

**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>

**4th Floor Conference Room
Planning Dept., 1650 Mission Street
Wednesday, August 24, 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 (<i>ex officio</i>)

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 meetings of June 22, July 27, 2011 [act]
(*there were no minutes for the July meeting because there was no quorum*)
4. Review/ response to initial draft of IPIC recommendations for 2012 M/O CIP Priorities [discuss; act]
5. Criteria for Parking CUs in Market/Octavia [discuss]
6. Pipeline Report—developments in process; CAC project reviews [discuss; act]
 - Quarterly pipeline report and mapping
 - Current month cases
 - Potential projects for CAC review
7. Implications of policy for converting rental BMRs to ownership BMRs [discuss; act]
8. Committee members comments/issues for Committee to consider in future meetings [discussion]
10. Public Comment
11. Adjournment & announcement of next meeting

NEXT MEETING: WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2011, 6:30PM AT 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 (**Dischinger**, distributed at meeting)
2. Exhibit 2: IPIC Recommendations for 2012 M/O CIP Priorities (**Dischinger**)
3. Exhibit 3: Comparison/critique of IPIC Recommendations (**Cohen**)
4. Exhibit 4: Rough capital plan for M/O Impact Fee Allocations by Infrastructure Type [**emailed**]
5. Exhibit 5: CU/Parking zones [**Dischinger**]

DECISIONS

1. Decision 1: Consensus: meet with IPIC/agencies to inform/reconcile priorities & decisions
2. Decision 2: CU Permit discussion to be continued at next meeting

COMMITMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, INFORMATION DUE

#	<u>WHEN</u>	<u>WHO</u>	<u>WHAT</u>
1.	9/28	KD	Provide IPIC our rationales; ask for their comments on rejecting ours.
2.	9/28	KD	Include column summarizing hits to our Impact Fees budget per FY

MINUTES**1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL****EXHIBIT 1: AGENDA****ROLL CALL** (√=present; 0=absent; X=excused)

- √ Peter Cohen (Chair)
- √ Carmela Gold
- √ Jason Henderson (Vice Chair)
- 0 Robin Leavitt
- √ Ted Olsson (Secretary)
- √ Dennis Richards
- √ Marius Starkey
- 0 Ken Wingard
- 0 David Winslow

Ex Officio Members

- √ Kearstin Dischinger

Others attending: none

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

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

- 2.1 A lot of activity is happening with 55 Buchanan; they must go before the HPC because the property is a national landmark.
- 2.2 Hayes Valley Farm (on Parcel P) is beginning to move; expected to be completed by 2012. We asked to have this progress tracked on the pipeline report
- 2.3 299 Valencia St. has gone up very quickly.
- 2.4 2-way Hayes Street is now seen as a good improvement.
- 2.5 The Octavia Boulevard Circulation Study will be completed very shortly. The Department will meet with the neighborhoods in September to explain this to all of them.
- 2.6 Inclusionary Housing: 1) the City will do an update, a 5-Year Inclusionary Ordinance; 2) the Land Dedication Ordinance was approved by the Planning Commission. There have been questions about the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) requirement. As written, the developers do not think that it is viable for them. Prado was to be the pilot but they feel that the EIR is too tough and have now backed out of an on-site solution. They are still entitled to pursue their in-lieu fee. Cohen will notify the Supervisors of this trend.
- 2.7 Dolores Park. They evidently are planning to allow 4-16 food trucks to serve the park attendees. They are also speaking of a 16-foot road traversing through the middle of the park. There have been numerous complaints from surrounding merchants, let alone neighbors who are concerned about the cleanup and maintenance these food trucks will present to the neighborhood. There have been a lot of surprises and fractious discussion at the meetings.

3. Approval of Minutes from previous meetings [act] (Olsson)

A quorum not having been present at the last meeting, there was no official meeting and consequently no minutes were taken.

4. Review/ response to initial draft of IPIC recommendations for 2012 M/O CIP Priorities [discuss; act]

EXHIBIT 2: IPIC Recommendations for 2012 M/O CIP Priorities (Dischinger)

EXHIBIT 3: Cohen's comparison/critique of IPIC Recommendations (Cohen)

EXHIBIT 4: Rough capital plan for M/O Impact Fee Allocations by Infrastructure Type (Emailed)

Dischinger posed several questions to the CAC: 1) what are the CAC's priorities? 2) How can these best be leveraged with other projects that are already approved and being implemented? The focus for our decisions should be what's feasible between 2013-2016 as part of the five-year plan.

Since Rec & Parks has ignored our recommendations, Cohen asked how we can discuss this with them to avoid such confrontations. Richards commented that since all of our CAC-approved projects are still on the list but postponed beyond 2016, how is this CAC supposed to determine what is feasible. The committee discussed the Chair's comparison of what our CAC's own prioritized and approved CIPs, which we spent half a year defining, discussing, and agreeing upon. Dischinger suggested that our recommendations and those of the IPIC now needed to be reconciled. It was suggested that Dischinger ask IPIC to comment upon each of our recommendations. It was felt that this would have been more reasonable as a preliminary to reconciliation rather than mere outright rejection of all of our recommendations at this initial phase. Dischinger will create another column of CAC Notes on our survey, summarizing our rationales for each prioritized and approved project. She will present this to IPIC asking them to respond to each of our projects.

Cohen said that it was unclear from Dischinger's spreadsheet of the IPIC recommendations how our CAC priorities were even presented to IPIC. Richards also suggested that this spreadsheet include a column explaining IPIC's rationale for reallocating our funding priorities, as the basis for any reconciliation.

Dischinger mentioned that Duboce Park just received major capitalization. Gold said that we would not put significant funds into Hayward Park, which is funded through a bond. It appeared to Henderson that since the agencies couldn't fund some of their projects, they proposed to fund them with our money. Dischinger encouraged the CAC to consider the most urgent needs, in the area where the impact fees come from, rather than proposing to spend money at each developer's place. She believes that the city agencies are trying to be strategic about spending major sums of cash. Her own strategic opinion is that from an Open Space perspective, what should be prioritized. Gold said that we can all agree about that, but that is not the issue here. She suggested that R&P should come to us explaining why they felt that their proposals had greater priority than ours. If they needed our money, then it is up to them to convince us that theirs is a better strategic investment, which also meets the needs of our constituents and neighbors. Specifically this CAC needs to be informed of what other funds there are which can be tapped and under which circumstances.

Henderson clarified the chart at this point indicating that Open Space/Parks is Rec&Parks turf; whereas Streetscape, Green, and Public Realm is under Public Works. The point here is that money's cannot all be moved around wherever we choose. The percentage of our budget to be allocated to each major category is specified and we are obligated to spend accordingly. Cohen then pointed out that according to our prioritization over many meetings, our two highest choices were the Hayes Green Rotating Art and the improvement to existing parks. There were two types of improvements in parks: 1) the two hubs under parks were Hayward and Duboce; and 2) the smaller neighborhood parks. We decided to reserve money for the neighborhood parks so as to have sufficient money to invest in some neighborhood parks each year. We oppose Rec&Parks taking all of the money budgeted for their category—which we had reserved for neighborhood parks over time—and dumping it into a single hub such as Hayward. The question is why does Rec&Parks disagree with our more prudent, distributed approach? Henderson suggested that their thinking may be based upon the premise that future costs will be more expensive than current ones.

Richards pointed out that this has been a painful process and lesson. We should know the rationales for various projects and the preferences of the agencies up front to inform our CIP priorities. Dischinger tried to reassure the CAC that IPIC and the agencies are open to such dialogue; they do not have the intentions we are attributing to them. But Richards repeated that we need to be informed before making our priorities and decisions; and, further, when things change, we need the agencies to come and explain to us what has changed and its implications for us. That would be a true and constructive dialogue. Gold agreed that such an improved process would lead to greater consensus more quickly. When Dischinger suggested that in the future she would provide a more detailed explanation on each of the projects, this was rejected by the CAC in favor of direct talks with respective agencies, because Dischinger's liaison shuttling takes too long to accomplish the same thing as speaking directly with the agency. Further, in a direct conversation, the agency can respond immediately in a discussion if we question other aspects of a proposal.

At this point Dischinger asked for time to explain in more detail each of the projects on the IPIC list, beginning on page two of the spreadsheet with Greening VanNess and Mission. The city will not plant any trees that they need to maintain. The Planning Department did not receive the grant, as a matching source, for its Living Alleys proposal. The Hayes rotating art project has not been rotating the art objects. Re-envisioning Market Street from the Ferry Building to Octavia Blvd. is a multi-billion dollar project (they might even remove all vehicles from Market St., including public vehicles). The VanNess Special Use District would pay for a lot of the improvements in that small area. Cohen noted at this point that the first two of these projects (the Greening of Van Ness and Mission as well as the Lighting) were not even on the list of possibilities as CAC projects and so, were neither reviewed nor recommended by the CAC; yet CAC money (~\$1m) is proposed by others to be committed to these items, which are not even among our priorities. Henderson suggested that they may have been part of the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) since it runs all along Van Ness. Cohen also noted that when the CAC prioritized CIP projects all agreed that the list we were given was an old, out-dated list drawn up more than five years earlier by the Planning Department. At that time we agreed to limit our prioritization to the items on that list on condition that hereafter we would consider much more current and worthwhile CIP projects recommended by neighbors and our constituents. Cohen said that we were much more focused on critical intersections but Dischinger said that some of these "greening" projects could just as well be considered pedestrian improvements, enhancing critical intersections.

At this point Olsson asked what happens if, in meeting with the agencies to reconcile our differences, we don't concur with them. It is necessary to recognize that our funds are severely constricted because of the delays by developers in paying the impact fees. Given that and our differences of opinion, it is hard to see how this reconciliation might be achieved. The CAC should report from what we see on the ground and what we hear from our constituents. Each time this is brought before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. Olsson repeated that we need a discussion with the agencies of what's current or changed before we can provide an informed decision. Gold agreed that our current process is not a functional model and therefore all on our CAC are frustrated. We need a discussion with the relevant agencies. Cohen mentioned that these decisions must be finalized by October. Cohen finally pointed out that the agencies must know that this money does not come easily: if they want to use some of our money to jointly fund their projects, then they need to come to us and persuade us to invest our funds in their project; if they do not, we are not obligated to fund their projects. So, it is in their best interests to inform us, as partners, and keep us current on their projects and the possible sources to fund them.

Dischinger reported that the Church Street improvements have begun. The Polk Street is the number one bicycle improvement. The agencies consider the bulb list is no longer to be current. Channelization (Guerrero, Herman, Laguna, and Market) is bicycle lane striping (this has to do with roadway improvements, not pedestrians), and it is grossly underfunded at \$250K. Cohen repeated that the majority of the CAC's pedestrian crossing improvements were not supported by IPIC.

Dischinger indicated that transit-preferential streets are yet to be defined. And the Hayes Street sidewalk improvements will not occur for another five years. Henderson mentioned that the recently published TEP plan needs to be reviewed by our CAC.

Our CAC wants IPIC and the agencies to state why they think our priorities (e.g., Hayes St. sidewalk widening) is not a viable plan. This would explain why our priorities do not show up among their priorities. This would at least show that there was some consideration of our choices, even if they ultimately do not agree with them. Dischinger agreed to ask the IPIC to do this. Further, Cohen asked Dischinger to include a column that would sum and subtotal the amounts by fiscal year according to our Impact Fee budget. This would help us to spread the investment among all of the neighborhoods and constituents. Olsson asked for a clarification of how the impact fee would be spent; Dischinger explained that while the fee could be spent on anything within the plan, it is unlikely that the developer would agree to build the improvement unless it benefitted the occupants of his development; however, they do not get to choose what they will and will not fund.

Cohen asked what Dischinger would suggest to make the process more functional. Dischinger asked for more time to think about this. She will contact Cohen with her suggestions.

Henderson was bothered by the tone of the discussion. The city bureaucracy creates its own problems and Dischinger is merely trying to be a liaison between us and the agencies. Spending all of our time on budgets is not his idea of our CAC being particularly functional. Richardson,

speaking from private industry, thinks that the most effective thing would be to simply talk to the agencies directly to learn from them their rationales and any other current concerns which could inform and aid our decision. He prefers the business model: get them to cooperate or fire them (or take away their money). Dischinger provided perspective, while we are on a five-year plan, the agencies are focused on the immediate 1-3 years so they can move on the projects.

5. Criteria for Parking CUs in Market/Octavia [discuss]

EXHIBIT 4: PARKING ZONES CHART AND MAP (URL?)

DISCHINGER WILL EMAIL THE URL FOR THE MAP WHICH IS ON THE OUR WEBSITE.)

With fifteen minutes remaining the CAC took up this next topic. Dischinger and colleagues thought of four reasons to think of parking: 1) urban design, which impacts safety; 2) transportation; 3) general geography; and 4) local priorities—how much space do we use to store cars vs house people, sell goods, or grow gardens. The urban design piece is covered by the Department. The italicized comments on her chart apply to M/O area. Residential Housing (RH1 and RH2) are all allowed 1:1 parking. Under Transportation are causing delays in traffic and causing conflicts. Not Commercial Transit (NCT) are the purple and purple-striped areas on her map. The Geography category is wherever one is close to major transit routes. This topic will be carried over to the next meeting. The explanations of “necessary or desirable” is a judgement rationale used by those reviewing the developer’s plans. Market Street, Hayes Street, and Haight Street do not allow curb cuts. We must understand some rationale/criteria where 0.50 or 0.75 ratios are necessary. These parking requirements were hard-fought battles. But according to Dischinger, we must have a policy that is consistent. Gold thinks that we now believe that less parking is important for the City and that we are moving toward this. We must look to the future. At least one possible exception must be possible or there is no conditional use. But Gold thought that any exception should be quite rare. However, Starkey and Olsson indicated that some developers must pull out if they cannot sell their developments to people because of these parking restrictions.

6. Committee members comments and issues which the Committee may consider in future meetings [discussion]: NONE

7. Public Comment: No public having attended, there was none.

8. Adjournment & announcement of next meeting

There being no further business and the time having expired, the meeting adjourned at 8:30pm.

NEXT MEETING: WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2010, 6:30PM, PLANNING DEPARTMENT, RM.400.

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

2011 Calendar: 1/26, 2/23, 3/23, 4/27, 5/25, 6/22, 7/27, 8/24, 9/28, 10/26, 11/23, 12/28

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

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

- Jan & Feb meetings held monthly on third Wednesday.
- NQ = No Quorum

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

2010 SCHEDULE OF TOPICS — THE 2011 SCHEDULE IS YET TO BE DEFINED

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

- 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 **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*

MOP-CAC RESOLUTIONS

2. APPENDICES—CAC Resolutions

2.1 20Oct2009 RESOLUTION 1: INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Market/Octavia Plan's Community Improvements Program lays out a comprehensive set of measures "necessary to accommodate projected growth of residential and commercial development in the Plan Area while maintaining and improving community character." Partial funding for those needed community improvements will come from the Plan Area's impact fees funds. However, as the Plan notes, to fully implement the Community Improvements Program "some future revenue streams must be established, or additional revenue sources must be made available to the program." A recent report by an Infrastructure Finance Working Group and the City's Capital Planning Committee at the direction of the Board of Supervisors recommends a number of financing tools as strategies for funding public improvements, including tax increment financing and community facilities districts. The CAC expects such financing tools to be applied to the Market/Octavia Area, as called for in the adopted Plan and Community Improvements Program Document as future revenue streams. Therefore, the Community Advisory Committee supports the recommendations of the July 2009 Capital Planning Committee report as relevant to the fulfillment of the Market/Octavia Plan's adopted community improvements goals.

RESOLUTION #1: Infrastructure Finance Recommendations (20Oct2009)
MOTION: Moved by Richards, seconded by Levitt
YES: Unanimous: Brinkman, Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards, Villiers
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Gold

2.2 24Mch2010 RESOLUTION 2: IN-KIND AGREEMENT, COMMISSION POLICY

The MOP-CAC commends Kearstin Dischinger on a well-expressed policy which incorporates all of the input from the MOP-CAC and EN-CAC delegates. The CAC conditionally approves the Department's latest draft of an In-Kind policy presented by her to the Committee at its August 25, 2010 meeting subject to incorporating the following:

- 1) The policy shall require the developer to report back to the Commission on the status of his project midway through the project's construction, in order for this to be a matter of public record, transparent to the public.
- 2) Since this In-Kind policy and fee deferrals directly reduce the fund of money which the CAC can use to direct community improvements benefitting the larger community, and because it allows developers to more directly influence the direction of CIPs, the CAC must know the tradeoffs (how it would have prioritized CIPs and allocated funds to them if it had the full funds vs how it must now prioritize CIPs with reduced funds). The CAC must also consider whether the developer's proposed In-Kind CIP is truly a priority at this point. The CAC may also wish to rank CIPs according to which it would approve developers constructing.
- 3) Since this policy could allow routine projects to be approved for the sake of expediency—i.e., lower priority CIPs might be completed at the expense of more important CIPs—and since developers are not constrained to propose projects in the CIP list, therefore the CAC can encourage developers to adopt the CAC's prioritized CIPs and if the proposal is misaligned with CAC priorities, the CAC has the right to vigorously disapprove a developer's concept based on this rationale alone.
- 4) The policy is meant to let the developers understand the CAC's top priorities and to allow them to choose to construct an In-Kind CIP from among these.

RESOLUTION #2: In-Kind Policy (24Mch2010)
MOTION: Moved by Henderson, seconded by Levitt
YES: Unanimous: Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Brinkman, Gold, Starkey, Wingard

2.3 25Aug2010 RESOLUTION 3: FEES DEFERRAL PROGRAM
CAC Resolution on Fees Deferral for the Market and Octavia Plan Area

WHEREAS the Market/Octavia Plan encourages "smart growth" development for the many neighborhoods it encompasses, and is predicated upon complementary implementation of a comprehensive set of community and infrastructure improvements "necessary to accommodate projected growth of residential and commercial development in the plan area while maintaining and improving community character";

WHEREAS the Findings of the Better Neighborhoods Area Plan Monitoring Program state that, "Successful fruition of the plan's goals requires a coordinated implementation of land use controls, community and public service delivery, key policies, and community infrastructure improvements";

WHEREAS streets in the Market and Octavia Plan area are already carrying a disproportionate share of the city's mainline through-traffic at a great cost to the public safety, health, and well-being of Market and Octavia residents;

WHEREAS the key bus and rail lines that transverse the Market and Octavia Plan area are already severely strained and at or near capacity during peak hours;

WHEREAS the Market and Octavia Plan area is expected to absorb 6,000 new housing units but already has severely overburdened parks;

WHEREAS a key component of smart growth is affordable housing and mixed income neighborhoods accessible to a range of diverse lifestyles, but the price of housing and retail space in the neighborhood is out of reach for most people;

WHEREAS the Community Advisory Committee strongly supports the Plan's development impact fees on residential and commercial growth in the Plan Area to provide a portion of the funding for those needed infrastructures that include safe transportation, affordable housing, and adequate parks and public spaces;

WHEREAS it is essential that those fees be paid and the funds available in advance of the development itself so that the community improvement projects can be initiated early enough to be in the ground and ready to absorb the increased demands from population growth created by development projects;

WHEREAS there is a logical reason that the building of infrastructure always comes before, or at the same time as, the increased demands created by construction of residential and commercial development;

WHEREAS the ordinances proposed would in combination defer, delay and effectively reduce the development impact fees that help fund this infrastructure;

WHEREAS in effect, the entire premise of the Market/Octavia Plan – to enable increased development coupled with mitigating community improvements – would be seriously tested by these proposed changes in the fee structures;

WHEREAS the one aspect in the package of three proposals that has clear merit is to consolidate fees collection with a single city agency (i.e., a single-point-of-payment system) and that this is perhaps a good "efficiency" measure for collection, management and monitoring of various development fees required on each project but that, however, must be unbundled from the very different idea in this same ordinance proposal of deferring fees to a later point in the entitlements and development process rather than at the front end prior to any construction permits;

WHEREAS the Community Advisory Committee recognizes that current economic conditions and difficult access to financing capital have stalled construction activity throughout the City;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee can support a temporary fees deferral program that incorporates:

1. Requirement of a minimum 10% payment at DBI Permit of all fees (ie, allowing a maximum deferral of 90% of fees due);
2. Creation of a Community Infrastructure Fund to enable the pre-development design, planning and engineering (ie, "shovel ready") for priority improvement projects, and that the initial the size of the Fund be between \$3 million and \$5 million, and that the capitalization of the Fund will further grow as the amount of deferred fees from pipeline projects grows, and that the enactment of the Fees Deferral program is explicitly contingent upon creation of the Community Infrastructure Fund;

3. Affirmation that prioritization of improvement projects for use of the Community Infrastructure Fund is done through CACs in plan areas where they exist;
4. Retention of Sec. 315 inclusionary housing in-lieu fee payment standards (i.e., not subject to deferral);
5. Sunset of the Fees Deferral program in three years.

Approved by the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee on March 24th 2010

RESOLUTION #3: Fees Deferral Program (25Aug2010)

MOTION: Moved by Henderson, seconded by Levitt

YES: Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards (unanimous)

NO: none

ABSTAIN: none

ABSENT: Brinkman, Gold, Starkey, Wingard

**2.4 22 Sep10 RESOLUTION 4: INCLUSIONARY AFFORDABLE HOUSING
Resolution Advising Inclusionary Affordable Housing in the Market & Octavia Plan
Area**

WHEREAS the spirit and policy intent of the Market and Octavia Plan includes providing low and middle-income affordable housing within new development in the Market and Octavia Plan area;

WHEREAS affordable housing is critical for diversity and economic well-being within the Market and Octavia Plan Area;

WHEREAS affordable housing is part of a complete community, and the goal of the Market and Octavia Plan is to create complete communities;

WHEREAS affordable housing is an investment in the community including the Market and Octavia Plan Area;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee advises the San Francisco Planning Commission, the San Francisco Planning Department, the Mayor's Office of Housing and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors that the priority is that ALL inclusionary housing for new development within the Market and Octavia Plan Area be built on-site. If a project sponsor considers that infeasible, the inclusionary units should be built offsite within the immediate area of the new development or a developable site of equivalent value within ¼ mile of the new development should be dedicated to the city for affordable housing. For such latter land dedication alternative, eligible sites should not include Redevelopment-owned parcels and must have necessary entitlement-ready zoning established at time of dedication. The CAC encourages creative application of these offsite and land dedication alternatives by the Mayor's Office of Housing to allow project sponsors to pool resources for maximizing local inclusionary housing impact in the Market/Octavia Plan Area.

FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that geography matters—the primary importance of the inclusionary housing policy for the Market/Octavia Area is that it be a mechanism to achieve mixed income housing development at a very localized scale within the various neighborhoods of the plan area, whether in the form of on-site below-market-rate units, off-site BMR units or land for future lower income affordable units. Simply paying in-lieu fees to satisfy the inclusionary requirement in the Market/Octavia Area has no value to advancing the inclusionary housing policy.

Approved by the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee on September 22, 2010

Revision approved by M/O-CAC on December 15, 2010

This revision included all text regarding the land dedication alternative.

RESOLUTION #4: Inclusionary Affordable Housing (22Sep2010)

MOTION: Moved by Henderson, seconded by Richards
YES: Unanimous: Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards, Starkey, Wingard
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Gold

REV. RSLN #4: Inclusionary Affordable Housing (15Dec2010)
MOTION: Moved by Henderson, Seconded by Gold
YES: Unanimous: Cohen, Gold, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Starkey, Wingard
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Richards

2.5 22Sep10-2 RESOLUTION 5: HAYES STREET PROJECT INVESTMENT
Resolution Advising Expenditure of Market & Octavia Community Impact fees
for the Hayes Street Two-Way Project

WHEREAS the Hayes Street two-way project is a key project identified in the Market/Octavia Plan;

WHEREAS the Hayes Street two-way project has been identified by both the Market and Octavia Plan Community Advisory Committee and the Interagency Plan Implementation Committee (IPIC) as a high priority project;

WHEREAS the Hayes Street two-way project is an inexpensive, optimal use of limited available funds;

WHEREAS there are only \$105,000 available for expenditure for community benefits in the Market and Octavia Plan area to date;

WHEREAS anticipated future community benefits funds have been deferred for up to three years and few additional funds are anticipated in the near future;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee advises the San Francisco Planning Department to invest \$52,500, or half of the currently available community impact funds, to the Hayes Street two-way project.

Approved by the Market and Octavia Community Advisory Committee on September 22nd, 2010

RESOLUTION #5: Hayes Street Project Investment (22Sep2010)
MOTION: Moved by Henderson, seconded by Levitt
YES: Unanimous: Cohen, Henderson, Levitt, Olsson, Richards, Starkey, Wingard
NO: none
ABSTAIN: none
ABSENT: Gold