

Edwin M. Lee
MAYOR



Marilyn Mondejar
CHAIR

Miguel Bustos
VICE-CHAIR

Leah Pimentel
Mara Rosales
Darshan Singh
COMMISSIONERS

Nadia Sesay
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
17th DAY OF OCTOBER 2017**

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 17th day of October 2017, 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 1:13 p.m. Roll call was taken.

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

Chair Mondejar was absent and Commissioner Rosales arrived at 2:35 p.m. All other Commission members were present.

2. Announcements

A. The next scheduled Commission meeting will be a regular meeting held on Tuesday, November 7, 2017 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

a) Approval of Minutes: September 19, 2017

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Commissioner Singh motioned to move Item 5(a) and Commissioner Pimentel seconded that motion.

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH TWO ABSENCES THAT APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 19, 2017 BE ADOPTED.

REGULAR AGENDA

b) Selecting Bridge Housing Corporation and Community Housing Partnership for the development of 141 affordable rental housing units (including one manager's unit) with supportive services for formerly homeless persons at Mission Bay South Block 9; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 38-2017)

Presenters: Nadia Sesay, Executive Director; Kimberly Obstfeld, Development Specialist, Housing Division; Margot Antonetty, Manager of Adult Housing Program, San Francisco Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (DHS)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Due to the number of speakers, Vice-Chair Bustos limited public comment to two minutes each.

Speakers: Corinne Woods, Chair, Mission Bay (MB) CAC; Toby Levine, MBCAC; Richard Lee, MB resident; Todd David, San Francisco (SF) Housing Action Coalition; Corey Smith, MB resident; Arlene Singer, MB resident; Peter Cohen, Council of Community Housing Organizations; Bill Brase, MB resident; Tony Robles, Senior and Disability Action; Theresa Flandrich, Senior and Disability Action; David Elliott Lewis, SF Police Department, Crisis Intervention team trainer; Ramon Quintero, Community Organizing Supervisor, TNDC; Dina Cehand, Madrone resident; Laura Foote Clark, NIMBY action; Ace Washington, community activist; Gail Gilman, CEO, Community Housing Partnership (CHP); Smitha Seshadri, Bridge Housing Corporation; Oscar James, native resident Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP); Joanne Abernathy, BV advocate

Ms. Woods reported that the CAC held three presentations on this project and opponents also had a separate meeting in May. At their Sept 14, 2017 CAC meeting, staff presented the recommended team and draft proposal. This was an informational item only and the CAC did not formally vote to support this. In general, Ms. Woods reported, CAC members and the public attending the meeting endorsed support of the affordable housing proposal into MB. However, concerns were raised about the design and how it would fit into MB, especially with modular buildings. There was some

impassioned opposition to this project. Ms. Woods reported that some people were opposed to housing for the formerly homeless, some were opposed to housing for those with mental health issues, and others were concerned about the quality and adequacy of provision from the supportive services provider. Safety and security were the main concerns. Ms. Woods wanted to ensure a good neighbor policy and ongoing communication between the providers, the developer, and the community about how this would all work, which would be critical to the success of this project.

Ms. Levine stated that the CAC was assured that a good team would be chosen. In the next few months, there would be meetings to organize the good neighbor policy and questions answered, especially how the residents would be treated and introduced into the MB community. Ms. Levine explained that the MB community had been under considerable stress lately, especially with traffic and the impending closure of the 3rd Street Bridge. Ms. Levine felt sure that if everyone worked together, they would be able to bring together a great project.

Mr. Lee's concern was that the approach and the decisions that had been made throughout the process were not transparent. He reported that when they bought their homes, it was not communicated to them that this project would be supportive housing. At first it was represented as affordable housing for sale and then changed to supportive housing. Mr. Lee hoped the community would be listened to, especially concerning design and security.

Mr. David was 100% in support of this project and happy with the choices made so far. He explained that concerns from the neighborhood were understandable; however, he noted that you didn't always get to choose your neighbors and everyone needed to be thoughtful and to be a good neighbor no matter anyone's income or situation. Mr. David had full confidence in the leadership in this project and offered the services of his organization, if needed.

Mr. Smith read a letter from a resident in MB South, Efrem Bycer, across the street from the proposed supportive housing site. Mr. Bycer was in support of the project. He stated that supportive housing would help with the homeless crisis in the City, would contribute to ongoing development of mixed income communities, and would help take one step forward to combatting poverty in the city.

Ms. Singer was in support of the housing but echoed concerns already raised. She wanted to ensure ongoing communication and support and encouraged CHP to have direct discussions with people already living there.

Mr. Cohen commended OCII staff in the process of this project and was in total support of this project. He recalled that 30% affordable was a very visionary goal at the beginning and asserted that housing for the homeless was part of the solution because the solution to homelessness was to provide homes. He stated that concerns by residents were understandable but felt that CHP and Bridge would provide well-designed and well-managed affordable housing and that this would be executed at the highest standards. He was pleased with the support by many different organizations.

Mr. Brase lived across the street from this development and he was opposed to this project. His concern was that their district, MB and the Tenderloin had received the bulk of the affordable housing and homeless housing in recent years. He reported that this one came as a shock because no one had advised residents about this and now they were hearing that another one would be developed down the street. Mr. Brase explained that they had expected affordable for sale but then it was changed to supportive housing. Residents had no option to vote on this at all.

Mr. Robles was in support of this item. He stated that many of the homeless were seniors, people who were once housed but displaced because of evictions; some with physical and mental disabilities. He felt that many of the concerns from opposition dealt with safety and security but he noted that having a home provided safety and security, which was a very basic need. Supportive housing was much needed in the City and that this project would help people in dire need of this kind of housing.

Ms. Flandrich stated that much of their work involved trying to keep people in their homes and to stop evictions, especially seniors and those with disabilities. She reported that she lived in North Beach and wished they could have more affordable and supportive housing there but it was too dense in that neighborhood for that. Ms. Flandrich was pleased that MB had the opportunity to provide people in need with a stable living situation and added that creating a mixed income development would be good for the community.

Mr. Lewis stated that he had been a resident of SF for 32 years and stated that as a trainer they taught police to talk, not shoot, and to deal with people in mental health crises. He reported that this would not be possible if it were not for the Community Housing Partnership (CHP). Mr. Lewis explained that he himself had been a victim of untreated mental illness and became homeless. CHP helped him with housing at the Iroquois Hotel which allowed him to begin to rebuild his life and turn it around, and he started volunteering for the community. Mr. Lewis was a supportive housing resident and was treated very well and he witnessed how it worked with neighboring residents. Mr. Lewis stated that CHP knew how to develop relationships with market rate (MR) neighborhoods while at the same time helping the homeless rebuild their lives.

Mr. Quintero stated that 100% supportive housing development had always been part of the MB plan prior to any MR housing development. He felt that they needed to do more to distribute the construction of low income housing throughout the City, so that it was not just located in MB or the Tenderloin. Mr. Quintero reminded everyone that people were being displaced by the housing crisis. As more high paying jobs were being produced, more low-paying jobs were also being produced and those folks needed a place to live as well. He reported that there was a co-relationship between MR development and the displacement of people of color. So this project was crucial in order to keep the City diverse and to provide housing for everyone, not just the rich.

Ms. Cehand explained that as a nurse practitioner, she worked with people with substance abuse and mental health issues, the majority of who were homeless. She was very pleased to know that some of these people would be provided with supportive housing, because that meant they would get a new lease on life. Ms. Cehand reported that she had been living at the Madrone since 2011 and has always been in support of affordable housing coming in. She explained that much of the fear she heard from her neighbors was irrational and she hoped that the fear would disappear as they got to know their new neighbors. Ms. Cehand wanted supportive housing built in her back yard.

Ms. Clark was in strong support of this item. She explained that the point about not seeing projects like this being developed in other neighborhoods was valid, but this was a reason to look for other sites to build affordable housing in order to keep neighborhoods integrated. Ms. Clark felt that low income people should be living in every community. She reported that recently passed legislation should allow the City to build more shelters and supportive housing and they should be looking at ways to use this legislation to develop this. Ms. Clark reported that she passed by people living in tents on her way to work every day which was not acceptable and housing needed to be provided faster.

Mr. Washington stated that black residents in SF were in a state of emergency. He spoke about Jim Jefferson, Justin Herman Plaza, public housing and MB.

Ms. Gilman was excited about this item for Block 9. She explained that their organization had been helping the homeless secure housing and become self-sufficient for the past 27 years. The 17 properties that they owned and operated throughout SF supported formerly homeless families, young adults (18-24) who had exited foster care, as well as single adults and seniors. She explained that CHP successfully owned and ran properties in the Marina on Scott and Lombard, the Richardson Apartments in Hayes Valley, and RCA in Transbay (TB). They considered themselves to be good neighbors and they understood that they needed to engage in communication with the community and build relationships. She reported that their residents also wanted a safe and secure home and wanted to be part of a thriving neighborhood and to be able to give back. Ms. Gilman reported that through their service, their residents reached a level of self-sufficiency, returned to school, retained an income and eventually left for other housing opportunities when the time was right for them.

Ms. Seshadri reported that Bridge had partnered successfully with CHP and Leddy Maytum Stacy in the past to provide supportive housing in TB that was well maintained and operated by CHP. She thanked OCII staff for recommending the Bridge team and was looking forward to working with the CAC on developing more successful housing on Block 9.

Mr. James was in support of this senior homeless housing and reminded MB homeowners that this property was a part of the original Model Cities. He reported that when supervisors came up with the idea to bring the hospital in, they split the districts and took it out of the area. Mr. James wanted to make sure that COP holders had first preference and that BVHP, Dogpatch and Potrero Hill residents, who were all the affected people, had first preference to move into any development in MB.

Ms. Abernathy stated that she used to volunteer for CHP and reported that it was a good service for the homeless. However, she felt that the real issue was whether the homeless were going to stay and for how long. She explained that some homeless people had mental issues and they needed help before they got into housing. Now was the time. Ms. Abernathy's other concern was that there was only one T-line into the community. With more people coming into the community there would be a need for more transit lines into MB.

Commissioner Singh inquired about whether they had a list of who was going to get these units; inquired whether these units were rental or for sale; inquired about the completion date.

Ms. Obstfeld responded that they did not have a list. She explained that any residents coming into this project would be referred by the DSHS and all potential residents would be entered into their new coordinated entry system and then be prioritized according to need. Ms. Obstfeld responded that these units would be rental, which would be for the initial lease-up and then ongoing vacancies would be filled by referrals from the DSHS. She reported that they were anticipating construction start in 2019 and completion within a year to 18 months.

Commissioner Pimentel inquired about the evaluation process for those residents with mental illness issues to determine when they would be ready to live on their own and also inquired about day-to-day case management; inquired about what happened when an incident occurred.

Obstfeld deferred to Ms. Antonetty for more details.

Ms. Antonetty responded that they already had a coordinated entry system in place for the federal subsidies and were currently implementing it for families. For adults in city-supported housing this system was in the process of being developed. However, that tool assessed people's needs, the amount of time they were homeless, and their interests in housing. She explained that the coordinated entry system would filter and streamline the way people entered the one system and got themselves registered and then the tool would prescreen in terms of whether or not they

needed permanent and supportive housing. Then there was a deeper assessment and after that the application went through another level of screening. So, Ms. Antonetty reported, there were several levels of assessment to make sure that people were prepared to move into housing. She indicated that there were house rules which would be similar to other lease house rules. Additionally, in order to keep the subsidies, there were additional house rules, such as the requirement to be part of certain services such as third party rent payment. In response to the incident question, Ms. Antonetty responded that property management would address any incidents to supportive services and they would work together to resolve any incident that might occur through due process.

Commissioner Pimentel thanked staff for the presentation and especially Mr. Lewis as someone who had gone through mental illness and been homeless and come out on the other side to serve as a mentor. Ms. Pimentel indicated that she herself had a disability and she felt that this project really had the potential to take care of people in need in San Francisco. The mentally disabled and the homeless needed help and they should not have to leave the city to be able to survive. Ms. Pimentel explained that supportive services made an impact on people's lives and helped them get back on their feet and back into school and work and life and then be able to give back. Ms. Pimentel recommended increasing their outreach and engagement with the community and meeting with all the community based organizations, tabling at events, creating partnerships with restaurants and coffee shops and suggest that they offer a gift card to new folks moving in as a welcoming expression.

Vice-Chair Bustos stressed that the good neighbor policy was crucial in this type of project as well as engaging with all the neighbors because now there were many people in MB. He described San Francisco as a large city in a small area and residents had to get used to having neighbors from all walks of life with many different issues. He stressed that in this city everyone had to live as a community.

Commissioner Singh motioned to move Item 5(b) and Commissioner Pimentel seconded that motion.

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH TWO ABSENCES THAT RESOLUTION NO. 38-2017, SELECTING BRIDGE HOUSING CORPORATION AND COMMUNITY HOUSING PARTNERSHIP FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF 141 AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING UNITS (INCLUDING ONE MANAGER'S UNIT) WITH SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR FORMERLY HOMELESS PERSONS AT MISSION BAY SOUTH BLOCK 9; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Agenda Items 5(c), 5(d), 5(e) and 5(f) related to the removal of P20 from the Mission Bay South Plan Area were presented together, but acted on separately

- c) Approving the Report to the Board of Supervisors on the Amendments to the Redevelopment Plan for the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project to remove an approximately 0.3-acre portion of Seawall Lot 337 known as "P20" from the Redevelopment Plan Area and authorizing the transmittal of the Report to the Board of Supervisors; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 39-2017)

- d) Approving the amendments to the Redevelopment Plan for the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project to remove a 0.3-acre portion of Seawall Lot 337 known as “P20” and adopting environmental review findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Recommending adoption of the Redevelopment Plan Amendments by the Board of Supervisors and submitting the recommendation, including the Redevelopment Plan Amendments, to the Board of Supervisors; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 40-2017)
- e) Approving the Sixth Amendment to the Mission Bay South Owner Participation Agreement to remove a 0.3-acre portion of Seawall Lot 337 known as “P20”; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 41-2017)
- f) Approving amendments to the Mission Bay South Design for Development to remove a 0.3-acre portion of Seawall Lot 337 known as “P20”; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 42-2017)

Presenters: Nadia Sesay, Executive Director; Marc Slutzkin, Project Manager, Mission Bay

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Corinne Woods, Chair, Mission Bay (MB) CAC and member, Port Central Waterfront Advisory Group; Ace Washington, community advocate; Oscar James, BVHP resident

Ms. Woods informed that she had been working on the seawall project for the Port for many years. She did not understand why it was taking so long to move this forward because it had been in the plans for a long time. Ms. Woods explained that both the MB side and the Port side knew that it made sense to incorporate this park into the seawall lot. She urged Commissioners to approve this item.

Mr. Washington stated that there should be something at this project to commemorate that a black man was instrumental in creating MB. He was concerned that no one was talking about the out-migration of blacks from San Francisco and that there was no mention of the Fillmore either.

Mr. James was in support of this item and wanted to speak about food courts. He was deferred by Vice-Chair Bustos to speak during Item 6 on his issue, as it was not dealing with the items in question. Mr. James requested that certain individuals stay for the Item 6 discussion.

Commissioner Singh motioned to move Item 5(c) and Commissioner Pimentel seconded that motion.

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH TWO ABSENCES THAT RESOLUTION NO. 39-2017, APPROVING THE REPORT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON THE AMENDMENTS TO THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT TO REMOVE AN APPROXIMATELY 0.3-ACRE PORTION OF SEAWALL LOT 337 KNOWN AS “P20” FROM THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AREA AND

AUTHORIZING THE TRANSMITTAL OF THE REPORT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

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

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH TWO ABSENCES THAT RESOLUTION NO. 40-2017, APPROVING THE AMENDMENTS TO THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT TO REMOVE A 0.3-ACRE PORTION OF SEAWALL LOT 337 KNOWN AS "P20" AND ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; RECOMMENDING ADOPTION OF THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS AND SUBMITTING THE RECOMMENDATION, INCLUDING THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS, TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

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

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH TWO ABSENCES THAT RESOLUTION NO. 41-2017, APPROVING THE SIXTH AMENDMENT TO THE MISSION BAY SOUTH OWNER PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT TO REMOVE A 0.3-ACRE PORTION OF SEAWALL LOT 337 KNOWN AS "P20"; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

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

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH TWO ABSENCES THAT RESOLUTION NO. 42-2017, APPROVING AMENDMENTS TO THE MISSION BAY SOUTH DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT TO REMOVE A 0.3-ACRE PORTION OF SEAWALL LOT 337 KNOWN AS “P20”; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA , BE ADOPTED.

- g) Confirming the issuance of taxable and tax-exempt refunding tax allocation bonds captioned 2017 Series D Taxable Subordinate Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds (San Francisco Redevelopment Projects) in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$158,000,000 and 2017 Series E Subordinate Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds (San Francisco Redevelopment Projects) in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed \$27,000,000, approving preliminary and final official statements and a continuing disclosure certificate, and approval of other related documents and actions; various project areas (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 43-2017)

Presenters: Nadia Sesay, Executive Director; John Daigle, Senior Financial Analyst

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speaker: Ace Washington, community advocate

Mr. Washington stated that the decisions OCII was making today would impact his great grandchildren. He spoke about Jim Jefferson and replacing the Justin Herman Plaza name with Mr. Jefferson’s name.

Commissioner Singh inquired about interest rates on the tax-exempt and taxable bonds.

Mr. Daigle responded that the current rate on the taxable bonds was about 3.5%, a blended rate for the entire bond and that on the tax-exempt bonds it was 3.6%. He explained that the reason the tax-exempt rate was higher was that the average maturity of the tax-exempt bonds was longer. The average maturity for the 2017D was only about 8 years and the 2017E was about 14 or 15 years.

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

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 43-2017, CONFIRMING THE ISSUANCE OF TAXABLE AND TAX-EXEMPT REFUNDING TAX ALLOCATION BONDS CAPTIONED 2017 SERIES D TAXABLE SUBORDINATE TAX ALLOCATION REFUNDING BONDS (SAN FRANCISCO REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS) IN AN AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$158,000,000 AND 2017 SERIES E SUBORDINATE TAX ALLOCATION REFUNDING BONDS (SAN FRANCISCO REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS) IN AN AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$27,000,000, APPROVING PRELIMINARY AND FINAL OFFICIAL STATEMENTS AND A CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE, AND APPROVAL OF OTHER RELATED DOCUMENTS AND ACTIONS; VARIOUS PROJECT AREAS, BE ADOPTED.

THE COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE RECESSED AT 2:48 p.m. TO CONSIDER ITEMS ON THE FINANCING AUTHORITY AGENDA.

Motion to recess was made by Commissioner Singh and seconded by Commissioner Pimentel at 2:48 p.m.

The Financing Authority meeting ended and the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure reconvened at 2:58 p.m.

- h) Presentation by FivePoint, the Master Developer on Candlestick Point and Phase 1 and 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard, on their compliance with the Community Benefits Programs for April through June of 2017; Hunters Point Shipyard and Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Areas (Discussion)

Presenters: Nadia Sesay, Executive Director; La Shon Walker, Outreach program, FivePoint

PUBLIC COMMENT

Due to the number of speakers, Vice-Chair Bustos limited public comment to two minutes each.

Speakers: Dorothy Kelley, Bayview (BV) resident; Michael Franklin, Anchor Program; Joi Jackson-Morgan, Executive Director, Third Street Youth Center and Clinic; Trashaughn Hicks, Third Street Youth Center; Marcus Tartt, Center Director, Renaissance Entrepreneurship Service, BV; Sister Lilly Fitzpatrick, Immaculate Conception Academy (ICA); Catherine Sneed, San Francisco Sheriff's Department; Timothy Waters, Program Director, Young Community Developers (YCD); Ace Washington, community advocate; Oscar James, BVHP resident; Dr. Veronica Hunnicutt, Chair, Shipyard CAC; Linda Richardson, BVHP resident; Charlie Walker, disabled vet

Ms. Kelley stated that she had been a BV resident for over 20 years and encouraged OCII to move forward with this project. She commented that the City needed more employment and more housing. There were more and more homeless families and something needed to be done. Ms. Kelley reported that her daughter worked for the City and was trying to get into this MB housing; however, she was being told that she made too much money.

Mr. Franklin stated that he was a graduate of the Anchor Program and commended it highly. He suggested that OCII support it more strongly. Mr. Franklin commented that the instructors were excellent; however, young people didn't know much about it because it wasn't advertised enough.

Ms. Jackson-Morgan wanted to speak on behalf of Health Corp., a new program which served ages 17-24 and with help from community benefit funds, they were able to send youth to college. She explained that most of their youth come from BV and in the past two years, they have been able to send 60 people to college. Ms. Jackson-Morgan reported that they work with SF State, Skyline, City College SF, and East Bay schools, such as St. Mary's in Moraga. She reported that these were students who didn't see themselves going to college but through this program they were able to learn more about the healthcare industry and obtain sustainable careers. Ms. Jackson-Morgan added that the program paid for childcare, school fees and books and students earned a stipend as well. She had brought a few students with her to come and speak.

Mr. Hicks stated that he had been a student at Health Corp. for two years. He reported that the program broke barriers for him because he had gone to City College but did not finish and Health Corp. helped pay for him to go back to school. He was an at risk youth at one point in BVHP and now he was looking forward to a future and a career.

Mr. Tartt explained that his organization provided comprehensive business support services, such as training, mentorship, networking, access to capital, peer support for small businesses and entrepreneurs in BVHP. He reported that about 8 years ago, with the support of FivePoint, they started their contractor's initiative, a program that helped to build the capacity of local contractors to be able to work on the Shipyard project. Mr. Tartt described how the program worked: if a contractor had capacity to work on a \$50,000 project, the program would help that contractor to be able to work on a \$250,000 project or more. This was accomplished by connecting local contractors with prime contractors in the community, such as Nibbi, Cahill, WebCorp, and Clarke Construction, who helped smaller contractors to build capacity. Mr. Tartt pointed out that there were challenges, however, because this all took time and sometimes it took too long for the contractors that had these contractual obligations to bring in the smaller contractors. He added that FivePoint had been a great partner in helping his organization to resolve issues with local contractors. Mr. Tartt urged OCII to support this item.

Sister Lilly explained that her school was an all-girls college prep Catholic high school that had been in existence for 135 years. Their students worked in corporate entry-level jobs to help pay the majority of their tuition while also completing a full college prep curriculum. Sister Lilly reported that 100% of their students go on to college. She explained how the program worked: each student worked one day/week; five days/month at TV stations, banks, hospitals, accounting firms, real estate, biotech, construction companies and other industries. These jobs allowed students to be in corporate environments that would not have been available to them given their personal demographics. Sister Lilly explained that in order to be in the program students must be low income. She explained that a few years ago she approached FivePoint and in particular, Kofi Bonner (Regional President, FivePoint), for jobs for the students. Unfortunately, that turned out not to be a good fit for FivePoint but Mr. Bonner still found a way to help the program by providing uniforms for all the students in District 10 who attended Immaculate Conception. Sister Lilly reported that over the past four years, that contribution has amounted to about \$40,000. She commended Mr. Bonner and FivePoint and stated that they had made a big difference.

Ms. Sneed stated that she started the Garden Project in 1992 and with support from OCII, Lennar and the City, they had employed over 2,000 teenagers over the past five years. She reported that this past summer they had a total of 243 13-15 year old teenagers, 143 of whom were boys. Ms. Sneed reported that earlier that day they had been working at Crescent and Putnam Streets and in three hours they had cleaned up weeds and garbage. Ms. Sneed indicated that they looked forward to doing more. She thanked OCII for all their support.

Mr. Waters was there on behalf of Shamann Walton (Executive Director, YCD) and explained that YCD focused on delivering workforce development services to residents of BVHP, District 10 and other areas of the City. He explained that they supplied clients with job placement services and helped them engage with diverse industries. He reported that they have been able to place their clients in construction as well as many other industry sectors. Mr. Waters reported that Lennar Urban had been a critically important supporter and partner in their success and in the success of the residents of District 10 in gaining employment in the construction sector. He explained that Lennar had provided significant financial support for residents, specifically barrier mitigation funds, union dues, initiation fees and tools. While YCD supplied the workforce readiness training, Lennar actually enabled residents to be able to gain employment by removing financial barriers. Mr. Waters stated that Lennar also continued to be committed and invested in furthering opportunities for District 10 residents. For example, they were providing the resources for a math academy to be able to increase placements in electrical and plumbing trades. He explained that applicants had to pass tests with heavy concentration on mathematics, geometry, algebra, which many of their clients struggled with. He added that Lennar had also approved a math emergence proposal. Mr. Waters indicated that Lennar continued to be a great supporter of YCD, BVHP and District 10.

Mr. Washington commended Mr. Kofi Bonner and was in support of this item.

Mr. James stated that he had been against Lennar coming into the community at first. However, he reported that Mr. Bonner and Ms. Walker had done a great job in BVHP and he was in support of them.

Dr. Hunnicutt explained that she was a member of both the IC (Implementation Committee) and the Legacy Foundation. She explained that both groups were in control of community benefits and reported that they had been working very hard to find ways to funnel money into workforce development and housing. However, she reported it was a real challenge keeping low income residents in the City in affordable housing. Dr. Hunnicutt mentioned the Hacker Hub RFP and a number of college educational opportunities for residents which would be coming out soon. She commended the ICA program and commended Lennar for providing uniforms for them.

Ms. Richardson congratulated FivePoint and commended the presentation by Ms. Walker. She reported that this was the only project that had met and exceeded its obligation. Ms. Richardson declared that this was a testament to how things could work if everybody was on the same page and reporting progress.

Mr. Walker reported that he was a disabled vet from the Air Force after three airplane crashes. He inquired about whether blacks had benefitted from the money being spent at the Shipyard. Mr. Walker reported that he had spent \$7,000 on a study that showed that blacks received 1/10 of 1% of the money getting spent in BV and the Shipyard. He explained that when he returned from the service, he had to fight to get work at the Shipyard. Now Lennar wanted to put meters on the street he lived on. Mr. Walker felt it was not fair to put parking meters on certain streets in the Shipyard. He requested that OCII conduct a study to see how much blacks were benefitting from this project.

Commissioner Pimentel thanked Ms. Walker and Lennar for the presentation and thanked speakers from the public who came forward to deliver first hand stories, especially Ms. Jackson-Morgan from the Third Street Youth Center and Clinic and Sister Lilly from ICA. Ms. Pimentel highlighted the significant achievement of having 100% of their graduates going to college and exposing students to different jobs in various industries and fields, especially the health industry. Ms. Pimentel inquired about whether they had any follow-up reports regarding applicants who had attended the six workshops and whether they had been successful in getting into housing. She inquired about the number of workshop attendees who had been successful in obtaining housing.

Ms. Walker responded that there was a report in Commissioners' packets with a total number of workshop attendees. She reported that 75% of attendees were from San Francisco and 41% were from District 10. She indicated that more data was available in the full report.

Commissioner Singh inquired about who comprised the IC and how many members there were.

Ms. Walker responded that the IC was made up of seven members of representatives from several entities: the developer, the SF Labor Council, Faith in Action (which used to be SFOP [San Francisco Organizing Project]), the CAC, and the PAC and she added that there was one open seat for a seventh community member.

Commissioner Rosales inquired about what the total annual value of community benefits Lennar had committed outside of the IC; inquired about whether there was an annual minimum amount. She referred to Ms. Walker's statement during the presentation that to date nearly \$16 million had been spent in expenditures and inquired about whether that included the IC's \$8.293 million. Ms. Rosales requested clarity again regarding overlap between OCII money and IC money, whose programs were similar but distinct, and requested assurance that the money from both agencies were being combined to their fullest impact potential to avoid duplication. Ms. Rosales inquired

about whether there was adequate management with cross-referencing to objectives to make sure this was being done. She requested information about how people get into those programs.

Ms. Walker responded that it was just over \$7 million. She responded that there were programs with an annual minimum, such as the job training commitment for Phase I and contractor assistance program for Phase II, but not the total annual spend commitment. Ms. Walker responded in the affirmative, that the amount in question included both the Phase I and II commitments, including the IC commitments. To explain further, that included money that had already been distributed to the community through the Anchor Program, some upfront payments on other DDA commitments, such as the scholarship fund of \$500,000 and some money being held by the SF Foundation. She explained that while the programs were divided by phase, the expenditures were not divided that way.

Ms. Walker responded that she worked with the IC, Legacy Fund and CAC members together. There were individuals who were distinct to those committees and others who were on multiple committees at the same time, which helped ensure that duplication did not occur. However, she explained that this also helped augment programs that needed this duplication. For example, the Anchor Program was unique to IC funding. However, in other programs the different buckets might support one another, such as the Small Contractor Mobilization Fund. Initially, the \$250,000 in seed money came from the IC; however, over time as contractors were using these funds, they realized that contractors needed a larger pot to mobilize and manage their payroll before the first draw. As a result, the Legacy Fund created a match for the Mobilization Fund, so the second pot of money was now coming from the Legacy Fund. Ms. Walker explained that these programs were supporting each other as well as single, individualized program funding. Ms. Walker responded in the affirmative and added that she was there as well to help with the funding road map and avoidance of duplication. She stated that there were six funding meetings/month and she was present at all of them.

Ms. Walker responded that there were three new IC programs, including the Anchor Program and reported that the CAC participated in the outreach for that program. She explained that now with the success of having nine men graduate from the program, they would look at how they would continue funding this project. Ms. Walker reported that any local contractor who wanted to come in for technical assistance to CAP or to Renaissance and partner with a mentor could do so. However, the Mobilization Program was set up for contractors who specifically had contracts on the project and when new SBE's had signed contracts, they brought those contracts in as part of their application to the program.

Vice-Chair Bustos thanked Ms. Walker for her presentation.

- i) Candlestick Point Retail Center Garage Status: Transmittal of Information on Air Quality Issues (Discussion)

Presenters: Nadia Sesay, Executive Director; Tamsen Drew, Senior Project Manager, Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point Redevelopment Project

PUBLIC COMMENT

Due to the number of speakers, Vice-Chair Bustos limited public comment to two minutes each. He stated that it was his understanding that there was a representative for the group to speak.

Speakers: Shirley Moore, BV Neighborhood Association; Dr. Raymond Tompkins; Michael Theriault, SF Building & Construction Trades Council; Ellouise Patton, community resident; Brian Butler, community representative; Linda Richardson, community activist; Bart Pantola, Union of

International Painters and Allied Trades; Joanne Abernathy, resident; Timothy Waters, Program Director, YCD; Joyce Armstrong, President, San Francisco Housing Authority Public Housing Tenants Association; Neola Gans; Rene Narcisse; Ace Washington, community advocate; Oscar James, BVHP resident; Muhammed al-Kareem, Founder/Editor of BV Newspaper; Corwin Cooley; Audrey Leong; Earl Moore, BV Hill Association; Shem Korngold

Ms. Moore stated that her association had come before OCII on June 20 to request to be on the July agenda for this item, but that had not been granted. She reported that meetings were cancelled in August and September and she had sent several emails as well as a registered letter to the OCII secretary and wanted to know why they were not allowed to be on the agenda. She stated that they had been ignored and denied the opportunity to present their issues.

Vice-Chair Bustos stated that since they were not on the agenda, they would be given five minutes to speak at this time.

Ms. Moore stated that they were the homeowners and residents in the area and they had not received any outreach from OCII or the developer. She contended that the plan outlined in the presentation for this item would negatively impact the streets, quality of life as well as the environmental health of the area and this was why the community had fought against this garage. Ms. Moore reported that the first time they heard about the plans for the garage was in March 2016. There had been no communication from the developer. They wrote a letter to OCII in March complaining about the lack of input in the development plan regarding the garage. They were also concerned about the rush to get this garage approved. Ms. Moore reported that on March 15, OCII approved the amendment to the design without any outreach. At that time, the community received a brief description about the development but they had been very dissatisfied with the outcome. Ms. Moore reported that the only definitive information on this project had been from the SFMTA who told community members that they would lose their driveway access. They found out about the underground garage only by hearsay.

Dr. Tompkins described a report written by the Air District and referred to a passage that listed three cities described as health care zones, in particular BVHP, which stated that residents there had a life expectancy which was 14 years shorter than other areas in the City. Therefore, any development would impact life expectancy in that area. Dr. Tompkins reported that he had set up his own weather station at Candlestick Point and demonstrated slides showing air quality results. He spoke about particulate amounts and the fact that there was a 100% increase in dust in the air in the area. Dr. Tompkins stated that by placing a garage underneath apartments, there would be a major adverse impact on residents' health. He clarified that they wanted and needed the jobs; however, just not at this location with over 3,000 residents.

Mr. Theriault commended Lennar for relocating the garage underground at its own expense. He indicated that Lennar had been very responsive to the needs of the community and as a result, the disbursement of traffic would lead to a negligible increase in air pollution, which should address the concerns of the neighbors. Mr. Theriault corrected Commissioner Rosales' statement and clarified that contractors did not pay union dues, but rather paid benefits on behalf of their employees, which led to a tax benefit for the contractor.

Ms. Patton read a letter from Shirley Jones, in which Ms. Jones congratulated Ms. Sesay in her promotion to Executive Director. The letter described Ms. Jones' history at BVHP and her advocacy work. She stated that she had attended the Shipyard CAC meeting which was well attended. In the letter, Ms. Jones pointed out that improvements had occurred and they must move forward to avoid losing additional opportunities. She stated that dealing with these very large projects was very difficult but they must all work together to move forward. She was very pleased that promises made to the residents of Alice Griffith had been kept. She was also pleased that they

had moved the entrances to the parking garage and other changes. Ms. Jones urged OCII to move forward with the project.

Mr. Butler stated that he was a mechanical engineer who worked with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District in BVHP as a result of BVHP becoming a care zone. He referred to Dr. Tompkins' presentation regarding air quality in the BVHP area and underscored the poor air and water quality due to different reports referenced. He felt that community residents should be listened to regarding the placement of this garage.

Ms. Richardson stated that she had been working on environmental issues at BVHP for many years. She was pleased that the developer had made changes to the garage and had put the garage underground to help with the air quality in the area. Ms. Richardson urged the public to look at what had been proposed before and look at what was there now and then make a decision.

Mr. Pantola stated that he was there on behalf of Tony Tofani, and that they both represented the union. He explained that Mr. Tofani was a floor layer and that he was an architectural glass metal worker and they also represented painters and drywall finishers. Mr. Pantola reported that they had over 400 workers who resided in the City and they looked forward to the project. As a SF resident and due to the major housing crisis in the City, it was difficult for his union members to stay and reside in the City. Mr. Pantola added that under this project, members would receive union wages, which were fair and would allow them to recruit and bring in more workers from surrounding areas.

Ms. Abernathy was in support of this item and wanted to see some progress and some jobs as a result of this project. She claimed that in 1999 her baby was born premature with birth defects as a result of the air pollution from the excavations they were doing in the area at the time. Ms. Abernathy reported that many people in the area were suffering from cancer and asthma and the air was not being monitored well enough. She was concerned about the amount of cars and the type of people that would be coming into the area, especially because a movie theatre was being proposed.

Mr. Waters was in support of this item because of the creation of jobs as well as 156 units of affordable housing proposed. He stated that Lennar continued to work with constituents and that he expected them to continue with that work. Mr. Waters urged OCII to move forward with the implementation of the project.

Ms. Armstrong was there to speak on behalf of District 10 residents, including from Alice Griffith, Sunnydale, Potrero Hill, Hunters View and all the residents under the Public Housing umbrella, who wanted to see housing and jobs. Ms. Armstrong stated that she had attended the meeting in April and she felt that Lennar had tried to address some of the issues raised in this project. She pointed out that not everybody was going to be happy with this project and that this was not going to be easy but that it was doable.

Ms. Gans was in support of the Candlestick Point project. She knew there were objections to the garage and parking space concerns. Ms. Gans felt strongly that the time for hearings and talk was over and they needed to get this project moving.

Mr. Narcisse voiced his concern over the issues that should have been resolved long ago. He was aggravated about countless meetings and the fact that a handful of people were impeding progress. He indicated that they should stop the nonsense and move forward with the project.

Mr. Washington spoke about people who came up to speak on the biggest projects but who did not attend any meetings at any other time. He stated that there was a garage in the Fillmore which had nobody taking care of it right now.

Mr. James supported what Ms. Jones had stated in her letter and also what Mr. Tompkins was trying to say. He was aware of the health issues in BVHP due to the air quality and they needed to make sure that the hazardous materials were removed from the community. Mr. James hoped that they were making the right decisions.

Mr. Al-Kareem was in support of this project. He lived on Gillman and was a painting contractor. Mr. Al-Kareem reported that the contractors had not done anything to restrict the dust being released and were not wetting down the streets. He explained that he had to sweep the streets every day or the dust would come into his garage. Mr. Al-Kareem felt that this was not right and asked OCII to help with this issue.

Mr. Cooley stated that Mr. Washington was correct about people being paid in the BV to advocate Lennar's actions, which allowed Lennar to bypass adequate applicants. He was concerned about the traffic on Gillman Avenue, which was 24/7. Mr. Cooley reported that when his father bought their house, he had a list of things he had wanted as a resident, such as parking, parks, etc. Now they wanted to put a freeway in place of the parks where he coached football and basketball to little kids. He was concerned that now they were taking parking away.

Ms. Leong stated that she had lived in the neighborhood over 30 years. They really cared about the community but the air pollution was a concern. She reported that she had relatives who had died of lung cancer and asked OCII to pay attention to the air quality in the area because health was critical to the residents. Ms. Leong indicated that she was not aware of any parking and traffic changes on Gillman because residents were not informed about anything going on.

Mr. Moore stated that he had lived in SF since 1942. He reported that he had gotten permission from the City to have dances after church and have organized basketball games at parks for the kids in HP. Mr. Moore stated that he was a volunteer tutor. He expressed concern about hearing that the lives in BVHP were being shortened by 14 years due to air pollution and stressed that OCII needed to pay attention to that fact.

Mr. Korngold stated that he lived on Ingerson Avenue and had not received any notification about what was going to happen to his street or about the garage. He indicated that he had finally received some news from his neighbor, Shirley Moore. He thought it was a good idea to have the garage be located underground facing the shoreline. His concern was that Ingerson Avenue would become a corridor to the city center unless they created an entrance/exit onramp from the freeway. Mr. Korngold stated that unless they do that there would be significant traffic problems on Ingerson.

Commissioner Pimentel thanked all the speakers who had waited so long to speak. She pointed out that there were many things that community members could work on together, especially with the SFMTA on transit. She indicated that Lennar had taken action to move the parking garage as a response to resident concerns. However, it was important to move the project along because many people were waiting for the resultant jobs.

Commissioner Rosales stated that there was a new process underway and there was more opportunity for engagement on these concerns. As an individual, she was concerned about air quality, so if there was a segment of the City that was impacted, they needed to be extra-sensitive to those concerns. Ms. Rosales pointed out that this was not the first garage in a residential area that was being built and wondered if there were lessons to be learned from earlier parking scenarios, some of which were under SFMTA jurisdiction. She inquired about what jurisdiction OCII had to be able to address some of the concerns and whether there was room for additional studies on the environmental issue reports. She stated that they had heard from residents who just wanted to move this project along as well as residents who still had air quality concerns and who did not want it to advance forward.

Vice-Chair Bustos thanked staff for their report. He reminded everyone that this was an informational report but many issues were still outstanding, including concerns over the garage.

Ms. Drew wanted to clarify some issues regarding the Gillman Street Improvement Project. She clarified that there would not be any meters placed on Gillman Street and also that driveways on Gillman Street would be maintained. She reported that there would be another meeting regarding this project early next year and that if members of the public wanted to be included on communication regarding the project, they should contact her to be put on the list.

6. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

Speakers: Oscar James, BVHP resident; Dr. Raymond Tompkins; Elloise Patton, resident

Mr. James wanted to thank President Trump for being the president of Puerto Rico. He reported that he knew a young person from BVHP who wanted to get a food truck in the community. Mr. James admired this young man for his tenacity and wanted to help him with his endeavor. He asked OCII to help this person obtain a spot on Fourth Street to start his own business. He stated that he would also bring this issue to the CAC.

Dr. Tompkins stated that he was working with the Air District on air quality and he wanted to speak about creating jobs for people of color to get into the sciences. He asked OCII to express to Lennar that they needed scientists of color to work in SF. They were desperate to get people of color into the sciences as they were looking for the next generation to carry on in the environmental community. Dr. Tompkins stated that he would be available to work with and mentor interested parties if they came.

Ms. Patton was concerned with the bundling of the RFP that went out. She had spoken with some contractors who had attended the pre-bid and who were not pleased with how the meeting was organized. They felt that there was not enough information to give a solid bid and they were also concerned about who was going to be the general contractor. So Ms. Patton reported that they needed more guidelines and information on the RFP. She also indicated that there were two LBE contractors at the meeting who had to leave and who had not received any information regarding the bid. Next Ms. Patton reported that this was going to be Commissioner Pimentel's last meeting with OCII. She thanked Ms. Pimentel for all her hard work with residents in the communities as a working mother and community resident. Ms. Patton stressed that OCII must appoint a working family person who was representative of D10 and the BVHP community to replace Ms. Pimentel. The community needed someone who understood all the challenges in BV and was not out of touch with the feel of the community. Ms. Patton stated that due to the amount of development going on in D10, they needed representation from OCII.

7. Report of the Chair

Vice-Chair Bustos announced that Commissioner Pimentel was leaving OCII to pursue other challenges. He thanked her on behalf of all Commissioners for all her hard work as Commissioner representing the community and wished her much luck.

8. Report of the Executive Director

Executive Director Sesay stated that she had no report.

9. Commissioners' Questions and Matters

Commissioner Pimentel stated that it had been a pleasure to serve on OCII Commission. She had especially appreciated the opportunity to talk to residents about how they felt and how pleased they were to be able to find housing in SF and be able to stay in the City. She was pleased about how these homes and communities were benefitting the residents.

10. Closed Session – None

11. Adjournment

Motion to adjourn was made by Commissioner Rosales and seconded by Commissioner Pimentel.

The meeting was adjourned by Vice-Chair Bustos at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Jaimie Cruz
Commission Secretary