

**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>

**Planning Department, 1650 Mission St., Ste.400
Wednesday, May 26, 2010; 6:30pm
Regularly scheduled monthly meeting**

Cheryl Brinkman	Peter Cohen
Carmela Gold	Jason Henderson
Robin Levitt	Ted Olsson
Dennis Richards	Marius Starkey
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 meetings (February24, March 24, April 26 2010) [act]
4. M/O Plan Monitoring Report preparation [discuss; possibly act]
 - A. Guests—Planning Department staff
 - A1 Major Environmental Analysis
 - A2 Neighborhood Planning
 - B. Review and comment on Planning Department draft Monitoring Report
 - C. Establish a subcommittee to work on CAC supplement to Monitoring Report
5. Community improvements Program recommendations [discuss]
 - A. Review recommendations from subcommittee
 - B. CAC rating of overall community improvements program balance/variety
 - C. Finalize first year program preliminary recommendations and accompanying text regarding continuing process refinements
6. In-Kind Guidelines [discuss; possibly act]

Informational presentation by staff regarding developing guidelines for approving In-Kind Agreements, followed by discussion, comment, and potential action.
7. Committee members' comments and issues the committee may consider in future meetings [discuss]
7. Public Comment
8. Adjournment

Next Meeting: **Wednesday, June 23, 2010, 6:30pm, City Hall, Rm. 278**
(Jan27, Feb24, Mch24, Apr26, May26, Jun23, Jul28, Aug25, Sep22, Oct27, Nov24, Dec22)

EXHIBITS (handout documents informing the discussion)

1. Exhibit 1: Agenda
2. Exhibit 2: Minutes (February24) [Olsson/Oropeza]
3. Exhibit 3: Minutes (March 24) [Olsson/Oropeza]
4. Exhibit 4: Minutes (April 26) [Olsson/Oropeza]
5. Exhibit 5: MOP Checklist of applicable codes and regulations [Luellen]
6. Exhibit 6: MOP Fundamental Design Principles [Luellen]
7. Exhibit 7: Subcommittee's written summary of CIP recommendations [Cohen]
8. Exhibit 8: Subcommittee's tabular compilation of CIPs, revised [Cohen]
9. Exhibit 9: Draft of In-Kind Guidelines [Dischinger's PowerPoint slideshow]

DECISIONS

1. Decision 1: Minutes of 3 previous meetings adopted
2. Decision 2: Henderson & Olsson will draft CAC report from members' submissions
3. Decision 3: Cohen & Levitt will assist Dischinger on In-Kind policy
4. Decision 4: CAC adopted subcommittee's summary (2 documents) to be submitted to IPIC

COMMITMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, INFORMATION DUE

#	WHEN	WHO	WHAT
1.	06/15	ALL	Submit suggestions for CAC's supplement.
2.	05/20	JH/TO	Draft CAC's supplementary report on MOP process; discuss at next meeting.
3.	05/21	KD	Submit In-Kind Policy to CAC; discuss at next meeting

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

- x Cheryl Brinkman
- √ Peter Cohen (Chair)
- x Carmela Gold
- √ Jason Henderson (Vice Chair)
- √ Robin Levitt
- √ Ted Olsson (Secretary)
- x Dennis Richards
- √ Marius Starkey

Ex Officio Members

- √ Kearstin Dischinger

Others attending:

- √ Sarah Dennis Phillips, AICP, Sr. Planner; Manager, Plans and Programs, SF Plng.Dpt.
tel: 415 558 6314; fax: 415 558 6409; em: sarah.dennis@sfgov.org
- √ Mark Luellen, Northeast Team Manager, SF Plng.Dpt.
tel: 315 558 6478; fax: 415 558 6409; em: mark.luellen@sfgov.org
both located at:
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

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

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

To expedite matters and accommodate our guests, the Chair postponed Item 2 until later in the meeting. It was never discussed.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS (FEB. 24, MAR. 24, APR. 26 2010) [act]

Exhibit 2: Minutes of February 24th CAC meeting [Olsson/Oropeza]

Exhibit 3: Minutes of March 24th CAC meeting [Olsson/Oropeza]

Exhibit 4: Minutes of April 26th CAC meeting [Olsson/Oropeza]

The minutes from the previous three meetings were unanimously approved on condition that Robin's last name (Levitt) be spelled correctly in the April minutes. They will be posted to the CAC website.

4. M/O PLAN MONITORING REPORT PREPARATION [discuss; possibly act]

A1 Major Environmental Analysis (Sarah Dennis Phillips)

Sarah Dennis Phillips evaluates public and private projects in the City and County of San Francisco in order to provide the Planning Department and the public with information about significant environmental impacts, which might result from these developments; her role does not include advocacy. The scope of the EIR depends upon the size of the project and the magnitude of any environmental impacts.

EIRs require a lot of public involvement: answering questions for officials and the public as well as providing testimony in any litigation. CEQA provides an opportunity for people who do not want to see a project be realized to kill that project.

Here team created the EIR for the MOP. That has provided them with a big opportunity and challenge. There will be some substantial impacts to some aspects of this area resulting from this plan. And any development of any size is contributing to these impacts in fulfillment of the plan.

Normally under CEQA, a project contributing to a Cumulative Impact, requires the highest level of EIR, as well as a lot of time and a lot of money, which therefore can delay or prevent a plan being implemented. However, once done, CEQA allows the Department not to have to continually return to review and revise its entire assessment. Instead it can grant project exemptions for projects within planning areas. Most exemptions are predicated on the idea that there will not be environmental impacts from the project, but this Community Plan Exemption (CPE) is predicated on the idea that while there could be impacts, they have already been analyzed so that it not necessary to analyze them yet again. Unlike other types of exemptions, this Community Plan Exemption lets the Department issue an exemption even if there are significant Cumulative Impacts in the area. It also lets it take the mitigation efforts identified in the plan and apply them to the projects in the plan under that exemption, which normally cannot be done. However, it is noted that this new CPE (Community Plan Exemption from environmental review) means that the local community will have less notice about development proposals in the pipeline.

The fact that the Plan and the EIR have been so carefully crafted presents a significant opportunity, because under these circumstances rather than repeatedly analyzing the same aspects, CEQA terms these exceptions “peculiar impacts”—i.e., site-specific or project-specific impacts which would not normally have risen to the level of having to be reviewed from the perspective of the whole project but which might be required to be analyzed at the project level. As a result, CEQA allows the review to be confined to analyzing the specific impact at the project level.

Asked to provide some examples of “peculiar impacts”, she mentioned the following, while indicating that they have not issued many of these yet:

- 1 Franklin (at Market)
- SF Jazz
- 2001 Market (Whole Foods)
- 1540 Market

When these “peculiar impacts” arise, each division in the department must indicate that it feels that the project is consistent with the MOP and therefore should be able to benefit from the analysis that the department did for the MOP. Citywide these peculiar impacts need only pass a minimal threshold—such issues as parking or design are not considered; rather the Department sees that the project is consistent with the MOP (though a major consideration is density and use). The project must also pass a Neighborhood Review by Luellen’s group, which is where they get into parking ratios, design, and other specifics.

Asked to provide a specific instance of “peculiar impacts” on any of those projects which she had mentioned above, Dennis Phillips discussed these:

- 1 Franklin
This was looked at more for its contribution to a traffic impact.
- 555 Fulton / 2001 Market
Because no mitigation was built into the MOP EIR for hazardous materials on a site-specific basis, the Department is now having to deal with this issue for these projects. This is typically because the site was a gas station/garage or has naturally occurring asbestos at the site.

Dennis Phillips emphasized that during the EIR process, her team must analyze the projects in the plan to identify any peculiar impacts or to indicate that other projects do not have them. Though they say that these are exempt from review, they still have to perform technical analysis to support their conclusion either for or against such “peculiar impacts”.

Both 555 Fulton and 1960 Market (gas station) came before the department before the MOP was adopted. At adoption these projects were ready to go. They had their EIRs and there was a long time between when the EIRs were certified and when the MOP was adopted. The Department can only issue a CPE once the plan is adopted. Now when “peculiar impacts” are identified our CAC is likely to see a study that covers only the topic in contention.

Henderson asked why 2001 Market is required to have an extensive traffic study. Dennis Phillips explained that the MOP looked at traffic in general throughout the Plan. However, in this case it must look at specific traffic patterns affecting particular intersections in the Plan resulting specifically from the development that is being built at that site. Specifically the Plan, devised before the developer’s site-specific client requirements were known, did not consider such a client and the impact which this would cause on all types of traffic. These types of specific studies really depend upon the use of the site and the impacts which that causes. The department looks at each development to see whether site-specific development differs considerably from the Plan so as to require an assessment specific to this use. That site will also have a focused study on hazardous materials, since under the previous owner it was used as an auto repair garage.

In response to Levitt asking if there had been a challenge to the MOP EIR, she noted that there has been one but since no injunction has been issued, the Plan is proceeding. Dischinger explained that the citizen (Mary Miles) who requested/required an impact report, has filed for a another extension. The lawsuit has been ongoing for two years but they have yet to reach the initial stages. So, this may pick up again in the fall.

Cohen then asked her a hypothetical: if the department performs a Transportation Study—such as that for 2001 Market—and consequently issues a CPE (an exemption under CEQA), does that mean that a challenge to a transportation analysis is not a CEQA challenge but is just a substantive critique of the Transportation Study? She answered, that the study supports their conclusion, which goes into the CEQA document. And, of course the department is better off in a CEQA challenge having done a technical analysis, which supports their CEQA conclusion, since an exemption has a fairly low threshold for challenge. To clarify, Cohen asked if the challenge, then, is on the determination of the exemption rather than on the environmental documents—i.e., does the transportation study exist as an environmental document or merely as a technical document? Specifically he asked if one could challenge the transportation study before the Planning Commission. Dennis Phillips disagreed: no, the transportation document would be challenged on its own merits. A challenge to the exemption determination may be appealed to the BOS. Cohen said that he merely wanted to clarify this point that there is no Planning Commission route for such a challenge. In answer to Levitt’s question, Dennis Phillips stated that while exemptions are appealed all the time, the Planning Commission is not likely to overrule a Department decision that a CEQA document is required by a developer.

Starkey asked if the department had looked at 25-35 Dolores Street. She said that that developer’s plans also preceded adoption of the MOP. However, in that case there is a significant impact because of the demolition of a historic resource (a repair garage). She added that EIRs are prepared by consultants under the direction of the Planning Department. The consultant gets a fee from the developer; the department’s fee is based upon the construction costs.

A2 Neighborhood Planning (Mark Luellen, Planning Department)
Exhibit 5: MOP Checklist of applicable codes and regulations [Luellen]
Exhibit 6: MOP Fundamental Design Principles [Luellen]

After or concurrent with EIR review, developers documents come before the Neighborhood Planning section of the Planning Department. This group is divided into quadrants of the City (NE, NW, SE, SW). They are staffed with historical analysts and work closely with the environmental team.

He showed the CAC his team’s Checklists which show which code sections have been changed by the Plan. These are used on all major projects.

He next showed us the MOP Fundamental Design Principles. There is a similar document for all Plan areas. Dischinger explained that this had been a section in the general plan document but the department pulled it out and made it a separate, distinct document. This discusses massing and articulation of towers, alleys and open spaces. This shows the team what aspects to look at in light of applicable regulations within that plan area.

He was asked how the Policy Framework is used as a lens for looking at the Plan and the neighborhoods effected. He replied that this discussion typically involves all areas of the Planning Department collaboratively. Cohen noted that while the MOP policy provisions underlie all the work of the Department's Neighborhood Teams, there is not a specific set of procedures for reviewing development proposals within the MOP policy framework, as there is for the checklist of Planning Code compliance with zoning within the MOP area. Cohen pointed out that our CAC and the neighborhood associations look at developments within the Plan area differently, not as a checklist but rather at how the particular development fits the values and character of the Plan area and their neighborhoods. This was particularly borne out in the case of discussions about the Upper Market Area. Dennis Phillips indicated that the EIR team feels that it is almost impossible to evaluate any project apart from the specific Plan that it fits into and how the project carries out the goals and purpose of that Plan. Dischinger indicated that whenever a planner in the department has an issue, typically it is brought up before the whole department for discussion, where it is evaluated from many professional perspectives.

Dischinger reminded us that the purpose for having her colleagues present before us tonight was to prepare us for the Monitoring Report which she hopes to have before us in a couple of weeks. A subcommittee of us will be writing our supplementary report. We were invited to ask them questions in light of the means by which our CAC operates with the Department?

It was mentioned that some projects proceed too far along before any of citizens or the CAC know of them or become involved. They were asked when do they feel that the CAC or neighborhood associations can request them to explain such projects. There are many neighborhood associations which might provide useful information and which would want to know about developments potentially effecting their neighborhoods. They do officially notify neighbors of developments near them. But they were asked if there is any way that neighborhood associations can be notified about these developments?

The Universal Planning Notification initiative, started by the Department last Fall but currently on hold, would be very helpful to maintain clear and consistent communication about projects being reviewed by the Department. Both Dennis Phillips and Luellen seemed to agree. Cohen mentioned that many people in the Plan area miss the Universal Planning Notifications. As a result they have to rely upon their neighborhood associations to inform them. Luellen has spoken to the Hayes Valley Neighborhood Association and is happy to do this for other neighborhood associations whenever they have particular questions or issues. So CAC members are encouraged to inform the neighborhood associations effected by the MOP and to ask that the UPN be implemented.

It was mentioned that Dischinger puts together our Pipeline Report. But Henderson still wanted more components in the report: a listing of the actual parking that was requested, whether it was approved, and any Conditional Use permits issued for the project. We are limited by the department's not having a unified reporting system which could be easily customized for each CAC's needs.

Levitt wanted to know, once the economy rebounds, how we can make the approval/review process more efficient, as in the CEQA process. They are improving but much more is needed.

B. Review and comment on Planning Department draft Monitoring Report

There being no draft, there was no review and comment. Instead, throughout the meeting there were suggestions about the purpose of our report.

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.

Dischinger indicated that 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.

Olsson stated that at some point we need to know what our budget is and how it is prioritized among these categories. Our prioritization should be based upon accurate current costs as well as what's possible and or likely to be accomplished. We should deduct the costs of projects until we reach the budget allotment for that category, though we may choose not to spend all the money at once. He also reminded the CAC that there are categories which we have not even considered yet (e.g., Historical/Cultural/Educational criteria, which we promised to include this fall; or other criteria, such as green/sustainable requirements for each project).

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.

Dischinger suggested that we might compare how the MOP/CAC and relevant city agencies and commissions work together and recommend any improvements. But above all, she recommended that we keep our report succinct.

C. Establish a subcommittee to work on CAC supplement to Monitoring Report

By mid-June Dischinger will provide us the Department's Monitoring Report which will be the basis of our CAC supplementary report. We need to decide which elements we want to have in our report of the process during the past two years. This should be a tight, brief report which accompanies the Department's report. Henderson and Olsson agreed to compile, summarize, and draft the CAC's report.

Dischinger, suggested that our report is not merely a critique of the Department's report but rather is the committee's perspective on the process of implementing the plan more than it is 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. 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.

Legally the subcommittee can send the request to everyone; however, all recipients cannot just Reply All. Anyone should feel comfortable to send their drafts to Jason and Ted by June 15. 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. After reviewing it, the CAC members will submit their drafts to Olsson and Henderson to be compiled into an integrated supplementary report to be submitted to the Planning Commission.

5. Community improvements Program recommendations [discuss]

Exhibit 7: Subcommittee's written summary of CIP recommendations for IPIC [Cohen]

Exhibit 8: Subcommittee's table of CIP's revised categories and projects [Cohen]

A. Review recommendations from subcommittee (Cohen, Olsson, Henderson)

Cohen explained the summary of the subcommittee. Dischinger compiled the CAC's rankings and averages. Ted and Peter played with formatting this. Then the subcommittee turned this into draft recommendations. Three of the categories presented no problems; however, we recommend that the Transportation category be subdivided further, in order to better consider the various modes of transportation, each of which have their own advocates. In this way, we might better represent the community's desires by choosing several projects under each mode. However, this means that some of the projects which scored very high, would be subordinated.

B. CAC rating of overall community improvements program balance/variety

This does not represent a calculation of costs. The costs are two year's old; and some projects do not even have costs attached. The Word document indicates that some projects are very generalized while others are more specific. The revised tabular data showing modes as subcategories, allows us to better group all Transportation items by mode of transportation.

Last, we agreed that the CAC would rate the balance and variety in the overall CIP program when reviewing our priorities and finalizing the program recommendations at our meetings in the Fall.

C. Finalize first year program preliminary recommendations and accompanying text regarding continuing process refinements

The CAC unanimously adopted the subcommittee's preliminary recommendations to be forwarded by Dischinger to the IPIC for their feedback and suggestions. The CAC will then consider the IPIC comments in the process of modifying and adding to recommendations, which will be finalized in the Fall (projected for adoption by the CAC at its November meeting).

Specifically CAC agreed to subdivide the Transportation category to give equal weight to the various modes of transportation. Consequently they also agreed to override some of the more generalized CIPs which otherwise had gained more votes but would have used up more of the budget. They also acknowledged that this was done with two-year old cost estimates (no longer accurate), so they agreed to review these in the fall at the same time as they revise the categories to include other categories (e.g., Historical/Cultural/Educational criteria) or projects submitted by the public in addition to the current two-year old projects proposed by the Department.

The CAC also discussed a new category of priorities, which would not be funded by the MOP funds. Like the City we are concerned about economic stimulus for shovel-ready projects. We are trying to prioritize probable, likely projects. The CAC agreed to adopt and submit the subcommittee's report

6. In-Kind Guidelines [discuss; possibly act]

Exhibit 9: Draft of In-Kind Guidelines (Dischinger's PowerPoint slideshow)

Dischinger informed the CAC that she was drafting for the Department an In-Kind Policy whereby developers could offset their impact fees by undertaking and paying for authorized and approved CIP projects. She discussed her outline of topics and her thinking on each aspect of the policy. Cohen and Levitt were delegated to assist her on her working group. She will provide a draft of this policy to the CAC for review at our next meeting.

7. COMMITTEE MEMBERS COMMENTS & ISSUES THE COMMITTEE MAY CONSIDER IN FUTURE MEETINGS

Our next meeting should consider the following:

1. Finalize our critique of Department's Monitoring Report; hopefully before next meeting
2. CAC Supplementary report
3. Review In-Kind policy prepared by Department staff for Commission's July meeting.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT

Since there were no visitors at this meeting, there was no public comment.

9. ADJOURNMENT

There being no guests nor further business remaining, we adjourned at 8:38pm.

The next meeting (fourth Wednesday) will be on June 23rd from 6:30-8:30pm at City Hall, Room 279.

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

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

Respectfully submitted,

~TED OLSSON
Secretary

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

January 27February 24

- Working session on CIP evaluation and prioritization
 - Explanations and updates on CIP Appendix C projects list
 - Projects evaluation and individual scoring
 - Review and discuss preliminary scoring results
 - Prep for next meeting: finalize 1st year CIP recommendations of projects and process

March 24

- Finalize 1st year program recommendations and text defining continuing refinement of the process
- Monitor and report; overview and discussion

April 24

- Neighborhood Planning and MEA staff presentations and discussions
- Discussion of Monitor Report by key topics of interest

May 28

- Review draft Monitor Report and potential action
- Review CAC draft section of Monitor Report; potential action

June 23

- IPIC presentation and discussion with CAC
- Discuss a process to continually refine and augment Appendix C's list of potential CIPs

July 28

- Finalize proposed process — potential action

August 25

- Implement Appendix C process
- Discuss MOP Fund expenditure categories; potential action
- Discuss additional funding sources for CIPs

September 22

- Update CAC CIP recommendations

October 27

- Finalize 2011 CAC CIP recommendations; potential action

November 24

- As needed; potential action to finalize 2011 CAC recommendations

December 22 HOLIDAY: NO MEETING

**LIST OF RELEVANT DOCUMENTS
TO BE INCLUDED ON MOP-CAC WEBSITE
(other than Exhibits, unless cross-referenced_
<http://www.sf-planning.org/index.aspx?page=1700>**

Each member of the CAC should indicate which public documents relevant to the MOP should be incorporated onto our website or at least linked from it. This page should be annotated to explain the document and its relevance to the MOP. The point is to make everything relevant to MOP transparent in order to inform the citizens about the CAC's decisions.

- Parking Nexus Study
- TEP
- NCD-20 (Neighborhood Community District) by Dan Sayer (model of superb government report)
-
-

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

Following on Theresa's presentation of outline, we can have a brief CAC brainstorm on any further suggestions to add to this list. Sound okay with you? Would you please bring copies of this list as a one page handout for the CAC meeting?

Much appreciated,
Peter

**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?

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

12. 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.
13. 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.
14. At some point we need to know what our budget is and how it is prioritized among these categories.
15. 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.
16. 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.
17. 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.
18. 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.
19. 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.
20. Members can offer comments and suggestions, with the emphasis on improving the process of implementing the MOP.
21. Dischinger will email the Department's Monitoring Report to the CAC by mid-June. After reviewing it, the CAC members will submit their draft comments to Olsson and Henderson to be compiled into an integrated supplementary report to be submitted to the Planning Commission.