

**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, March 24, 2010; 6:30pm
Regularly scheduled monthly meeting**

Cheryl Brinkman	Peter Cohen
Carmela Gold	Jason Henderson
Robin Levitt	Ted Olsson
Dennis Richards	Brad Villers
Kearstin Dischinger (ex officio)	

The Agenda & Minutes of all community meetings, a matter of public record, are available at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor or on our website (above).

SUMMARY

AGENDA (Exhibit 1: Agenda)

1. Call to order and roll call
2. Announcements, upcoming meetings and general housekeeping [discuss]
3. Approval of Minutes from previous meeting (February 24, 2010) [act]
4. Coordination with Eastern Neighborhoods CAC (EN-CAC) [discuss; act]
5. Pipeline Report—developments in process; CAC project reviews [discuss; act]
6. Update on MOP amendments adoption at BOS; next steps for implementation [discuss]
7. Update: Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Recommendation; next steps at Plng.Cmss & BOS [discuss]
8. Resolution for revised OEWD Development Fees Deferral Program [action]
9. Continued Working Session on community improvements evaluation and prioritization [discuss; act]
 - a. Explanations & updates on CIP Appx.C projects list (continued from Feb 24th)
 - b. Projects evaluation and individual scoring
 - c. Prepare for next meeting fo finalize first year CIP recommendations; refine process
 - d. Subcmte draft recommendations for review and adoption at April CAC meeting
10. Committee members' comments & Issues the Committee may consider in future meetings [discuss]
11. Public Comment
12. Adjournment

**Next Meeting: Wednesday, April 26, 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
3. Exhibit 3: Pipeline Report
4. Exhibit 4: "Planning Code Amendments to implement the Market and Octavia Area Plan"
5. Exhibit 5: Tax Increment Financing ¶—"The Market and Octavia Draft Community Improvements Program Document, San Francisco Planning Department, Citywide Policy Planning, Exhibit P-1-B, February 2008", [consisting of title page; p.28, with TIF ¶ emphasized; and p.30 chart with 'Dedicated Revenue' emphasized
§341: Better Neighborhoods Area Plan Monitoring Program
6. Exhibit 6: MOP-CAC resolution for consideration October 20, 2009 [handwritten notation: "as adopted, 10-20-09"]
7. Exhibit 7: MOP-CAC Resolution on Fees Deferral for the MOP Area
8. Exhibit 8: Market/Octavia CAC Community Improvements [MOP-CAC CIP] Prioritization Scorecard—compiled by Kearstin Dischinger (undated worksheet)

DECISIONS

1. Decision 1: Minutes (24FEB2010) not having been distributed, adoption postponed to next meeting.
2. Decision 2: CAC's revised resolution of fee deferral was unanimously approved.
3. Decision 3: April meeting devoted only to two topics: 1) Dischinger's explanations & recommending CIPs to IPIC; 2) discussing the process for the Monitoring Report.

INFORMATION DUE

- | # | WHEN | WHO | WHAT |
|----|------|-----|---|
| 1. | 3/29 | All | Finish CIP scorecard and submit to Dischinger by Monday 3/29. |
| 2. | 3/29 | All | Email Cohen any proposed revisions or suggestions on the projects which we do not cover after Dischinger's explanations in Agenda Item 9. |

MINUTES**1. Call to order and roll call (Quorum = 5 of 8)**

ROLL CALL (√=present; 0=absent; X=excused_

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

Ex Officio Members

- √ Kearstin Dischinger

Others attending

1. David Winslow, architect for Linden Living Alley
2. Andrea Aiello, Ex.Dir., Castro/Upper Market CBD

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

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

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS, UPCOMING MEETINGS AND GENERAL HOUSEKEEPING [discussion item]**2.1 Death of Brad Villiers**

The Chairman announced that our committee colleague Brad Villiers died in his Market Street store a week ago at barely 50 years old. All expressed shock and sympathy. He was remembered as a cordial colleague on this committee and a valuable member of the community. This meeting, on this the first anniversary of the committee's meetings, was dedicated to Brad's memory.

It was noted that this leaves two vacancies on our board. It was recommended that Bo Hayward (Supervisor Bevan Dufty's Chief of Staff) should be notified that we must fill these two vacancies immediately. Julian was a renter and Brad a merchant, both within the MOP area. It was noted that Marius Starkey (a renter) and Ken Wingard (a merchant) are among those who have applied. Cohen mentioned that perhaps we should have someone representing District 6.

2.2 Birthdays

We congratulated our colleagues on their birthdays: Kearstin Dischinger (Friday) and Robin Levitt (last week).

2.3 Announcements (Dischinger)**1) *MOP & Transit Effectiveness***

Commenting upon Muni transit for the growing neighborhood, Dischinger mentioned that Muni is working on addressing problems with a bus route at the Market/Gough/Hayes intersection. This would include installing necessary overhead wiring and improvements for pedestrian safety. Only about 35% of the funding for this is secured.

2) New Developers Fees change from net to gross

The Planning Department is initiating a hearing on Development Fees. The MOP will have no substantive changes. One building will be effected by the change of the developer fee from the current \$10/net sq.ft. to the new rate of \$8.50/gross sq.ft. Now all fees will go from net sq.ft. to gross sq.ft., which will make this fee both uniform and more easily calculated. This discussion does not involve the deferral of developers fees.

2.4 Sunday Streets

Sunday Streets will have two celebrations in April. On April 11th they will meet at Golden Gate Park and the Great Highway. On April 18th they tour Terry Francois/Third St./Bayview.

3. MINUTES

EXHIBIT 2

The minutes of the last meeting not having been distributed, approval is postponed until April's meeting, when both sets of minutes will be voted upon.

4. COORDINATION WITH EASTERN NEIGHBORHOOD COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (EN-CAC) (Cohen)

Their entire meeting was taken up by two items:

1. They had a presentation about the infrastructure finance working group focusing upon details of tax increment financing. They, like the MOP CAC, are trying to find sources of financing for full implementation of the community improvements program (CIP) in addition to development impact fees.
2. They discussed one of the other stimulus package proposals: transferring inclusionary housing fees. This motion stalled and died.

In terms of coordination, Cohen spoke with their Vice Chair about each CAC agendizing monthly brief updates of each other's CAC discussion, possibly with reports from a member of that team.

Ken Rich, Kearstin Dischinger and Peter Cohen met to discuss how the staff is dealing with both CACs to try to make consistent the operation, support and coordination of both CACs.

5. PIPELINE REPORT (Dischinger)

EXHIBIT 3

Dischinger reported on new developments, highlighted at the end of the chart. Other members mentioned more properties in the MOP area which were showing activity:

- 1) 150 Otis Street—This is a historic Julia Morgan building with a tower and terra cotta tiles being considered to be converted or adapted for affordable housing. It needs to be both seismically and ADA upgraded.
- 2) 1 Franklin Street—Robin noted that there seemed to be some movement on this property.
- 3) 555 Polk Street also seems to have some activity.
- 4) Parcel B of MOP at Market/Octavia appears that it may be getting funding.
- 5) 555 Fulton—there seems to be a preliminary deck being constructed there last Saturday.

As a result of members mentioning more properties than were listed on the Pipeline Report, they wondered how accurate the report was in catching updates on properties with the MOP area. Dischinger mentioned that she takes her reports from whatever is in the department's 1970s database but that planners do not enter every time something happens at a property. She suggested that our neighborhood groups are more accurate at monitoring these changes. This problem is a limitation of how the database was constructed and what it can report on. The department is awaiting a new citywide database solution to this problem but it is not yet available. For now she will compile a spreadsheet/database (in Excel), which we can modify.

6. UPDATE: BOS ADOPTED MOP AMENDMENTS; NEXT STEPS FOR IMPLEMENTATION (Cohen)

Dischinger reported on the revised MOP legislation—"The Market/Octavia Area Plan Level Historic Preservation Survey Integration Legislation"—was approved by the Planning Commission at the end of last year. The Board (BOS) decided to revisit this on their agenda for March. It includes some deadlines, some General Plan amendments, and zoning map amendments to increase heights on the Upper Market corridor. The Board chose to make one amendment to the Planning Commission

recommendations — not to increase the heights on the Tower Record site from 55 feet to 65 feet, based upon DTNA's comments before them.

Richards mentioned that there is a vision for a Market and Noe Plaza after the CBD gets approval of their proofs of concept for 17th Street, the Farmer's Market there, as well as closing this intersection on Easter Sunday, as they did last year. That being the goal, having a 65 foot building there (in place of the outdoor café there now) would probably take away from the vision.

Cohen stated that he told the Board of Supervisors on the Land Use Planning Committee that the Upper Market community is wrestling with the MOP boundary, which currently ends in the middle of the 17th/Market/Noe intersection, while we have a hot property (the old Trinity Methodist Church pit) at that very intersection that's causing confusion in the community about two sets of development criteria, whereas we think that it would be more harmonious for the same, consistent set of MOP standards to extend the extra block to Castro. While DTNA as well as EVNA and CAPA are talking with the Department head and the Supervisor about how to fix this, it doesn't make any sense to allow one set of heights on one side of the boundary and an abrupt break at the intersection with a conspicuous different height standard. So, DTNA asked the supervisors to maintain the current height limits on the one site directly at the Market/Noe/16th streets intersection, since it would be easier to come back to them with a reasoned exception, but it would be difficult if not impossible to reduce the height of a building once approved or constructed. There were multiple perspectives about the height changes on the Upper Market corridor but DTNA's point was not about the site per se. This will come before the board again on Monday. According to Dischinger, the site is not going to be developed in the near term or within a short time. So, the Board requested the Department to return the height limit to 55 feet, which is not a big loss in terms of housing. The building which houses Radio Shack and Kard Zone is a somewhat "ugly" building with bay windows, which will not be greatly affected by maintaining the reduced height; it would be worse if taller. This issue could return before the board either this coming Monday or the following one, but this is not determined.

7. UPDATE: TAX INCREMENT FINANCING (TIF) RECOMMENDATION;

NEXT STEPS— PLNG.CMSS & BOS

EXHIBIT 4: "[Planning Code Amendments to implement the Market and Octavia Area Plan

**EXHIBIT 5: "Market/Octavia CAC Resolution for consideration Oct 20, 2009"
[with handwritten annotation: "as adopted 10-20-09"]**

EXHIBIT 6: "The Market and Octavia Draft Community Improvements Program Document; San Francisco Planning Department, Citywide Policy Planning. Exhibit P-1-B, February 2008:"

In September/October we talked about how to get more money for CIPs. We mentioned Tax Increment Financing (TIF) as new financing tool. We even passed a resolution supporting this new vehicle since it is relevant to our own plan.

Cohen passed out three documents (the Exhibits above). These are excerpts directly out of the MOP, with language inserted into the CIP and the Planning Code calling for Tax Increment Financing.

Cohen explained the concept of Tax Increment Financing (TIF): as the property values increase (the Tax Increment), then the city can earmark a portion of this money for CIPs. On April 1st the plan is to be introduced and heard before the Planning Commission; on April 5th it is scheduled to be heard by the Board of Supervisors' Land Use Committee. These are informational hearings, with actual proposals for approval expected to be brought back in the summer or early fall according to the Planning Department.

Cohen also noted for the CAC that whereas the EN-CAC received this update, our CAC did not. He attributed this to the fact that the Eastern Neighborhoods plan received more high profile attention. Nevertheless the prospect of tax increment financing will apply equally as importantly to the Market/Octavia Plan and, as already noted, is called for in the Code and the CIP.

So, we must require that staff inform our CAC at least with anything pertaining to our CAC in the same way that they do for the EN-CAC. It is also important that the BOS hear our voices on issues. We must ask staff for more complete information. We must be at these public BOS discussions.

8. REVISED RESOLUTION FOR OEWD DEVELOPMENT FEES DEFERRAL PROGRAM

Exhibit 7: CAC Resolution supporting OEWD plan to defer developers impact fees. On condition that the Seed Bank is approved and capitalized with at least \$2.5m

Cohen passed out a revised resolution which he said was up-to-the-minute, incorporating comments that Michael Yarney had just explained to him. Cohen's idea for a payment of earnest money was adopted and increased to 25%, leaving 75% with interest as the IOU to be paid by the developer before occupation. With the updated information, the committee favored the resolution, but would have preferred to see the written summary from Yarney if it had been available.

The discussion which followed considered LISC—Local Initiatives Support Corporation funding <www.lisc.org>, a source of neighborhood infrastructure funding. The Bridge Loan concept would add to the size of the fund to keep important projects in the neighborhood moving. However, we must be able to prioritize both the projects and funding vehicles based upon their parameters and whether interest is paid within a specified time.

Henderson thought we should send the resolution on to Yarney. But Gold cautioned that while the proposed down-payment must be 25%, LISC does not have that kind of money. The CAC revised its resolution to support any fee deferral program which included the following conditions: 1) the initial down-payment should be 25% with the remaining 75% to be paid with interest at the end (occupancy); 2) the plan should create a Community Infrastructure Fund sufficient to enable the design, planning, and engineering aspects of a project (i.e., to make the project shovel-ready) for priority improvement projects, and that the capitalization of the fund will further grow as the amount of deferred fees from Pipeline projects grows, and that the fund will be further capitalized to be able to provide "Bridge Loans" for completion of shovel-ready projects, and that the enactment of the Fee Deferral Program is explicitly contingent upon the creation of such Community Infrastructure Fund; 3) that the deferral plan must specify that at the end of the project the developers must pay a fair rate of return as the interest for the deferral. With those revisions the motion, moved and seconded by Henderson/Levitt, was approved unanimously.

9. CONTINUED WORKING SESSION ON CIP EVALUATION AND PRIORITIZATION

EXHIBIT 7: The Scoring Matrix (based upon CIPs described in MOP Appendix C)

- a. Explanations & updates on CIP Appx.C projects list (continued from Feb 24th)
- b. Projects evaluation and individual scoring
- c. Prepare for next meeting to finalize first year CIP recommendations; refine process
- d. A subcommittee draft recommendations for review and adoption at April CAC meeting

The Chair assigned **homework** to the committee members: to review the remaining CIPs in Appx.C on our own and to send to him by this coming Monday (March 29th) any suggestions or revisions and to Dischinger any revisions to our Scoresheets. However, some members still expressed some reservations about the scoring and the process.

Dischinger led this discussion explaining to the CAC some CIPs listed in Appendix C of the MOP as explanation of each of these items on the score sheet. The CAC is trying to finalize our prioritization of these CIPs. The following CIPs from MOP Appx.C and on our Scoresheet were explained:

A14 Hayes Street Two-way Improvements (\$250k)

This project is a big win for the Planning Department because it has great effect at small cost. Further, the community really supports this project.

A15 Improve Safety of City Parking Garages (\$70k)

This is essentially for providing lighting for safety throughout Civic Center Garage.

A16 Parking Supply Survey and Program Recommendations (\$300k)

This survey would help us determine how better to use the space we have. One consideration would be to have variable rate pricing for parking, making it lower at night when there is less demand. It would also consider parking sharing programs (e.g., currently private owners of property with parking will not open it to the public in evenings nor on weekends for fear of liability. It would also consider a Parking Benefit District, which currently is unfunded.

A17 Pedestrian Improvements for Priority Intersections (\$14.810m)

This would consider developers fees or in-kind CIPs (e.g., the Department currently is talking with Whole Foods for such improvements at Market and Dolores, which could add to their ambiance and provide greater safety for the pedestrians and vehicles). Other options being considered are: 1) fake brick paving treatment (to designate and differentiate pedestrian areas

from vehicular ones); 2) bulbouts to reduce vehicular speed by constricting the roadway as well as to enhance the neighborhood by landscaping these; and 3) raised pedestrian crosswalks to alert drivers to pedestrian safety.

A18 Extend Octavia ROW to Golden Gate Avenue (\$1.630m)

This project is on hold.

A19 Church Street and Van Ness Avenue Muni Metro Entrances (\$2.140m)

One should not consider the drawings for this project in Appendix C as anything but placeholders. So, we should consider if anything different than the functional entrances is needed or whether the money could be better spent elsewhere.

Dischinger concluded by describing the Department's process between plan (Appx.C) and execution of these CIPs. The Appendix lists idealized plans and attempts to determine funding. As funding sources are reduced the plans must be reduced and prioritized as to which can and cannot be done and to what degree, based upon which things are the most important to the community and for their safety.

Cohen reminded us that several months ago our CAC decided to eliminate from the scorecard all of the criteria that had to do with feasibility and to limit our criteria to need (both quantitative and qualitative). So, we must determine what has the greatest added value from the perspective of community need.

Several months ago our CAC decided that our criteria in judging these improvements should be based upon need (both quantitative and qualitative), and should not be based merely upon money or feasibility. And when it comes to prioritizing among these semifinalists, we will choose those that can move or be completed fastest, as the Department advises us. Dischinger suggested approaching these in two ways: 1) one or more CIPs are more important than others; or 2) all of the CIPs are important but taken together they don't make full projects so we will allocate only some proportion of money to them and try to leverage each of these CIPs with other city expenditures. Given the City's projected income for the next year, Dischinger highly encouraged us to allocate specified amounts per category, rather than by individual project within that category.

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

The Chairman reserved the last few minutes of the meeting to report that he had met with Kearstin Dischinger (our staff liaison) and Ken Rich (staff liaison for EN-CAC) and suggests forming a small subcommittee to make recommendations on priority community improvements based on the CAC scoring process for the April 28th meeting. Most importantly, we must all complete the CIP Scorecard to the best of our abilities by this Monday, March 29th.

Based upon our CAC's compiled scores, the subcommittee would recommend the priority CIPs to forward to the IPIC and Planning Commission, which would first have to be approved by the CAC. The Chairman suggested the Executive Team (Chair, Vice-Chair, Secretary) to be this subcommittee in collaboration with Dischinger. They will circulate a draft of these top priority CIPs and their rationale to the CAC for discussion and approval at the April meeting. The purpose of this is to speed up the decision process, since we cannot devote a full meeting to this. The deadline is upon us and we must send some signal to IPIC of what we believe are the most important CIPs.

It was suggested that we devote the entire next meeting to completing this task of recommending CIPs to IPIC and the Planning Commission. Cohen pointed out that he and Dischinger have already scheduled the obligations our CAC has to complete, especially the Monitor Report. This is why Cohen proposed a small working group of no more than four, as an expedited way to forward recommendations to IPIC. Levitt mentioned that we're only at CIP-A19 out of 42. He doesn't know how we are to make up our minds on the value of these projects without Dischinger's explanations. Gold agreed to the small group process to draft the top CIPs to be recommended but she needed Dischinger's explanations to be able to meaningfully evaluate projects on the scorecard. Brinkman and Richards similarly contended that we need one more dedicated meeting solely dedicated to this process with Dischinger's explanations. The April meeting should consist of nothing but: 1) roll call; 2) announcements; 3) approval of minutes; and 4) concluding this process by hearing Dischinger's explanations and establishing a process to complete our recommendations by the May CAC meeting.

According to Dischinger, we missed the original deadline of getting our recommendations to IPIC, but that's not a big problem. Now we have three principal functions: 1) Prioritization of Capital Plan Projects; 2) Monitoring MOP; and 3) Enforcement of the MOP. So rather than spend all our time on only the first function before we're all termed out; the recommendation is that we accomplish the purpose of the CAC.

Cohen, turning to the CAC Schedule of Meetings (modified "roadmap" appended below) established to meet all of our goals. At our April meeting we must be ready to begin finalizing our first year program recommendations. The expectation is that we'll update these beginning in September/October, anticipating the next fiscal year. Additionally in April we are scheduled to discuss: 1) Monitoring Reporting—overview and discussion; 2) recommendations and discussion with other Department staff to inform us about the Monitoring program; 3) and then we are going to establish a CAC subcommittee to work on our own report that will be appended to the Department's Monitoring Report to the BOS. So, their thought was that at next month's meeting we really needed to deal with the Monitoring Report and finish the CIP recommendations. These are the choices. Richards asked if time is flexible, that we can extend our meetings or hold special meetings.

Cohen mentioned to Dischinger that at this time since the fiscal cycle is already proceeding, because there is no money in the fund, and because they are not going to spend money without getting recommendations, the more important deadline to consider is the Monitoring Report. The prioritized CIPs recommendations is really aimed at the next fiscal cycle. Recognizing that members really want her to explain each of these CIPs in order to inform their judgements, Dischinger suggested that we do Appendix C for half the meeting and then do the Monitoring Report with Teresa (of the Department) for the other half of the meeting. And that, and only that, is the agenda for the entire meeting.

We have had some hot topics that we have discussed in previous meetings (e.g., the Tax Increment and Stimulus topics have each been discussed in several meetings). It was suggested that it would be better to pick two topics and finalize decisions on each because now we are once again spending time discussing procedures of the committee.

The CAC decided that they want to devote the entire April meeting to Dischinger's explaining Appendix C and the Monitor Report and the process of recommendations to IPIC and the Planning Commission. We will not have a subcommittee before the April meeting but will have one after that meeting based upon the decisions arrived at in the meeting.

11. PUBLIC COMMENT

Our guest, David Winslow, architect for Linden Living Alley, was called upon to comment. He said that construction on his project would begin next month. They were funded, though you can still buy trees from Friends of the Urban Forest. They will scrape to the subsurface and replace the water main. When that is done then they will begin plantings. This will be a street without curbs—it is not the whole street but rather the little border of the street. The street is not closed to traffic. Having done this project, Winslow is interested in doing others in our neighborhood. He has been thinking of the same funding mechanisms we have discussed tonight.

12. ADJOURNMENT

No guests nor further business remaining, we adjourned at 8:30pm in honor of our colleague Brad Villiers.

**The next meeting (fourth Wednesday) will be on March 24th from 6:30-8:30pm
at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 conference room.**

CAC Meetings (Third Wednesday monthly, City Hall, Rm 279, 6:30-8:30pm)

Calendar: 4/24, 5/28, 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)
-
-