

**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, September 28, 2010; 6:30pm
Regularly scheduled monthly meeting**

Peter Cohen	Carmela Gold
Jason Henderson	Robin Leavitt
Ted Olsson	Dennis Richards
Marius Starkey	Ken Wingard
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. Scheduling November and December CAC meetings [act]
4. Approval of Minutes for meetings of June 22, August 27, 2011 [act]
(*there were no minutes for the July meeting because there was no quorum*)
5. Pipeline Report—developments in process; CAC project reviews [discuss; act]
 - Quarterly pipeline report and mapping
 - Current month cases
 - Potential projects for CAC review
6. Discuss and clarify CAC/IPIC collaboration and reconciliation for Area Plan Community Improvements [discuss/act]
7. Review IPIC responses to CAC priorities for 2012 M/O Community Improvements Program [discuss/act]
8. IPIC guest—Recreation & Park Department staff [discuss]
9. Next steps towards finalizing 2012 M/O Community Improvement Program recommendations for Capital Plan [discuss; act]
10. Committee members comments & issues the Committee may consider in future meetings [discuss]
11. Public Comment
12. Adjournment & announcement of next meeting

NEXT MEETING: WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2011, 6:30PM AT 1650 Mission, Rm. 400

(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: Minutes (June 22, 2011) — see previous meetings' attachments [**Olsson**]
3. Exhibit 3: Minutes (August 24, 2011) — see previous meetings' attachments [**Olsson**]
4. Exhibit 4: Quarterly Pipeline Report & Mapping—detailed [**Dischinger**]
5. Exhibit 5: Annual Capital Processing [**Dischinger**]
6. Exhibit 6: CAC's CIP Priorities [**Cohen**]
7. Exhibit 7: IPIC Comments [**Cohen**]
8. Exhibit 8: IPIC Proposal [**Cohen**]
9. Exhibit 9: M/O Impact Fee Allocation by Infrastructure Type [**Byer**]
10. Exhibit 10: Byer's PowerPoint slides [**Byer**]

DECISIONS

1. Decision 1: *Consensus*—Byer’s Rec&Park talk did not meet the purpose of the meeting: to inform/reconcile priorities & differences between the CAC and her agency. In the future, any IPIC person invited to attend a CAC meeting should be informed of the purpose of meeting with the CAC, to assure that the purpose is fulfilled in a timely manner.
2. Decision 2: *Consensus*—Staff should monthly inform the CAC of any issue which might effect this CAC and the Market/Octavia area as well as of any issues pending or acted upon by the BOS or commissions effecting our area. This report should become a standing item on all agendas.
3. Decision 3: *Consensus*—The current indirect liaison process does not seem to be as effective as needed. An efficient and effective annual CAC procedure should be established so that the CAC can be informed when making decisions and that any differences can resolved quickly with IPIC agencies requesting funding from our CAC, well before any deadlines regarding these projects.

COMMITMENTS, ASSIGNMENTS, INFORMATION DUE

<u>#</u>	<u>WHEN</u>	<u>WHO</u>	<u>WHAT</u>
1.	10/26	CAC	Submit to Dischinger questions for MTA to answer at next meeting.

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)
- √ Robin Leavitt
- √ Ted Olsson (Secretary)
- 0 Dennis Richards
- √ Marius Starkey

Ex Officio Members

- √ Kearstin Dischinger (SF Planning Department)

Others attending:

1. Matt Snyder: SF Planning Department
2. Alexis Smith: SF Planning Department
3. Adam Varet: SF Planning Department
4. Carly Rose: Storic Building
5. Catherine Grant: SFSU journalism student reporter
6. Lisa Byer: SF Park&Rec Dpt., guest speaker

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

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

- 2.1 See email from Mary Brown re DTNA forwarded by Dennis Richards. Sup. Chiu introduced two pieces of legislation on behalf of the Planning Department: 1) addressing/revising Article 2 of the Planning Department ordinance; 2) legislation regarding the Northeast section. Our CAC will receive a briefing on these at next month's meeting.
- 2.2 Cohen requested that the Department should be proactive in advising us on any issue which might effect this CAC and the Market/Octavia area. This was a consensus of the CAC members.
- 2.3 Olsson suggested that a monthly report by staff on any legislative/commission issues concerning the Market/Octavia area be made a standing report of all future agendas. This too was a consensus of the CAC members.

3. Scheduling for November and December CAC meetings [act]

To avoid conflict with the holidays, it was proposed that we hold our November and December CAC meetings earlier. We will electronically survey members to decide on dates most convenient for a majority/quorum. Dates suggested were the third Wednesday in November (Nov.16) and the second Wednesday in December (Dec.14). The third Wednesday is impossible as it conflicts with the regular monthly meeting of the Mission Dolores Neighborhood Association. Tangentially it was mentioned that the focus of our meeting for this month and next will be CAC's recommended CIP projects

4. Approval of Minutes from previous meetings [act] (Olsson)**See Exhibits from previous meetings — Exhibit 2 (June 22); Exhibit 3 (August 24)**

The minutes of the June and August meetings were moved, seconded (Starkey/Gold) and approved.

5. Pipeline Report—developments in process; CAC project reviews [discuss; act]

EXHIBIT 4: QUARTERLY PIPELINE REPORT & MAPPING (DETAILED)

- Quarterly pipeline report and mapping
- Current month cases
- Potential projects for CAC review

Pipeline Report item 22 (2175 Market St., 76 gas station): The Planning Commission has not yet approved a proposed development on this site. It was mentioned that planners should consider where and why alternative-fueling and ride-sharing stations should be located in our area, since these are persistent trends.

6. Discuss and clarify CAC/IPIC collaboration and reconciliation for Area Plan Community Improvements [discuss/act]

7. Review IPIC responses to CAC priorities for 2012 M/O Community Improvements Program [discuss/act]

9. Next steps towards finalizing 2012 M/O Community Improvement Program recommendations for Capital Plan [discuss; act]

NOTE: At this point the above three agenda items were handled as a single discussion. Agenda item 8—Rec&Park speaker Lisa Byer—was handled subsequently

EXHIBIT 5: ANNUAL CAPITAL PROCESSING

EXHIBIT 6: CAC'S CIP PRIORITIES

EXHIBIT 7: IPIC COMMENTS

EXHIBIT 8: IPIC PROPOSAL

Dischinger asked us to look at these projects from an annual perspective about how to spend the impact fees (our budget can only meet 30% of capital needs) to enhance the MOP's goals for higher density and emphasizing mass transit for the area.

In terms of collaborating with the IPIC to reconcile their and our CIP recommendations, the IPIC report was a consensus effort. She urged us to consider which projects are fully committed to and funded by the city agencies. She encouraged our CAC to focus on those projects where the CAC & IPIC agree.

Gold said that the CAC has projects near developments and raised the question How does money go to many specific projects? Dischinger asked us to have some flexibility and to look at the CIP projects strategically, not confrontationally.

In referring to the various exhibits on this topic, it was mentioned that Lisa Byer, our guest speaker from the Rec&Park Department, will speak on the topic of Open Space.

Other city projects effecting our MOP area—**Market Street Project** (from the Ferry Building to Octavia Blvd.) and the **Van Ness BRT** (Bus Rapid Transit, from Mission St. to City Hall on Van Ness Ave.). These projects supercede the MOP, including along the Franklin & Gough corridors. Both have capital funding. The Van Ness project, which is farther along than the Market St. one, is competing for federal funding. The Market St. project does not yet have solid cost estimates.

It is possible that the Market/Guerrero/Laguna project is threatened; if it is not fully designed, it cannot be implemented.

Dischinger will arrange to have a speaker from MTA address us at our next meeting to help reconcile their proposed CIP projects with our CAC recommended CIP projects. Cohen suggested that we need to establish a reconciliation process between our CAC and IPIC agencies so that differences can be discerned and discussed early on, rather than at a late date. The process must be better thought out so that an efficient annual procedure can be established. This appeared to be the consensus of the members.

8. IPIC guest—Recreation & Park Department (RPD) staff [discuss]

EXHIBIT 9: M/O IMPACT FEE ALLOCATION BY INFRASTRUCTURE TYPE

EXHIBIT 10: BYER'S POWERPOINT SLIDES

Lisa Byer spoke to CAC about RPD's Open Space park plans and how they determine which parks to improve. However, she did not seem to have been briefed on the purpose of her invitation to speak to us, so she did not speak about the differences between RPD and our CAC recommendations for CIP projects. So, while her talk was informative, the CAC consensus was that

it neither addressed nor proposed how we can resolve our differences on these projects. For that to occur, we must: 1) invite someone else to specifically address our concerns; 2) have a subcommittee meet with the agency; or 3) have our staff liaison to IPIC more strongly advocate our CAC positions and facilitate these agencies meeting with us early to resolve differences.

Byers is the RPD representative to IPIC and works with Dischinger, our representative on IPIC. She informed our CAC about RPD's Open Space policy. Seven parks are involved in this plan, involving more than 12 acres of Open Space.

1. Margaret Hayward Playground (5.9 acres; \$11-13m)
2. Patricia's Green
3. Hayes Valley Playground (0.67 acres)
4. Page St. Community Garden (0.17 acres; \$0.75m)
5. Koshland minipark (<1 acre; \$100k)
6. Duboce Park & Milk Center
7. Page & Laguna minipark

After Byers' slide-illustrated talk, Cohen reminded us of the purpose of her visit: for her to present RPD's comments on our CAC CIP project priorities and how we could reconcile our differences. He indicated that, evidently to begin to reconcile our differences, CAC and RPD and IPIC need to talk directly, so that we could not merely listen to others and learn of other issues effecting their decisions, but that both sides could follow up on new information in that meeting seeking to move together and to find what our CAC would be likely to partially fund (such as her items 1a: the youth play area; and 1b: Hayward Park).

Gold mentioned that our Impact Fees (and, therefore, our budget) are dramatically shrinking, which encumbers a lot of our project. CAC has recommended some funds for Hayward Park. This is not just for parks but rather for Open Spaces. It is important for RPD and other IPIC agencies to understand that our CAC intends to spread our investments among many small projects benefitting neighbors throughout our area. She wondered if Rec&Parks has looked at how the anticipated increase of people will effect the capacity of the parks in our area. Byers will provide the overlay maps for these parks to our CAC. It was noted that Hayward Park is not directly serving our M/O area except for the freeway parcels. Little streets (e.g., Beaver) have a disproportional impact on their immediate neighbors but also benefit the whole city, not merely the neighbors. Our CAC wants more money from the Small Grants Program—1) Community Challenge Grants fund; 2) Community Opportunity fund—to support these immediate communities.

According to Cohen we need to be concerned with the next Five Fiscal Year period (2012-2016). About \$2m of our budget has been allocated for Rec&Parks expenses during these next 5 years. He recommended that we allocate \$100k this year and ~\$200k/yr for park community improvements for this period, leaving the rest of our budget to be dedicated to the Hayward Park. There was no consensus nor was this acted upon.

Dischinger will provide our CAC with Byers' digital slideshow and contact information. Dischinger also mentioned that MTA has asked to attend our October meeting. To focus on our CAC needs, Olsson suggested that we prepare our questions for the MTA and ask that they come prepared to answer these. All were asked to submit their questions to Dischinger by next week so that she could include them in the invitation to the MTA. Our CAC is particularly interested in the intersection at Van Ness and Mission. Our focus is on pedestrians, not on greening the intersection. It was mentioned that DPW does not plant trees; this is done by Friends of the Urban Forest. We are also interested in the Living Alleyways program. Since our recent grant application was not successful, we will reapply. Olsson suggested that we should encourage and emphasize citizen maintenance of these curbside gardens, since this seems to be a new trend in our neighborhoods. Perhaps we should learn from those who do maintain these beautiful improvements how we can recruit others and how we can partner them with these successful gardeners.

Several of the new Transit projects were mentioned: 1) Church Street from Market to Duboce is ongoing; 2) Polk Street is being developed for bicycles; 3) the Haight Street 2-way improvement has grown from costing \$2m to \$5m and they are now trying to find funding for the new design. Evidently the initial cost estimates were "weak".

The pedestrian amenities at 16th Street and Noe are also being focused on.

As a separate topic the CAC concluded the meeting by discussing what is included in funding the Program Administration for this CAC. Dischinger will try to provide the CAC with a more detailed

explanation of how this budget item is allocated. Four percent is locked into the budget for this purpose. Dischinger wanted our members to understand that all of our CAC's administration is subsidized by the Planning Department and other agencies; i.e., the MOP-CAC budget allocated for administration does not provide all that is necessary to support our deliberations. Dischinger will provide this administration spreadsheet and asked that our CAC members come with ideas and recommendations.

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

Because of a scheduling conflict, Leavitt asked if we might be able to change our meeting time to between 7-10pm, to better accommodate his attendance. All members will be digitally surveyed on this issue and the result reported to all. New meeting times, if agreed, will be announced and noted on the agenda.

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

12. Adjournment & announcement of next meeting

There being no further business and the time having expired, the meeting adjourned at 8:50pm.

NEXT MEETING: WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 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	Y			
Carmela Gold	X	Y	N	Y	Y			Y	Y			
Jason Henderson	Y	Y	Y/Q	Y	Y			Y	Y			
Robin Leavitt	Y	Y	Y/Q	Y	Y			N	Y			
Ted Olsson	Y	Y	Y/Q	Y	Y			Y	Y			
Dennis Richard	Y	N	N	Y	Y			Y	N			
Marius Starkey	Y	N	N	Y	Y			Y	Y			
Ken Wingard	Y	N	N	N	N			N	N			
David Winslow	Y	N	N	Y	N		RESIGNED					
<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/DEADLINES: 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