objectives. We need to describe the Plan holistically not merely by its data points. The interim Annual Report on how the Plan is meeting its objectives was due last February. We need to determine the Plan's first ten year's priorities by October and present this to IPIC. To do this we need to deliberate upon the community improvement principles and priorities and then rank all of the projects accordingly. So, at our August meeting we will finalize the evaluation criteria to use for the Plan's Community Improvements priorities. At the September meeting we need to determine the project rankings and our initial recommendations. And at our October meeting we need to reconcile our rankings with those of IPIC. The **Time Series Report** is due next May covering the scope of the Plan for the period 2008-2010. During November and December the CAC must develop the framework for the next Annual Report.

8. **Committee members comments and Issues the Committee may consider in future meetings [discussion item]**

8.1 Future Issues

a. *Tax Increment Funding*

We should discuss **Tax Increment Funding** at our September meeting before this issue goes before the Board of Supervisors.

b. *Other CACs*

It was suggested that the MOP-CAC should establish some liaison with the other two CACs (the Eastern Neighborhoods CAC and the Balboa CAC) to determine the best policies and procedures for CACs, since these

City Plan Areas all have Community Advisory Committees and subsequent projects will all have their own CACs. Tentatively we will discuss this at our October meeting.

c. *Agenda item: who can attend next meeting?*

Dischinger suggested that we include as a standing agenda item at each meeting asking how many/who can attend the next scheduled CAC meeting to be sure that there are enough to hold a meeting.

d. *Submit all handouts as pdf*

The CAC agreed that all handouts for discussion must be submitted as pdf documents to the Secretary for inclusion in the minutes as exhibits.

9. Public Comment

The public not having attended the meeting, this item was dispensed with.

10. Adjournment

There being nothing further to discuss, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:01pm

NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, August 19, 6:30pm. Room 479, City Hall.

Respectfully submitted,

Ted Olsson
MOP-CAC Secretary

MOP-CAC GLOSSARY

20 July 2009

Annual/5-year Reports

Every Plan area must submit to the Board of Supervisors annually for the first two years and thereafter every five years a report on how the implementation of the Plan is proceeding to meet the goals and objectives of the Plan as well as the budget and schedule. The CAC for the Plan area, working with the Planning Department, prepares this which should demonstrate the citizen monitoring and oversight for which that CAC was created.

APN

Assessment District

In contrast to a Community Benefits District (see below), this is an area of the city in which residents agree to assess themselves an extra fee for improvements to their neighborhood.

BMR Below Market Rate.

The developer will sell some units as “affordable housing”.

BOS Board of Supervisors

San Francisco City and County’s legislative body, responsible for all laws and for approving the Market/Octavia Plan and the Citizens Advisory Committee.

BRT Bus Rapid Transit

(e.g., Van Ness BRT)

CAC Community Advisory Committee (also referred to as the **Committee**)

The Committee represents the people living and working within the Plan area. The committee acts on their behalf and must keep them informed of the Plan (any changes to it), monitoring its implementation (budget and schedule), as well as prioritizing community improvement projects.

CBD Community Benefits District

A fee which businesses in a district agree to assess themselves in order to improve their business area; in contrast Assessment Districts are areas where the residents have agreed to assess themselves to pay for community improvements.

Certificate of Occupancy

CIP Community Improvements Program

The planned and approved improvement projects for the Plan area designed to enhance the community’s quality of life or its cultural and historic heritage.

Commission San Francisco’s Planning Commission

The board responsible for overseeing the Planning Department.

Community Workshop

CU Conditional Use permit

Granted by a city authority, this permits a developer to have a variance from a specific requirement (e.g., the number of parking spaces)

DBI

Department City and County of San Francisco’s Planning Department

The agency charged with designing and implementing the Plan, with input from the Citizens Advisory Committee and from suggestions made by citizens of the Plan area at Department workshops designed to keep them periodically informed about the plan and its implementation, as well as any changes to the Plan.

EEA

EIR Environmental Impact Report

GIS Geographical Information System

(Historic) Landmarks Board

Now a separate commission which approves the historic or cultural significance of buildings and public monuments. Once anything is designated as historical, it has additional restrictions

Historic Preservation Study

Historical Survey

Impact Fee

This is a fee assessed upon developers (?) for the impact which their development will have upon a neighborhood and upon the city’s services. [?]

IPIC Interagency Plan Implementation Committee.

A committee to coordinate all city agencies to assure that they are implementing this and other Board-approved (BOS) strategic Plans on schedule and budget.

IPIC Capital Planning Committee

All area plans must be submitted to this IPIC committee for five year capital funding. Annually it learns from each department each fall the capital plan projects each has scheduled. It also learns the needs for each area from each area plan's CAC.

LGBT Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender

This community is one of many important ones that characterize the Plan area. Their Market St. headquarters at Octavia is within the Plan area

Market Street Bike Plan

Monitoring Report

MOP Market/Octavia Plan (also referred to as the **Plan**)

MOP-CAC Market/Octavia Plan's Community Advisory Committee

Designed to be a representative body of all citizens living and working in the Plan area which can oversee the Plan and its implementation during the life of the Plan and any changes to the plan. They especially need to keep their constituency informed about the plan and its implementation as well as to assure that the community improvements reflect the will of the people in the area.

MTA Municipal Transportation Authority

This is the board responsible for Muni, the city's transportation agency.

Nexus Study

This is a study of a delineated area [*for what reason/purpose?*]. The fee from the developer for this study must meet two requirements: 1) the benefit resulting from this fee must be directly connected to their own development; and 2) the fee must be proportional to the impact on the development. When the developer is assessed a fee, the authorizing ordinance requires that the percentage and the purpose or use of the fee must be specified.

Parking Nexus Study

Pipeline Report

A currently accurate monthly status report by the Department to the Committee of all projects in the MOP area.

SFCTA San Francisco County Transportation Authority.

Tax Increment Financing/Funding

Time Series Report

VanNess/Market Density Area

Variance