

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE
COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HELD ON THE
16TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2014**

The members of the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure of the City and County of San Francisco met in a regular meeting at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 416, in the City of San Francisco, California, at 2:00 p.m. on the 16th day of December 2014, at the place and date duly established for holding of such a meeting.

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

1. Recognition of a Quorum

Meeting was called to order at 2:16 p.m. Roll call was taken.

Commissioner Bustos - present
Commissioner Mondejar – present
Commissioner Singh – present
Chair Rosales – present

All Commission members were present.

2. Announcements

A. The next scheduled Commission meeting will be a regular meeting held on Tuesday, January 6, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. (City Hall, Room 416).

B. Announcement of Prohibition of Sound Producing Electronic Devices during the Meeting

Please be advised that the ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing of or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic device.

C. Announcement of Time Allotment for Public Comments

3. Report on actions taken at previous Closed Session meeting – None.

4. Matters of Unfinished Business – None.

5. Matters of New Business:

CONSENT AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Ace Washington, community activist; Dr. Espinola Jackson, Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP) resident

Mr. Washington spoke about being in a new era and explained that his purpose in being there was to find out and record information. He expressed his concern for the condition of the Western Addition and the Fillmore district. Mr. Washington asked the Commission to please not repeat what had been done before in the Fillmore so that generations to come would not suffer as those that had come before them.

Dr. Jackson asked Commissioners to listen very carefully about what was being said at the meeting and to make decisions on those items that they understood and to please not vote on anything that they did not know anything about.

- a) Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting of November 18, 2014.

Chair Rosales had one comment regarding her own comments on the top of page 10 and requested striking certain words, so that it read "She suggested a discussion..."

Commissioner Singh motioned to move Items 5 (a) (b) and (c) and Commissioner Bustos seconded that motion.

Secretary Nguyen called for a voice vote on Items 5 (a) (b) and (c).

Commissioner Bustos - yes
Commissioner Mondejar - yes
Commissioner Singh - yes
Chair Rosales - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT THE MINUTES FROM THE REGULAR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 18, 2014 BE ADOPTED.

- b) Authorizing a Second Amendment to the Disbursement Agreement with HV Partners 2, LP, a California Limited Partnership, to extend the outside date permitted for the Ground Lease Closing to December 31, 2014 and to modify certain provisions related to the tax credit investor, in connection with the development of approximately 107 very low- and low-income rental units pursuant to the Hunters View Phase II-III Rental Housing Loan Agreement, Middle Point and West Point Roads; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area. (Action) (Resolution No. 100-2014)

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 100-2014, AUTHORIZING A SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE DISBURSEMENT AGREEMENT WITH HV PARTNERS 2, LP, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, TO EXTEND THE OUTSIDE DATE PERMITTED FOR THE GROUND LEASE CLOSING TO DECEMBER 31, 2014 AND TO MODIFY CERTAIN PROVISIONS RELATED TO THE TAX CREDIT INVESTOR, IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF APPROXIMATELY 107 VERY LOW- AND LOW-INCOME RENTAL UNITS PURSUANT TO THE HUNTERS VIEW PHASE II-III RENTAL HOUSING LOAN AGREEMENT, MIDDLE POINT AND WEST POINT ROADS; BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA. BE ADOPTED.

- c) Authorizing a Second Amendment to the Legal Services Contract with Renne Sloan Holtzman & Sakai, a Limited Liability Partnership, to Increase the Contract Amount by \$50,000, For a Total Aggregate Contract Amount not to exceed \$100,000, to Obtain Specialized Legal Services. (Action) (Resolution No. 101-2014)

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 101-2014, AUTHORIZING A SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN & SAKAI, A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP, TO INCREASE THE CONTRACT AMOUNT BY \$50,000, FOR A TOTAL AGGREGATE CONTRACT AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$100,000, TO OBTAIN SPECIALIZED LEGAL SERVICES, BE ADOPTED.

REGULAR AGENDA

(Items 5(d), 5(e) and 5(f) related to the Alice Griffith Public Housing site were presented together, but acted on separately)

- d) Authorizing a First Amendment to a Permanent Loan Agreement with Double Rock Ventures LLC to modify source of funds, for the '93-unit Phase 1 of the HOPE SF Redevelopment of the Alice Griffith Public Housing site, consisting of replacement public housing units as well as other affordable housing units, 2600 Arelious Walker Drive; and Adopting Environmental Findings Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 102-2014)
- e) Authorizing a First Amendment to a Permanent Loan Agreement with Double Rock Ventures LLC to modify source of funds, for the 91-unit Phase 2 of the HOPE SF Redevelopment of the Alice Griffith Public Housing site, consisting of replacement public housing units as well as other affordable housing units, 2700 Arelious Walker Drive; and Adopting Environmental Findings Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 103-2014)
- f) Conditionally approving Schematic Designs for the Alice Griffith Block 1 development, which is part of Phase 3 of the Alice Griffith Housing Development, pursuant to the Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Disposition and Development Agreement and approving a Variance from the Candlestick Design for Development Grade Separation Requirement for two units adjacent to Block 1's main entrance; and Adopting Environmental Review Findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 104-2014)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Amabel Akwa-Asare, Assistant Project Manager, Hunters Point Shipyard; Jeff White, Housing Program Manager; Maricela Flores, Project Manager, McCormack Baron Salazar

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Ace Washington, community activist; Yolanda Lewis, Black Human Rights Leadership Council of San Francisco; Dr. Espinola Jackson, BVHP resident

Mr. Washington spoke about the historical perspective of this item and specifically about the involvement of the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA) and the San Francisco Housing Authority and how all the different entities, including developers and planners, were

involved in all the different projects but stressed that the residents themselves were not involved. He recalled that citizens used to sue the City to block construction activities because there were no safeguards until the discussion of litigation began.

Ms. Lewis spoke against the demolition of the Candlestick Park stadium. She pointed out that it stated in the EIR documentation that "alternatively" Lennar may use conventional demolition techniques in the implosion scenario. Ms. Lewis wanted to know under whose authority this approved this as an alternative. She stated that her organization did not believe that the proper authorization had been obtained, that this had not been approved, that the EIR report had not been completed and added that the community had not been involved in this decision. Ms. Lewis requested to see the permits submitted by the appropriate City departments and the analysis from the Air Quality Monitoring Board and the EPA, specifically where it stated that "alternatively" conventional demolition techniques should be used rather than what had been approved. She claimed that no one was taking into consideration what was happening to those living in the community because the implosion alternative would be in violation of the residents of the area. Ms. Lewis also spoke about racism and gentrification in San Francisco and how the City of San Francisco was notorious about violating the human rights of the black community.

Dr. Jackson was not in support of this item. She stated that she was present at the SFRA meeting when it was stated that the Agency needed to purchase Carroll and Arelious Boulevards in order to get \$30 million to build and expand Alice Griffith. She advised the Commissioners to get hold of the minutes from that meeting because she stated at that meeting that the area under question was landfill and toxic. At that time the Commissioners rejected the proposal until more information was obtained. Dr. Jackson stated that now things were being added as if they had been approved during the SFRA era; however, history cannot be rewritten. Dr. Jackson stressed that the area in question was not clean and was still toxic. She advised Commissioners to check the internet for discussions about Toxic City-San Francisco to be informed on this issue.

Commissioner Singh inquired about the term of the loan; inquired about the interest rate; inquired about why parking was not available for each unit; inquired about which residents would get the parking spots. He stated that he preferred one parking space for each unit and especially for larger working families. Mr. Singh inquired about garage parking. He stated that affordable housing units should all have parking as well.

Mr. White responded that the term of the loan was 55 years and that the interest rate would be less than 3%.

To the parking question, Ms. Akwa-Asare responded that the ratio was 0.5 so that every other unit would have a parking spot and that they were working with the developer to maximize that number, but this would probably not result in more than one or two spaces. She explained that it was common in San Francisco for affordable and public housing projects to have a parking ratio of less than one, and according to the code requirement for the site, one parking space per unit would be the maximum. Ms. Akwa-Asare added that there would be a massive investment in public transportation in the Candlestick area, so residents would be able to rely less on cars and use public transportation more. She responded that the discussion regarding the mechanism to determine who gets the parking spots had not been completed but added that sometimes it was by lottery and sometimes on first come, first serve basis. Ms. Akwa-Asare noted Commissioner Singh's comments about prioritizing the parking assignment process for larger units.

Ms. Flores added that there was street parking but as far as garages, the Planning Department wanted less cars, so as a citywide perspective, they wanted to maximize public transportation opportunities and minimize the number of parking spaces.

Chair Rosales recalled that the parking issue has been raised repeatedly by the Commission for a long time and asked Executive Director Bohee to add more comment to this issue.

Executive Director Bohee responded that there was a very large public parking garage which would be built in association with the Candlestick retail center with several thousand spaces. She stated that they had been constrained from a site perspective but this development was no different than any other housing project. She added that staff would take into account the delicate balance between the need for parking particularly for families and available parking spaces.

Chair Rosales commented that the larger households in particular would be in greater need for parking.

Commissioner Bustos inquired about whether the residents would be charged to pay in the public garage.

Executive Director Bohee responded in the affirmative and that it would be fee-based.

Ms. Akwa-Asare added that residents would be charged to park in the public garage, but not in the housing project at the Alice Griffith development.

Commissioner Singh inquired about how many parking spaces there would be in Block 1 at Alice Griffith.

Ms. Akwa-Asare responded that there would be 61 and that they were hoping to get to 63 spaces.

Chair Rosales stated that 61 spots compared to the total number of units would not be enough.

Commissioner Bustos suggested having a serious conversation with the MTA and the Planning Department about the new trend in San Francisco to systematically remove parking spots and to redefine what the Transit First movement really meant. He stressed that trying to get seniors or families with four children to go grocery shopping on bikes or on buses would not work. Mr. Bustos added that as a result of this trend, families with cars were taking parking spots away from businesses and that small businesses were suffering because of it. Mr. Bustos commended staff on their great work on this project, but stated that he was still frustrated about the parking issue.

Chair Rosales asked for an explanation on how development would line up with transit plans underway and how they would be interconnected.

Ms. Flores responded that Lennar Urban was the master developer working on the infrastructure and street stops.

Executive Director Bohee stated that there would be a transit stop directly in front of the housing development as well as an extension of the frequency of the existing MUNI 29 bus line for Alice Griffith residents. She stated that she would have to check on coordination timing with MUNI, but assured Commissioners that it would be ready. Ms. Bohee added that the master developer was already running shuttles on Shipyard hilltop to downtown, BART, and other locations in the interim, which would continue throughout the development period.

Chair Rosales pointed out that this was a part of the City that had traditionally been denied public transportation opportunities and which historically had had to rely more on cars, so the coordination between transit and construction had to be lined up and made available as soon as possible.

Ms. Flores stated that MUNI 29 bus line was already there, and the stop was less than a block away and that in addition there was a stop on Carroll and 3rd for existing light rail opportunities. She reported that this was all in development now and would make this information available at a future meeting.

Commissioner Bustos again stressed that families in Bayview and Alice Griffith that were multi-generational with senior members and young children most likely would not use buses or light rail because it was just too difficult to handle. He stated that as a result residents of those areas remained inside their communities and never enjoyed the rest of the city. Mr. Bustos expressed concern that the parking situation was making it harder for families to live in San Francisco.

Ms. Flores stated that they would take family size into consideration in this issue and would be happy to participate with the OCII in conversations of broader transportation opportunities.

Commissioner Mondejar referred to Lennar's irrevocable letter of credit and inquired about how much Lennar's contribution would be; inquired about what stage the relocation plan with the San Francisco Housing Authority was in; inquired about the nature of the responses; inquired about whether anyone was being evicted or adversely affected by relocation.

To the first question, Mr. White responded that the cost over-runs as per the July loan agreement approvals were estimated at about \$14 million. He stated that currently they had slightly improved cost estimates for over-runs for the two phases of \$10 million, which would be the amount of the letter of credit.

To the relocation question, Ms. Akwa-Asare responded that there were certain legal requirements regarding relocation plans. She explained that the plan had been published over a month earlier with a 30-day public review period for residents and other interested parties to have an opportunity to comment on the relocation plan. The review period had ended on December 9, 2014. Ms. Akwa-Asare added that all comments, questions and responses to the suggestions would be included in the final plan which would be presented to the San Francisco Housing Authority on December 17.

To the responses question, Ms. Flores responded that they had received about 40 comments from a variety of sources, including tenants, community entities, Bay Area legal aid, etc. She explained that a portion of the tenant comments had dealt with design rather than relocation issues. To the eviction question, Ms. Flores responded in the negative; however, she stated that Alice Griffith residents would have a right to return, but must be in good standing, which meant they could not have been evicted or be in the process of being evicted, which would happen as a result of not paying their rent. Ms. Flores added that the Housing Authority was working with households to make sure they remained in good standing.

Commissioner Mondejar commented that this was moving forward very quickly because the move-in date for residents was 2016, and that this involved not just preparing residents to move, but included the parking and transit issues as well.

Executive Director Bohee commented that the planning and development had been going on for a decade. She added that the process through OCII, citywide resources, and the CNI grant from the federal government was designed to prepare people to be ready for the move.

Ms. Flores added that they had a relocation plan consultant who was writing and consolidating the plan and added that they had been holding meetings every two weeks with a relocation committee comprised of residents and members of the Housing Authority, the City and herself since the beginning of the summer. She reported that during the last meeting, the relocation committee had requested to speak with the property management staff because those questions were starting to come forward. She agreed that much more still needed to be done by 2016.

Chair Rosales wanted comment for the record regarding the environmental concerns that had been raised and demonstrate for the record whether that issue had been resolved.

Executive Director Bohee responded that a number of speakers had commented on the proposed demolition of the Candlestick stadium, which had nothing to do with the Alice Griffith project, the amendments to the Alice Griffith Phase I and II development loans or to the schematic design. She reported that there was an environmental impact report with addenda which had been issued for the overall implementation of the Candlestick/Shipyard project, and which were currently available on the OCII website as well as on the Planning Department's website.

Commissioner Singh motioned to move Item 5(d) and Commissioner Mondejar seconded that motion.

Secretary Nguyen called for a voice vote on Items 5(d).

Commissioner Bustos - yes
Commissioner Mondejar - yes
Commissioner Singh - yes
Chair Rosales - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 102-2014, AUTHORIZING A FIRST AMENDMENT TO A PERMANENT LOAN AGREEMENT WITH DOUBLE ROCK VENTURES LLC TO MODIFY SOURCE OF FUNDS, FOR THE 93-UNIT PHASE 1 OF THE HOPE SF REDEVELOPMENT OF THE ALICE GRIFFITH PUBLIC HOUSING SITE, CONSISTING OF REPLACEMENT PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS AS WELL AS OTHER AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS, 2600 ARELIOS WALKER DRIVE; AND ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Commissioner Singh motioned to move Item 5(e) and Commissioner Mondejar seconded that motion.

Secretary Nguyen called for a voice vote on Items 5(e).

Commissioner Bustos - yes
Commissioner Mondejar - yes
Commissioner Singh - yes
Chair Rosales - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 103-2014, AUTHORIZING A FIRST AMENDMENT TO A PERMANENT LOAN AGREEMENT WITH DOUBLE ROCK VENTURES LLC TO MODIFY SOURCE OF FUNDS, FOR THE 91-UNIT PHASE 2 OF THE HOPE SF REDEVELOPMENT OF THE ALICE GRIFFITH PUBLIC HOUSING SITE, CONSISTING OF REPLACEMENT PUBLIC HOUSING UNITS AS WELL AS OTHER AFFORDABLE HOUSING UNITS, 2700 ARELIUS WALKER DRIVE; AND ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Commissioner Singh motioned to move Item 5(f) and Commissioner Mondejar seconded that motion.

Secretary Nguyen called for a voice vote on Items 5(f).

Commissioner Bustos - yes

Commissioner Mondejar – yes

Commissioner Singh – yes

Chair Rosales – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 104-2014, CONDITIONALLY APPROVING SCHEMATIC DESIGNS FOR THE ALICE GRIFFITH BLOCK 1 DEVELOPMENT, WHICH IS PART OF PHASE 3 OF THE ALICE GRIFFITH HOUSING DEVELOPMENT, PURSUANT TO THE CANDLESTICK POINT AND HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD PHASE 2 DISPOSITION AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AND APPROVING A VARIANCE FROM THE CANDLESTICK DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT GRADE SEPARATION REQUIREMENT FOR TWO UNITS ADJACENT TO BLOCK 1'S MAIN ENTRANCE; AND ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

(Items 5(g) and 5(h) related to Transbay Block 9 were presented together, but acted on separately)

- g) Authorizing, pursuant to the Transbay Implementation Agreement and the Option Agreement, the Executive Director to exercise an option to purchase Transbay Block 9 (Block 3736, Lot 120), located on Folsom and First Streets, from the City and County of San Francisco and to execute a Disposition and Development Agreement with Block 9 Transbay, LLC for a proposed residential project with 436 market-rate and 109 affordable units on Block 9, and adopting environmental findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Transbay Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 105-2014)
- h) Approving, pursuant to the Transbay Implementation Agreement, the schematic design for a proposed high density residential project on Transbay Block 9, located on Folsom and First Streets, and making environmental findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Transbay Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 106-2014)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Courtney Pash, Acting Project Manager, Transbay; Javier Arizmendi, Design Director, Skidmore Owings & Merrill (SOM); Sally Oerth, Deputy Director

Speaker: Ace Washington, community activist

Mr. Washington spoke about the history of San Francisco and affirmative action. He suggested they put something together for the community that they could have right away, like a construction internship, covering everything they do in construction. Mr. Washington suggested they let the community get involved with the planning and development of new building construction over several years.

Commissioner Bustos inquired about the 109 market rate units which were planned to be on the lower 21st floors and inquired about why some of them would not be on the top floors.

Ms. Pash responded that these were the below market rate (BMR) units and that this was consistent with the inclusionary housing policy and how the Request for Proposals had been written. She explained that typically in such a tall building, the affordable units would be distributed evenly throughout the lower floors. She reported that theoretically this could affect land sale proceeds and stressed that all of the land sale proceeds from this transaction would go directly to the TJPA to fund the construction of the Transbay transit center.

Commissioner Bustos pointed out; however, that the 20% were what made the 80% real; meaning that having the 20% affordable allowed the 80% to be built.

Ms. Pash responded that they would go together because it was one project. The RFP required that 80% of the units be market rate and 20% be inclusionary with no subsidy from OCII and the RFP had stated that if they chose to do an 80/20% project, the BMR units must be distributed throughout the lower half of the building. Therefore, she concluded, the developer was acting in accordance with the RFP and the inclusionary housing policy.

Commissioner Bustos inquired about how many of the 109 below market rate units would be on floors 19-21.

Ms. Pash responded that the BMR units had to be distributed evenly throughout the bottom 21 floors and added that, within the next 60 days, they would receive information regarding the exact locations of the BMR units. She added that the Executive Director would have to approve those locations, but assured Commissioners that they would be distributed evenly throughout the lower 21 floors.

Commissioner Bustos stated that this was about parity and being fair to all residents. He inquired about how many of the 109 units would have parking spots.

Ms. Pash responded that the ratio was a little over 0.5/unit, which was the same ratio as for the entire building, in a transit-rich neighborhood. She explained that parking was consistent with rental housing in the area and with citywide and Transbay policy. She stated that the maximum ratio in this area was 1:1 and the goal for this neighborhood was to keep cars off the streets. Ms. Pash explained that the reason they were building housing in that location was to create a transit-oriented development to keep people in transit and in order to limit the amount of cars in downtown San Francisco.

Commissioner Bustos referred to the 206 bike parking spaces and inquired as to why there were so many bike parking spots if the goal was to get people to use public transit.

Ms. Pash responded that the goal was to get people to use public transit as well as bicycles.

Commissioner Bustos inquired about how many parking spaces would the 206 bike spots create, if the bike spaces were converted to parking spaces.

Ms. Pash responded that the bike parking was stacked so probably not that many. She added that there was a minimum amount of bike spaces required in the development controls and that this project met that minimum.

Mr. Arizmendi responded that the bike parking was accommodated in the mezzanine, right under the ramp area, and that it would not be possible to park cars in that space. Therefore, he concluded, the bike spaces would not really be taking away from any potential parking spaces for cars.

Commissioner Bustos inquired about whether everyone would have access to the community room, fitness centers, etc. and clarified that there would be no separate entrances.

Ms. Pash responded in the affirmative for both questions. She pointed out that the schematic design packet showed there was just one entrance. She explained that the transition from the joint development project to the 80/20 project had allowed them to provide just one entrance as well as to provide more retail along Folsom Street, which improved the ground floor space. She added that the old joint development project had positioned the BMR units on the bottom seven floors only and that the new 80/20 project had allowed them to scatter the BMR units among the lower 21 floors.

Commissioner Bustos inquired about whether some of the affordable units would have access to balconies; inquired about whether the lines in front of the windows were metal; inquired about whether they would look like bars from the inside.

To the balcony question, Pash responded in the affirmative, presumably.

Mr. Arizmendi responded that the bars were metal shading elements which projected about six inches from the face and that there was a 2" space between the glass and the metal fin, so they would appear to be very light for the purposes of shading. He explained that they did not want this to look like an office building and that this was one of the elements that would distinguish it from a commercial building. To the bar question, he responded that the bars were spaced about 3' apart so they would be imperceptible, but would add a special character as an aggregate in the façade. Mr. Arizmendi reported that some of the windows were also operable.

Commissioner Singh inquired about who would be getting the BMR units and whether a list was available; inquired about whether they had any sort of authority for the distribution of the BMR units; inquired about the BMR price range. Mr. Singh then asked that all the people in the room involved in this project stand up.

Ms. Pash responded that the units would be marketed by Bridge Housing according to OCII policies, based on order of preference and then the lottery. She stated that they would have approval for the distribution of the BMR units. Within the next 60 days, the developer would present their distribution proposal to the OCII and OCII would work with them to make sure the distribution was fair and met the OCII's goals and policies for distribution. To the price question, Ms. Pash responded that the BMR units were priced for households earning up to 50% of AMI. She deferred to Mr. White for response on rental prices.

Mr. White responded that he did not have his income chart with him but stated that the rent for a one-bedroom unit at 50% AMI, which included these units, would be \$1100/month.

Chair Rosales wanted clarification as to whether the issues brought up at this meeting would come back to them for approval.

Ms. Pash responded that the only decision that would be deferred to the Executive Director was the one involving the exact location of the BMR units. She explained that there were conditions of approval as attached to the memo, which was typical for all schematic design, and added that other fine-tuning activities would be worked through with the staff. Ms. Pash reported that they anticipated going to the Board of Supervisors for the 33433 finding on February 3, which would be the last regulatory approval required from the Board of Supervisors. The rest would be directed to the Executive Director and conducted at staff level.

Executive Director Bohee added that for another project that had come before the OCII earlier, there was a delegation for the precise location of affordable units, in terms of comparability, type, product mix, location, distribution in a non-discriminatory manner, which were all baseline requirements of the policy as well as citywide policy. She stressed that what was not required was the equivalency of market rate finishes and she was happy to announce that the development team had volunteered to have equivalent BMR finishes to the market rate units on the lower 21 floors, and that the OCII staff had supported this.

Commissioner Bustos inquired about whether they would get a report back on the precise location of the affordable units.

Executive Director Bohee responded that this information would be provided in an informational memo to the Commissioners. She added that as part of the conditions of approval, the developer had to submit the exact locations within 60 days.

Commissioner Mondejar inquired about whether they would get a report back on the marketing and selection processes.

Executive Director Bohee responded in the affirmative, not just for this project, but for all projects. She explained that upon lease-up, there was a progress report for the residential project and then also an annual global progress report for all projects.

Chair Rosales inquired about when that report would be forthcoming.

Ms. Oerth responded that the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), which helped them in the implementation of the marketing obligations, would assist in providing that report 90 days after each individual project concluded its marketing, so it would be several years. She added that they were working on an overall OCII housing production report which would be available in early 2015.

Commissioner Bustos asked to see who was present from Bridge Housing. He explained that many years ago, people living in San Francisco had been forced out of the City and had received Certificates of Preference. He explained that those people were at the top of the list and that the Commission wanted them to come back. Mr. Bustos reported that many of those people had actually worked as construction workers on the buildings that were being built back then. He offered his help in this effort to bring people back to San Francisco and be able to benefit from the new development underway.

Chair Rosales concurred with those comments.

Commissioner Singh stated that he would like to see the report on who actually received the BMR units.

Commissioner Bustos motioned to move Item 5(g) and Commissioner Singh seconded that motion.

Secretary Nguyen called for a voice vote on Items 5(g).

Commissioner Bustos - yes
Commissioner Mondejar – yes
Commissioner Singh – yes
Chair Rosales – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 105-2014, AUTHORIZING, PURSUANT TO THE TRANSBAY IMPLEMENTATION AGREEMENT AND THE OPTION AGREEMENT, THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXERCISE AN OPTION TO PURCHASE TRANSBAY BLOCK 9 (BLOCK 3736, LOT 120), LOCATED ON FOLSOM AND FIRST STREETS, FROM THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND TO EXECUTE A DISPOSITION AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH BLOCK 9 TRANSBAY, LLC FOR A PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL PROJECT WITH 436 MARKET-RATE AND 109 AFFORDABLE UNITS ON BLOCK 9, AND ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Commissioner Bustos motioned to move Item 5(h) and Commissioner Singh seconded that motion.

Secretary Nguyen called for a voice vote on Items 5(h).

Commissioner Bustos - yes
Commissioner Mondejar – yes
Commissioner Singh – yes
Chair Rosales – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 106-2014, APPROVING, PURSUANT TO THE TRANSBAY IMPLEMENTATION AGREEMENT, THE SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR A PROPOSED HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL PROJECT ON TRANSBAY BLOCK 9, LOCATED ON FOLSOM AND FIRST STREETS, AND MAKING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

6. Public Comment on Non-agenda Items

Speakers: Dr. Espinola Jackson, BVHP resident; Ace Washington, community activist; Shirley Moore, Vice President of the Bayview Hill Neighborhood Association and Chair of Candlestick Point Neighborhood Committee; Yolanda Lewis, Black Human Rights Leadership Council of San

Francisco; Prof. Tompkins, retired Professor of Engineering, UC Berkeley; Eric Brooks, Chair, San Francisco Green Party; Dennis MacKenzie, Round the Diamond Consulting and Education and public school teacher

Dr. Jackson reminded Commissioners that there was a height limit in the City, which was voted in back in 1947. Dr. Jackson recalled that when they built Candlestick, they removed much of the ground from Bayview Hill and BVHP, which was the burial ground for the Muwekma-Ohlone tribe. She expressed concern about discussions of imploding the area and wanted to know what would happen to the remains that were still there. There had been no discussion on that issue. Dr. Jackson recalled that the Board of Supervisors had passed the local hiring ordinance but yet there was no state or federal certified compliance officer in any City department to make sure that the residents of San Francisco were getting the jobs and were being trained according to the local hiring ordinance that was passed. She stated that she had no confidence in the City when it came to its residents and she did not believe there would be any changes for the people that had been in San Francisco for many years. She advised the Commission to not be a rubber stamp for Lennar.

Mr. Washington spoke about the Western Addition and stated that he had become the Fillmore Corridor ambassador. He said that millions of dollars had been spent to put together the Jazz Preservation District but now things were going on in the Fillmore that needed to be addressed. Mr. Washington commended Tracie Reynolds for her help with issues in the Western Addition and stated that she would be coming to the area to speak to the community and answer some questions. He again asked the Commission to hold one of their meetings in the Western Addition in the near future.

Ms. Moore stated that she was a 20-year resident of Candlestick Point and lived on Ignacio about 400 feet from the stadium. She expressed support for demolition of the stadium but opposed implosion as a method. Ms. Moore reported that on September 19, 2014, an addendum to the 2010 EIR was submitted by Lennar to the Planning Department to change the demolition process from manual dismantling, the method which had been passed by all city agencies and the community, to implosion, which was in violation of the precautionary principle, a principle which was passed by the Board of Supervisors in November 2002 to protect communities from reckless decisions that could cause undue harm. Ms. Moore handed out a copy of the precautionary principle to the Commissioners and read the first paragraph of it. She continued by stating that imploding Candlestick stadium would cause irreparable damage to the residents, homes and wildlife in that area by flying debris which would contaminate the interior of homes and cause immediate environmental health hazards when inhaled. She reported that over 30% of the 9/11 first responders had died since that incident as a result of inhaling the toxic dust. Ms. Moore also reported that there had been no outreach to provide information about the demolition to the community and that there had been only one meeting so far on this issue.

Ms. Lewis commented on Executive Director Bohee's previous comment that the proposed demolition of Candlestick stadium had nothing to do with the items being discussed at the meeting and she replied that she was confused by that statement. Ms. Lewis clarified that the discussion was about approving money to build when there had been no determination about how to destroy and compared this issue to approving a car loan for someone who had no driver's license. She stressed that this was especially significant given the fact that no outreach had been done for the residents and that they were moving forward with an event before they had any right to do so. Ms. Lewis spoke about the parking issue and the disconnect which was evident between the City and the poor people of San Francisco. She wondered how one could park a car in half of a parking spot. She repeated the point made that this had been ten years in planning and yet there was still no parking plan in place.

Prof. Tompkins was not in support of the implosion of Candlestick stadium, even though he was in support of the project. He explained that the EIR had designated a mechanical dismantling of the stadium, not an implosion and reported that on September 19, 2014, an addendum was submitted for the implosion of Candlestick stadium without any public input and without the public having any opportunity to review those documents. Soon thereafter, he had been invited to a meeting at Golden Gate University Law School with Lennar and the Planning Commission to look at the destruction documents. He displayed a map on the screen for Commissioners and stated that the information submitted was grossly inadequate and did not reflect the conditions in the community. He stated that the documentation submitted was not based on any scientific evidence and that there was no math explaining the size of the particulates which would be scattered, as if the laws of physics did not exist in BVHP. Prof. Tompkins provided more documentation for the Commissioners to review regarding the health conditions of BVHP residents. He asked the Commissioners not to accept implosion as a demolition method for the Candlestick stadium without more scientific study into the environmental impact of this event.

Mr. Brooks submitted documents to the Commission and asked Commissioners to review them. The documents spoke about the danger and risks of implosion demolition done in an urban setting and stated that implosion as a method should be avoided at all costs. He reported that debris could extend 10-20 km downwind from the implosion site and warned that this type of demolition should not be done in an urban setting. Mr. Brooks added that mechanical removal would not only be safer, but would create more jobs and would enable the materials to be recycled and reused.

Mr. MacKenzie spoke about the EIR currently being considered between the OCII and the Planning Department for the Warriors Arena. He announced that he had recently submitted a proposal at the latest Mission Bay CAC meeting to be included in the EIR in order to create a high school classroom strategically located inside the arena in order to study the long-term positive social and economic effects of education and the environment on the next seven generations. The full-text of his proposal was available on his website, RoundtheDiamond.com.

7. Report of the Chair

Chair Rosales stated that she had no report; however, she encouraged Commissioners to carefully read the information they received regarding the Warriors project which was on the calendar for the next meeting.

8. Report of the Executive Director

- a) Informational Memorandum on the Major Phase for the Golden State Warriors Event Center and Mixed-Use Development on Blocks 29 to 32 in the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion)

Executive Director Bohee referred to an extensive informational memorandum on the status of the Golden State Warriors project and a document called the Major Phase document available to the public. She announced that there would be an in-depth presentation at the OCII meeting on January 6th regarding this issue and also that the Planning Department would hear a presentation on December 18.

Ms. Bohee referred to an informational memorandum distributed at the meeting regarding the demolition at Candlestick. She reported that this issue had not been calendared for the OCII agenda, but that public meetings were being scheduled on this issue. Ms. Bohee announced a public meeting scheduled for December 17 at 6:30 p.m. at Bret Harte, 1035 Gilman Avenue, at

the request of residents and community members with Supervisor Malia Cohen. Another discussion of this issue would take place on January 8 during the regular Hunters Point CAC meeting at 6:00 p.m. in the Shipyard trailers and another on January 12 at 6:00 p.m. This item was also calendared for discussion at the Commission meeting on January 20.

Ms. Bohee sadly announced the passing of two former colleagues:

Jennifer Entine Matz, a former director of the Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development, a former legislative aide and attorney, who was active in many facets of San Francisco life and who had a direct affiliation as a point person for the Mayor's Office for the Golden State Warriors.

Sam Sause, former husband of Helen Sause, former Redevelopment Agency Deputy Director, who helped build Yerba Buena Gardens, had been recently killed in an automobile accident.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speaker: Ace Washington, community activist

Mr. Washington commented on what Executive Director Bohee did not report, which was the situation at the Western Addition and the Fillmore. He respectfully requested once more that Commissioners come to the Western Addition to hold a meeting there.

9. Commissioners' Questions and Matters

Commissioner Bustos requested an opportunity to discuss the demolition event at Candlestick Park and have a discussion with Lennar about concerns regarding this upcoming event.

Chair Rosales added that she wanted to see what exactly Lennar had submitted to the Planning Department; wanted clarification on how that might be in conflict with what was presented to the OCII and OCII's understanding of their plans; on how that information was consistent or inconsistent with the environmental impact reports and documentation submitted; on what liaison role the Planning Department would play with the OCII before they took action; and finally, on whether approval would be determined by the Planning Commission or by OCII staff recommendation.

10. Closed Session – None.

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Rosales at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Lucinda Nguyen, Interim Commission Secretary