

**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 June 17, 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 May 20, 2009 [action item]
4. Pipeline Report—Developments in process & projected Funds [discussion and possible action]
5. Update and next steps on pending Market/Octavia Plan and M/O Community Improvements Plan items {discussion and possible action}
6. Developing criteria for prioritizing community improvements projects [discussion and possible action]
7. Committee members comments and Issues the Committee may consider in future meetings [discussion item]
8. Public Comment
9. Adjournment

NEXT MEETING: July 15 2009 or August 19, 2009, 6:30pm, Room 479, City Hall.

EXHIBITS (handout documents informing the discussion)

1. Notice of Meeting & Agenda (June 17, 2009).
2. Market/Octavia CAC monthly pipeline report & timing of impact fees (June 16, 2009)
3. Market/Octavia Community Improvements expenditure criteria chart (Cohen's draft)

DECISIONS

1. **Minutes**—Approved: May 20, 2009 Minutes.
2. **Pipeline Report**—Approved: Dischinger will prepare the revised pipeline report for next meeting.
3. **IPIC Capital Plan for MOP**—Consensus: Dischinger at next meeting for IPIC will inform CAC of how MOP's Capital Plan is determined.
4. **IPIC Liaison**—Dischinger will ask IPIC about the feasibility of a CAC liaison attending their meetings.
5. **MOP Annual Report**—Consensus: At CAC's next meeting Dischinger will present the Department's draft to CAC for our annual report to the Board of Supervisors.
6. **IPIC's Plan**—Consensus: At CAC's August meeting Dischinger will present IPIC's plan to CAC, indicating where their plan and ours agree and where we diverge.
7. **Next Meeting**—Consensus: For possible lack of a quorum, it was suggested that we postpone our July meeting; however, this decision is left to the Chair.

MINUTES

1. Call to order and roll call

Present: Cheryl Brinkman, Julian Davis, Carmela Gold, Jason Henderson, Robin Levitt, Ted Olsson, Brad Villers; Kearstin Dischinger (ex officio).

Absent: Peter Cohen, Dennis Richards (both excused).

A quorum being present Vice Chair Jason Henderson called the meeting to order at 6:38pm.

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

Nothing was discussed

3. Approval of Minutes for the meeting of May 20, 2009 [action item]

Approval of the May 20, 2009 minutes, moved by Levitt and seconded by Brinkman, was unanimous.

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

4.1 The draft of a pipeline report was adopted by the committee with revisions as noted below. Kearstin will create a draft of this newly revised report for discussion at our next meeting.

Peter Cohen’s original draft (updated June 16, 2009) [Exhibit 2] consisted of a row to track each development’s information under the following columns (left to right): 1) Address; 2) APN# (geocode mapping); 3) Project Type; 4) Description; 5) # units/# s.f. comm.; 6) Proposed parking ratio; 7) Inclusionary BMR [Below Market Rate] units on-site; 8) CUs & Variance Requests; 9) Project status* [*=Project Status categories: Pre-Application; EEA filed; Site Permit/Dev Review; Entitled; DBI permit appl; Tentative Cert. of Occupancy]

Additional discussion on and monitoring items to be included in the pipeline report:

- BMR should apply to rentals and condos, not only to owners.
- The project type will determine the Market Rate and the funding.
- The description should indicate whether this is rental or owner-resident property.
- The description should also include the name of the Developer and of the Architect.
- The table should indicate if the project has been approved by any neighborhood groups.
- The next step in the process should also be indicated.
- The zone for each development should be indicated.

Dischinger asked who was going to keep and maintain this report. She indicated that the department was in the process of creating a new database connected to the DBI. This new database at the moment is only conceptual and will be GIS-based to complement the Department’s GIS interface. It is not known whether this database will be accessible online. She wondered whether we might maintain this table manually, commenting that probably fewer than half a dozen projects would change status each month. She also indicated that the Department will not monitor which groups developers have or will meet with.

In the end she offered to incorporate the committee’s revisions into the chart drafted by Peter. She also solved the problem of the format by suggesting that the project status could be accommodated by subrows for each project according to the basic steps they had fulfilled.

Dischinger also discussed each of the columns on the draft with the committee.

- Project Type—this would include additions and demolitions
- Description—this would include any additional comments beyond project type
- BMR—this will be determined (TBD) by the developer
- Project Status—among the subrows here would be any discussion of CUs and Variances
- Notification dates—she had no idea who tracks this or if the department tracks this.

There was a discussion as to what was meant by this column. It was suggested that this might refer to whenever the Department notifies neighbors or associations within the Plan area of some development affecting them.

Dischinger did indicate at this point that no development in the area is “grandfathered in”.

- Neighborhood meetings—this new column should be titled “Upcoming Meetings”.

This refers to any meetings by the Department or Developers with neighbors or associations.

Kearstin again mentioned that the Department does not monitor Developers for this. The committee would have to do this.

It was moved, seconded (Henderson/Gold), and unanimously approved that we accept Dischinger’s kind offer to incorporate all of these suggestions into a single report on all projects within the Plan Area for our next meeting. She will provide the content in this report for all known developments in the Area.

5. Update and next steps on pending Market/Octavia Plan and M/O Community Improvements Plan items {discussion and possible action}

5.1 San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) Circulation Study

The SFCTA is conducting an 18-month traffic circulation study of our Plan Area, in particular to determine how the city’s traffic is impacted from the freeway, including the Ninth Street corridor. The SFCTA needs a liaison from our CAC to them to keep us informed and to speak for us to them. Robin Levitt asked to be appointed since he had long interest and experience in working with them during the planning for the freeway. It was moved, seconded (Olsson/Davis) and unanimously approved that Levitt be our liaison to SFCTA. It was also mentioned that SFCTA will be meeting with neighborhoods. The next meeting of the SFCTA will be on June 30, 2009. Unfortunately Levitt and his substitute, Henderson, will be out of town; so, Dischinger will substitute as our liaison to them, since she is a member of that Authority, and inform us of their meeting.

5.2 Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC)

Dischinger led this discussion informing the committee of our responsibility to 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 in July to inform us of how we work together and to discuss with us IPIC’s current projects.

Dischinger will schedule an agenda item to discuss fee ordinances.

It was asked if a liaison from CAC could regularly attend IPIC meetings. Dischinger indicated that her role as staff, attending all IPIC meetings was to keep us informed about IPIC meetings and matters pertinent to our Plan Area as well as to coordinate meetings between our two committees as needed. However, she will ask IPIC if a CAC liaison could attend their meetings. We need to create a Capital Plan for the MOP area and it was agreed that Dischinger, as a member of IPIC, could inform us about this.

She mentioned that Hayes Street as a two-way street was very important to our MOP-CAC.

Gold mentioned that she did not want a sequential process but wanted the IPIC’s work to be presented so that she and our committee had some perspective before deciding upon Agenda Item 6 (Developing criteria for prioritizing community improvement projects. Vice Chairperson Henderson invited IPIC to our next meeting. By consensus it was decided that Dischinger, as a member of IPIC, could inform the CAC at our next meeting of how the Capital Plan for MOP is derived and determined.

5.3 Community Improvements Report to the Board of Supervisors

Annually this committee is required to report progress on the MOP to the Board of Supervisors. Dischinger informed us that we should schedule this for our next meeting and that she would bring us the Department’s draft. She suggested that perhaps this could be scheduled for CAC’s August meeting. This was agreed to.

5.4 Historical Survey

Dischinger reported that a Historical Survey is underway about an area within the Plan Area. The survey will be integrated into the Plan. The Department will schedule a Community Workshop meeting this summer to learn from the community how the survey should be integrated into the plan. The Historical Landmarks Board and the Planning Commission have both separately approved this historical survey.

5.5 Sale of Freeway Parcels

Supervisors approved the sale of freeway parcels. These ancillary projects are moving forward.

6. Developing criteria for prioritizing community improvements projects [discussion and possible action]

Cohen had emailed to members of the committee a grid, "Market/Octavia: Community Improvements expenditure criteria" (Exhibit 3). This table consisted of four columns, of which only the first three were labeled: 1) Core Lenses in social and/or community context; 2) Quantitative Measurable/identifiable impacts; 3) Qualitative Measurable/identifiable impacts. Under the first column were listed these row headings, with three lines for description: 1) Economic Development Impact; 2) Social Equity / Equity of Impact; 3) Physical Environment Impact; 4) Community-building Impact. As a key in front of the grid was the following list: "Possible evaluation criteria/factors": 1) Community stabilization; 2) Need relative to growth/development; 3) Neighborhood/local-serving transit; 4) Neighborhood/local-economic vitality; 5) "shovel-readiness"; 6) Public value per dollars invested; 7) Leveraging capacity; 8) Local stewardship; 9) Equity of use/usability; 10) Balance of priorities within Plan Community Improvements Program.

Since only Levitt had the grid with him at the meeting, Dischinger copied the Possible Evaluation Criteria/ Factors onto poster paper and facilitated our discussion. From her notes on our discussion, here were the additions made to Cohen's draft of the Community Improvements expenditures criteria.

- 1) Community stabilization—no comments
- 2) Relationship to growth—committee requested project specific impacts
- 3) Neighborhood...transit—meets broad goal of MOP => COD, Ped
- 4) "Shovel-readiness"—no comments
- 5) Public value vs investment—include safety issues (e.g., bike route at off-ramp; bus delay; standards over hot spots
- 6) Leveraging capacity—no comment
- 7) Local stewardship—operate; maintain; long-term funding
- 8) Usability—no comment
- 9) Balance of priorities—scale of projects

Other issues to be incorporated into this chart:

- 1) identified by planning effort: frameworks?
- 2) Coordination with other agencies/studies, MTA work plans, bike plan, etc.

We may need small subcommittees to deal with various aspects of evaluating projects by these criteria. The committee wondered which part of the Plan Area was absorbing growth. This aspect might become a lens for assessing fees or distributing funding. The committee also questioned what kind of project-specific impacts might result. They wanted to know which projects were already identified as being within the MOP Area; among these were listed the following: living streets; Mission and South Van Ness; Oak/Octavia (the most dangerous intersection in the city). We were reminded that in order for us to have the plan fully implemented, we must get other agencies to agree with our priorities.

The Market Street Bike Plan would require the removal of some parking spaces on Market Street. We were reminded that there is no legislation for how the bike lanes would effect parking. We should learn from the 17th Street Plaza experience: namely, that after having rammed through and implemented the plaza, there are no funds for any follow-up work on this plaza. The same questions should be asked of anything in the MOP: are there funds to maintain the improvements once installed?

Only a few areas are mentioned in the MOP framework (e.g., Church and Market Streets intersection). See the Appendix to the MOP for the broad goals.

It appeared to Henderson that our goals and those of the IPIC were similar. He proposed that at our next meeting we discuss how our plan coordinates with that of the IPIC. It was agreed that our next meeting should include this discussion on our agenda. Dischinger would present IPIC's plan and try to indicate where our plan agrees or diverges from theirs.

Levitt was concerned about safety issues and specific transit delays as well as about dangerous hot spots: specifically, Market/Gough, and Octavia/Oak.

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

7.1 LGBT neighboring work

The committee wondered why construction equipment was next to the LGBT Center. It was explained that there has been no progress on that project. The developer went bankrupt but is required to remove foundation material and to shore up the adjoining buildings with retaining walls. It was noted that there is no time limit but they can sell the entitlements which the City granted them.

7.2 Consensus: Postpone July meeting; schedule next meeting for August.

Because a number of members would be absent in July during our scheduled meeting time (possibly we would not have a quorum), it was suggested that we postpone our July meeting (15JUL09) and schedule our next meeting in August (19AUG09). However, this decision is left for the Chair.

7.3 Julian Davis inquired about 1:1 parking at the Old Ebenezer Church property at 15th & Dolores Streets, but nothing was known about this.

7.4 It was noted that the Thai House project on Market at Sanchez has been approved.

7.5 It was also noted that Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association will meet with Whole Foods in August. It was also noted that Whole Foods pulled out of the housing project at Hayes and Stanyan Streets.

8. Public Comment

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

9. Adjournment

There being nothing further to discuss, the Chair adjourned the meeting at 8:15pm

NEXT MEETING:

At the decision of the Chair: either

1) **Wednesday, July 15, 2009, 6:30pm. Room 479, City Hall**

OR postponed until

2) **Wednesday, August 19, 6:30pm. Room 479, City Hall.**

Respectfully submitted,

Ted Olsson
MOP-CAC Secretary

GLOSSARY

APN	
Assessment District	Assessment Districts are areas where the residents have agreed to assess themselves to pay for community improvements.
CIP	Community Improvements Program
BMR	Below Market Rate. The developer will sell some units as “affordable housing”.
CAC	Community Advisory Committee (also referred to as the Committee)
CBD	Community Benefits District. Businesses in a district agree to assess themselves a fee 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>
Community Workshop	
CU	
DBI	
Department	City and County of San Francisco’s Planning Department.
EEA	
GIS	
Historical Survey	
Historical Landmarks Board	
IPIC	Interagency Plan Implementation Committee. This committee coordinates the city’s departments and agencies to implement legislation and plans that span city organizations.
LGBT	Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender community and Market St. headquarters.
Market Street Bike Plan	
MOP	Market/Octavia Plan (also referred to as the Plan).
MOP-CAC	Market/Octavia Plan’s Community Advisory Committee.
MTA	Municipal Transportation Agency
Pipeline Report	
Planning Commission	
SFCTA	San Francisco County Transportation Authority.
Variance	