

Mark Farrell
MAYOR



Marilyn Mondejar
CHAIR

Miguel Bustos
VICE-CHAIR

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
5TH DAY OF JUNE 2018**

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 5th day of June 2018, 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 1:03 p.m. Roll call was taken.

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

Vice-Chair 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, June 19, 2018 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: Regular meetings of April 17, 2018 and May 1, 2018
- b) Authorizing a Third Amendment to the Memorandum of Understanding for Environmental and Design Review Services with the City and County of San Francisco, acting through the San Francisco Planning Department, to extend the term from Fiscal Year 2018 to Fiscal Year 2020 and to increase the budget by an amount not to exceed \$450,000, for a total aggregate amount not to exceed \$1,575,000 (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 24-2018)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speaker: Ace Washington, community advocate

Mr. Washington stated that he had a meeting with OCII Executive staff, which included Mr. Morales, but was not pleased with the outcome. He did not include any details of the meeting.

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

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION TO APPROVE MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETINGS OF APRIL 17 AND MAY 1, 2018, BE ADOPTED.

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 24-2018, AUTHORIZING A THIRD AMENDMENT TO THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AND DESIGN REVIEW SERVICES WITH THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, ACTING THROUGH THE SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT, TO EXTEND THE TERM FROM FISCAL YEAR 2018 TO FISCAL YEAR 2020 AND TO INCREASE THE BUDGET BY AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$450,000, FOR A TOTAL AGGREGATE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$1,575,000, BE ADOPTED.

REGULAR AGENDA

- c) Adopting Environmental Review Findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and approving amendments to the Mission Bay South Design for Development and Signage Master Plan to establish a comprehensive sign program for the Golden State Warriors Event Center and Mixed-Use Development on Blocks 29-32 in Mission Bay South and approving specific displays pursuant to such comprehensive sign program including general advertising; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 25-2018)

Presenters: Nadia Sesay, Executive Director; Marc Slutzkin, Project Manager, Mission Bay; Rick Welts, President, Golden State Warriors; Peter Bryan, Vice-President, Construction & Development, Golden State Warriors

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Bruce Agid, Mission Bay (MB) resident & Board member, South Beach Rincon MB Neighborhood Association; Corinne Woods, Chair, MB Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC); Ace Washington, community advocate; Oscar James, native resident BVHP; Michael Freeman, MB CAC

Mr. Agid stated that he had been a MB resident for nine years and was in support of the signage plan. He attended the Warrior presentation, had reviewed the information provided and was aware of many of the potential community concerns. He then came up with a list of questions for the Warriors, concerning some potential illumination impacts, such as: which constituent groups had they spoken with and what was their feedback? What would the effect be on UCSF? What would you see from this residential building and others and what about hours, etc.? Mr. Agid reported that the Warriors were truly committed to being good neighbors and took the time to talk to the community and listen to concerns. Not surprisingly, they had the answers to all his questions. They shared proposals and adjustments and changes that they had made with community members. Mr. Agid read a list of the benefits of the signage plan benefits that would help and support the community. He urged Commissioners to approve the signage plan.

Ms. Woods stated that the CAC had held a special meeting with good attendance the previous week to review the signage plan, which was the culmination of ongoing discussions with different neighborhood groups, where each entity was allowed to ask questions and review the plan. She had not received any negative feedback. Ms. Woods herself wanted more neon and thought that the plan was very restrained but believed this was a good plan that tamped down sports arena glitz and would still activate MB in a positive way. Ms. Woods reported that there would be on-going review and consultation not just on lights, but also sound and traffic as the plan moved forward. She recommended OCII support this plan.

Mr. Washington reminded Commissioners that he had requested some kind of memorial to Jim Jefferson in MB.

Mr. James stated that he was glad the Warriors were coming back to San Francisco. He supported this plan 100% because the Warriors was the best sport team in the world, not just in play, but with their community activity and support and their work with UCSF.

Mr. Freeman stated that he was a native San Franciscan and had watched the evolution of MB over time. He commended the Redevelopment Agency and its successor, OCII, in the amazing redevelopment of that part of the City. Mr. Freeman reported that he has been a member of the CAC for 14 years and was initially concerned with the signage because he feared there would be another big red glowing Oracle sign. However, after attending the signage presentation by the Warriors, Mr. Freeman stated that he was very impressed with the attention given to the community and to UCSF and the hospital and was assured that the signage would not overwhelm the neighborhood. He reported that the heliport on top of the hospital would also be able to function without conflict with the signage. UCSF had approved the design and the CAC had overwhelmingly approved the plan.

Commissioner Rosales commended staff for the excellent presentation and believed that concerns with neighborhood impact, visual impacts, and noise had been addressed successfully.

Commissioner Singh was very pleased that the project was moving along well with no conflicts with UCSF and was looking forward to opening day in the future.

Chair Mondejar thanked staff for the presentation and expressed her appreciation to the Warriors for being such a good neighbor. However, she expressed concern over the video board regarding traffic and crowd control during the movie nights and wondered if 1400 spaces would be enough and what would happen if more than 1400 people showed up. She inquired about whether the Warriors already had a plan in place on how to manage those concerns.

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

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 25-2018, ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND APPROVING AMENDMENTS TO THE MISSION BAY SOUTH DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT AND SIGNAGE MASTER PLAN TO ESTABLISH A COMPREHENSIVE SIGN PROGRAM FOR THE GOLDEN STATE WARRIORS EVENT CENTER AND MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT ON BLOCKS 29-32 IN MISSION BAY SOUTH AND APPROVING SPECIFIC DISPLAYS PURSUANT TO SUCH COMPREHENSIVE SIGN PROGRAM INCLUDING GENERAL ADVERTISING; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

- d) Approving a Resolution of Intention to approve a Contract Amendment between the California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS) and the Successor Agency to incorporate a previously-approved Employee Contribution to Retirement Benefits (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 26-2018)

Presenters: Nadia Sesay, Executive Director; Monica Davis Stean, HR Administrative Services Manager

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speaker: Oscar James, BVHP resident

Mr. James stated that he was a retired Redevelopment Agency employee with a health plan. He explained that his health plan through the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA) was set up like the City's health plan and that the OCII health plan now being brought to staff was different than his. He explained that SFRA employees had also been covered under the Local 261 health plan, which was much better than the City's, according to Mr. James. However, he reported that current OCII employees did not have coverage under Local 261 health plans. He wanted to ensure that current OCII employees had the best health plan that continued during retirement. Mr. James asked Commissioners to make sure that all OCII employees and their families had a health plan that was equal to or better than the health plan that Mr. James received.

Commissioner Singh inquired about whether all City employees had the same retirement plan; inquired about what the differences were

Ms. Davis Stean responded that OCII had the CALPERS retirement plan because they were considered a stand-alone agency independent from the City, which was covered under the SFERS Pension Plan. Ms. Davis Stean responded that within the OCII pension plan there were two types of plans depending on whether you were a new or existing employee. She stated that the action today did not impact retirement pensions or health benefits.

Commissioner Rosales stated that she was confused about the dates and inquired about whether this meant that what was approved today would be retroactive to 2016.

Ms. Davis Stean responded in the negative. She clarified that regarding the CalPERS part, this action would move the date of finalization moving forward but was not a retroactive action. However, she

explained that on the MOA agreements, they had been treating all contributions on a pre-tax basis and they were bound to honor that. The employees approved by election and if approved by Commissioners moving forward that additional 1.25 would be treated as employee's share moving forward from the date of the action.

Chair Mondejar inquired about whether this was an improved action for all employees.

Ms. Davis Stean responded that a majority of the entire staff body needed to vote on approval of this action.

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

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

Commissioner Rosales - yes

Commissioner Singh - yes

Vice-Chair Bustos - absent

Chair Mondejar – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 26-2018, APPROVING A RESOLUTION OF INTENTION TO APPROVE A CONTRACT AMENDMENT BETWEEN THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM (CALPERS) AND THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO INCORPORATE A PREVIOUSLY-APPROVED EMPLOYEE CONTRIBUTION TO RETIREMENT BENEFITS, BE ADOPTED.

e) Certificate of Preference Holder Survey - Final Results and Recommendations (Discussion)

Presenters: Nadia Sesay, Executive Director; Pamela Sims, Senior Development Specialist, Housing Division; Maria Benjamin, Director, Home Ownership & Below Market Rate Programs, MOHCD

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Ace Washington, community advocate; Oscar James, BVHP resident

Mr. Washington stated that he was appalled at the outcome of the meeting he had with OCII executive staff. He felt that nobody cared about the black people of San Francisco. He reported that obligations made for the Fillmore area were not met by the City or by OCII. He stated that the Western Addition needed help and asked for a grant to conduct some activities in the Western Addition.

Mr. James stated that he was on the Joint Housing Committee that created the Certificate of Preference (COP) Program and he commended the people working on this project. He reported that his entire household and family received the letters coming in the mail from the COP Program. Mr. James inquired about what OCII could do about contacting people who did not live in the City but lived in the outer Bay Area to let them know about the COP program. Mr. James stressed the importance of keeping the people with preference alive and to allow the certificates to be passed down to their grandchildren as well.

Commissioner Rosales referred to the first recommendation of the action and was pleased to hear about 98% eligibility for COP holders. She inquired about matching and the ability to match interests with opportunities. She explained that if they knew what and who was in the pipeline, they should be able to bridge the gap in between.

Ms. Sims responded that there were two different things going on there. First there was a lot more interest in housing opportunities by COP holders now due to the extensive outreach and DAHLIA and

additional housing sites. As for matching, she explained that what they were seeing was that COP holders were applying for everything and then at the last minute, they were changing their minds. She felt this was due to the fact that COP holders are now realizing that they have this golden ticket; however, if everything was not right, they were withdrawing, much of the time due to rent concerns. Ms. Sims reported that many COP holders needed rental subsidy. Unfortunately, she explained, there were only two City programs that offered rental subsidies--Section 8 and the Local Operating Subsidy Program (LOSP) for formerly homeless individuals.

Commissioner Rosales clarified that there was no program in the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) for rent support. She inquired about whether the Board of Supervisors could implement additional funding for rental subsidies, much like the down-payment assistance plan.

Ms. Benjamin responded that there was a program that was partially funded by the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) for rent subsidies; however, the program quickly filled up each year because the need was so great. She explained that the City had an agreement with the non-profit Q Foundation which distributed the subsidies to save a bit more for COP holders. She responded that rental subsidies required a huge monetary commitment and the source for that was difficult to identify; in contrast, the down-payment assistance was given once to a household and when the household moved, they paid it back so that the City could then give a down-payment to the next low-income household that needed it.

Commissioner Rosales inquired about which of the several outreach methods (social media, letters, postcards, face-face, etc.) was the most effective method for soliciting response from COP holders.

Ms. Sims responded that it was a combination of all of the above and that it was all making an impact due to the fact that more people were now aware of and engaged in the program. She reported it was like a switch had been flipped on.

Commissioner Singh inquired about how many COP holders they had; inquired about what the chances were that they would get into housing; inquired about how long it would take to house all 900 COP holders; inquired about how many COP holders were housed last year.

Ms. Sims responded that they now had 900 COP holders, but she explained that not everybody wanted the same thing and that many were waiting. She was hopeful that eventually they would be able to house all the COP holders. Ms. Sims responded that it would be difficult to say how long it would take.

Ms. Benjamin responded that not all 900 COP holders were currently looking for housing and most of them were already housed in sustainable housing. However, with the certificate, they had the opportunity to come back and that was their right. She reported that so far this fiscal year they had housed 26 households. There were about 200 applicants for housing but many of them faced barriers to eligibility criteria. Ms. Benjamin explained that when they faced those barriers, applicants were set up to work with the Bayview Senior Center and the San Francisco Housing Development Corporation to overcome those barriers and help them prepare for future opportunities as they came along. She reported that DAHLIA had helped with ease of application, paperwork and provided more access. Also, she explained that the developers that were building housing for COP holders were becoming more aware of the importance of this construction for the City and for the history of displacement by redevelopment.

Chair Mondejar inquired about the reason for the increase to 900 COP holders after the housing of the 26 COP holders; inquired about whether the COP holder market even had access to social media and whether they could do better in their marketing efforts to explain the COP program; inquired whether their marketing effort explained what a COP was.

Ms. Benjamin responded that sometimes COP holders were removed from the list but not always, because the certificate could be used twice. She explained that back then families were large and when one sibling received a certificate, other siblings started applying as well.

Ms. Sims responded that siblings were applying because of the COP program successes. As for marketing to COP holders, she believed it was more word of mouth. However, they did tweet and then they showed up for information sessions. She reported that the program is definitely coming along.

Chair Mondejar commended staff and MOHCD for their hard work in the COP program and for reaching out to educate the Bay Area communities. Regarding the rental subsidy program, she inquired about whether there were other non-profits that could fund a rental subsidy for those that needed it. She thanked staff and MOHCD for their work on this program.

6. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

Speakers: Ace Washington, community advocate; Oscar James, BVHP resident

Mr. Washington stated an interest in making a presentation to OCII at the next meeting regarding CASE, which stood for Community Assistance Service Enterprise. He explained that he had been involved with redevelopment for over 31 years. He requested all documentation to show what had happened to redevelopment in the Western Addition which showed “retired” in the budget line. He inquired about what that meant.

Mr. James wanted to encourage people to get out and vote on that day (June 5) because the country was in bad shape and it was important for everyone to get out and vote for change. He stated that people in Puerto Rico, Mexico and many other people around the world needed help.

7. Report of the Chair

Chair Mondejar announced that she had attended the graduation of the small business training program at Clarke Construction. She met with the graduates and a couple had already received contracts. Ms. Mondejar commended Clarke Construction for offering that program which encouraged, certified and taught small business owners how to run a business.

8. Report of the Executive Director

- a) 360 Berry Street (Mission Bay by Windsor) Marketing Outcomes Report, a 129-unit market rate development, which includes 26 inclusionary units which are affordable at 90% Area Median Income; Mission Bay Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion)

Ms. Sesay announced that there was an informational memo regarding a 129-unit project known as Mission Bay by Windsor with 26 inclusionary units with a mix of one, two and three bedrooms. They had received over 887 applications; 8 from COP holders and 2 COP holders had been successfully housed there; one of whom was from Daly City.

On May 30, Ms. Sesay announced that Chair Mondejar was honored by SF District Attorney George Gascon for her work within the Filipino community and the City and County of San Francisco as part of Asian Pacific Islander Heritage Month. Ms. Sesay congratulated Chair Mondejar for her good work.

Executive Director Sesay announced that since the last meeting, Board of Supervisor Cohen had called for a public hearing on May 14 on the HP Shipyard clean up. She reported that there were representatives from various regulatory agencies, the EPA, the Navy, SFDPH, DTSD, among others. Tetratex was also invited. Ms. Sesay stated that the take away from that meeting was that the Mayor (Mark Farrell) as well as Nancy Pelosi had requested that the Navy and the

regulatory agencies do a re-evaluation of Parcel A and Supervisor Cohen insisted that re-testing be done in Parcel A and that this item be brought back in September. Ms. Sesay explained that the Navy and the EPA would be releasing their work plan in two weeks to the public and public comment would be available for 60 days and that this would inform the process for re-testing for the rest of the Shipyard. The good news was that there was a coordinated effort between the EPA and the Navy and clear direction from federal as well as local leadership was to expedite retesting of Parcel A where residents were currently housed as well as the creation of next steps. This would create a template for future testing of the site.

Executive Director Sesay announced that OCII had approved the re-design of the HP Shipyard last April and it was due to be heard by the Land Use committee on June 25 and by the Board of Supervisors on June 26. She stated that additional information regarding meeting schedules would be forthcoming.

Chair Mondejar inquired about what other measures or actions OCII could carry out to expedite the EPA and Navy re-testing of Parcel A, because there was much urgency regarding this issue.

Executive Director Sesay responded that they were actively working with the regulatory agencies in trying to push this forward. She explained that the work plan for the other Parcels G, UC1 and 2, which were supposed to be transferred last summer, was much more extensive. However, right now they were concentrating on Parcel A because people were already living there. Ms. Sesay reported that the plan was under the Navy's jurisdiction and should have more flexibility. She would keep Commissioners informed of any additional developments.

Chair Mondejar wanted to assure Parcel A residents that OCII was working very diligently to correct this situation and to make them feel safe.

9. Commissioners' Questions and Matters - None

10. Closed Session – None

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Mondejar at 2:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Jaimie Cruz
Commission Secretary