

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE
COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HELD ON THE
6th DAY OF OCTOBER 2015**

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 6th day of October 2015, 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 1:10 p.m. Roll call was taken.

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

All Commission members were present.

2. Announcements

A. The next scheduled Commission meeting will be a regular meeting held on Tuesday, October 20, 2015 at 1:00 p.m. (City Hall, Room 416).

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

Please be advised that the ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised 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

Chair Rosales requested that Item 5c) be removed from the Consent Agenda and added to the Regular Agenda.

- a) Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting of July 7, 2015.
- b) Approving a Fourth Amendment to the construction contract with Azul Works, Inc. for the Shipyard Art Installation Project, Contract No. HPS 01-14, extending and authorizing the Executive Director to extend the date of final completion as necessary; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area (Action) (Resolution No. 58-2015)
- d) Authorizing a second amendment to the legal services contract with the Thomas Law Group to increase the contract amount by \$100,000, for a total aggregate contract amount not to exceed \$150,000, to obtain specialized legal services (Action) (Resolution No. 60-2015)

PUBLIC COMMENT – None

Commissioner Singh motioned to move Items 5a), 5b) and 5d) and Commissioner Mondejar seconded that motion.

Secretary Guerra called for a voice vote on Items 5a), 5b) and 5d).

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FIVE COMMISSIONERS THAT THE MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF JULY 7, 2015, BE ADOPTED.

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FIVE COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 58-2015, APPROVING A FOURTH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT WITH AZUL WORKS, INC. FOR THE SHIPYARD ART INSTALLATION PROJECT, CONTRACT NO. HPS 01-14, EXTENDING AND AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXTEND THE DATE OF FINAL COMPLETION AS NECESSARY; HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FIVE COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 60-2015, AUTHORIZING A SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH THE THOMAS LAW GROUP TO INCREASE THE CONTRACT AMOUNT BY \$100,000, FOR A TOTAL AGGREGATE CONTRACT AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$150,000, TO OBTAIN SPECIALIZED LEGAL SERVICES, BE ADOPTED.

REGULAR AGENDA

- c) Authorizing a Third Amendment to the Legal Services Contract with Renne Sloan Holtzman & Sakai, a Limited Liability Partnership, to increase the Contract Amount by \$75,000, for a Total Aggregate Contract Amount not to exceed \$175,000, to Obtain Specialized Legal Services (Action) (Resolution No. 59-2015)

Chair Rosales recused herself from discussion and action on this item due to the fact that the law firm, Renne Sloan Holtzman & Sakai, was a subcontractor involved in a legal matter with her law firm. She directed Commissioner Bustos to carry on as Chair in her absence.

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Jam Morales, General Counsel and Deputy Director

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Commissioner Singh motioned to move Items 5c) and Commissioner Mondejar seconded that motion.

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE RECUSAL THAT RESOLUTION NO 59-2015, AUTHORIZING A THIRD AMENDMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH RENNE SLOAN HOLTZMAN & SAKAI, A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP, TO INCREASE THE CONTRACT AMOUNT BY \$75,000, FOR A TOTAL AGGREGATE CONTRACT AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$175,000, TO OBTAIN SPECIALIZED LEGAL SERVICES, BE ADOPTED.

- e) Workshop on the City's Transit Policy (Discussion)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Sally Oerth, Deputy Director; Tom Maguire , Director of Sustainable Streets Program, San Francisco MTA

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Wendy Silvani, Mission Bay (MB), TMA; Corinne Woods, Chair, Mission Bay (MB) CAC

Ms. Silvani stated they had a very robust foundational program with over 22 zip cars and city car shares, so that residents could have a wide range of transportation options. She explained they conducted an annual survey and their drive-alone rate had been within 19-23% in the last five years they had been in business. This was significantly lower than all other districts in San Francisco except the Financial District. Ms. Silvani believed working closely with the community to ensure they were designing appropriate services and multiple modes of transport were critical as well as the ability to access those modes. She discussed the difficulty in finding places for people near BART and CALTRAIN stations and

were considering how to rework these critical areas to function as working transit hubs. Ms. Silvani reported they had met with Pier 70 and other new neighborhoods and was excited to be part of a larger organization and MUNI to work on delivering excellent service to their customers. She invited Commissioners to Mission Bay to see how the community had changed in the last five years.

Ms. Woods recalled this discussion came about as a request by Commissioner Bustos regarding Block 3 East and thought it would be a good idea to have Ms. Silvani come and speak about the Mission Bay Transportation Management Plan (TMP). Ms. Woods reported the TMP was very robust but MUNI had not kept up with Mission Bay and she outlined several transit plans and lines that had still not been completed. She reported ongoing discussions and negotiations with MUNI, which she acknowledged had experienced some difficulty in the past few years. However, the TMA, the shuttle program, bike share and zip cars were helping to reduce single occupancy vehicle traffic in MB. She commented on the continuing congestion problems because of the Giants, which they did not want to be worsened when the Arena came in. She reported they were working with the Ballpark Mission Bay Transportation Coordinating Committee through MTA regarding traffic during special events. Overall, Ms. Woods reported their objective was definitely to reduce the amount of cars in Mission Bay, which meant giving people alternatives to driving. She requested support from OCII to request MUNI move faster and support the TMA.

Chair Rosales welcomed Commissioner Pimentel to the Commission.

Commissioner Pimentel thanked staff for the presentation and especially commended Slide 16 regarding methods of getting people to take public transportation. On slide 12 regarding transit improvements, she inquired whether CALTRAIN and BART would also offer economic incentives for individuals of different economic status to ride their services.

Mr. Maguire stated he could not really speak for CALTRAIN and BART and their fare policies because the City had no control over those services. However, he explained that MUNI carried most of the riders in San Francisco, so that the MUNI deep discounts and free fare policies would cover most of the people in the City.

Commissioner Pimentel pointed out that depending on where you were leaving from in the City, the other types of public transportation could be used more and perhaps riders needed more of an incentive to utilize those other services. She referred to Slide 32 regarding car share and bike share membership and inquired whether this was for all individuals; inquired about whether that would be given as a reduced rate or if someone had a financial barrier, would the entire membership be covered or would a certain amount of membership be offered and covered.

Mr. Maguire responded there were lots of innovative models for this. One was the developer would offer a discounted membership or pay for the first year of a zip car membership and then there were other programs where the developer might subsidize zip car services for certain households, especially low income households. He indicated he would like to work with OCII to figure out how to make that choice and to have more discussion about how to remove barriers for low income households to have access to zip car services because this would require having a credit card or smart phone app.

Commissioner Singh inquired whether Mr. Maguire owned a car; inquired about what the ratio was of units to cars. Mr. Singh explained he lived near Lincoln at Golden Gate Park and everyone in his neighborhood had two or three cars. There was a bus line in the area, but it took a long time to get

anywhere by bus when some destinations were 20 blocks away and that this created a hardship on the elderly.

Mr. Maguire responded in the affirmative, that he did own a car. To the second question, Mr. Maguire responded that it depended on the project. He stated all these choices did not have to work for anyone. For a project downtown where there was lots of public transportation access, the 1-1 ratio would be too high, but in other areas of the City, it would still be appropriate. He explained it was difficult to try to decide who would get to have a car but people made many different decisions about how to get around. He added that some people owned cars but took public transport, take taxis or Uber every day. He suggested that they not assume the 1-1 ratio was the right answer for everyone in every neighborhood, but to go as low as possible and still work at serving the needs of the populations in question. In order to do this, they would have to look at each location separately. He reported the objective of the MUNI Forward program was to serve those types of long commutes, especially in the neighborhoods that were further out, and make them more reliable and faster.

Commissioner Mondejar referred to Slide 34 regarding protecting MTA investments and inquired about what was meant by "smart parking management".

Mr. Maguire responded this meant two things. He explained that the MTA's job was to manage parking in San Francisco on a day-to-day basis. MTA managed all the metered parking in the City, all resident permit parking, street parking and off-street parking in public garages throughout the City. He reported they were trying to give drivers more information about when and where parking was available and set the prices right so that it was not too expensive for people to park. He added that on the developer side, it was more about getting the correct amount of parking spaces and making sure parking was available.

Commissioner Mondejar inquired about whether they had figures on how many cars were in the City at a certain time; inquired about how many residential parking permits were granted and who used them. Ms. Mondejar stated that where she lived, there was a lot of double parking by delivery trucks, no parking available, \$60 tickets being issued, and other problems.

Mr. Maguire responded that there were approximately 100,000 residential parking permits currently issued and about 27,000 parking spaces in off street lots, which were full on weekdays but empty overnight and not used very frequently on the weekends. He added there were 80,000 metered parking spaces and that utilization ranged from 100% to much less in low traffic areas.

Commissioner Mondejar inquired about whether they issued resident parking permits in MB; inquired about how people would get around and how would they be managing parking in MB.

Mr. Maguire responded they had not issued resident parking permits in MB. He explained all the options discussed would be offered, including off-street parking and car share. Mr. Maguire also reported that Mission Bay had been the location for an on-street parking management pilot called San Francisco Park, which was conducted from 2011-13, and looked at varying the price of parking and providing drivers with real time information about where parking was available and pricing. He stated that this was the toolbox they were using in Mission Bay and all over the downtown area.

Commissioner Mondejar requested clarification that the model they were using in Mission Bay was to not issue residential parking permits, so that residents would use other transportation options. She inquired as to whether Mission Bay was the only area where they were not issuing residential permits; inquired about what areas in San Francisco did not have residential parking other than MB.

Mr. Maguire responded that the resident permit parking program was strictly for residential areas that were under parking pressure for some reason, such as Glen Park because of the BART station and Telegraph Hill and North Beach, which were close to downtown and close to tourist attractions. He explained that resident permit parking was not about streets where there was mixed use or a mix of office, retail, campus and resident, but rather about the strictly residential streets that were near large traffic generators. He responded there were no specific areas in the City, but that they did not issue residential permits in places that had large amounts of commercial land use, but rather in just strictly residential locations.

Commissioner Mondejar inquired about how MTA got their real time information out.

Mr. Maguire responded they had an app that drivers could check called sspark. He warned that they were in the process of rebooting the technology, because it was still 2011-era technology.

Commissioner Mondejar indicated that she lived near Mission Bay so it would be helpful to have that parking app. She added that it would also be helpful to communicate that real time information to residents and commuters. Ms. Mondejar inquired about whether most of the cars in the City were from out of town residents coming into the City to work; inquired about what "TDM" stood for. Ms. Mondejar commented that this would mean a change in lifestyle for many San Francisco residents, especially since projections indicated that there would be an increase of 280,000 new residents in San Francisco by 2040. She wondered where all these people would go.

Mr. Maguire responded that it was a mix, but that the majority of cars in the City were San Francisco residents driving around. He reported that there were over 800,000 residents in San Francisco and that 2/3 of them had access to a car. He responded that TDM stood for Travel Demand Management, which meant that if they had a fixed amount of travelers all coming into the City from the same place, the idea was that TDM would be able to provide all the strategies and choices they needed so that they would not all have to drive, including travel discounts, real time information about transit, raising the price of parking, lowering the price of transit.

Chair Rosales inquired about whether the Transit First philosophy included the entire City or whether it about creating transit priority for just the densest part of the City. Ms. Rosales referred to Commissioner Singh's comment regarding his situation where residents had multiple cars and access to parking and then to Bernal Heights where she lived where it was very hilly and there was no parking. She inquired as to whether the Transit First philosophy applied to all those neighborhoods. She stated that when people had more services, such as on Mission Street rather than Glen Park, then more people would go to Mission Street and not to the other location.

Mr. Maguire responded that when making transit investment decisions, their first priority would be to make transit as effective and robust as possible. To the philosophy question, he responded in the affirmative and explained that it was not about dictating to individuals that they had to make choices but about giving people more choices. He acknowledged that Bernal Heights was a very difficult location to have a car, but added there were other parts of Bernal Heights, such as on the 23 line, where if they beefed up the service and widened the sidewalks, then perhaps more residents would take public transit instead of driving.

Chair Rosales commented that if they were anticipating a very dense city, then she had an issue with the tech shuttles in the Mission. She related that recently she and Commissioner Bustos were at a restaurant

on 18th & Valencia between 5-6 p.m. and she was shocked at the number of buses travelling on that street. She described it as packed with tech buses followed by MUNI buses. She noted that the tech buses did not even seem to fit on the street and were in conflict with the MUNI buses. Ms. Rosales inquired about whether MUNI had a vision about how to deal with this issue. Given that the City regulates all other modes of transportation, she thought they could do a better job of regulating the tech shuttles.

Mr. Maguire responded that 18 months ago they started a pilot program which put the tech shuttles under a regulatory framework; so that they could not operate on any street they wanted to and had to go to the MTA to request certain routes. MTA had located their stops on wider, heavier traffic streets where the tech workers would congregate to get on the buses and be less likely to block MUNI buses. Mr. Maguire reported they had been doing more monitoring and enforcement regarding those stops and had written about 1200 violations in the past year for the tech buses blocking MUNI. As a result, he reported that the incidence of commuter buses blocking MUNI had decreased since that finding. They concluded that the regulated commuter shuttle was working a lot better but there were still some issues that needed to be addressed. He added that the tech buses were regulated by the state PUC, so MTA could not prevent them from operating on City streets but were working hard to confine them to the streets that were appropriate for their size.

Ms. Rosales noted that on Market Street there were more cars now with Uber and Lyft, people on bikes blowing through stop signs and red lights, as well as people on skateboards and skates. She inquired about whether MTA was empowered to regulate those modes of transportation as well when those modes were creating chaos and unsafe conditions.

Mr. Maguire responded that MTA had been working on the "Safer Market Street Program" over the past year, which involved Market Street west of 3rd, and had reorganized how everyone used that street. He reported that they had created dedicated red bus lanes for MUNI, green bike lanes for skaters, bikes and non-motorized vehicles, and designated turn-on and turn-off points for private drivers, Uber and Lyft, so it was clearer and more transparent where cars could and could not go. He added that this was an example of the kinds of tools they would be using more and more in the future.

Commissioner Pimentel referred to Slide 10 and remarked there were instances where driving was inevitable. She referred to his comment during the presentation that one of the ideas would be to increase the cost of parking and she stated she was against the idea of punishing those who had to drive. Ms. Pimentel inquired about what the ratio was of new residents moving into developments who had cars versus those who did not.

Mr. Maguire acknowledged that for many people driving was the only logical choice and he reiterated that MTA was not trying to taking away that choice for people. However, MTA wanted to make sure that there were many other choices out there for residents. He reported that it could cost up to \$100,000 to build one parking space. Mr. Maguire responded that he did not have that data, but that it would probably vary with every project, and suggested that MTA work closely with OCII to figure that out for future planning.

Commissioner Bustos stated he wished that Ed Reiskin had been present at the meeting because he was head of the department and suggested they hold a joint meeting with the MTA Commission soon because what they had heard was nothing new and there were other things that they should be considering. On Slide 8, Mr. Bustos referred to protecting the quality of life for existing residents and inquired about who defined "quality of life". Mr. Bustos pointed out that throughout the presentation; Mr. Maguire spoke about giving people choices. Mr. Bustos disagreed with that statement, because he believed that MTA

was trying to limit choices rather than enhance them. He referred to page 6 and the reference to Transit Friendly; however, Mr. Bustos pointed out that the entire presentation was about parking and there was no discussion about safety issues. Mr. Bustos stated people did not want to ride MUNI because it was dirty, not on time and not safe, especially for young kids and seniors and that he had witnessed many fights on MUNI, where the bus driver had not gotten involved. Mr. Bustos indicated that Transit Friendly needed to include those issues within the current system they had right now and improve it. He added lots of money and resources went into the transit system but riders and residents were not getting much back from it. Mr. Bustos stressed the negative issues regarding MUNI had been ignored and allowed to continue as status quo, but now MTA was concentrating on parking as the answer without offering any incentive for people to take public transportation except to punish people for driving.

Commissioner Bustos reminded Mr. Maguire that neither large families, the elderly, nor the disabled would be riding bikes to go shopping; besides the fact that the streets were not even safe for bike-riding. Mr. Bustos pointed out there had been 30 fatalities on bikes in San Francisco and needed to be considered as well. Regarding Mr. Maguire's statement that parking spots were taking up too much space, Mr. Bustos disagreed with that statement because OCII very often dealt with developers and designs that provided sufficient and adequate parking. Regarding the emphasis on car-share, Mr. Bustos reminded Mr. Maguire that this required the use of a computer, knowing how to use it, and affordability. He insisted that there were many issues involved here, including language barriers, financial situation, or number of family members. On page 11, Mr. Bustos referred to MTA's statement that if you gave access to parking, more people would drive. Mr. Bustos disagreed with that statement and stated it in another way: that if you wanted people to take public transit, then provide public transportation that worked, was comfortable, safe and create incentives for them to do that. Regarding BART, CALTRAIN and other so-called partners, Mr. Bustos remarked that if they were truly partners, then they should have already stepped up to the plate to provide senior discounts and other incentives to use their services.

Commissioner Bustos inquired about why they had bike lanes on the same street as cars. He stressed that drivers and bikers were two groups that didn't like each other but were being forced to drive together on the same street, such as Folsom. Mr. Bustos referred to the smart system they had in Portland, where they allowed cars on major thoroughfares and bikes on designated side streets. He suggested a system allowing cars on Folsom and bike lanes on the ancillary streets. This could turn into a bike system that would work, be safer, avoid more road rage and not be on a major street with cars. He added that in Portland the result was that the side streets had become more populated with more lights and were safer for pedestrians. Regarding accessibility, Mr. Bustos inquired about accessibility for whom; obviously, not for the disabled, seniors or families. He stressed that community input was critical and referred to when the CALTRAIN station was set up, it was lauded, but then it didn't work in a practical sense and now it was a mess. Mr. Bustos suggested setting up focus groups with people in the communities and asking them how they wanted their transit system to work. He stated that they had been asking for this in the Mission regarding the 127 parking spots being taken out of Potrero Street, but had not received any answer to it. He stressed that the people using the streets in the neighborhoods needed to have a voice in the decisions being made in their neighborhoods. Mr. Bustos inquired about why they were taking away parking spots and replacing them with parklets, when nobody really wanted them. He believed that this really was about privatizing public space. He reported that on 24th Street, parklets had been banned because the businesses in the areas needed the parking for the people who were coming in from out of town and wanted to shop.

Overall, Commissioner Bustos stated that MTA needed to provide residents with some real choices. He stated he would love to ride MUNI if it was clean, safe and on time. He would love to ride his bike if he felt safe around other cyclists. He stressed all he was hearing from MTA was limiting parking and taking away parking spots, which did not constitute offering choices. Mr. Bustos inquired about who was

making the decisions at MTA and hoped it was not only younger staff who did not consider the plight of the elderly and the disabled who had difficulty with public transportation. Mr. Bustos asked MTA to include community based organizations, which would love to participate in these decisions and were invested in their quality of life. He thanked Mr. Maguire for representing MTA at the meeting and hoped to have another meeting with the entire MTA Commission to work on improving transportation policies for the entire City.

Commissioner Mondejar inquired about what had been rejected in Prop L by the voters. She requested that Executive Director Bohee provide some representation from CALTRAIN and BART so they could present an overview of their plans as well. Ms. Mondejar recalled an earlier discussion regarding water ferries and utilizing the docks along the waterfront in San Francisco and inquired about that possibility.

Mr. Maguire responded he was not entirely clear about Prop L, but thought that it asked voters whether MTA should be building more off-street parking in neighborhoods and offering less transit choices. He indicated that the vote was 72-30 against that. He responded that there was a Water Emergency Transportation Authority that was governing the waterfront plan. Mr. Maguire appreciated the feedback and stated that that he had learned a lot listening to everyone's concerns regarding this issue.

Chair Rosales pointed out that Commissioners had all come to the same concerns and conclusions about the transit problems, even though they all lived in different areas of the City and she wanted to stress that their concerns weren't about just particular neighborhoods, but were more global regarding the entire City.

6. Public Comment on Non-agenda Items - None

7. Report of the Chair

Chair Rosales stated that she did not have a report.

8. Report of the Executive Director

- a) Informational Memo - Release of Request for Proposal (RFP) for Mission Bay Open Space Management for Operation of Public Open Space in Mission Bay North and South (Discussion)

Commissioner Mondejar inquired about MJM; inquired about whether the RFQ was open to anyone.

Executive Director Bohee responded MJM Management Group was the prime contractor for Mission Bay parks and other parks and was also the owner's representative for Yerba Buena Gardens. Ms. Bohee responded the RFQ was open to anyone.

- b) Informational Memo - Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule for January 1, 2016 to June 30, 2016 (ROPS 15-16B) (Discussion)

9. PUBLIC COMMENT

Speaker: Corinne Woods, Chair, Mission Bay CAC

Ms. Woods commented on Item 8a). She acknowledged that OCII had to go through this periodic review of Mission Bay parks management. She highly commended MJM Management Group and said they had

done a good job with security and of attracting visitors to the parks. Ms. Woods indicated that they had been working with MJM for a long time, held quarterly meetings to talk about the park system and added that the Mission Bay neighborhood was very engaged in this issue and wanted to keep it at the high quality they now had.

10. Commissioners' Questions and Matters

Commissioner Singh inquired about the Governor bringing back redevelopment.

Executive Director Bohee responded that the Governor had signed Senate Bill 107. With support from OCII, the City sponsored Senate Bill 441, which the Governor incorporated into his budget trailer legislation, which had become effective September 22, 2015 and contained San Francisco-only portion that allowed for OCII to have state authorized bonding authority to complete their affordable housing obligations in Mission Bay, Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point and Transbay. She explained they had 3,300 - 4,000 affordable housing units still to be built in the 3 major development areas, but there was a cash flow issue. This legislation would allow OCII to take what was owed and due and pay back over time and accelerate the housing program. In the Fiscal Year 15-16 budget, they expected to put out five new housing RFP's, which represented at least 600 new affordable and mixed income housing units. Ms. Bohee referred to another bill, AB 2, which was a community reinvestment or more narrowly tailored redevelopment plan, which was approved by Legislature and the Governor. She indicated that they were working with other City agencies regarding areas OCII was unable to continue new projects due to dissolution.

Commissioner Singh inquired about whether the Oversight Board would continue to exist.

Executive Director Bohee responded in the affirmative and added that the Oversight Board would remain in place until OCII had completed all of its obligations or until state law changed.

Chair Rosales referred to a recent Chronicle article regarding census data on the boom in San Francisco, which had trickled down to everyone in the City except African Americans. She requested that staff highlight the numbers for African Americans during review of small business and work force reports at the next reporting cycle. Ms. Rosales reported that, according to the report, Asians, Latinos and whites had experienced an increase in income but African-Americans had lost ground in income. She wanted to address that issue and have OCII do everything possible to rectify that situation, which was really about employment opportunities. She recalled that the last report indicated that income for the Latino group was low. Ms. Rosales explained that even though dollars were represented in the reports, it was critical to know how many companies were participating in those dollars as well, because one company could be doing fine but hundreds of others possibly were not.

Commissioner Bustos added that part of the issue was that many City companies, like Twitter and Facebook, were not hiring locally, but rather from all over the world. He inquired whether the local hire piece for the City had been put to the new businesses to make sure that they were hiring locally.

Chair Rosales stated that since they were talking about new retail outlets and grocery stores, there would be hiring opportunities there as well.

Commissioner Mondejar suggested that they push the developers to look at the numbers and ethnicity of people hired as contractors and also to extend that employment to other industries, outside of construction. She reported on a conversation she had had with the Arts Commission recently, whereby

they indicated that for the arts, they considered San Francisco to be a world class city and wanted to make sure that they extended their invitations to the best artists all over the world. They were aware that they should be represented locally but they also wanted to bring in talent from outside as well. Ms. Mondejar stressed that they needed to remember that there were plenty of qualified artists in San Francisco.

11. Closed Session - None

12. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Rosales at 2:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Claudia Guerra, Commission Secretary