

Edwin M. Lee  
MAYOR



Mara Rosales  
CHAIR

Marilyn Mondejar  
VICE-CHAIR

Miguel Bustos  
Leah Pimentel  
Darshan Singh  
COMMISSIONERS

Tiffany Bohee  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE  
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HELD ON THE  
18th DAY OF OCTOBER 2016**

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 1:00 p.m. on the 18th day of October 2016, 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 1:07 p.m. Roll call was taken.

Commissioner Bustos - absent  
Vice-Chair Mondejar - present  
Commissioner Pimentel - present  
Commissioner Singh - present  
Chair Rosales – present

Commissioner Bustos was absent. All other Commission members were present.

**2. Announcements**

A. The next scheduled Commission meeting will be a regular meeting held on Tuesday, November 1, 2016 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 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 - None**

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

### **Agenda Items 5(a) and 5(b) related to Mission Bay South Block 3 East were heard together, but acted on separately**

- a) Conditionally approving a combined Basic Concept and Schematic Design for a new 119- unit (including one manager's unit) low-income rental housing development serving formerly homeless veterans and low-income families at Mission Bay South Block 3 East (1150 3rd Street) that is within the scope of and is adequately described in the Mission Bay Redevelopment Project approved under the Mission Bay Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report ("FSEIR"), a program EIR, and adopting environmental review findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 48-2016)
  
- b) Authorizing an Option to Ground Lease Agreement with MB3E, L.P., a California limited partnership and an affiliate of Chinatown Community Development Center and Swords To Plowshares for the construction of a 119-unit (including one manager's unit) low-income affordable rental housing development for formerly homeless veterans and families at Mission Bay South Block 3 East (1150 3rd Street) that is within the scope of and is adequately described in the Mission Bay Redevelopment Project approved under the Mission Bay Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report ("FSEIR"), a program EIR, and adopting environmental findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 49-2016)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director, OCII; Benjamin Brandin, Development Specialist, Housing Division; Greg Novicoff, Associate Principal, LMS; Kim Piechota, Project Manager, CCDC; Leon Winston, Executive Director, Swords to Plowshares; Raymond Lee, Contract Compliance Supervisor; Bob Nibbi, President, Nibbi Bros.

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Speakers: Oscar James, native resident Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP); Ambber Hall, Mission Bay (MB) Veterans Project; Del Seymour, former homeless veteran

Mr. James stated that he was in support of this project because it was about time the City started doing things for veterans. He recalled that Mission Bay was part of the Model Cities project which extended from Geneva Street to the 280 freeway. Mr. James explained that the 1970 MOU which was passed by the Board of Supervisors and ratified by the unions guaranteed that 50% of all the work would be given to residents of that area but that 100% of the work would be given to citywide firms, and Mr. James still wanted that to happen. He requested that minority contractors have first priority on construction and other jobs in that area and suggested that this be monitored. Mr. James wanted first preference for homeless and homeless families in the area so they would be able to secure housing in this development. He expressed great respect for Nibbi Bros. regarding their work to make sure minorities had strong participation but wanted to make sure the community was included in this project.

Mr. Hall, a former homeless veteran, stated that San Francisco had taken a long time to address the issue of homeless vets. He stated that thanks to Swords to Plowshares he no longer had to sleep on the concrete outside. Mr. Hall asked Commissioners to fund this program and this project and to fund as many more as they could because many more vets would be coming home from war.

Mr. Seymour stated that he had been a helicopter rescue medic during the Vietnam War and that even though he was fortunate not to have to fight in the war, he felt that his fight actually began when he returned home. Mr. Seymour felt strongly that vets should not be living in tents on the street. He recalled that in 1965 he was taken away from his home, his family and his education and his new Mustang, along with other vets, who all left without protest and they expected the same in

return regarding housing. He was on the Board of Directors of Swords to Plowshares, a Board of Directors member for another homeless organization, and was an advocate for the 7,000 homeless living on the streets of San Francisco.

Commissioner Singh inquired about the start and completion dates of the project; referred to the fact that there would be approximately one parking space for every 2 ½ units and inquired about where the others would park; he also inquired about public parking in the area. Mr. Singh pointed out that public parking was expensive. He inquired about what it would take and how much it would cost for each unit to have its own parking space; he also asked about whether there was a list of who would be getting these units.

Mr. Brandin responded that they were targeting the fall of 2017 for start of construction and since this was a two-year build, lease up would start in 2019. Mr. Brandin responded that they were getting more parking here than in many of the other Mission Bay projects. He explained that they had looked at the need for parking through discussions with Swords to Plowshares but were faced with the tradeoff of having either more units or more parking and went with having more affordable units. Mr. Brandin responded that there was public parking on Mission Rock Street and also metered parking on the street to the north and there was other public parking in the area. He pointed out how transit-rich this area was and that this would grow. Currently the T 3rd line ran right in front of the site less than ½ mile from Mission Bay North and the Townsend area and very close to downtown. He could not respond to the parking cost question but stated that the contractor would have that information and could provide it later.

Executive Director Bohee responded that they did have the list of the Certificate of Preference (CoP) holders who had top priority for this development, including the veterans. She added that they also go through an extensive affirmative marketing process where people applied through the City's system to ensure that the potential applicants had everything they needed to apply and be ready.

Commissioner Pimentel inquired about how the bike parking would be allocated.

Mr. Brandin deferred to the developer to answer that question since they were the property manager.

Ms. Piechota responded that they had 72 bike parking spaces for 119 units which meant that most households would have at least one space. She stated that they would look at the need for the spaces and would hold a lottery if more spaces were needed. She added that there was bike parking outside and they could use the courtyard as well, if necessary.

Mr. Winston stated that most of the veterans were seniors and disabled and they anticipated that parking would be more for the families and younger tenants.

Vice-Chair Mondejar was pleased about the 62 units for vets and 56 for families and that there were many two- and three-bedroom units. She pointed out that it would take two years to complete this project and they had 7,000 homeless on the streets. Ms. Mondejar commented that the grocery store was pretty far from the location and inquired about the large space in front of the building, and whether it could be programmed to include more neighborhood-serving small businesses.

Mr. Brandin responded that this space was the Giants parking lot which was slated for their seawall lot development sometime in the future. As part of this development across the street they would be building housing and a 10-story parking lot to replace their parking that would be lost to the development of their extensive surface parking lot.

Vice-Chair Mondejar asked for clarification that there would be some retail services from the Giants project that could serve the OCII project. She requested that there be additional parking spaces available at affordable rates for the families living in the OCII project.

Executive Director Bohee responded that 4<sup>th</sup> Street was the primary retail corridor, including restaurants and food retail slated for this area and which was less than half a block away. She pointed out that there was a Safeway a few blocks away.

Vice-Chair Mondejar requested more innovative ideas for parking from the developer. She recalled that in New York they had a stacked parking scheme and inquired about whether this could be considered for this project.

Mr. Brandin stated that they had considered the stacking scheme but had ruled it out because it would be too expensive. He deferred to the developers to respond to this question.

Ms. Piechota responded that they had explored the stacked parking scheme but the cost was prohibitive and added that there was also a concern about maintenance and safety because they had never worked with stackers before.

Commissioner Singh inquired about which tenants would be getting the parking spaces.

Ms. Piechota responded that resident parking would be assigned by lottery system.

Chair Rosales inquired about whether Mission Bay was part of the City's residential parking program, which was run by SFMTA, because residents of that program could apply for extended parking privileges. She added that anything that would allow residents to park in their own neighborhood would be helpful.

Executive Director Bohee responded that certain streets would be eligible for that program but because of the overlay of Giant's ballgames there might be other restrictions in place that the SFMTA would enact in both Mission Bay North and South.

Commissioner Pimentel stated that she did not drive often in the City and also that she had a child. If she had more than one bag of groceries, it became cumbersome to try to control the groceries and the child. Ms. Pimentel pointed out that metered parking would represent an additional expense for veterans and affordable housing families, which was not reasonable. She requested that they look for a way to offer affordable accessible parking so these residents would be able to drive.

Mr. Brandin pointed out that the action item before them today was the schematic design approval. He indicated that the development and design teams needed to move forward through two more phases through the design development and construction drawings still to come. He responded that staff could work with the developers as well as the design team to explore the parking situation and continue to consider potential solutions.

Chair Rosales inquired about whether the children from this development would be eligible for the child care center spots in the Mission Bay centers indicated on the map.

Mr. Brandin responded in the affirmative and added that they did have preference for those spaces. He indicated that there would also be spaces at 1180 4<sup>th</sup> Street, and the new Uber building.

Chair Rosales inquired about whether they knew how many CoP holders were veterans.

Mr. Brandin responded that the City's Department of Human Services had been compiling a list of both homeless individuals and homeless veterans. In order to create the priority list for referrals, they established the length of time of homelessness for the individual and a vulnerability index that indicated how likely they were to survive if they were to stay on the street. This resulted in a greatest need list, which was cross-referenced with the CoP holder list. If there was a match from the two lists, that individual would be elevated to the top of the priority list for housing options.

Chair Rosales assumed there would be no lottery system among the veteran CoP holders unless there were more veteran CoP holders than there were units available. She stressed that they at least wanted to house the veteran CoP holders.

Mr. Winston responded that he was not sure how many there would be on that list. He explained that there was a priority list that was required in order to secure the HUD homeless dollars and then HUD created a coordinated entry system using veterans as a trial. They went out on the streets and created a list of every homeless vet in the City, who were prioritized for risk and then those individuals were prioritized for permanent supportive housing, which was what these units would be for. He added that not every vet would need supportive housing but these units were reserved for those that did.

Chair Rosales clarified that this list was for veteran CoP holders at greatest risk and they would be first served.

Mr. Winston agreed.

Vice-Chair Mondejar asked for clarification regarding the difference between the CoP program and the HSH program and whether they overlapped. She understood that CoP veterans were first priority and HSH veteran referrals were second priority.

Mr. Brandin responded in the affirmative. He explained that there was some overlap but because these units were prioritized as permanently supportive housing, those formerly homeless veterans who needed supportive housing and who were also CoP holders would be given first priority for a spot in the housing.

Mr. Winston added that he would like it if veterans could be prioritized for the family housing for one-bedroom units, if they did not need the supportive housing.

Chair Rosales tried to explain that CoP holders that were at greatest risk were number one.

Vice-Chair Mondejar inquired about what happened to the other CoP holders then.

Executive Director Bohee responded that there were 62 supportive housing units for veterans with the highest needs at the highest risk who needed to get off the streets to qualify for the services provided by Swords to Plowshares. The balance was comprised of family units for CoP holders who had priority as long as they were income qualified. She explained that there were those individuals at highest risk identified by the City and then there was an overlay of being a CoP holder at the same time. But they did not anticipate that there would be 62 highest priority CoP holders who were at highest risk.

Mr. Winston responded that he was not sure within the homeless world how often the CoP program came into play.

Chair Rosales liked the design and commented that the color scheme was gentle and comforting. She inquired about whether this would be the actual color scheme.

Mr. Novicoff responded that it would be close for the Third Street elevation in the blue tones. There was a limited selection of colors that were available from the manufacturer in contrast to the unlimited amount of tile colors which were more open-ended.

Vice-Chair Mondejar suggested that City car share and/or other car share organizations have one car stationed permanently at the project site so the families could take advantage of that service. She also suggested that Uber and Lyft have a special pricing program for families there and at other OCII developments.

Mr. Brandin responded that they could look at the City car share option. He thought there were already some car share spaces in that area and would check on those specific locations. He was not sure about the Uber and Lyft special pricing options.

Commissioner Pimentel inquired about whether it could be part of the Warriors community benefit program to offer a special sticker for these residents because there were specific restrictions prohibiting parking for residents.

Executive Director Bohee responded that there were community outreach programs. She explained that the Warriors obligations fell under the Mission Bay South OPA.

Chair Rosales referred to slide 34 and to the breakout of MBE and WBE from SBE. Inquired about whether the MBE and WBE numbers were contained within the SBE numbers.

Mr. Brandin deferred to Mr. Lee to respond to that question.

Mr. Lee responded in the affirmative, and clarified that this was not a breakdown but an accumulation of numbers.

Chair Rosales inquired about whether they could in the future have the San Francisco SBE numbers broken down so that they could see the MWBE numbers broken out within that. Ms. Rosales requested hearing from contractors and developers about what efforts they were making to increase the SBE numbers on the construction side as well as exploring joint venture opportunities.

Mr. Nibbi responded that their firm had active joint ventures ongoing at the General Contractor (GC) level and gave as an example a joint venture with Michael Baines at Alice Griffith. He explained that they were looking to build capacity with subcontractors through either pairing them up with larger subcontractors or breaking out specific work for SBE subcontractors to be involved with. He added that they had recently done this on concrete, framing, fire protection, drywall, paint, electrical and some other projects and it was helping them to grow and build capacity.

Chair Rosales inquired about whether Nibbi Bros. had an established mentor-protégé program.

Mr. Nibbi responded in the affirmative and added that he was personally mentoring a small glass contractor and that other people in his company were mentoring a janitorial company and an earthwork company.

Vice-Chair Mondejar motioned to move Item 5(a) and Commissioner Singh seconded that motion.

Secretary Guerra called for a voice vote on Item 5(a).

Commissioner Bustos - absent

Vice-Chair Mondejar – yes

Commissioner Pimentel - yes

Commissioner Singh - yes

Chair Rosales - yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION No. 48-2016, CONDITIONALLY APPROVING A COMBINED BASIC CONCEPT AND SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR A NEW 119- UNIT (INCLUDING ONE MANAGER'S UNIT) LOW-INCOME RENTAL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT SERVING FORMERLY HOMELESS VETERANS AND LOW-INCOME FAMILIES AT MISSION BAY SOUTH BLOCK 3 EAST (1150 3RD STREET) THAT IS WITHIN THE SCOPE OF AND IS ADEQUATELY DESCRIBED IN THE MISSION BAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT APPROVED UNDER THE MISSION BAY FINAL SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ("FSEIR"), A PROGRAM EIR, AND ADOPTING

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Commissioner Singh motioned to move Item 5(b) and Vice-Chair Mondejar seconded that motion.

Secretary Guerra called for a voice vote on Item 5(b).

Commissioner Bustos - absent  
Vice-Chair Mondejar – yes  
Commissioner Pimentel - yes  
Commissioner Singh - yes  
Chair Rosales - yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION No. 49-2016, AUTHORIZING AN OPTION TO GROUND LEASE AGREEMENT WITH MB3E, L.P., A CALIFORNIA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP AND AN AFFILIATE OF CHINATOWN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CENTER AND SWORDS TO PLOWSHARES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 119-UNIT (INCLUDING ONE MANAGER'S UNIT) LOW-INCOME AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING DEVELOPMENT FOR FORMERLY HOMELESS VETERANS AND FAMILIES AT MISSION BAY SOUTH BLOCK 3 EAST (1150 3RD STREET) THAT IS WITHIN THE SCOPE OF AND IS ADEQUATELY DESCRIBED IN THE MISSION BAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT APPROVED UNDER THE MISSION BAY FINAL SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ("FSEIR"), A PROGRAM EIR, AND ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

**Agenda Items 5(c) and 5(d) related to CalPERS were heard together, but acted on separately**

- c) Approving the CalPERS form Resolution Authorizing a Contract between the California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS) and the Successor Agency (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 50-2016)
- d) Electing to be Subject to the Public Employee's Medical and Hospital Care Act at an Equal Amount for Employees and Annuitants (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 51-2016)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director, OCII; Bree Mawhorter, Deputy Director, Finance & Administration

**PUBLIC COMMENT - None**

Commissioner Singh inquired about how OCII provided their pension plan and whether OCII was part of the City pension plan.

Ms. Mawhorter responded that the City provides pension benefits to its employees through a city-run pension plan called SFERS (San Francisco Employee Retirement System) and that SFERS benefits were codified under local San Francisco law. She explained that OCII receives its benefits through CalPERS (California Public Employees Retirement System), the benefits of which are codified under state law.

Vice-Chair Mondejar motioned to move Items 5(c) and 5(d) and Commissioner Pimentel seconded that motion.

Secretary Guerra called for a voice vote on Items 5(c) and 5(d).

Commissioner Bustos - absent  
Vice-Chair Mondejar – yes  
Commissioner Pimentel - yes

Commissioner Singh - yes  
Chair Rosales - yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION No. 50-2016, APPROVING THE CALPERS FORM RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A CONTRACT BETWEEN THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM (CALPERS) AND THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY, BE ADOPTED.

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION No. 51-2016, ELECTING TO BE SUBJECT TO THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEE'S MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL CARE ACT AT AN EQUAL AMOUNT FOR EMPLOYEES AND ANNUITANTS, BE ADOPTED.

- e) Workshop on the 2016 First and Second Quarter Community Benefits Report for the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 1 and Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Disposition and Development Agreements; Hunters Point Shipyard and Bayview Hunters Point-Redevelopment Project Areas (Discussion)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director, OCII; La Shon Walker, Five Point; Kasheica McKinney, Assistant Project Manager, Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point

### **Public Comment**

Speakers: Ollie B'Lanton; Kenneth Carbin, co-owner of CK Interiors; Marcus Tartt, Director, Renaissance Entrepreneurship Center, Bayview; Joi Jackson-Morgan, Executive Director, 3<sup>rd</sup> Street Youth Center & Clinic, BV; James Mabrey, Owner, Your All day Everyday Janitorial Services; Sister Lilly, Immaculate Conception Academy; Catherine Sneed, San Francisco Sheriff's Department and the Garden Project; Oscar James, native resident, BVHP; Ari Coleman, BV resident; Linda Richardson, BV resident; Roberta Achtenberg, Consultant, Lennar Urban; Vincent Harris, Sr. Supervisor, The Garden Project; Dr. Veronica Hunnicutt, Chair, Shipyard CAC

Ms. B'Lanton stated that she was a veteran and owned a painting company started in 2009. She reported that because of the CAP program, she was able to attend classes and learn about how to run a business and was very grateful to be able to be part of the program.

Mr. Carbin stated that he had started his company about five years ago and made the transition from skilled laborer to business owner, which was difficult, especially in the administrative area, which included dealing with taxes and payroll. He thanked the CAP office and Renaissance for help mentoring his company and teaching him how to run his business, including the administrative part.

Mr. Tartt thanked OCII for their time and support. He spoke about construction being challenging and how to address the issue of capacity, which was a big issue for contractors, and which they addressed at Renaissance through their mentorship program. Mr. Tartt reported that Nibbi Bros., Turner Construction, Cahill, Clark Construction and Herrera Bolt had served as mentors for them in the mentoring program, which was run for local contractors. They served 99.9% minority contractors in the BVHP community and the program helped them build capacity by giving insight as prime contractors to the smaller contractors. Their services included comprehensive business support services, training, peer support, mentorship, networking and technical assistance. One of the solutions to the capacity issue was being able to offer smaller projects so that the subcontractors could secure that work and grow from there. He urged OCII to continue to support their center. He reported that Lennar had been an outstanding partner.

Ms. Jackson-Morgan stated that she was a proud ICA graduate and a second generation Bayview native. She spoke about the health corps program which was an allied health bridge program with San Francisco State, City College, Skyline, UCSF and Walgreens. She explained that this program was for middle ground youth looking for a career in the health industry, but not at the MD or



nursing level. Target ages were 16-24 in the Southeast sector but they were open to youth from all over. Students received CPR and reproductive health certification. The program paid their school fees, and students received intense case management, a mentor, were offered internships at UCSF or San Francisco General, and if they went into the pharmacy tech program at City College, they were guaranteed a job at Walgreens. The program focused on careers and they talked to students about being x-ray technicians and other career opportunities and took them on field trips to labs and hospitals to be able to meet and talk to people in the field for exposure and opportunity. Ms. Jackson-Morgan reported that 63 people had been through their program in the last year, broken down as follows: 71% female, 29% male, 63% African-American, 20% Latino, 5% Asian or Pacific Islander; overall, 98% minority. She added that 64% were from Bayview, 100% from district 10 and was very proud to report that 71% of students were currently enrolled in college. She was very pleased to have Five Point as a partner in getting their participants in college. Ms. Jackson-Morgan relayed a success story about one participant who was now an EMT and working on becoming an ER doctor.

Mr. Mabrey stated that he was a second generation business owner at Bayview Hunters Point and hired men and women from Bayview Hunters Point District 10 to work for his company. He explained that he had benefitted from support from Lennar, as well as the CAP program and Renaissance, both of which provided him with technical and administrative assistance, software, and consulting to help him to be able to do business with larger GC's like Nibbi Bros. and Cahill. Those companies had hired his company to work at Block 49 in the Hunters Point Shipyard, Blocks 56 & 57 and other large projects as a result of Lennar's attempts to build capacity. Mr. Mabrey reported that he had started small six years ago and wanted to hire youth that did not want to work in heavy construction. Now he had 10 employees and office assistants and was still building capacity as an SBE and MBE certified business. He added that they were still working with the Lennar mentor-protege program starting with Herrera Bolt as a mentor and now Nibbi Bros. Renaissance had given him small business support and the CAP program put him in direct contact with GC's to be able to negotiate and win contracts. Mr. Mabrey was in support of these programs.

Sister Lilly explained that her academy was an all-girls college prep Catholic high school that had been in existence for 133 years. She explained that students worked at corporate entry-level jobs to pay for tuition while also completing a full college-prep curriculum and that 100% of their students went on to college. The way the program worked was that four students--a freshman, sophomore, junior and senior--shared a clerical position and job share one day a week and five days/month. Students worked at law firms, banks, hospitals, TV stations, construction companies, etc. Sister Lilly explained that her job was to find work for the students and she cold-called companies using the Business Times and online services. One day she got in touch with Kofi Bonner at Five Point and told him what she was trying to do. He put her in touch with La Shon Walker, who came and visited the school. As it turned out, the Five Point office was not a good fit because they were dealing with teenagers who needed mentors. However, as a result, Five Point over the past two years, had been donating \$25,000 for uniforms for their students. Sister Lilly stated that they needed more people and companies like Five Point to help them. She announced that if anybody wanted to hire their students to please contact her.

Ms. Sneed had been working since 1980 at the Sheriff's office and she believed that they had made a contribution to the City with their work. She reported that Ms. Achtenberg was her former teacher. Ms. Sneed indicated that her office has hired many people over the years, including teenagers over the past five years to work all over the City and gave specific examples of people who have worked with them during their partnership with Lennar.

Mr. James was happy to see so many people come forward and speak about the benefits that Lennar/Five Point had provided to Bayview Hunters Point and to the City. He felt that the community should support Five Point because they hired people from the community and gave them opportunities to become contractors and hold other job positions. Mr. James stressed that it was important for a contractor to build its bonding capacity by meeting payroll and hoped that was being done at Bayview Hunters Point so small contractors had the ability to be secure and stand

on their own when Lennar left. He felt there was a need to hire people to go door to door to let residents know about the CAC meetings.

Ms. Coleman stressed how important this program was because the community needed these jobs. She reported that she didn't see as many men hanging out because now they were working and not littering anymore. Ms. Coleman stressed that projects like the Gardening project or the Tenderloin Clean-up project led to civility and self-respect. Jobs gave people something to look forward to and mornings were different now because you could see people getting up and going about their business. She reported that there were still a lot of barriers in their community; however, all the community support allowed people to get ahead. She asked OCII to continue supporting and funding these projects.

Ms. Richardson inquired about how many times people from the community had come forward to speak before the Commission. She pointed out that the Hunters Point project at Candlestick Point, the largest project in San Francisco, was the only project that had met and exceeded the goals for hiring and SBE. Ms. Richardson stressed that a tremendous amount of work was going on at the project and now they needed to look carefully at the comprehensive community benefit report, which should reflect all that good work and which was still part of this development. Ms. Richardson indicated that if OCII would not do this, then the CAC could do it.

Ms. Achtenberg stated that she had been a community development consultant for Lennar Urban for almost 10 years and worked with staff to assist them in developing their approach to the discharge of the community benefit agreements that Lennar has undertaken over the years in order to try to bring the breadth of knowledge that she had been privy to and to bring the best practices to bear. She spoke about the CCBA Implementation Committee that worked with the San Francisco Foundation and stated that with input from Lennar, they discharged the duties that they had undertaken with respect to the affordable housing commitments and the workforce training commitments set out under that program. Ms. Achtenberg explained that, along with Dr. Hunnicutt, she had been on the implementation committee from the outset. She acknowledged that disbursement of the community benefit funds was going slowly; nonetheless, each of the grants put forward by the committee had been up to the highest standard and done properly through the San Francisco Foundation, awarded consistently and results were being achieved. Ms. Achtenberg reported that the Committee was about to award as much as \$800,000 in career advancement grants that would be available in January. She was very proud of her association with Lennar and the work that the committee had done. Ms. Achtenberg acknowledged that it had taken time to get up and running but they were eager to be able to brief OCII about their work, progress and schedule in detail over the next year.

Mr. Harris stated that he was very happy working with Ms. Sneed and that the Garden project was greatly needed. He felt that without projects like this one, San Francisco would end up being a city without any color. Mr. Harris indicated that he had been in San Francisco since 1966 and the City's help was greatly appreciated, especially for African-Americans living in the City. Mr. Harris stated that he was seeing lots of construction projects in the City but did not see many blacks working on those projects. He thanked the Commission for all their hard work.

Dr. Hunnicutt stated that the volunteer organization Shipyard CAC had been in existence for over 30 years. Their goal was to work collaboratively with the City and the developer to convey the intentions of the community and to ensure that the community benefits from this development benefitted the Bayview community and San Francisco residents. She stated that the current report presented by OCII staff fell short of what the CAC knew about the various programs in the Community Benefit Agreement. Dr. Hunnicutt indicated that the report lacked pertinent information about the stakeholders, the areas of jurisdiction, who was working on what and who was responsible for implementing which programs. She stressed that the report did not tell the entire story. The CAC had not been kept informed of the key issues raised in the report, even though it was a partner in the implementation of the community benefits, and this was unacceptable. This report could not possibly be taken as a good faith effort by OCII. Dr. Hunnicutt reported that a year ago she asked OCII to hold a public hearing on the community benefits with no response to that

request to date. She stressed that it was time for OCII to get serious about finding out what was involved in the Community Benefits Agreement because these bits and pieces of information were doing a great disservice to all the hard work done by the parties. All the issues raised in the report needed to be looked at and resolved at CAC meetings. Dr. Hunnicutt indicated that there was a huge demand for Shipyard housing and that at a recent CAC meeting there were huge issues brought before the committee by community members. Dr. Hunnicutt requested that OCII hold an all-out workshop or summit in the Bayview to review the entire community benefits package where all the stakeholders could be present to shed some light on the program, including the Implementation Committee, which was holding and controlled millions of dollars which were not being spent.

Commissioner Singh stated that Commissioners should visit the Bayview project site or hold a meeting there to witness what was going on. He inquired about what Lennar's affiliation was with the Immaculate Conception Academy; he inquired about how many years it would take to complete the buildout. Mr. Singh commended Five Point on their good work.

Ms. Walker responded that Immaculate Conception Academy was an all-girl Catholic school located in the Mission and that many District 10 girls attended the school. She explained that the school had changed orders within the Church and even though the tuition had been reduced, many of the families could not afford the tuition. Sister Lilly came to Lennar to try to get their girls into the internship program, which turned out not to be a good fit for them. However, because there were so many District 10 girls attending the school, Lennar decided to help by providing school uniforms to help mitigate barriers for families. She responded that it would take 20 years to complete the project.

Commissioner Pimentel pointed out that this was the largest project in the City and stressed that public communication about the meetings and project programs was needed. She referred to the workshops Lennar had held, such as a meeting with 1300 Bayview residents to hear their issues. She stated that people needed to know about the uniform payment program because if more people knew about that program, it might help to get more girls into that school. Ms. Pimentel indicated that many people did not know about the project and programs and that community benefits were designed to help community members and keep them in the Bayview. She urged holding a public workshop in the BV for more communication and information.

Chair Rosales referred to a community meeting calendar that was supposed to be ongoing, even though they had not done this because they were down to only three commissioners for a while.

Vice-Chair Mondejar was happy to hear about the community benefits programs and from all the people who had benefitted from these programs. However, she felt there were many items that were missing and requested a more comprehensive report as well as sustainability information about these programs after the project was finished. Specifically, Ms. Mondejar requested information about who was receiving these benefits, how much they were receiving, and how these decisions were being made. She referred to slide 16 of the developer's obligations regarding the job training and employee assistance program, but indicated that there were no details. She referred to a shortfall presented in the presentation but there was no detailed information, just summaries. Ms. Mondejar stated that it was great to see the big picture but details were needed not only for OCII but for the community as well.

Ms. McKinney responded that OCII was responsible for obtaining the information from the developer, which was what they were reporting on--how these dollars had been expended, tracked and spent with the various Community Based Organizations. She deferred to the developer representative for more detail.

Ms. Walker stated that, as she had mentioned during her presentation, they had a plan to accelerate their job training spending per the DDA, which had not included any provision for the years on the project when there was no activity. She acknowledged there was a shortfall. However,

they did have a plan which included the Garden Project, the 3<sup>rd</sup> Street Youth Clinic, and the Echo Center and provided a projected spending plan for the acceleration and the catch-up to OCII staff.

Vice-Chair Mondejar insisted that she was looking for more of a comprehensive report. She referred to the second slide regarding the business incubator space program without any dollar amount, a community health and wellness program without any dollar amount and a small business assistance program without a dollar amount. She stated that she would like to see the differences in amounts between the different programs. Ms. Mondejar acknowledged that this was a summary but a dollar breakdown with names of the recipients would be valuable. She suggested a spreadsheet or a quarterly report including expenditures and recipients of the benefits, which would be helpful for the community and the businesses in the area and which was more than just highlights. She inquired about whether it was a requirement for the developer to report the accomplishments in detail and if not, stated that it should be and be indicated within the DDA; she inquired about would happen when the work was completed and the developer left.

Ms. Walker responded in the affirmative and acknowledged that this was a highlight report. However, she explained that it was required that they give a more detailed report to OCII staff. That report listed the Phase I and Phase II obligations, defined those obligations and when payments would be due. Ms. Walker explained that some of the programs were left blank because they had not arrived at that period of time. The Community Health and Wellness program was \$350,000 to date. Her expectations for the presentation at this meeting was to give highlights only and not go into detail, but expenditures to date and explanations of what the particular benefits were and when those payments were due were in the detailed report, which was available. Some of that information was in the report at their last presentation in November.

Ms. McKinney responded that they had provided the report from the developer, which was Exhibit A attachment to the memo. She added that information about the \$58,000 expended by the developer was also available. She could request additional information but this report was meant to focus on the first and second quarters only.

Chair Rosales pointed out that there would be another report coming up at the end of October and perhaps there were some adjustments that could be made in order to reveal more detail and information. She was grateful that people came to tell their stories because that brought to light the impact of these programs and how they were benefitting the community. Ms. Rosales was in favor of holding another community meeting and thought their last meeting in the Bayview was one of their most effective because it involved an interactive conversation between Commissioners and the community.

Vice-Chair Mondejar stressed that some of the community at this meeting had come forward to complain that they were not getting enough information about the community benefits program and that it was the responsibility of the Commission to respond to that. It seemed there was a disconnect somewhere between the developer, OCII and the community about the level of detail in the report. Ms. Mondejar referred to slide 17 which indicated that the developer did not include language in contracts with consultants even though it was a requirement and inquired about how they were addressing this issue; she inquired about why they were not in compliance.

Ms. McKinney responded that they were working with the developer to bring them into compliance with the requirements of the DDA and that this was ongoing.

Ms. Walker responded that currently the contracts did indicate that contractors had to comply with all requirements in the DDA and the BVHPECP in general. She explained that they were being asked to highlight and specify information and add language specifically around the 20% requirement of local suppliers' purchases by the contractors. This involved a capacity issue on both ends for suppliers as well as contractors, looking at the capacity level of local area suppliers and the contractors that would be purchasing those supplies and the suppliers' ability to provide the level and scope of the supplies needed on any particular project. She reported that Five Point had created a suppliers guide provided to all the contractors and a suppliers website so contractors

could find appropriate suppliers. They were also hosting quarterly events to bring contractors and suppliers in contact with one another to encourage relationships and purchases. So they were actively working on how to meet this requirement and move forward with the project in a cost-effective way. Ms. Walker reported that currently they were doing an assessment of local suppliers and working on how they would meet this particular requirement.

Chair Rosales suggested that the end-of-October report be tweaked so that it captured the information at the level of detail that Commissioner Mondejar had requested. She felt that the more detail that could be supplied to satisfy Commissioners as well as the community members, the better it would be.

Executive Director Bohee responded that this was the developer's report and the scope and scale of what was included in that report was in the hands of the developer. She explained that the project benefits were immense and the developer, OCII, the CBO's and the partners in the room were all working together and that it behooved everyone to make it as robust as possible.

Ms. Walker responded that she would like to work with Commissioner Mondejar as an aside to answer her questions once she been able to review that detailed report. If there was still something missing, they could add or amend the report as required.

Chair Rosales thanked everyone who came to speak at the meeting and confirmed that they wanted this project to succeed. She recalled her trepidation about her first vote as a junior Commissioner on this project which had the impact of gentrifying an area that had truly been an African-American experience. Ms. Rosales remembered feeling that she could not say yes without assurances from the developer that all their promises were kept and met. She felt that this report was much better than she had expected. She still had more questions but felt that those would be answered in the future and perhaps at a community meeting. Ms. Rosales reaffirmed that her commitment was in community investment and that was the reason she was there. She felt that Lennar/Five Point was doing a good job and it was obvious that their work was having positive impacts.

## **6. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items**

Speaker: Oscar James, BVHP native resident

Mr. James stated that there was a multimedia organization called BAYCAT that was supposed to be included in the Shipyard project but for some reason was not there. He explained that BAYCAT worked with youth in District 10, Potrero Hill and the Mission and that they helped young people learn how to make movies, videos and films. Villie Wang was the founder of this project and Mr. James asked OCII to investigate what happened with this project. He stressed the importance for youth in that area to learn and be exposed to this industry. He commended Commissioners for their commitment to the community and for their dedication and support.

## **7. Report of the Chair**

Chair Rosales stated that she did not have a report.

## **8. Report of the Executive Director**

Executive Director Bohee announced the grand opening celebration that week of Pacific Pointe, the 100% affordable housing project that Lennar/Five Point had advanced in order to satisfy the developer's Phase One 50% AMI obligation. It was the first project by Young Community Developers (YCD) as a non-profit partner with AMCAL. Ms. Bohee reported that they had 12 CoP holders for this development and she believed it was at least 50% African-American in terms of the demographic. They would have the actual report later. There were strong job construction and professional services numbers. Ms. Bohee reported that Lennar

had dedicated that site to OCII to advance their inclusionary housing obligation. Everyone was invited later in the week to the grand opening.

**PUBLIC COMMENT** - None

9. **Commissioners' Questions and Matters** - None

10. **Closed Session** – None

11. **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Rosales at 4:28 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Interim Commission Secretary