

Daniel Lurie
MAYOR



Dr. Carolyn Ransom-Scott
CHAIR

Vanessa Aquino
VICE-CHAIR

Kent Lim
Mark Miller
Earl Shaddix
COMMISSIONERS

Thor Kaslofsky
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE
COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HELD ON THE
18th DAY OF NOVEMBER 2025**

The members of the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure of the City and County of San Francisco met in a regular meeting in person at 1:00 p.m. on the 18th day of November 2025.

REMOTE ACCESS:

WATCH LIVE ON SFGOVTV: <https://sfgovtv.org/ccii>

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Members of the public may provide public comment in-person at the noted location or remotely via teleconference (detailed instructions available at: <https://sfocii.org/remote-meeting-information>). Members of the public may also submit their comments by email to: commissionsecretary.ocii@sfgov.org; all comments received will be made a part of the official record.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:

DIAL: 1-415-655-0001 **ENTER ACCESS CODE:** 2663 485 4565 **PRESS # PRESS #**
again to enter the call. Press *3 to submit your request to speak.

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

1. Recognition of a Quorum

Meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by Chair Scott.

Roll call was taken.

Commissioner Lim - absent
Commissioner Miller - present
Commissioner Shaddix - present
Vice-Chair Aquino - present
Chair Scott - present

Commissioner Lim was absent. All other Commissioners were present.

2. Announcements

- a) The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will be held **in person** on Tuesday, December 2, 2025 at 1:00 pm at City Hall in Room 416.

- b) Announcement of Prohibition of Sound Producing Electronic Devices during the Meeting:
Please be advised that the ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers, and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing of or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic device.
- c) Announcement of Time Allotment for Public Comments from Participants dialing in:
Please be advised that a member of the public has up to three minutes to make pertinent public comments on each agenda item unless the Commission adopts a shorter period on any item. It is recommended that members of the public who are attending the meeting in person fill out a "Speaker Card" and submit the completed card to the Commission Secretary. All dial-in participants from the public will be instructed to call a toll-free number and use their touch-tone phones to provide any public comment. Audio prompts will signal to dial-in participants when their audio input has been enabled for commenting.

PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN: 1-415-655-0001 **ACCESS CODE:** 2663 485 4565

Secretary Cruz read the instructions for the public to call in.

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 Meeting of October 21, 2025

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

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

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

Commissioner Lim - absent
Commissioner Miller - yes
Commissioner Shaddix - yes
Vice-Chair Aquino - yes
Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF OCTOBER 21, 2025, BE ADOPTED.

REGULAR AGENDA

- b) Authorizing a Personal Services Contract with Hollins Consulting, Inc., a California Corporation, for three-years, with three one-year options to extend, in an amount not to exceed \$1,300,000, for infrastructure coordination and engineering support services in connection with the implementation of the Disposition and Development Agreements for Hunters Point Shipyard Phase I and Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II; Hunters Point Shipyard and Bayview Hunters Point Project Areas (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 26-2025)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; Inderbir Grewal, Development Specialist, Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Park (HPS/CP)

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

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

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

Commissioner Lim - absent

Commissioner Miller - yes

Commissioner Shaddix - yes

Vice-Chair Aquino - yes

Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 26-2025, AUTHORIZING A PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH HOLLINS CONSULTING, INC., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION, FOR THREE-YEARS, WITH THREE ONE-YEAR OPTIONS TO EXTEND, IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$1,300,000, FOR INFRASTRUCTURE COORDINATION AND ENGINEERING SUPPORT SERVICES IN CONNECTION WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DISPOSITION AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS FOR HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD PHASE I AND CANDLESTICK POINT/HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD PHASE II; HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD AND BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT PROJECT AREAS, BE ADOPTED.

- c) Approving Preliminary and Final Official Statements, a Continuing Disclosure Certificate and other related documents and actions for new money Tax Allocation Bonds previously approved by the Successor Agency Commission, the Oversight Board, and Department of Finance and permitted under Section 34177.7(a)(1)(A) of the California Health and Safety Code, to finance affordable housing obligations (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 27-2025)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; Nick Jones, Debt Manager

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Commissioner Miller inquired about the status of the current market for OCII bond sales.

Mr. Jones responded that the market for the OCII bonds, which were tax-exempt at the state and federal level, was very strong. He added that there had been some recent decreases in interest rates which would bode well for the ability to sell bonds at a good interest rate.

Commissioner Shaddix inquired about whether this was the final vote on these bonds and whether they would then go to market.

Mr. Jones responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Miller motioned to move Item 5(c) and Vice-Chair Aquino seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Lim - absent

Commissioner Miller - yes

Commissioner Shaddix - yes

Vice-Chair Aquino - yes

Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 27-2025, APPROVING PRELIMINARY AND FINAL OFFICIAL STATEMENTS, A CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE AND OTHER RELATED DOCUMENTS AND ACTIONS FOR NEW MONEY TAX ALLOCATION BONDS PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BY THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY COMMISSION, THE OVERSIGHT BOARD, AND DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND PERMITTED UNDER SECTION 34177.7(A)(1)(A) OF THE CALIFORNIA HEALTH AND SAFETY CODE, TO FINANCE AFFORDABLE HOUSING OBLIGATIONS, BE ADOPTED.

Agenda Item Nos. 5(d) through 5(j) related to Mission Bay South 4 East were presented together but acted on separately

- d) Approving an amendment to the Design for Development in connection with the approval of the first phase of the Mission Bay South Block 4 East mixed-use affordable residential project; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 28-2025)
- e) Conditionally approving a Basic Concept and Schematic Design for the first phase of the Mission Bay South Block 4 East mixed-use affordable housing project of approximately 165 rental units and approximately 1,253 square feet of commercial space; approving an amendment to the Major Phase for Blocks 2-7 and 13; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 29-2025)
- f) Approving an amendment to the Redevelopment Plan in connection with the development of the second phase of the Mission Bay South Block 4 East affordable housing project; referring the plan amendment to the Planning Commission for its report and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 30-2025)
- g) Approving the Report to the Board of Supervisors on the amendment to the Redevelopment Plan; and authorizing transmittal of the report to the Board of Supervisors; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 31-2025)
- h) Conditionally approving an amendment to the Design for Development in connection with the approval of the second phase of the Mission Bay South Block 4 East affordable residential project; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 32-2025)

- i) Conditionally approving an amendment to the Major Phase for Blocks 2-7 and 13, and a Basic Concept and Schematic Design for the second phase of the Mission Bay South Block 4 East affordable housing project of approximately 233 rental units; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 33-2025)
- j) Conditionally Approving an amendment to the Mission Bay South Owner Participation Agreement in connection with the second phase of the Mission Bay South Block 4 East affordable housing project; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 34-2025)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; Phillip Wong, Development Specialist, Housing; Yakuh Askew, Principal, Y.A. studio; Steve Perry, Principal, Perry Architects; Maria Pecot, Senior Contract Compliance Specialist

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Demetrius Williams, President, San Francisco (SF) Hyper-Local Building Trades Contractors Collective; Shandni Patel, Mission Bay (MB) resident; Samantha Thrower, MB resident; Daniel Adler, MB resident; Janice Smith, resident Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP); Oronde Sterling, member of the SF Hyper-Local Building Trades Contractors Collective and Vice-President, BVHP Coordinating Council; Raymond Raymond, SF resident; Dennis Williams, local micro minority developer; Linda, resident of the Madrone, MB; Prince Dean, contractor in the Bayview

Mr. Williams reported that the Collective met every Tuesday at 8:00 a.m. at 1550 Evans on the 2nd floor. He stated that they had met several times to discuss the project at 4E and added that it was disheartening to learn that this project would not involve the community or community contractors. He recognized that OCII was supposed to be inclusive with community contractors with regard to helping them be involved in building this project. Mr. Williams inquired about the affordability of this housing because they had not heard any numbers regarding affordable pricing. He expressed concern over the fact that if community contractors could not build these units that they would not be able to afford to live in them. Mr. Williams acknowledged that this structure needed to be built but he inquired about how SF residents would be able to afford to live in a structure that they could not build. He decried the fact that OCII was outsourcing the resources that needed to be kept within the SF community and asserted that if the community built the structure, then they could maintain it and then could keep it alive. However, once again the community had been excluded from another project. Mr. Williams stated that he had met with the developer and the General Contractor (GC) and they were still being excluded. He stated that this was not okay and they continued to be left out of SF building projects. Mr. Williams stated that he had reached out, met and continued to meet and the Collective was ready and waiting. He asked how many contractors present at the meeting had received any contracts for this job. No hands went up.

Ms. Patel expressed her support for affordable housing. She stated that she had lived in MB for six years and she loved it there. She expressed strong concerns regarding the proposed amendments for 250 additional units and the 90-foot height increase for the new MB development. Ms. Patel felt that these amendments would change the scale of the project dramatically and would significantly affect the neighborhood in several ways. Regarding safety concerns, Ms. Patel stated that the SF Police Department (SFPD) was already stretched thin and there was talk about redistricting to include other parts of the City, not just MB. She stated that she lived right next to Home Rise, a 141-unit building and that during its first year, Ms. Patel reported that there were over 1,000 service calls

and over 350 Priority A police reports from her building. She explained that Priority A meant immediate threat to life and substantial risk of major property loss or damage. Ms. Patel was apprehensive about the construction of a 398-unit building, if one 141-unit building could produce that many safety calls. She reminded OCII that when homeowners bought into MB, they were given a height limit; however, now they were being asked to acquiesce to a 90' height increase. This deviation undermined prior agreements and created the risk that future projects would disregard any established height limits. Ms. Patel speculated that a building with this many units would bring in many more people and would impact already limited resources, such as the sinking and broken sidewalks in MB. She felt it was unfair to build into the ground such a massive structure that could further damage the existing units.

Ms. Thrower stated that she had lived in affordable housing back in England and fully supported the efforts of OCII. She was in favor of creating a great neighborhood but had some concerns regarding density and the environment. She explained that MB was made up of artificial landfill with high ground water and there was already soil subsidence. There was already evidence that could be seen of sidewalks sinking, pavement separation, drainage failures and she reported that it was currently unsafe for pedestrians because some of the gaps in the sidewalks exceeded six inches. Ms. Thrower expressed concern that there had not been any up-to-date geographic survey or groundwater or environmental study in the planning of this project. She inquired about why this was not done first. She voiced worry that this building would be built on a very small lot and be very high and possibly be dangerous. Ms. Thrower requested that OCII complete the studies in question and disseminate other relevant information to the affected neighborhoods before they begin construction.

Mr. Adler was in support of affordable housing. He expressed concern about the 90' height increase, which was higher than what he was told the height limit would be when he bought into MB. Mr. Adler pointed out that there were six more projects to be built in MB and he wondered about what the impact would be for MB in total. He asked Commissioners to walk the neighborhood to get an idea of the status of the street conditions. Mr. Adler reported that the sidewalks were sinking and felt that it would be a good idea to understand what the problem there was before they added more congestion and weight to the area.

Ms. Smith inquired about low-income affordable housing. She expressed concern that a lot of people at low income would not be able to afford to live in these buildings. She stated that the word "affordable" was misleading because many people were not able to afford affordable housing. Ms. Smith believed that since the Chase Center was built, they had moved the zip code 94124 District 10. She voiced worry that not one of the community contractors had a contract to build in their own community. Ms. Smith suggested that Commissioners take a walk through the Alice Griffith project to see how Mr. Stewart (the John Stewart Company) was treating those residents as well as how Cathy Davis (Executive Director at Bayview Hunters Point Multipurpose Senior Services) was treating the residents on Carroll Street.

Mr. Sterling stated that he was there as a contractor and a community advocate. He wanted everyone to know that nobody was against this project but wanted to follow up on the statements of Mr. Williams and Ms. Smith that there needed to be transparency to ensure that the developers of these projects were reaching out to community contractors because they were the ones who could build, maintain and put the community to work. He stressed that OCII should be mandating this. Mr. Sterling asserted that community contractors kept asking for the opportunity to participate in these projects and just kept getting passed by. He recognized there was this idea that small businesses

were under-qualified but the truth was that they were not only qualified but over-qualified and had everything necessary to make this a success. He reminded OCII of their own requirements to utilize community contractors and small businesses and demanded that they not be overlooked again. Mr. Sterling agreed with Ms. Smith that OCII should visit Alice Griffith and other projects. He pointed out that there were projects in SF that were becoming uninhabitable and advised OCII not to turn a blind eye to them. The developers and General Contractors (GCs) in some neighborhoods were collecting the money and going back to wherever they came from. Mr. Sterling ensured OCII that community contractors would take care of their own community better than anyone from the outside.

Mr. Raymond stated that he lived at Mission Plaza apartments on 16th and Mission. He reported that on November 5, BART had called for a community meeting to discuss the BART plazas. Mr. Raymond became aware that BART had completely excluded the community before making their decisions and was appalled that BART intended to build a concrete wall blocking the plaza and any kind of view. He discussed the status of the sidewalks in MB as well as the ongoing exclusion of local contractors in SF building projects. Mr. Raymond thanked the architects of this project for including space and visual details for residents.

Mr. Williams stated that he did not understand why local contractors were still being excluded after they had been involved in the planning of this project for several years. He contended that local hire would not allow conditions to exist such as those that had been discussed. Mr. Williams stated that he had asked OCII several times to facilitate a meeting between DC Williams Development Co. and the prime developer to no avail. He stated that he knew the players being discussed here and was adamant that there was space for micro developer participation. Mr. Williams asked OCII to draw up a pilot agreement. He stated that micro developers were essential to the development of real equity in SF. He stated that he was part of a coalition, including the SF Hyper-Local Building Trades Contractors Collective, churches, others and community leaders. He praised Demetrius Williams as one of the most skilled SF plumbers and Oronde Sterling as one of the best framers in SF and the fact that they were not included in this project did not make any sense. Mr. Williams requested action to establish a micro developer participation policy across all OCII projects because it was missing as well as access to community benefits agreements. He stated that they had two years to get this done and he truly hoped OCII would work to help them to make this project a true success for the residents and builders of SF.

Ms. Linda stated that she was a native resident of SF. She supported affordable housing for everyone but also wanted to keep the neighborhoods clean. She was not in support of the height increase. Ms. Linda recalled the Geneva Towers and how everyone at that time was looking forward to the success of that project. She expressed concern over the lack of attention to maintaining these projects and the cost of maintenance as it increased in the future. She stated that this was being overlooked with these new projects coming to SF.

Mr. Dean stated that he was from the Fillmore and lived in the BV. He stated he was in financial turmoil because of being excluded from so many projects in the City and community where he was raised. He commented that his children were being left out of activities they could be enjoying because of his lack of work. He was a contractor and he just wanted to be a part of this project.

Vice-Chair Aquino stated she was feeling happiness and excitement for the construction activity in this world class city which she speculated would continue to grow. She commented that she rode her bike around town all the time and was aware of the conditions in the areas in question.

Regarding the building itself, Ms. Aquino noted the great visuals with the money shots that were prepared for the presentation. She requested more information about the windows due to the height increase and inquired about whether the windows would open and how wide would they open. She inquired about whether the windows would be double-paned.

Mr. Wong deferred the question to Mr. Askew.

Mr. Askew responded that for buildings of this size and above four stories, they used limiters on the operable windows to provide fresh air to the units mechanically. He explained that the limiters prevented anything larger than 4" from going outside so this would not be a safety concern. He responded that he believed the windows would be double-paned.

Vice-Chair Aquino was pleased that they had tried to integrate the history of the site, the integrity of the land and the community because these things were so hard to keep together. She inquired about whether there would be any kind of plaque or map on the wall to reveal the historic background of MB.

Mr. Wong responded that they were working with tribal leaders on an acknowledgment plaque which would be refined with the developers as they progressed with the design.

Vice-Chair Aquino referred to bike parking on 3rd Street and inquired how this would be accessed. She pointed out that bikes frequently get broken into and stolen and she inquired about how they would keep the bikes safe.

Mr. Wong responded that there had been discussion between OCII staff and the design team to ensure that on the 3rd Street frontage there would be storefront glass to create activation. There would be a specific ratio created to provide a specific number of secured Class 1 bike parking spaces behind closed doors and accessible only by residents. He reiterated that safety of personal property was paramount to this team.

Vice-Chair Aquino requested an update on the status of MB streets, the pavement problems and environmental issues.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that the sidewalks were the responsibility of the adjacent property owners to the extent there were any pavement problems. He explained that the project developers were responsible for the sidewalks adjacent to this site. He added that the streets were the responsibility of the City so any maintenance or repairs that needed to be made would be for the City.

Mr. Wong added that the conditions in MB were very well known. He explained that Curtis Development built Block 9A and had those considerations in mind when constructing that building and the same considerations were being made for Block 4 East. There had been extensive geotechnical studies of the site which was part of the predevelopment due diligence, especially one of this scale and these considerations were taken very seriously. Mr. Wong added that there were controls in place through City regulations and permits that were top of mind for the development team.

Shaddix liked the colors being brought in. He inquired about whether there would be only one ground floor retail in Phase One and none in Phase 2. Chase was right there and the Giants ballpark was there and a lot of people would be walking in that area and he thought there would be opportunity for more retail.

Mr. Wong responded that the solicitation for Request for Qualification was quite specific about considering a community-serving commercial use because the zoning did not require a commercial space on 3rd Street because it was primarily a transit corridor. So most of the retail focus would be on the 4th Street corridor. In their response to this solicitation the team asked the developer to consider a community-service use and right now the consideration is on a youth or senior service focus but this would develop as the project moved forward.

Commissioner Shaddix stated that he walked the streets often and he was aware of the sinking sidewalks issue. He hoped that issue would be addressed. He confessed that it was very hard for him to hear from his neighbors that they were not being included on a project and was struggling with this. Mr. Shaddix asked to hear more about this issue because he would feel a whole lot better knowing that local contractors were being included, especially in BVHP where he lived.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that they all shared the same concerns about this issue. He suggested putting this project and its approval in context of time of construction as well as the process of design and bidding. He reminded Commissioners that some of these things would be out for negotiation and he asked Ms. Pecot to talk about what stage those items were at for this project.

Ms. Pecot stated that since the inception of this project she had worked closely with the Curtis Development team. Most of the construction would go out to bid, but had not gone out to bid yet and opportunities for construction sub-trades representing 70% of contracting opportunities for the project still remained available. She explained that they had completed the professional services contracts for design, achieving 83.4% SBE participation for Phase 1 and 84.5% SBE for Phase 2 with the majority of those contracts going to local firms. For construction the only work that had gone out to bid was for design build for the Mechanical, Electrical, Fire (MEPF) and those contracts are currently under negotiation. Ms. Pecot reported that they were looking at exceeding the 50% SBE participation goal for the MEPF scopes, including substantial LBE participation. Those had not been officially awarded yet. That being the case, 70% of the work had still not gone out to bid and there were many opportunities still available for the local contracting community. Ms. Pecot mentioned good faith efforts so that everyone understood that the SBE program had 50% good faith effort with first consideration to project area firms followed by SF-based firms followed by all other small businesses that met OCII size standards. She reported other good faith efforts being made so far: two community meetings, one at Swinerton (Construction Company) headquarters and another at the SE Community Center, had taken place in order to inform the community about this project. She also mentioned that the GC on the project was a joint Venture between Swinerton Builders, and Rubicon, an LBE. In addition to the community meetings, the GC and the Development team met 24 times with different SBE contractors and attended various community groups to meet the good faith efforts. Ms. Pecot reported that more meetings would take place as well as larger outreach events, most likely in Q1 2026, when the remainder of the work was anticipated to begin going out to bid. She reiterated that so far, the only construction packages that had gone out to bid were the MEPF Design Build (mechanical/electrical/plumbing/fire). She invited members of the development team to speak.

Commissioner Shaddix clarified and summarized that the bulk of the work had not yet gone out to bid.

Ms. Pecot responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Miller thanked the team and the community for their input. He promised that OCII would follow up on the issues raised during public comment. Mr. Miller stressed that this was a great project because affordable housing was not easy to build in SF and he thanked everyone involved for trying to make this happen. He stated that he spent a lot of time in his career working in public facility maintenance and he recognized the importance of that kind of work. Mr. Miller appreciated that the building design reflected the cultural heritage of the area and the aspirations for the community which was very inspiring and thanked the architectural team for that. He advocated that the site location was a gateway between downtown and MB, adjacent to public transit and close to parks and that the project was designed with safety for residents as well as for the public in mind with good lighting as well as having the SFPD station located right across the street. This project was geared to affordability and the design and landscape supported quality of life for families and seniors. Mr. Miller was pleased to see social spaces for seniors as well as for the kids and was pleased with the inclusion of native SF plantings. He stated that there would be 264 required bike spots which would help offset some of the traffic concerns.

Vice-Chair Aquino was very pleased with this project but reiterated that there was more to do.

Chair Scott thanked staff for the presentation. She stated that as a native of SF since the 1940's, she had seen the hard work starting with the Shipyard which had succeeded in getting this generation into school, higher education and jobs. Dr. Scott considered 1550 Evans which was built by qualified builders and had not had any problems with maintenance. The great work on foundation and leveling by qualified workers had guaranteed that it was still safe, sustainable and secure. Dr. Scott was very grateful for the detail they had put into the project plans. She was looking forward to hearing about choosing qualified local workers with excellent experience to participate in this project. Dr. Scott advocated for the holistic care that went into building these projects, for the health and wellness for children and seniors, and for affordability. She promised that they would consider every qualified worker for a position and inclusion within this project. Dr. Scott underscored care for one another and working together and making sure that no man was left behind.

Vice-Chair Aquino motioned to move Item 5(d) and Commissioner Miller seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Lim - absent
Commissioner Miller - yes
Commissioner Shaddix - yes
Vice-Chair Aquino - yes
Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 28-2025, APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT IN CONNECTION WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE FIRST PHASE OF THE MISSION BAY SOUTH BLOCK 4 EAST MIXED-USE AFFORDABLE RESIDENTIAL PROJECT; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Vice-Chair Aquino motioned to move Item 5(e) and Commissioner Shaddix seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Lim - absent
Commissioner Miller - yes
Commissioner Shaddix - yes
Vice-Chair Aquino - yes
Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 29-2025, CONDITIONALLY APPROVING A BASIC CONCEPT AND SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR THE FIRST PHASE OF THE MISSION BAY SOUTH BLOCK 4 EAST MIXED-USE AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECT OF APPROXIMATELY 165 RENTAL UNITS AND APPROXIMATELY 1,253 SQUARE FEET OF COMMERCIAL SPACE; APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE MAJOR PHASE FOR BLOCKS 2-7 AND 13; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Commissioner Shaddix motioned to move Item 5(f) and Vice-Chair Aquino seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Lim - absent
Commissioner Miller - yes
Commissioner Shaddix - yes
Vice-Chair Aquino - yes
Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 30-2025, APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SECOND PHASE OF THE MISSION BAY SOUTH BLOCK 4 EAST AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECT; REFERRING THE PLAN AMENDMENT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR ITS REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Vice-Chair Aquino motioned to move Item 5(g) and Commissioner Shaddix seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Lim - absent
Commissioner Miller - yes
Commissioner Shaddix - yes
Vice-Chair Aquino - yes
Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 31-2025, APPROVING THE REPORT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN; AND AUTHORIZING TRANSMITTAL OF THE REPORT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Commissioner Miller motioned to move Item 5(h) and Commissioner Shaddix seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Lim - absent
Commissioner Miller - yes
Commissioner Shaddix - yes
Vice-Chair Aquino - yes
Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 32-2025, CONDITIONALLY APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT IN CONNECTION WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE SECOND PHASE OF THE MISSION BAY SOUTH BLOCK 4 EAST AFFORDABLE RESIDENTIAL PROJECT; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Vice-Chair Aquino motioned to move Item 5(i) and Commissioner Miller seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Lim - absent
Commissioner Miller - yes
Commissioner Shaddix - yes
Vice-Chair Aquino - yes
Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 33-2025, CONDITIONALLY APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE MAJOR PHASE FOR BLOCKS 2-7 AND 13, AND A BASIC CONCEPT AND SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR THE SECOND PHASE OF THE MISSION BAY SOUTH BLOCK 4 EAST AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECT OF APPROXIMATELY 233 RENTAL UNITS; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Commissioner Miller motioned to move Item 5(j) and Commissioner Shaddix seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Lim - absent

Commissioner Miller - yes
Commissioner Shaddix - yes
Vice-Chair Aquino - yes
Chair Scott – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 34-2025, CONDITIONALLY APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE MISSION BAY SOUTH OWNER PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT IN CONNECTION WITH THE SECOND PHASE OF THE MISSION BAY SOUTH BLOCK 4 EAST AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECT; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

6. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

Speaker: Raymond Raymond, SF resident

Mr. Raymond stated that it was a comfort to him to be in a forum with so many San Franciscans. He recalled that former Mayor Joseph Alioto referred to the Dogpatch as “honky-tonk”. The Mission District buildings were aged, built during the popular Victorian style but were more like European style. Mr. Raymond pointed out that the honky-tonk still lingered at 16th & Mission. He reported that there was a BART station there. On November 5, 2025, BART had convened a community meeting to talk about the plazas. Mr. Raymond was excited about this because it was in the spirit of revitalizing the City.

7. Report of the Chair

Chair Scott reported that she had attended another CityBuild graduation and was pleased to hear that 25 students had been placed in permanent jobs. She also attended the Oscar James ribbon cutting. Dr. Scott hoped they continued to do the right thing and make sure that the opportunity to build was given to everyone who was qualified.

8. Report of the Executive Director

Executive Director Kaslofsky remarked on the CityBuild graduation which Vice-Chair Aquino and Commissioner Miller had attended along with Chair Scott. He stated that it was a wonderful event.

Executive Director Kaslofsky referred to the memo in the Commissioners’ packet regarding HP Shipyard (HPS) and provided an update on recent Navy clean-up activity. He explained that the Navy’s clean-up activities were monitored by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the California Department of Toxic Substance and Control and the Regional Water Quality Control Board and included air and dust monitoring as well. Mr. Kaslofsky stated that in November 2024, the Navy reported that one air sample at Parcel C had a detection of plutonium 239, exceeding what was referred to as an action level for the work they were doing, which triggered a review by the Navy. According to the Navy and other regulators, this was not an indication of a public health risk. They conducted a month-long investigation to verify this finding which was concluded in October 2025. The Navy acknowledged that this was too long for the community to wait for results of this finding. The California Department of Public Health and the environmental regulators requested additional documentation on this issue, which the Navy would provide. The HPS CAC (Citizens Advisory Committee) held an environmental committee hearing the previous evening which Executive Director Kaslofsky and Chair Scott had attended. He reported that it was very well-attended and information was disseminated to the community regarding the clean-up. However, the delay in reporting had damaged trust and, as a result, the Navy committed to approving communications, having greater transparency and posting more relevant documents on their public website. Supervisor Walton from D10 had called for a hearing on the matter on December 15 at 10 a.m. at City Hall.

Chair Scott thanked Executive Director Kaslofsky for that update and requested that OCII be kept informed of any additional updates on this matter. She stated that OCII would not accept any property if not cleaned up properly and which was not signed off as safe for redevelopment by the environmental regulators.

Vice-Chair Aquino thanked Executive Director Kaslofsky for this report and reminded everyone that resident safety must remain the top priority. She appreciated the continued clean-up efforts and strongly supported the Navy maintaining responsibility for this work to ensure thorough and safe remediation for the BV community.

9. Commissioners' Questions and Matters

Vice-Chair Aquino announced that she also attended the CityBuild graduation event which was exciting and was very promising and which Mayor Lurie attended as well. Ms. Aquino reported that she had attended the Oscar James new residence in the BV, near the Shipyard. It was a very historic moment and she stated that it was an honor to be in the company of such amazing community leaders. Ms. Aquino took the opportunity to plug (her neighborhood) Dogpatch and announced that the Holiday Market would take place on 22nd Street between 3rd and Illinois on Saturday, December 6 from 11-5. She explained that they blocked off a street for this event and she invited everyone to attend this holiday fiesta.

10. Closed Session - None

11. Adjournment

Chair Scott asked for a motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Miller motioned to adjourn and Vice-Chair Aquino seconded that motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Jamie Cruz
Commission Secretary