

**MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
SAN FRANCISCO REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
AND THE
SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION
HELD ON THE 3RD DAY JUNE OF 2010**

The Commissioners of the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco and the San Francisco Planning Commission met in a Special meeting at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Board of Supervisors Chamber, Room 250, in the City of San Francisco, California, at 1:00 p.m. on the 3rd day of June 2010, at the place and date duly established for holding of such a meeting.

Planning Commission President Ron Miguel called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. President Miguel stated the following: "Because there hasn't been a combined meeting of our two bodies, Planning and Redevelopment, for some time, I thought perhaps a brief intro was in order. The Planning Commission participates in joint commission hearings when a major land-use project before us will also take action by another of our City's commissions, as we have done recently with the Recreation and Park Division and with the Health Commission. This joint interface avoids duplicative presentations by both staffs and duplicative testimony from the public, saving all of us a great deal of time, effort, and money. In addition, and at least of equal importance, joint hearings such as this enable a discussion among members of both the Agency and the Commission that would otherwise be legally impossible. Joint Planning and Redevelopment hearings in the recent past have included Yerba Buena, Mission Bay, and South Beach. Each of these development areas has proven itself to be eminently successful and each of them continues to provide viable additions of infrastructure, housing, commerce, and recreation for the benefits of San Franciscans. Today's project areas are equally massive. They encompass over 700 acres in land. They envision not only a similar expansion and intensification of San Francisco's built environment, again infrastructure, housing, commerce, and recreation, but mandate a distinct emphasis on viable connections with our city's streets and transportation grids, an emphasis which is absolutely integral to the sustained viability of the Candlestick Point and Hunters Point communities. I'm not going to recite all the statistics. The staff will present those details as we move along in this hearing today. And as most of you today know, they have been well-emphasized in over ten hours of hearings recently, informational hearings at the Planning Commission, and I'm certain that President Swig has presided over a similar number of hours during Redevelopment Agency hearings. This has been an intentional public process to complement the many, many years of both formal and informal neighborhood and citywide outreach. Today I will chair the first part of the hearing, the certification of the EIR; President Swig will preside over the latter section, which starts after 5:00 p.m. We all look forward to hearing from the staff and the communities which are directly involved, and from the general public."

1. RECOGNITION OF A QUORUM

The Planning Commission Secretary Avery announced the presence of a quorum with the following Commissioners present:

Ron Miguel, President
Christine Olague
William L. Lee
Gwyneth Borden
Michael J. Antonini
Kathrin Moore
Hisashi Sugaya

John Rahaim, Director, and staff members were also present.

The Redevelopment Commission Secretary Solis announced the presence of a quorum with the following Commissioners present:

Rick Swig, President
Darshan Singh, Vice President
London Breed
Miguel M. Bustos
Francee Covington
Leroy King

Fred Blackwell, Executive Director, and staff members were also present.

2. Matters of New Business:

PLANNING COMMISSION:

Item No. 1: Consideration of the Motion Adopting Findings Related to the Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for a Proposed Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan

REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:

Agency Action 2a: Consideration of a Resolution Certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan Project Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Bayview Hunters Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Areas, Resolution No. 58-2010

Presenters: Gibson, Planning Department, and Stanley Muraoka, Redevelopment Agency

(TRANSCRIPT OF PRESENTATION/DISCUSSION/COMMENTS OF SPECIAL HEARING ON ALL ITEMS ATTACHED)

SPEAKERS: Francisco DaCosta, Maria Harrison, Vivian Donahue, Esselene Stancil, Alex Tom, Ya Yan, Emily Lee, Li Shuang Li, Daniel Landry, Drew Christopher Joy, Alicia Garza, Jose Luis Pavon, Daniel Solberg, Arthur Feinstein, Saul Bloom, Espanola Jackson, Rodger Scott, Michael Patton, Aurelius Walker, Carmen Policy, Matt Regan, Javier Ramirez, Eileen Hines, Celestine Howard, Jill Fox, Roange Kent, Tera Gray, Conny Ford, Stormy Henry, Thomas Tang, Richard Lau, Terry Anders, Javier Marquez, Gary Banks, Anthony Russo, Claire Bishop, Tiffany Carpenter, Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai, Bradley Bradley, James Mabrey, Amos Brown, Kristina Enea, Linda Richardson, Ann Huey, Ebony Manning, Janita Towns, Fred Noronho, Karina Bas, Gladys Soto, Dedrea Smith, Ace Washington, Charles Hayes, Reginald Rainer, Shantanese Gaines, Lokia Evans, Latasha Beasley, Tashara Johnson, Ashley Anderson, Tammy Ingle, Dennis Lamsey, Tony Rodriguez, Michael Theriault, Tim Paulson, Alonzo Menelik Abdul Raheem Walker, Russ Sturgis, Jarell, Gary Lynch, Tim Colen, Tony Kelly, Ron Stutts, Ricardo Contreras, Linda Shaffer, Marcia Dale Winter, Leon Muhammad, Dr. Veronica Hunnicutt, Renee Saucedo

PLANNING COMMISSION:

Item No. 1: Consideration of the Motion Adopting Findings Related to the Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for a Proposed Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan

Commissioner Lee put forth a motion to move Planning Commission Item No. 1.

Commissioner Antonini seconded the motion.

Planning Commission Secretary Avery called the roll:

Commissioner Antonini:	Aye
Commissioner Borden:	Aye
Commissioner Lee:	Aye
Commissioner Moore:	No
Commissioner Sugaya:	No
Commissioner Olague:	No
President Miguel:	Aye

Ms. Avery stated the motion passes 4 to 3, with Commissioners Moore, Sugaya, and Olague voting against.

REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:

Agency Action 2a. Adoption of the Redevelopment Commission Agency Action 2a: Consideration of a Resolution Certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan Project Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Bayview Hunters Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Areas, Resolution No. 58-2010

Vice President Singh put forth a motion to move Redevelopment Commission Agency Action 2a.

Commissioner Covington seconded the motion.

Commission Secretary Solis called the roll:

Commissioner Breed:	Aye
Commissioner Covington:	Aye
Commissioner King:	Aye
Commissioner Bustos:	Aye
Commissioner Singh:	Aye
President Swig:	Aye

Ms. Solis stated the motion passes unanimously.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL CALLED A RECESS AT THIS TIME - 9:21 P.M.

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WERE TO BE CONSIDERED NO EARLIER THAN 5:00 P.M. IN THE CONTEXT OF TWO PUBLIC HEARINGS, BOTH OF WHICH WERE CALLED AT THIS POINT IN THE PROCEEDINGS AND CONDUCTED CONCURRENTLY.

President Swig called the meeting to order at 9:32 P.M. and stated the following: "Good evening. It's now 9:32, where it was supposed to be 5:00 o'clock in the afternoon. And I'd like to get started again and remind you that this is the special joint hearing of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and the San Francisco Planning Commission. Welcome again to the public and radio and TV listening audiences. For those who are -- didn't get the announcement at 1:00 o'clock this afternoon, please turn off all pagers, cell phones and other sound emitting devices during the meeting. If you wish to speak, please fill out a speaker card for the item which is called and the item on which you address either of the commissions. Please state your name -- very important -- state your name for the record before you make your statements and please limit your remarks to three minutes. And this portion of the agenda is not intended for debate or discussion with Commissioners or staff. Please simply state your business you wish the Commission or staff to be aware of. If you have any questions you can follow up with staff or Commissioners during the break or after adjournment. There will be a

break absolutely at 11:30 p.m., as many of us have cars in the Civic Center parking garage and we wish not to have housed for the evening. It is not appropriate for Commissioners to engage in debate or respond on issues not properly set in a publicly notified meeting agenda. And, for press and the public, please stay within the designated seating area. You have the speaker podium. And members of press are requested to film or record the Commission meeting from the side area of the designated public seating area to my right and your left. And the filming or recording equipment should not interfere with the public's view of participation in the meeting as well as presentation materials before the Commission. These guidelines are in the spirit of promoting open and orderly public meetings. And your continued interest in the Agency, the Commission, and the Planning Commission meetings is welcomed and greatly appreciated. Before I ask Madam Secretary to call the first item, I'd like to let you know what's going to occur so it catches nobody by surprise. First of all, we will have the reading of the Planning items. Then we will have the reading of the Redevelopment items, as they are separate from each other. Those are Items 2 through 9. Then we will hear public comment at the same time on all items, both Planning and Agency items. And then, as we did in the last session, we will have a common session for both Agency and Planning Commission comments and questions on the Agency and -- on all items. Then President Miguel will ask for a call on the Planning items and there'll be a roll call and a vote. And after that is complete, the Planning Commission may adjourn, if they would like. And then the Redevelopment Agency will go through our call on our items and at the end of that we'll adjourn."

President Swig asked to call the next items on the agenda.

PLANNING COMMISSION:

Planning Commission Secretary Avery read the following Planning Items:

Planning Item 2: Motion adopting environmental findings (and a Statement of Overriding Considerations) under the California Environmental Quality Act and State Guidelines in connection with the adoption of the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 and related actions necessary to implement such plans.

Planning Item 3: Formulating a Resolution to approve Amendments to the Bayview Hunters Point Area Plan, the Transportation Element, the Recreation and Open Space Element, the Commerce and Industry Element, the Land Use Index, establishing the Candlestick Point Subarea Plan, the Hunters Point Area Plan along with other minor General Plan Map Amendments.

Planning Item 4: Formulating a Resolution to approve Amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code by establishing the Candlestick Point Activity Node Special Use District, the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Special Use District and to establish special height provisions for the Candlestick Point Activity Node Special Use District and the CP Height and Bulk District, and special height provisions for the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Special Use District and the HP Height and Bulk District.

Planning Item 5: Formulating a Resolution to approve Amendments to the San Francisco Zoning Maps by amending Sectional Maps SU09 and SU010 to establish the Candlestick Point Activity Node Special Use District and the Hunters point Shipyard Phase 2 Special Use District; amending sectional maps HT09 and HT010 to establish the CP and HP Height and Bulk Districts.

Planning Item 6: Formulating a resolution to approve the Candlestick Point Design for Development Document, the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Design for Development Document and corresponding technical amendments to the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 1 Design for Development Document for the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Development Project.

Planning Item 7: Resolution Establishing findings of consistency with the General Plan of the City and County of San Francisco and with Sections 101.1 of the City Planning Code for the Candlestick Point Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Development Project including amendments to the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan, the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan and for various actions necessary for the implementation of the Project.

Planning Item 8: Resolution establishing findings of consistency with the General Plan of the City and County of San Francisco for proposed amendments to the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan and the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan, as part of the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project, recommending approval of the amendments to such Redevelopment Plans, and making office allocation findings pursuant to Planning Code Sections 320-325.

Planning item 9: Formulating a Resolution to approve a Planning Cooperation Agreement between the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and the San Francisco Planning Department for Zone 1 of the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area.

REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:

Redevelopment Commission Secretary Solis read the following Redevelopment Agency Agenda Items:

Agency Action b: Adopting environmental findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, including the adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project; Bayview Hunters Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Areas. (Resolution No. 59-2010)

Agency Action c: Approving the Report to the Board of Supervisors on the proposed Redevelopment Plan Amendment for the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area and authorizing transmittal of the Report to the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco. (Resolution No. 60-2010)

Agency Action d: Approving the proposed Redevelopment Plan Amendment for the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area and making findings under the California Environmental Quality Act and recommending adoption of the proposed Redevelopment Plan by the Board of Supervisors; and submitting the Agency's recommendation, including the proposed Redevelopment Plan to the Board of Supervisors; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area. (Resolution No. 61-2010)

Agency Action e: Approving the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Design for Development and corresponding technical amendments to the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 1 Design for Development; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area. (Resolution No. 62-2010)

Agency Action f: Approving the Report to the Board of Supervisors on the proposed Redevelopment Plan Amendment for the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area and authorizing transmittal of the Report on the Redevelopment Plan Amendment to the Board of Supervisors, Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area. (Resolution No. 63-2010)

Agency Action g: Approving the proposed Redevelopment Plan Amendment for the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area and making findings under the California Environmental Quality Act and recommending adoption of the proposed Redevelopment Plan by the Board of Supervisors; and submitting the Agency's recommendation, including the proposed Redevelopment Plan to the Board of Supervisors; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area. (Resolution No. 64-2010)

Agency Action h: Approving the Candlestick Point Design for Development; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area. (Resolution No. 65-2010)

Agency Action i: Authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Real Property Transfer Agreement between the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco and the City and County of San Francisco for certain City property at Candlestick Point; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area. (Resolution No. 66-2010)

Agency Action j: Authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Public Trust Exchange Agreement between the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco and the City and County of San Francisco, the California State Lands Commission and the California Department of Parks and Recreation in furtherance of the Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project; Bayview Hunters Point and Hunters Point Shipyard and Redevelopment Project Areas. (Resolution No. 67-2010)

Agency Action k: Authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Park Reconfiguration Agreement between the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco and the California Department of Parks and Recreation for the reconfiguration of the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area in furtherance of the Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area. (Resolution No. 68-2010)

Agency Action l: Authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Disposition and Development Agreement between CP Development Co., LP and the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco (“Agency”), and an Interagency Cooperation Agreement and a Tax Allocation Agreement between the Agency and the City and County of San Francisco, and a Planning Cooperation Agreement between the Agency and the Planning Department of the City and County of San Francisco for the development of Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard; Bayview Hunters Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Areas. (Resolution No. 69-2010)

Agency Action m: Making Findings Pursuant to Sections 33445 and 33445.1 of the California Community Redevelopment Law for the Funding of Installation and Construction of Public Improvements Related to the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area; Hunters Point Shipyard Project Area. (Resolution No. 70-2010)

Agency Action n: Making Findings Pursuant to Sections 33445 and 33445.1 of the California Community Redevelopment Law for the Funding of Installation and Construction of Public Improvements Related to the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area; Bayview Hunters Point Project Area. (Resolution No. 71-2010)

Agency Action o: Commending the Hunters Point Shipyard Citizens Advisory Committee and expressing the intention of the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco to consult with the Committee on the implementation of the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project. (Resolution No. 72-2010)

Agency Action p: Commending the Bayview Hunters Point Project Area Committee and expressing the intention of the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco to consult with the Committee on the implementation of the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project. (Resolution No. 73-2010)

PRESENTERS: Michael Cohen, Director of the Mayor’s Office of Economic and Workforce Development, Tom Evans, Lead Planner, Redevelopment Agency, Mat Snyder, Planning Depart., Tiffany Bohee, Mayor’s Office of Economic and Workforce Development, John Lau, representing Supervisor Sophie Maxwell’s office

SPEAKERS: Mitchell Evans, Jaron Browne, David See, Eric Butler, Christian Mohammad, Angelo King, Sabiche Hyde, Al Norman, Gloria Berry, Nyese Joshua, Lavelle Shaw, John McCarthy, Rev. Arnold Townsend, Arnie Stokes, Misha Wally, Sue Hestor, Sonny Loc, Dok Hu Jo, Su Ann, Susan Kelly, Kitty Lee, Eric Brooks, Arango Mims, Regina Douglas, Felipe Nuno, Simon Barber, Harold Lumar, Timothy Allen Simon, Bradley Wedemeyer, Kathy Perry, Mike Sislovik, Raymond Rivera, Chong Sing Chong, Annie, Kathy Davis, Manny Florez, James Gomez, Holly Wilson, Espanola Jackson, Wu Pok Bing, Richard Lau, Florence Kong, Ollie Burgess, Giselle Casada, Grace Martinez, Michael Theriault, Tony Rodriguez, Tim Paulson, Marcia Dale-LeWinter, Pastor Josiah Bell, Dr. Veronia Hunnicutt, Marie J. Franklin, Tony Kelly, Christine Ania, Saul Bloom, Jason Fremyou, Tim Colon, Martinez Pelosa, And unidentified members of the public

PLANNING COMMISSION:

Planning Item 2: Adopting environmental findings (and a Statement of Overriding Considerations) under the California Environmental Quality Act and State Guidelines in connection with the adoption of the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 and related actions necessary to implement such plans.

Commissioner Lee put forth a motion to move Planning Item 2.

Commissioner Antonini seconded the motion.

Planning Commission Secretary Avery called the roll:

Commissioner Antonini:	Aye
Commissioner Borden:	Aye
Commissioner Lee:	Aye
Commissioner Moore:	No
Commissioner Sugaya:	No
Commissioner Olague:	No
President Miguel:	Aye

Ms. Avery stated the motion passes 4 to 3, with Commissioners Moore, Sugaya, and Olague voting against.

Planning Item 3: Formulating a Resolution to approve Amendments to the Bayview Hunters Point Area Plan, the Transportation Element, the Recreation and Open Space Element, the Commerce and Industry Element, the Land Use Index, establishing the Candlestick Point Subarea Plan, the Hunters Point Area Plan along with other minor General Plan Map Amendments.

Planning Commission Secretary Avery called the roll:

Commissioner Antonini:	Aye
Commissioner Borden:	Aye
Commissioner Lee:	Aye
Commissioner Moore:	Aye
Commissioner Sugaya:	Aye
Commissioner Olague:	Nay
President Miguel:	Aye

Ms. Avery stated the motion passes 6 to 1, with Commissioner Olague voting against.

Planning Item 4: Formulating a Resolution to approve Amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code by establishing the Candlestick Point Activity Node Special Use District, the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Special Use District and to establish special height provisions for the Candlestick Point Activity Node Special Use District and the CP Height and Bulk District, and special height provisions for the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Special Use District and the HP Height and Bulk District.

Planning Commission Secretary Avery called the roll:

Commissioner Antonini:	Aye
Commissioner Borden:	Aye
Commissioner Lee:	Aye
Commissioner Moore:	Aye
Commissioner Sugaya:	Aye
Commissioner Olague:	Nay
President Miguel:	Aye

Ms. Avery stated the motion passes 6 to 1, with Commissioner Olague voting against.

Planning Item 5: Formulating a Resolution to approve Amendments to the San Francisco Zoning Maps by amending Sectional Maps SU09 and SU010 to establish the Candlestick Point Activity Node Special Use District and the Hunters point Shipyard Phase 2 Special Use District; amending sectional maps HT09 and HT010 to establish the CP and HP Height and Bulk Districts.

Planning Commission Secretary Avery called the roll:

Commissioner Antonini:	Aye
Commissioner Borden:	Aye
Commissioner Lee:	Aye
Commissioner Moore:	Aye
Commissioner Sugaya:	Aye
Commissioner Olague:	Nay
President Miguel:	Aye

Ms. Avery stated the motion passes 6 to 1, with Commissioner Olague voting against.

Planning Item 6: Formulating a resolution to approve the Candlestick Point Design for Development Document, the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Design for Development Document and corresponding technical amendments to the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 1 Design for Development Document for the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Development Project.

Planning Commission Secretary Avery called the roll:

Commissioner Antonini:	Aye
Commissioner Borden:	Aye
Commissioner Lee:	Aye
Commissioner Moore:	No
Commissioner Sugaya:	No
Commissioner Olague:	No
President Miguel:	Aye

Ms. Avery stated the motion passes 4 to 3, with Commissioners Moore, Sugaya, and Olague voting against.

Planning Item 7: Resolution Establishing findings of consistency with the General Plan of the City and County of San Francisco and with Sections 101.1 of the City Planning Code for the Candlestick Point Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Development Project including amendments to the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan, the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan and for various actions necessary for the implementation of the Project.

Planning Commission Secretary Avery called the roll:

Commissioner Antonini:	Aye
Commissioner Borden:	Aye
Commissioner Lee:	Aye
Commissioner Moore:	Aye
Commissioner Sugaya:	Aye
Commissioner Olague:	Nay
President Miguel:	Aye

Ms. Avery stated the motion passes 6 to 1, with Commissioner Olague voting against.

Planning Item 8: Resolution establishing findings of consistency with the General Plan of the City and County of San Francisco for proposed amendments to the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan and the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan, as part of the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project, recommending approval of the amendments to such Redevelopment Plans, and making office allocation findings pursuant to Planning Code Sections 320-325.

Planning Commission Secretary Avery called the roll:

Commissioner Antonini:	Aye
Commissioner Borden:	Aye
Commissioner Lee:	Aye
Commissioner Moore:	Aye
Commissioner Sugaya:	Aye
Commissioner Olague:	Nay
President Miguel:	Aye

Ms. Avery stated the motion passes 6 to 1, with Commissioner Olague voting against.

Planning item 9: Formulating a Resolution to approve a Planning Cooperation Agreement between the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and the San Francisco Planning Department for Zone 1 of the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area.

Planning Commission Secretary Avery called the roll on Planning item 9 as amended to include a History Walk along the shoreline of the shipyard similar to that of the Port; that Building 813 be evaluated for historic significance; and that there be further consideration with the Historic Preservation Commission of alternative 4A and other historic resources:

Commissioner Antonini:	Aye
Commissioner Borden:	Aye
Commissioner Lee:	Aye
Commissioner Moore:	Aye
Commissioner Sugaya:	Aye
Commissioner Olague:	Nay
President Miguel:	Aye

Ms. Avery stated the motion passes 6 to 1, with Commissioner Olague voting against.

President Miguel put forth a motion for the Planning Commission to adjourn.

REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION:

Agency Action b: Adopting environmental findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, including the adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project; Bayview Hunters Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Areas. (Resolution No. 59-2010)

Commissioner Bustos put forth a motion to move Redevelopment Commission Agency Action b.

Commissioner Breed seconded the motion.

Commission Secretary Solis called the roll:

Commissioner Breed:	Aye
Commissioner Covington:	Aye
Commissioner King:	Aye
Commissioner Bustos:	Aye
Commissioner Singh:	Aye
President Swig:	Aye

Ms. Solis stated the motion passes unanimously.

Agency Action c: Approving the Report to the Board of Supervisors on the proposed Redevelopment Plan Amendment for the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area and authorizing transmittal of the Report to the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco. (Resolution No. 60-2010)

Commissioner Bustos put forth a motion to move Redevelopment Commission Agency Action c.

Commissioner Breed seconded the motion.

Commission Secretary Solis called the roll:

Commissioner Breed:	Aye
Commissioner Covington:	Aye
Commissioner King:	Aye
Commissioner Bustos:	Aye
Commissioner Singh:	Aye
President Swig:	Aye

Ms. Solis stated the motion passes unanimously.

Agency Action d: Approving the proposed Redevelopment Plan Amendment for the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area and making findings under the California Environmental Quality Act and recommending adoption of the proposed Redevelopment Plan by the Board of Supervisors; and submitting the Agency's recommendation, including the proposed Redevelopment Plan to the Board of Supervisors; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area. (Resolution No. 61-2010)

Commissioner Bustos put forth a motion to move Redevelopment Commission Agency Action d.

Commissioner Breed seconded the motion.

Commission Secretary Solis called the roll:

Commissioner Breed:	Aye
Commissioner Covington:	Aye
Commissioner King:	Aye
Commissioner Bustos:	Aye
Commissioner Singh:	Aye
President Swig:	Aye

Ms. Solis stated the motion passes unanimously.

Agency Action e: Approving the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Design for Development and corresponding technical amendments to the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 1 Design for Development; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area. (Resolution No. 62-2010)

Commissioner Bustos put forth a motion to move Redevelopment Commission Agency Action e.

Commissioner Breed seconded the motion.

Commission Secretary Solis called the roll:

Commissioner Breed:	Aye
Commissioner Covington:	Aye
Commissioner King:	Aye
Commissioner Bustos:	Aye
Commissioner Singh:	Aye
President Swig:	Aye

Ms. Solis stated the motion passes unanimously.

Agency Action f: Approving the Report to the Board of Supervisors on the proposed Redevelopment Plan Amendment for the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area and authorizing transmittal of the Report on the Redevelopment Plan Amendment to the Board of Supervisors, Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area. (Resolution No. 63-2010)

Commissioner Bustos put forth a motion to move Redevelopment Commission Agency Action f.

Commissioner Breed seconded the motion.

Commission Secretary Solis called the roll:

Commissioner Breed: Aye
Commissioner Covington: Aye
Commissioner King: Aye
Commissioner Bustos: Aye
Commissioner Singh: Aye
President Swig: Aye

Ms. Solis stated the motion passes unanimously.

Agency Action g: Approving the proposed Redevelopment Plan Amendment for the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area and making findings under the California Environmental Quality Act and recommending adoption of the proposed Redevelopment Plan by the Board of Supervisors; and submitting the Agency's recommendation, including the proposed Redevelopment Plan to the Board of Supervisors; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area. (Resolution No. 64-2010)

Commissioner Bustos put forth a motion to move Redevelopment Commission Agency Action g.

Commissioner Breed seconded the motion.

Commission Secretary Solis called the roll:

Commissioner Breed: Aye
Commissioner Covington: Aye
Commissioner King: Aye
Commissioner Bustos: Aye
Commissioner Singh: Aye
President Swig: Aye

Ms. Solis stated the motion passes unanimously.

Agency Action h: Approving the Candlestick Point Design for Development; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area. (Resolution No. 65-2010)

Commissioner Bustos put forth a motion to move Redevelopment Commission Agency Action h.

Commissioner Breed seconded the motion.

Commission Secretary Solis called the roll:

Commissioner Breed: Aye
Commissioner Covington: Aye
Commissioner King: Aye
Commissioner Bustos: Aye
Commissioner Singh: Aye
President Swig: Aye

Ms. Solis stated the motion passes unanimously.

Agency Action i: Authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Real Property Transfer Agreement between the Redevelopment Agency of the City of County of San Francisco and the City and County of San Francisco for certain City property at Candlestick Point; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area.
(Resolution No. 66-2010)

Commissioner Bustos put forth a motion to move Redevelopment Commission Agency Action i.

Commissioner Breed seconded the motion.

Commission Secretary Solis called the roll:

Commissioner Breed:	Aye
Commissioner Covington:	Aye
Commissioner King:	Aye
Commissioner Bustos:	Aye
Commissioner Singh:	Aye
President Swig:	Aye

Ms. Solis stated the motion passes unanimously.

Agency Action j: Authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Public Trust Exchange Agreement between the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco and the City and County of San Francisco, the California State Lands Commission and the California Department of Parks and Recreation in furtherance of the Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project; Bayview Hunters Point and Hunters Point Shipyard and Redevelopment Project Areas. (Resolution No. 67-2010)

Commissioner Bustos put forth a motion to move Redevelopment Commission Agency Action j.

Commissioner Breed seconded the motion.

Commission Secretary Solis called the roll:

Commissioner Breed:	Aye
Commissioner Covington:	Aye
Commissioner King:	Aye
Commissioner Bustos:	Aye
Commissioner Singh:	Aye
President Swig:	Aye

Ms. Solis stated the motion passes unanimously.

Agency Action k: Authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Park Reconfiguration Agreement between the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco and the California Department of Parks and Recreation for the reconfiguration of the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area in furtherance of the Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area. (Resolution No. 68-2010)

Commissioner Bustos put forth a motion to move Redevelopment Commission Agency Action k.

Commissioner Breed seconded the motion.

Commission Secretary Solis called the roll:

Commissioner Breed:	Aye
Commissioner Covington:	Aye
Commissioner King:	Aye
Commissioner Bustos:	Aye
Commissioner Singh:	Aye
President Swig:	Aye

Ms. Solis stated the motion passes unanimously.

Agency Action l: Authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Disposition and Development Agreement between CP Development Co., LP and the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco (“Agency”), and an Interagency Cooperation Agreement and a Tax Allocation Agreement between the Agency and the City and County of San Francisco, and a Planning Cooperation Agreement between the Agency and the Planning Department of the City and County of San Francisco for the development of Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard; Bayview Hunters Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Areas. (Resolution No. 69-2010)

Commissioner Bustos put forth a motion to move Redevelopment Commission Agency Action l.

Commissioner Breed seconded the motion.

Commission Secretary Solis called the roll:

Commissioner Breed:	Aye
Commissioner Covington:	Aye
Commissioner King:	Aye
Commissioner Bustos:	Aye
Commissioner Singh:	Aye
President Swig:	Aye

Ms. Solis stated the motion passes unanimously.

Agency Action m: Making Findings Pursuant to Sections 33445 and 33445.1 of the California Community Redevelopment Law for the Funding of Installation and Construction of Public Improvements Related to the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area; Hunters Point Shipyard Project Area. (Resolution No. 70-2010)

Commissioner Bustos put forth a motion to move Redevelopment Commission Agency Action m.

Commissioner Breed seconded the motion.

Commission Secretary Solis called the roll:

Commissioner Breed:	Aye
Commissioner Covington:	Aye
Commissioner King:	Aye
Commissioner Bustos:	Aye
Commissioner Singh:	Aye
President Swig:	Aye

Ms. Solis stated the motion passes unanimously.

Agency Action n: Making Findings Pursuant to Sections 33445 and 33445.1 of the California Community Redevelopment Law for the Funding of Installation and Construction of Public Improvements Related to the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area; Bayview Hunters Point Project Area. (Resolution No. 71-2010)

Commissioner Bustos put forth a motion to move Redevelopment Commission Agency Action n.

Commissioner Breed seconded the motion.

Commission Secretary Solis called the roll:

Commissioner Breed:	Aye
Commissioner Covington:	Aye
Commissioner King:	Aye
Commissioner Bustos:	Aye
Commissioner Singh:	Aye
President Swig:	Aye

Ms. Solis stated the motion passes unanimously.

Agency Action o: Commending the Hunters Point Shipyard Citizens Advisory Committee and expressing the intention of the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco to consult with the Committee on the implementation of the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project. (Resolution No. 72-2010)

Commissioner Bustos put forth a motion to move Redevelopment Commission Agency Action o.

Commissioner Breed seconded the motion.

Commission Secretary Solis called the roll:

Commissioner Breed:	Aye
Commissioner Covington:	Aye
Commissioner King:	Aye
Commissioner Bustos:	Aye
Commissioner Singh:	Aye
President Swig:	Aye

Ms. Solis stated the motion passes unanimously.

Agency Action p: Commending the Bayview Hunters Point Project Area Committee and expressing the intention of the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco to consult with the Committee on the implementation of the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project. (Resolution No. 73-2010)

Commissioner Bustos put forth a motion to move Redevelopment Commission Agency Action p.

Commissioner Breed seconded the motion.

Commission Secretary Solis called the roll on Agency Action p, as amended, to include a History Walk along the shoreline of the shipyard similar to that of the Port; that Building 813 be evaluated for historic significance; and that there be further consideration with the Historic Preservation Commission and other historic resources:

Commissioner Breed:	Aye
Commissioner Covington:	Aye
Commissioner King:	Aye
Commissioner Bustos:	Aye
Commissioner Singh:	Aye
President Swig:	Aye

Ms. Solis stated the motion passes unanimously.

3. **COMMISSIONERS' QUESTIONS AND MATTERS:** None.

4. **ADJOURNMENT:**

It was moved by Commissioner Breed, seconded by Commissioner Singh, and unanimously carried that the meeting be adjourned at 1:36 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gina E. Solis
Agency Secretary

ADOPTED:

Attachment: June 3, 2010 Special Joint Hearing Transcript

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING COMMISSION
and REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

SPECIAL JOINT HEARING

Thursday, June 3, 2010

Public Hearing on the
Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard
Phase 2: Certification of the Final
Environmental Report

) and

Adopting Environmental Findings under
the California Environmental Quality Act
in Connection with the Adoption of the
Project and Related Actions Necessary to
Implement Such Plans plus Related
Amendments, Findings, and Approvals.

Board of Supervisors Chamber - Room 250

City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, California 94102

Volume I

REPORTED BY: SANDRA BOSTOW, CSR# 5770 (01-427345)

A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

Commissioner Ron Miguel, President
Commissioner Christine Olague, Vice president
Commissioner William L. Lee
Commissioner Gwyneth Borden
Commissioner Michael J. Antonini
Commissioner Kathrin Moore
Commissioner Hisashi Sugaya
Linda D. Avery, Commission Secretary

FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY:

Commissioner Robert Swig, President
Commissioner Darshan Singh, Vice president
Commissioner Miguel M. Bustos
Commissioner Leroy King
Commissioner Francee Covington
Commissioner London Breed
Gina Solis, Agency Secretary

ALSO PRESENT:

Staff Members: James Morales, Fred Blackwell,
Lisa Gibson, Stanley Muraoka.
Michael F. Rice, Project Director, BPS&J

PUBLIC SPEAKERS:

Francisco DaCosta, Maria Harrison, Vivian Donahue, Esselene Stancil, Alex Tom, Ya Yan, Emily Lee, Li Shuang Li, Daniel Landry, Drew Christopher Joy, Alicia Garza, Jose Luis Pavon, Daniel Solberg, Arthur Feinstein, Saul Bloom, Espinola Jackson, Rodger Scott, Michael Patton, Aurelius Walker, Carmen Policy, Matt Regan, Javier Ramirez, Eileen Hines, Celestine Howard, Jill Fox, Roange Kent, Tera Gray, Conny Ford, Stormy Henry, Thomas Tang, Richard Lau, Terry Anders, Javier Marquez, Gary Banks, Anthony Russo, Claire Bishop, Tiffany Carpenter, Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai, Bradley Bradley, James Mabrey, Amos Brown, Kristina Enea, Linda Richardson, Ann Huey, Ebony Manning, Janita Towns, Fred Noronho, Karina Bas, Gladys Soto, Dedrea Smith, Ace Washington, Charles Hayes, Reginald Rainer, Shantanese Gaines, Lakia Evans, Latasha Beasley, Tashara Johnson, Ashley Anderson, Tammy Ingle, Dennis Lamsey, Tony Rodriguez, Michael Theriault, Tim Paulson, Alonzo Menelik Abdul Raheem Walker, Russ Sturgis, Jarell, Gary Lynch, Tim Colen, Tony Kelly, Ron Stutts,

Riccardo Contreras, Linda Shaffer, Marcia Dale Winter, Leon Muhammad, Dr. Veronica Hunnicutt, Renee Saucedo,

THURSDAY, JUNE 3, 2010 1:12 P.M.
P R O C E E D I N G S

SECRETARY AVERY: Good afternoon. This is the special meeting of the San Francisco Planning Commission in the joint hearing with the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commission. This is Thursday, June 3, 2010. Before we call roll, let's just set a little guidelines. When you speak and address the Commission, speak directly in the microphone approximately three to six inches away. We ask that you state and spell your last name for the record. This is a crowded room. We will not tolerate disruptions of any sort. That would include clapping, yelling, cheering, speaking out of order. If we have to warn you, if we have to call you out for that, we will ask the guards to escort you from the room. We cannot continue the process with disruptions of that sort. Roll call for the Planning Commission:

President Miguel?

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Here.

SECRETARY AVERY: Vice president Olague?

VICE PRESIDENT OLAGUE: Here.

SECRETARY AVERY: Commissioner Lee?

COMMISSIONER LEE: Here.

SECRETARY AVERY: Commissioner Borden?

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Here.

SECRETARY AVERY: Commissioner Antonini?

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Present.

SECRETARY AVERY: Commissioner Moore?

COMMISSIONER MOORE: Here.

SECRETARY AVERY: Commissioner Sugaya?

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Here.

SECRETARY AVERY: Thank you.

SECRETARY SOLIS: President Swig?

PRESIDENT SWIG: Here.

SECRETARY SOLIS: Vice president Singh?

COMMISSIONER SINGH: Here.

SECRETARY SOLIS: Commissioner Breed?

Commissioner Bustos?

COMMISSIONER BUSTOS: Here.

SECRETARY SOLIS: Commissioner Covington?

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: Present.

SECRETARY SOLIS: Commissioner King?

COMMISSIONER KING: Here.

SECRETARY AVERY: Thank you.

We have a quorum and full commission. Commissioners, we are --

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Before we start,

Secretary Avery: Commissioner Antonini?

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Thank you, President Miguel. I'd like to make a statement. There have been some allegations by members of the public that I'm biased in favor of the project being continued today and cannot act objectively. I'd like to respond to those allegations. While it's true that I have been an advocate for keeping the San Francisco 49ers playing their National Football League games in San Francisco, I can unequivocally be open-minded, fair, and objective in considering the items before the Planning Commission today. A second Prop G, passed overwhelmingly by the voters in San Francisco in June 2008, calls for efforts to retain the San Francisco 49ers and calls them a source of considerable civic pride. I believe it would not be wrong to be a strong advocate for the preservation of our treasured civil institutions, be it the San Francisco Ballet, San Francisco Opera, our Fine Arts Museum, the 12th District Federal Reserve Bank, or the San Francisco Giants, among others. However, despite my personal feelings regarding the 49ers, I'm here today to listen with an open mind to all testimony, and I believe I can act in the City's best interests and be a fair and impartial decision-maker. I will consider all options, including no-project alternatives or proposed alternatives, with an open mind. For those of you who've observed me in the last eight years I've served on the Planning Commission, appointed three times and confirmed by the Board of Supervisors three times, I hope you will agree that, even those who may not agree with my

positions on all decisions, that I've always prepared carefully, attended almost every hearing, listened carefully to all comments, and supported my votes with thoughtful findings. Thank you for your time.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Because there hasn't been a combined meeting of our two bodies, Planning and Redevelopment, for some time, I thought perhaps a brief intro was in order. The Planning Commission participates in joint commission hearings when a major land-use project before us will also take action by another of our City's commissions, as we have done recently with the Recreation and Park Division and with the Health Commission. This joint interface avoids duplicative presentations by both staffs and duplicative testimony from the public, saving all of us a great deal of time, effort, and money. In addition, and at least of equal importance, joint hearings such as this enable a discussion among members of both the Agency and the Commission that would otherwise be legally impossible. Joint Planning and Redevelopment hearings in the recent past have included Yerba Buena, Mission Bay, and South Beach. Each of these development areas have proven itself to be eminently successful and each of them continues to provide viable additions of infrastructure, housing, commerce, and recreation for the benefits of San Franciscans. Today's project areas are equally massive. They encompass over 700 acres in land. They envision not only a similar expansion and intensification of San Francisco's built environment, again infrastructure, housing, commerce, and recreation, but mandate a distinct emphasis on viable connections with our city's streets and transportation grids, an emphasis which is absolutely integral to the sustained viability of the Candlestick Point and Hunters Point communities. I'm not going to recite all the statistics. The staff will present those details as we move along in this hearing today. And as most of you today know, they have been well-emphasized in over ten hours of hearings recently, informational hearings at the Planning Commission, and I'm certain that President Swig has presided over a similar number of hours during Redevelopment Agency hearings. This has been an intentional public process to complement the many, many years of both formal and informal neighborhood and citywide outreach. Today I will chair the first part of the hearing, the certification of the EIR; President Swig will preside over the latter section, which starts after 5:00 p.m. We all look forward to hearing from the staff and the communities which are directly involved, and from the general public. Thank you.

SECRETARY AVERY: Thank you, President Miguel. If I can call the first item into the record. This is from the Planning Commission Calendar. Item No. 1 is: Consideration of the Motion Adopting Findings Related to the Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for a Proposed Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan.

SECRETARY SOLIS: From the Agency Action 2A: Consideration of a Resolution Certifying the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Proposed Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Bayview Hunters Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Areas, Resolution No. 58-2010.

MS. GIBSON: Good afternoon, President Miguel, President Swig. I am Lisa Gibson of the Planning Department. And I'd like to say good afternoon also to the Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Agency Commission. Joining me here today is Stanley Muraoka of the Redevelopment Agency, and he will be making the second part of this presentation. The item

before you is certification of the Environmental Impact Report, or EIR, for the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Phase II Project. The Draft EIR was circulated for review and comment on November 12, 2009, for a 45-day comment period, which was extended by the Agency Commission to January 12, 2010, for a total of 60 days. During the public review period the Agency held public hearings on December 15, 2009, and January 5, 2010, to receive comments on the adequacy of the Draft EIR. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on the Draft EIR on December 17, 2009. In addition to the verbal comments that we received from the approximately 150 speakers at the public hearings, the Planning Department and the Agency received approximately 117 written comments through mail, hand-delivery, fax, and e-mail. The Comments and Responses document, or C&R document, was published on May 13, 2010, and it includes copies of all the comments received on the Draft EIR as well as individual responses to those comments. In some cases the responses to individual comments are in the form of master responses, which consist of comprehensive discussions of issues that received numerous comments. The C&R document also makes text changes to the Draft EIR that either clarify information or make minor corrections and changes to the document. The chapter of the document with the text changes repeats the changes that are specified and the individual responses to comments, which adds to the bulk of the document, but this enables the reader to easily review all the document changes in one place. Other changes were due to refinements in the project variants and alternatives, many of which were prompted by comments received on the Draft EIR. And the four primary areas of refinement are (1) an addition of a housing/research and development variant, or Variant 2A, as a non-stadium option, to provide a moderate increase in research and development based on the housing variant; (2) addition of an historic preservation Subalternative 4A that provides for historic preservation with no other changes to the project; (3) that the Tower Variant, Variant 3D, that minimizes shadow impacts on the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area, and increase in tower floor plates from 10,000 square feet to 12,500 square feet will allow an efficiency and flexibility in the design of the floor plates without increasing the total number of housing units; (4) an updated development schedule as reflected in the document, and that has construction starting in one or two years later to reflect the current entitlement process schedule. None of the refinements to the project or other clarifications and corrections in the EIR result in a change to the findings or conclusions of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR together with the C&R document constitute the Final EIR that is before you today for certification. At this time commissioners are not being asked to consider the merits of the project, as this is not relevant to the adequacy, accuracy, or objectivity of the EIR. Project proposals are the subject of the items that followed the certification item on the agenda for today's meeting. Subsequent to publication of the C&R document, we received correspondence from individuals and organizations, and some of that contains statements that are regarding the adequacy of the C&R document and the EIR as well. Individuals and organizations who provided comments that were copied to the Planning and the Agency staff include Francisco DaCosta, Arthur Feinstein on behalf of the Sierra Club, Margo Bors, Paul Nixon on behalf of Bay Access. And then in addition, this morning we received additional correspondence on the project from vice president Cortney Damkroger of the Historic Preservation Commission, Elizabeth Goldstein of the California State Parks Foundation, John Zwicke with the City of Brisbane and Potrero Hill Democratic Club, and Jim Lazarus of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce. And I believe that all the commission members have these letters, and the staff of the Agency and the Planning Department has provided them for you. Because of the recent date of receipt of these pieces of correspondence, we were not able to address them in the Comments & Responses document. And we reviewed

the comments that we received as of yesterday and find that they are similar to the comments that were already addressed in the C&R document, as I will explain. Regarding the letters that we received today, you know, given the timing of the receipt of them, we are in the process now of reviewing those and are preparing to comment on them after the public comment portion of this hearing. So the topics of concern in the letters that we received as of yesterday generally include toxic contaminants on Parcel E2, cleanup of hazardous substances, the precautionary principle, and the health of the Bayview community. And these are comments we did address in the C&R document in Master Responses 5, 11, 12, 13, and 15. Regarding noise from traffic generated by traffic on the Yosemite Slough bridge, we have Master Response 3 that addresses that issue. Regarding that comments we received recently on recreation, this is covered in Response 86-12 regarding the impacts of the bridge on recreational use. We have coverage of the issue of the importance of addressing access points for boats in the Blue Greenway. That's covered in our responses 31-9 and 116-2. Regarding aesthetic impacts of the bridge on the Candlestick Point State Recreational Area, we have numerous responses addressing that, including 31-14 and then responses to letter 47, including response Nos. 34, 36, 46, 58, 73, and 75 as well as response 75-5. And biological resources, we have a Master Response 3 that addresses the effects of the project, biological effects of the project, in relation to the Yosemite Slough Restoration Project, impacts on the state parks with the change of the amount of state park land, and other issues also in response to 86-6. We received cultural-resources-related comments in relation to the Muwekma Ohlone, and we have Master Responses 1 and 2 that cover that issue. We received comments stating preferences for a desire to see alternatives addressing a no-bridge BRT route allowing automobiles on the bridge, and these are addressed in Master Response 4, Response 17-1, and we also discuss this as part of Alternative 2 in the Draft EIR. And two other issues, cumulative projects and what projects we did address in the cumulative analysis of transportation, that's addressed in Response 43-2 and also in the transportation circulation section of the EIR. And also there were some comments that I received regarding the project merits, either support for or opposition to the project or elements of the project, and those comments are not pertinent to the consideration of the adequacy, accuracy, and objectivity of the EIR. So at this time I'd like to turn the presentation over to Stanley Muraoka with the Redevelopment Agency. Thank you.

MR. MURAOKA: Thank you, Lisa. Again, my name is Stanley Muraoka and I'm the Environmental Review Officer for the Redevelopment Agency. The EIR before you discloses a number of impacts, including those that would not create significant environment effects and those that could create significant environmental impacts but would either be precluded or reduced to a less than significant level with the implementation of mitigation measures. There are some impacts, however, which could remain as significant and unavoidable environmental impacts despite the application of mitigation measures. These impacts include project and cumulative construction-related impacts such as the effects of project construction on vehicle traffic, ground-borne vibration, an increase in ambient noise levels, impacts on historic resources, and shadows on Gilman Park for two of the tower variants; project and cumulative traffic impacts due to traffic volumes, traffic at intersections, and traffic at freeway ramps and freeway segments; project and cumulative transit impacts including impacts of traffic on Muni lines and SamTrans bus lines, project traffic impacts on bicycle routes, event impacts on traffic and transit during 49er games, secondary events at the stadium, and arena events; project and cumulative air quality impacts due to exceedences of criteria of air pollutants and the project's contribution to cumulative levels of toxic air contaminants and particulate matter; project and

cumulative noise impacts due to traffic noise levels and noise from stadium events; and the project's contribution to the cumulative demand for police services. If the Commissions certify the EIR, they can then proceed to considering the proposed project. If the Commissions decides to approve the project, they will need to adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations that explains how the benefits of the project outweigh these unavoidable adverse environmental effects. A Draft EIR certification motion is before the Planning Commission and a Draft EIR certification resolution is before the Agency Commission. Certification is not an action to approve the project but solely a decision that the EIR has been completed in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act and is adequate, objective, and accurate. This concludes our presentation on this matter. Lisa and I and other staff who have worked on the EIR and the environmental consultants are available to answer any questions you may have. Thank you for your consideration.

SECRETARY AVERY: Mr. President, before you start calling roll for the public comment, if I could just remind everyone of the public to speak slowly and clearly. We have a court reporter here, and we'd like to be able to make sure you get -- she gets all of your comments accurately. Thank you. And, again, there is overflow in the North Light Court. If the president calls your name from the North Light Court and you come up, you will be admitted to the room to give your testimony.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: As I call the names, since we are in the board chambers, we'll follow the normal procedure that the board follows for speakers. As I call your names, if you will line up in the center aisle and come up one by one, it will be easier to keep a continuous flow. Francisco DaCosta, Beverly Hutchins, Marie Harrison, Vivian Donahue.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Commissioners, my name is Francisco DaCosta. I'm the director of the Environmental Justice Advocacy, and I also represent the First People, the Muwekma Ohlone. Commissioners, the microphone is not working.

SECRETARY AVERY: Try it now.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: So I said that I am the director of Environmental Justice Advocacy and also a representative of the First People, the Muwekma Ohlone. So, Commissioners, I have appeared before you numerous times, but I've also written about my opinions thousands of times. I participated in the Comments & Response, and some of them have been addressed and some of them have not. And we have an opportunity to do whatever it takes to adjudicate that matter. One of the things that you commissioners know, or should know, is that the first time around you did not pay attention to the cultural resources and to the needs of the First People. Any way you look at it, this land belongs to the Muwekma Ohlone. And the least the commissioners can do is respect them and allow them to give their comments and allow them representation, and that was not done. When I worked at the Presidio of San Francisco, I had the ability and I did review hundreds and hundreds of environmental impact studies and reports. So I have read through the Draft EIR, I have gone through the Comments & Responses, and what I find is that here we are trying to accommodate 10,500 people, but we are not addressing cumulative pollution, transportation issues, and we are not paying attention to certain key things, what I call quality-of-life issues like child care, educational facilities, hospitals, and so on and so forth. Commissioners, in the year 2010 we do not have too much

land in San Francisco. The southeast sector is that last frontier, so we need the best minds to do the right thing. So here you have a developer named Lennar and you have certain representatives who are pushing for things without giving us representation. Senate Bill 792 was not done correctly. Not one single major meeting was held in the community. So I say to you commissioners, if Lennar has 700 acres at Hunters Point, why do they need the 23 acres of the state park that belongs to all of California? Why? Secondly, let me state to you in the 18 seconds that are left, it is wrong for the community to be divided. The community should be united to address this process. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Marie Harrison. Outside of the fact that I am a resident of Bayview-Hunters Point, I work in Bayview-Hunters Point, I play in Bayview-Hunters Point, and I pray in Bayview-Hunters Point, so I pray that you hear my comments and that you pay very close attention to the fact that I am here opposing the acceptance of this EIR process for a lot of moral reasons, but I won't even get into that. Let's just talk about some things that it does not do. It does not address the cumulative impacts that are going to happen and that are already occurring in my community. It does not now and at this rate if it is passed through it will not address the standards of the CEQA. And I guarantee you that pushing this thing through without at least adhering to the CEQA standards will cost not only my community but this city. I'm asking you to take a very good look at some of the comments that you have, letters. I don't want to repeat everything that so many of us are going to be repeating, but I want to tell you that any time a project such as this divides a community the way in which this project has divided this community -- and I want to let you know it wasn't a good division. It's okay to disagree with people, but it is not okay for a community to be at arms with each other over a job versus a life. And that's really what it comes down to: a job versus a life, and then only a promise of a job versus a life. You're dividing our community over a what-if-we-have-all-of-these-wonderful-things. What happens to the people who are already there? What happens to the people who come into this community and they find that you have allowed them to cap areas that really should be cleaned totally. This is what we're here about. That shipyard was supposed to be cleaned to residential standards. This entire city -- you didn't hear from us on it, but you heard from the entire city, who voted on that particular issue and overwhelmingly said that shipyard should be cleaned to the residential standards that we asked for in the very beginning. It is not, not with capping. And that's exactly one of my major fears, outside of the fact that, in reviewing some of the comments that they have, they don't truly address our issues. Their responses to our comments, if you really pay attention to them, to me and to very many of us is a lot of, for a nicer word, a lot of jumbo. And it's a lot of jumbo words thrown together to sound like they're important or that we've done what we were supposed to, when the reality is they didn't do it. I urge you, do not accept this EIR that is flawed.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Thank you for having us.

SECRETARY AVERY: Can you speak directly into that microphone.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I am here today to ask you to not approve this. Because I live at 178 Kiska Road, about half a block from the shipyard. My family has been affected from breathing in these toxic fumes for years. And it needs -- You need to look at the scientific

information that has been given us; not our decision but from a scientist. And I'm pretty sure you've heard of her. Her name is Subru, Subra -- I can hardly say that. But we have had a meeting with her on Third Street at the mosque, and we believe the scientific information that we have heard. And the way this land is over there in Hunters Point now, you can't plant a tree, you can't even cover it, and they have capped it up, 2003. And what worries me, am I going to be sleeping up there and an earthquake comes and the whole place blow up? You know, we want it cleaned up, period, clean. Because it's a frightening possibility of what could happen there. And I'm urging you to please do not say yes until this whole place is cleaned up. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: And your name?

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Vivian Donahue.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Is Beverly Hutchins here? Esselene Stancil, Alex Tom, Ka Yan Cheung, Emily Lee, if you'll line up in the center, please.

SECRETARY AVERY: You may approach the mike.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Thank you. Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Esselene Stancil, and I'm here to ask you, please do not pass the EIR until everything has been considered. I live in the area and I have lived there when the shipyard was in force and everything, and it is terrible out there. They had the burning out there that burned about three weeks or longer where they couldn't even stop it, and it's still burning underground. But we're asking you to consider not to pass this until you have thoroughly investigated to see. It is so toxic out there. The air is very, very toxic. We have so many people in the area sick. Why would you let Lennar come in there? Because he love to build on toxic ground all over the country. That is his way of doing things. So we're asking you to pay attention to this. Because I understand that you have plumbers and other people all lined up to come to San Francisco. People in the city think that they're going to get these jobs? No. Because they did the same thing on Third Street with the T Train. They didn't give the people the jobs like they promised. A promise is not considered effective until the people that you promise is given the opportunity to do what you have asked them to do. I am submitting to you two folders here for each one of you to get one, and we're hoping that you start looking at it as soon as you get your paper. One is on the greenhouse gases that's in our area, and then you have the other one is on the EIR that does not comply with what the other people have told you. It is not up to par. We have gone over the EIR thoroughly, and we find so many flaws in it that was not completed. So we're asking that somebody will give each one of you one of these papers so that you can start looking. But there's two folders. One has the green gas and one has the others. So we are asking you to please pass them. It's one for each one in here. It's a copy for each individual. The red is in the area where the EIR is not in compliance with the CA and CS projects. Please, don't pass this. Capping it is not for it. I know people that's working in the area, and they have told me thoroughly how toxic it is out there. I have walked the area at my age. Look at me. I'm not a young woman, and I've been in the area over 50 years. I know the area well. But I'm asking you to please consider our health over money. This is why the country is going down now, is because of greed over money. So please don't accept the EIR. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners, my name is Alex Tom. I'm with the Chinese Progressive Association. I'm the executive director. And we have been in the community for about 38 years organizing work with Chinese immigrant working families, and we do actually have a lot of members who live in the Bayview. And today my remarks are going to focus and highlight on the growing and vibrant diversity in the Bayview. And there are actually a lot of Chinese and Latino families in the Bayview. We wanted to make sure that voice was heard today. The percentage is about, I would say, 30 to 40 percent of the Asian community, and in the years to come there will be many more living in the Bayview, moving in. A lot of them are low income who pool together their money to be able to purchase homes or rent, and a lot of them are moderate income as well. They not only will be moving to the neighborhood, they will also be moving into these projects, the Lennar development, if this was approved. And this is actually why we are here: to request that you vote down this EIR. And the reason why I say this is because we want to make sure it's safe, it's clean and nontoxic. But this is where we disagree with the other side, which actually also agrees to clean up the shipyards. But we want a full cleanup, a full cleanup of all the toxic waste, the radioactive materials, before any construction. The community's health, we feel, should be your top priority, the most vulnerable people in this community should be your top priority. And I've talked to people on all sides of the community, and everybody just want jobs, they want housing, but the big question is: At what cost? And we believe you can do both, but you don't need to do that now. We need to be fully confident that it's clean, that it's nontoxic, and this is a place that families can flourish. And let's not forget what happened in New Orleans with BP. The same thing has happened. People went through this whole process cutting corners. Even Republicans are cautious of environmental health risk because of the unregulated nature of the project. So if you even think about that situation now, we want to really compel you all to say that both sides agree there are environmental health risks. We want you to not cut corners. Take the time to make the needed considerations on this project. And we know that there's a lot at stake, there's a lot of money, the developers are probably saying they are not going to build anymore, and that you have a lot of political pressure. But people are just hopeless and they're taking desperate measures. They want jobs and they want it now. So today is your opportunity to give people some hope, to vote this down and say that there are going to be possibilities in the future. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hi. Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Ka Yan, with the Chinese Progressive Association as well. I'm here to urge you to not approve this Environmental Impact Report because it does not meet CEQA standards. A project as politically charged as this needs to take into account regulatory biases, and also please look at the science and not, you know, allow a public interest to influence your decisions. Also, my community, as Alex just said, is really hurting for jobs right now, and Lennar is, you know, taking advantage of this need, this community need, to push for their own interests. So by fully cleaning up this Superfund site, our community will have jobs and our community will be safe for workers and residents. So please don't approve this Environmental Impact Report. Thanks.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon. My name is Emily Lee. I'm also with the Chinese Progressive Association, and I'm here today also to urge you not to approve the EIR before you today because it's inadequate and does not comply with CEQA. As many of you may know, the Bayview neighborhood, like many other neighborhoods in southeast San Francisco, has a long history of environmental racism and pollution in its neighborhoods. For too long toxic pollution has been the backdrop for the residents living there, for kids who go to school there, who grow up there. And we see that actually if this project goes forward without proper cleanup and its completion, that this is just another toxic site that's being added to the existing burdens in the community. So we know that for years PG&E was spewing out toxic pollution to residents who lived nearby. We know that there's diesel pollution from the many trucks and many buses that go through the neighborhood. There's many layers of this pollution that's going on to residents. It's not just one instance. And if you allow this development to go forward, it's just another hair on the camel's back, or the final straw that's going to break the camel's back. We believe that the EIR does not adequately address the health risk from the potential exposure to the toxic chemicals. There are chemicals of concern that are known carcinogens, that's cancer-causing chemicals, that are at levels above the acceptable human health risks. And we've seen what happens to corporations that assure us that it's safe; right? The BP spill. There's many examples of when corporations said, It's safe, trust us, let's move forward with this. But in the end who pays the price? It's going to be the residents who are living there. And so I think it's really important that we make sure it's absolutely safe before we allow any folks to be living on that site or for families to have their kids growing up in those homes, and to really ask ourselves: Is this the type of risk that we want to put families in, is this the type of risk that we want to build a whole project on top of? And I think that for acceptable risk to know that you might be getting cancer from the place that you're going to be living and the place your kids are going to be living. So we really urge you today to reject this EIR and move forward with a better proposal that will allow for full cleanup of the site. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Li Shuang Li, Drew Christopher Joy, Daniel Landry, and Alicia Garza.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC (through interpreter): Hi, everybody. My name is Li Shuang Li. I'm a resident of Bayview. I've been living there for over 15 years. I'm also a member of the Chinese Progressive Association. What I want to say today is that no one would want their family to live in unsafe conditions. I feel that if there's a full cleanup, it will be really good for Lennar as well as the residents. If anything happens to the health of the community, Lennar would be the one responsible. It's too late if there's new incidents of cancer and birth defects. If that happens, it's already too late.

So we hope that you would stand to make an ethical decision to can live on it and not just cater to self-interests. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Drew Christopher Joy, Daniel Landry, Alicia Garza. I'll call some more names, and if you'll line up in the central aisle. Jose Luis Pavon, Archbishop Franz King, Star Myles, and Pastor Daniel Solberg.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners from the Agency and also the Planning Commission. Daniel Landry, for the record. And first of all, I want to thank you for calling this joint hearing to discuss this critical issue of the future of San Francisco. One thought that comes to mind is what we do know and what we don't know at this point. What we do know is that the shipyard is not clean. What we don't know is what will happen if an earthquake happened right now and what would be the effects of a Superfund site that some call the toxic soup site. I want to just urge this body, both bodies, to reject the EIR entirely. It's not adequate, it's not sufficient for us to go forward, and it does not address the risk that we do know is out there in the shipyard and what future faces communities who will be there who will actually have to deal with the results of the damage that will take place once these toxins, which some have said, you know, you can't even define what's out there. Let me just touch on one thing that's real clear, though, and I was thinking about the golden question of all of this, since we do know that the shipyard is not cleaned up and, you know, we're talking about early transfer. We have to be clear that of course this city is in trouble financially. Of course San Francisco have put a lot of investment, time, money, resources into making this project happen. Of course there's been many meetings, there's been many minds that came to the table, and there's been signing off of the mayor, the sign-off of the previous mayor. However, let's be honest. In the United States of America, as we speak, we're seeing tremendous examples of rushing projects and not looking at the real defining point that the projects has become a risk, and as a result of like the BP spill that everyone is talking about, the damage that this will cause on the community and future communities. We have to look, I think, at the fact that if we're talking about jobs, well, there's jobs in cleanup. There's jobs in cleanup that can last for 20 years, however long it takes to clean up the shipyard. But we should not rush and put people out there unprepared and move along with a project that is not adequate and does not address CEQA, which is the most important fact that we're speaking of today. So I just want -- As a resident of San Francisco, I just want to urge this body to reject this EIR. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. There's been suggestion from the sheriff's officers that is quite logical: If you have already spoken, if you could leave the room, there is an overflow room in the North Light Court. And that way, others that are waiting to come in will be able to take seats in this room. That would be very generous of you to do so. Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Drew Christopher Joy. I'm a resident of the Mission District of San Francisco and I work with an organization called POWER. I am here today to urge you to not certify this EIR. The EIR does not meet CEQA standard and will not adequately protect future residents of the Hunters Point Shipyard. I've read both the EIR and the feasibility and remediation studies for all of the parcels, so I feel pretty clear on what the actual risks are. And I know that, unlike what Michael Cohen stated at the last Planning Commission meeting I was at, the shipyard in its current state is extremely toxic and there are many chemicals of concern and radionuclides that could cause cancer and other health risks. I think it's important to note that the significance of toxins has been downplayed in public meetings, and that if you look at the facts, we know that this is an extremely dangerous Superfund site. The risks assessed in the EIR is based on planned future use, but the EIR also states that the future use could change at any point. So when we're evaluating risk and we're evaluating that based on a recreational standard or research and development or like warehouse, we're not evaluating what actually all

the possible future uses for this land could be. And we need to be evaluating everything on the shipyard for a residential standard because at any point any of the shipyard could be used for a residential building because we know there's a push for more land for housing in the city. So the entire shipyard needs to be cleaned to residential standards and we need to protect the health of the San Francisco community first and foremost and not risk our community for the sake of an unwise development. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Alicia Garza. I'm the co-executive director of People Organized to Win Employment Rights. And I'm here to urge you to reject this EIR. It does not meet CEQA standards. The City and County of San Francisco is squandering an incredible opportunity on the worst possible developer. This developer has a track record across the country of building on toxic sites without remediating, and you all know this. The Bayview-Hunters Point community is adversely and disproportionately impacted by environmental racism. This is an opportunity for us, as a world-class city, as a city that considers itself a leader in green everything, to actually put our money where our mouths are. We cannot accept under any circumstances building on top of a radiological dump site. We cannot under any circumstances accept 150,000 tons of greenhouse gases where families live, where children play. I personally have knocked on thousands of doors in Bayview-Hunters Point. I have had mothers open their doors with their noses bleeding, right next to Parcel A, supposedly the cleanest parcel. We can do better. We must do better, and we have that opportunity today. As our friend said, Alex Tom, it's not an either/or; it can be a both/and. We can have development, we can have housing, we can have jobs. We can do that without sacrificing another generation of black, brown, Asian families, children, elders. It's time for us, as a world-class city, to stand up and say: As much as we appreciate the opportunities that exist here, we want to take full advantage, not partial, not a shortcut, and under no circumstances will we tolerate development on toxic waste. Please, please, this EIR does not meet CEQA standards, and we encourage you, we urge you, on behalf of all of the families that we represent, to reject this EIR. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Jose Luis Pavon. I work with POWER. I'm a San Francisco resident. I live in the Mission. And I'm here to ask you to please, please do not approve the EIR because it does not meet CEQA standards. I understand the need for jobs. Nobody here disagrees that we need jobs urgently. I was unemployed for almost a year. I have a little boy. I understand what it means to not be able to pay bills because you're unemployed. But what we're talking about here today, if this EIR gets approved, is immediate satisfaction versus long-term economic sustainability. We have an opportunity for long-term economic sustainability for the current residents of Bayview now if we stop the EIR and we develop a real progressive plan, with everyone at the table, that benefits the Bayview residents, that benefits San Francisco. It's been reiterated over and over again: We can employ people over the long term if we complete the cleanup. There's also small business opportunities for today's residents. There's also affordable housing opportunities for today's residents. And I would warn the folks of Bayview, I would warn you to look at what has happened in the Mission District. Developers promised us the world 15

years ago. Developers promised us jobs. Developers came to local nonprofits and gave them money and said, Hey, go and tell your constituents that we're here to build up the neighborhood. More than half the people I grew up with are gone. They're not in the Mission no more. I can barely afford to stay. I'm hanging on by my nails. I live with four roommates and I have a little boy. That is the truth. We're not talking about a theory about what could be happening; we're talking about the truth. People are sick. That is the truth. And folks have got to ask themselves, Will the developer be paying your bills if you get cancer? Will the developer be paying your children's bills if you get cancer? Who's going to pay that bill? Who is going to deal with the lawsuits? Ultimately you are responsible. The City is responsible for what happens with this critical historical decision. Your legacy is on the line, and when people get sick, you will be held responsible and the City will be held liable. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: My name is Pastor Dan Solberg. I'm pastor of St. Paulus Lutheran Church in San Francisco. I urge you, as a combined body, to reject this EIR as inadequate and does not comply with CEQA standards. Given the long history of Bayview-Hunters Point and it being the recipient of countless denigrations and racist-motivated treatment, it is a delight to know that at least at one point along the way the city of San Francisco voted 85 percent to call upon the City and the Navy to clean up that toxic waste dump, a Superfund site, to residential standards. Ten years ago the city of San Francisco took off that veil of environmental racism for a moment and requested that the area be cleaned up to residential standards. Over the process of the last ten years, and more focusedly over the last few years, the environmental racism card again is being played with almost unconscionable action. It is now being called upon that the place can be capped and that Superfund site can be ignored under a veil of asphalt and concrete, simply subjecting that community one more time to a racist, environmentally toxic quality. This EIR does not take into consideration the opinion and the demand of the city of San Francisco, through its electorate, to clean it up to residential standards. Play all the games that you want to in terms of parceling out, in terms of somehow coming up with jobs instead of environmental cleanup, and yet the place needs to be cleaned up to environmental -- or to residential standards. The city of San Francisco has called for that. Don't you allow for this sort of continued racism to be again placed over and against the population and the land of Bayview-Hunters Point. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Again, if you'll line up when I call your names: Arthur Feinstein, Saul Bloom, Mike Lynes, Michael Boyd.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Commissioners, I'm Arthur Feinstein representing the Sierra Club. We've submitted comments to you previously, and we believe those comments are still accurate in saying that this EIR is fatally flawed, in some cases because it has not adequately addressed issues, in others because it's actually factually inaccurate. So I'd just like to go through some of those instances. Talking about the impact of the bridge and its roads on Candlestick Point State Recreation Area, the writers of the EIR could not come up with a rationale that will say, no, there will not be an impact, so instead what they said is you cannot have a nature experience in an urban area. I don't think that is credible. In fact, it is not credible. I hope you folks from Rec & Park would recognize that. We have natural areas. We

have Golden Gate Park, we have Crissy Field, we have McLaren Park, we have many parks, Buena Vista Park. I've been in all of them and have had undisturbed nature experiences in all of them. The idea that the Planning Department had the gall to say you cannot have a nature experience in San Francisco is insulting to many of us who work on nature issues in this city. It's simply not true, and therefore that whole argument is debunked. And that's the only argument they can make and the only argument they do make. Secondly, in terms of the road around the bridge: Arc Ecology submitted an alignment that showed how you could go around Yosemite Slough instead of going over the bridge, with a minimum increase in time of perhaps only a minute and a half. Therefore, you don't need to do the bridge, which has significant environmental impacts. The EIR really couldn't challenge this either, so they took two tacks to address this issue. One, they refused to analyze the Arc alternative and instead created their own route around Yosemite Slough that was a more difficult route. And, secondly -- and I'm a 12-year Muni bus driver. Way back when, when I was just a kid, I drove Muni for 12 years. I never drove at seven and a half miles an hour except maybe on the Stockton 31 line through Chinatown, where you really have no choice. But they say that the reason that this route around Yosemite Slough is not feasible is because it would take five minutes longer than going across the bridge. The distance is only basically half a mile. It's not credible. And buses can go faster than 7.5 miles an hour. I'd also like to talk about things they left out. One is in the public comments. I was at the Planning Commission hearing about transportation. I did not hear them say that there was going to be a three-minute increase of the T-line in traffic speed or that there was going to be a 17-minute increase on the Sunset line, the 29. These are huge transit impacts that you're being asked to approve which were not clearly elicited. And there's also a question whether there will be new peaker plants at this development which have not been analyzed at all. Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Commissioners, my name is Saul Bloom. I'm the executive director of Arc Ecology. I'm going to speak on two specific subjects today. One is on the transportation issue which Arthur just touched upon. This is the alignment that Arthur was speaking to with regard to (indicating). There you go. The question has been raised that the alignment is going to require takings and it is going to require a number of special switching for the Muni line, but as you can see from this alignment over here, that's not the case. This alignment was developed for us by LSA Associates, a firm that has regularly contracted with local governments across the state of California, and we've spent a substantial sum of money analyzing these routes. In fact, the actual route that would cause the takings in this area is the change in the parking requirements and the length of the -- the width of the route along Ingells over here, which would actually make it very, very difficult for the 40 loading docks that you have over there to actually get service. So it will have a substantial impact on the PDR that's already existing over there. The second comment I wanted to make was on economic development, jobs, and specifically about green maritime technology. In the original 1997 plan for the shipyard there was a substantial amount of area designated, consistent with the Seaport Plan by BCDC, for maritime economic development. We have been looking at that at quite some length lately and have been very, very heavily involved in freeing up the vessels contained at the Suisun Bay mothball fleet for economic development and scrapping. As you can see here by this picture, this graph, shown by the Maritime Administration, you can see that maritime is a growth industry. It has enormous potential for job development, yet this is entirely absent from the plan that we are currently looking at today. In fact, when you look at the potential for jobs, you are looking at a wide variety of different job development, from

institutional research to research and development to repair and recycling of vessels, and no one has to look further than the evening news to see how much the maritime industry can use some green technology. These are the vessels that will be recycled. We are now on the eight vessels leaving this fleet, except those jobs are going to Texas. We have some jobs over at Pier 70. In conclusion, what I wanted to say was: We have worked hard to provide this City with a series of alternatives to engage it positively. We have wanted to see this project succeed. More than any other activity for five years, we have been working with research, spending over a quarter of million dollars, to address this concern, yet the City has a project that is devoid of many of the opportunities that we've attempted to show it. You've seen a few here today. Thank you for your time.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Kevin Eppes, Espinola Jackson, Claudine Jay, Rodger Scott.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon. My name is Espinola Jackson, Bayview-Hunters Point. You know, I've given you all information about my community. I believe I'm the oldest one in this room that have lived at Bayview-Hunters Point. I've been living in Bayview-Hunters Point since 1948, but I've been a citizen of San Francisco since 1943. I don't want to get it wrong here. We know that that area is toxic over there. The voters -- I called and said, Look, I've got more information about what happened at the state park in 1960 when the report was made. I came to the Commission meeting last Thursday and gave a packet for you to see where all -- no time have it ever been mentioned, but I have stated that the state park that was built, it was built on where the garbage company used to dump all the time here in San Francisco. Now, with all the toxins that's in that dirt, it states in there, a letter, an open letter that was written to then Art Agnos saying that no children should even be over there at that state park. When that pastor was talking, he almost brought tears to my eyes because of the fact of all of the toxins that we have had to live through in Bayview-Hunters Point, not just with PG&E, but we've got the sewage plant out there as well; the number of people who have died that have worked out there at that shipyard from the toxins that's there. They're bringing the stuff home and clothes being washed with the rest of the clothing, and children have died. And one young lady said she's the only one left alive because of what had happened with her father working out there at the shipyard. If you all don't do nothing else in your lifetime, make sure that you vote your conscience, not the fact that money is riding on the line. Because money do not mean the health of the people in Bayview-Hunters Point. We have requested that -- and even the voters, you voted in year 2000, that that shipyard should be cleaned to the standards where you could be able to say, Don't let that shipyard be another Love Canal. You all know what happened there. You know, we don't need to have things built on a toxic dump. I'm not opposed to Lennar. I'm opposed to how the action is being played here and played on the people. Talking about jobs. Yeah, people need jobs, but I want to make sure that the jobs are clean and that the young people have the proper gear to go out there in those toxins that I cannot even pronounce. Now, I gave even to the good president of the board of the Redevelopment Agency, I called him, I said I have more information. I don't know if you received it or not, but I wanted him to know what is going on out there at Bayview-Hunters Point. I invited him to my home so he could see from where I live where they have dredged and made a hill. He thought it was a hill. I said, No, baby, that's not a hill, that's man-made, because all of that area was bay. And don't forget, all of that area of that shipyard is landfill just like the state park. Thank you very much.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners, members of the public. My name is Rodger Scott. I'm a teacher at City College of San Francisco and I've completed five semesters at the Muhammad University of Islam at 195 Kiska Road, the building adjacent to the shipyard. And incidentally, I'm just sitting downstairs between my students at MUI and on my left was Tim Paulson, head of the Labor Council, so I have loyalties to both. There's no dispute that a multimillion-dollar development at any time can help, can benefit a large number of people. And certainly in our depressed economy the scope of benefits of this project offers great hope and numerous opportunities to many people. As someone with ties to the labor movement, I want to support projects that provide work for the building trades' brothers and sisters, for the broader labor community, and for the residents of Bayview-Hunters Point, who rarely, in my opinion, have received their fair share of job and educational opportunities in our great, yet certainly imperfect, country. I also have a deep sense of loyalty to my students at MUI, which is, as I said, near the shipyard. The school has toddlers who are not old enough to formulate a complete sentence but can still ask for apple juice, and the school has recent graduates who will be going on scholarship in the fall to Stillman College and to the University of Houston. Considering the vast amount of money involved in this project, the many groups and individuals advocating for and against the project, and the spectrum of views on what should and should not be accomplished, I have to say that these are issues that I don't have any depth of knowledge in. However, I have the right, as a teacher and as a citizen of this city and someone who has loyalties to both the labor movement and to that community that I work in, this EIR should not be accepted and the project should not continue until there is credible assurance by the relevant public- and private-sector parties and respected scientists, like Wilma Subra and others, that the health and safety of present and future workers and present and future residents of that community will be assured. You don't need someone like me to remind you that the primary responsibility of elected and appointed officials is to promote the well-being and health and safety of the people. I would ask you: Do you have any greater responsibility than to make sure that projects go forward only when you can assure that the health and safety of the present and future residents and present and future workers will be considered? Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Celestine Howard, Michael Patton, Lavona Crosley, Jacqueline Goodman.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: How are you doing? Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Michael Patton of Bayview-Hunters Point.

SECRETARY AVERY: Can you speak louder?

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Yes. Can you hear me now?

SECRETARY AVERY: Yes.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Please certify this EIR, because with \$700 million granted for this cleanup, I'm quite sure this will be one of the cleanest sites there is. Besides that, it's going to help create a lot of jobs for the Bayview community. This is a community that's in much need of this remodeling. Outside of that said, I can't say no more. But with the people

that came here today and spoke, in respect of them, you guys all know that it need to be cleaned up. They tell you it need to be cleaned up. So without cleaning it up, what do we have? It's still toxic. So I would say, you know, I'm trusting you guys that you all will do what's right and push forward and approve this here project because it need to be cleaned up. They say people was being sick, you know, the toxic waste and so forth with this here, with this here project, it need to be cleaned up. Please clean it up. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. If I've called your name, please come up. Perry Thomas, Matt Regan, Carmen Policy, Rev. Walker, Anthony Brewster.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Mr. Chairman, Honorable Commissioners, I am Aurelius Walker, pastor of True Hope Church. Today I'm representing the African-American Revitalization Consortium, also representing the Tabernacle Community Development Corporation and San Francisco Organizing Project. I've lived in San Francisco approximately 53 years. I've lived in Bayview-Hunters Point around 41 years. And since this process -- project began, I kind of looked at the amount of meetings that we've had. And I don't know if I'm off or close. I think I'm pretty close. Over 200 different meetings that we've had around this project and this process and discussions over about 20 years. Now, in Bayview-Hunters Point, as we know, the federal government or the Navy, whoever, is the one that planted that toxins in that shipyard in 1974, then the shipyard builders came in and continued that process. But one of the things that I'm so grateful for, in this process this shipyard is being cleaned up. And as I remember, that at one time with the Superfunds looking to clean the whole thing up before starting the process of development, that that would not work, that would take too long, so we looked at, as I understand it, parcels being cleaned up. Parcels like Parcel A have been cleaned up, and so in turn it's ready now when the time comes for the building. Let me also say that I have a personal interest in the shipyard being cleaned because I've live in that community, like I said, about some 47 years, and I live about a block and a half from where the bridge is going to be built, Yosemite Slough. I live about four blocks, period, from where the bridge is going to be built. And one of the things that's going to connect both of these projects together, the bridge is going to connect both of these projects together. Not only that, but as we know, the light rail is going to connect Bayview-Hunters Point with the other parts of the city. So I urge you to do the right thing. And I believe you will do that. I believe you're honorable men and women. The right thing is to approve this project. Because I'm sick and tired of hearing news people in many instances and articles talk about that poor, economical deprived neighborhood. This project will be the economical engine that will drive that particular community. So I urge you, Honorable Commissioners, to approve this project. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Messrs. President and respected members of both commissions and staff, my name is Carmen Policy, and I'm a resident of San Francisco and a farmer. The discussion so far today has been rather broad. I'm here to talk about one single piece of the project. And that single piece deals with the option, the alternative, perhaps the last alternative, that the City of San Francisco has in terms of keeping the 49ers. This site will not only provide the 49ers with an opportunity to build a world-class stadium with world-class views in a world-class city, but it will also give an opportunity to this project in the city to

have an iconic situation similar to what happened at AT&T Park, where the Giants play and where we all enjoy those Giants games and where the community has enjoyed a rebirth and a growth unparalleled certainly in this area and perhaps even in the nation. I suggest to you that we not become distracted by anything that might appear to be happening in Santa Clara. We are moving forward in San Francisco with the idea that the project at Hunters Point will produce the best option for the 49ers, the best option, very importantly, for the NFL. And when the day is done, when the dust has settled, no matter what happens on June 8th in Santa Clara, we feel that the best possible deal will be on the table here in San Francisco. All of the smart people, all of the people who are the pros in the field, feel that there are so many obstacles to financing and building the stadium in Santa Clara that the likelihood of that occurring could be considered to be less than 50 percent. San Francisco will be ready to move forward with the best deal for the league when that happens. I might also address something else that does not amount to opinion but, I'd like to submit to you, is a fact. And that fact is this. Without the causeway, the bridge, connecting Candlestick Point and Hunters Point, there will be no stadium. The league has made it patently clear that that connecting facility must be there for this to work. The 49ers also made that clear. But every consultant that was brought into the project on both sides said that this was a necessary ingredient, and I would ask you to consider that as you're considering the 49ers portion or the stadium portion, if you will, the NFL stadium portion, of this project. Thank you very much. Thanks for not falling asleep. Thank you for not yawning.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Mr. Presidents, Commissioners, my name is Matt Regan. I'm here from the Bay Area Council. We are a business-sponsored public policy and advocacy organization. We represent some of the largest employers in the Bay Area. One in five private-sector employees in the region works for one of our member companies. We work in areas of public policy, water, healthcare, climate change, responsible and appropriate land use. I'm here to speak in the favor of the EIR and the project. You've heard a lot of comments today about the potential risks of the site. And about eight months ago we took a delegation to Washington, D.C., of our infill developer members and the project sponsors were a part of that trip. And we met with some very senior people with President Obama's Environmental Protection Agency, and the staff there have jokingly dubbed it the Environmental Justice Agency because that's their core focus. And as the Planning Commission knows, when we last met to discuss this project, President Obama's Environmental Protection Agency declared the site safe for development. The project sponsor has already spent \$700 million on cleanup, with several hundred million more in the pipeline to finish the job. We are a regional organization. We don't normally get involved in single-project advocacy, but this is a regionally significant project. It will provide tens of thousands of homes for workers for this region. It will help improve our housing jobs in balance and reduce vehicle miles traveled and the resulting greenhouse gas pollution that our horizontal development of the region is producing. It will help us meet our AB 32 and SB 375 requirements as a city. And we would urge you for those reasons to adopt and approve the EIR. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hello. My name is Javier Ramirez, and I'm a leader of the San Francisco Organizing Project, also known as SFOP. SFOP is a faith-based community organization working with congregations and schools representing over 40,000 San Franciscans. San Francisco SFOP is part of an alliance for District 10 made up of SFOP, San Francisco Labor Council, and Ace, which is formerly known as ACORN. We were able -- According to a report that was written by UC-Berkeley economist Ken Jacobs, we were able to negotiate the best community benefits agreement in the nation, securing 17 million in workforce development, 33 percent affordable housing, and over \$40 million in Community First housing funds.* So there are three important remarks that we would like to make about the EIR. Number one, what many do not realize is that the EIR for this project was already passed in 2003 by the Board of Supervisors, and since then the Navy has spent \$400 million, if not more, in continued effort to clean the shipyard. Number two, the process of cleanup, as has been mentioned over and over again, is under several levels of oversight at the federal, state, and local level to ensure that the cleanup is up to standard. Number three, we met with Mike Montgomery from EPA, who informed us that the level of asbestos did not present a significant short-term nor long-term health risk, and that the EPA is providing oversight of the Navy's cleanup with a critical eye. We've had many conversations about toxins, and for far too long we have had to deal with social toxins in our community: violence and crime, unequal access to resources, lack of job opportunities, and isolation from the rest of the city. This project represents an incredible opportunity to begin to restore and clean up those social toxins that exist, and make our community what we envision it to be. Please act in accordance with the best interests in the community and all of San Francisco. Let this project move forward. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hello. My name is Eileen Hines. I'm with SFOP and I've lived in the Bayview-Hunters Point neighborhood for five years. The environmental ills that plague our community can be greatly improved by the adoption of this project. For over ten years we have been working with the City and the developer to guarantee improvement for the residents of Bayview. Now our neighborhood suffers from high asthma rates, hyperglycemia, malnutrition, exposure to heavy metals, and all will be cleaned up with this project. The EIR points out the project will have no hazardous-materials impact either through construction or the completion of the project and the particulate matter is well below mandated and acceptable levels. If you read the document, you'll learn that the latest green building methods, solar, recycled water and storm water, special landscaping and systems will be good, not just for the surrounding residents but our system as a whole. There are positive environmental impacts that are never acknowledged in the public and should be. Please, no further delays. Let's clean up the shipyard. The EIR adequately addresses all environmental impacts for the proposed project. Vote yes to certify it and the project's approval so we can begin a new chapter in our neighborhood. And on Saturday I took a tour of the shipyard and I got to see what is there now, and I got to hear the plans -- I've read the plan, but this is the first time I got to see what the plans are, and I am looking forward to watching this development happen so our neighborhood will be clean and be a part of this city for all. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hi, I'm Celestine Howard from Washington, D.C., representing the CDC. And I just have to say that I trust our United States Navy, I trust our federal government, our local, our state government that they would not turn over land to us that's toxic. So I would like to tell you, to ask you, please move forward with this process. We need it desperately. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Ebony Manning, Reginald Rainer, Ciree Smith, Roange Kent, Howard McCray, Lloyd Dillworth, if you're in the overflow room, please come upstairs. Tia Gray, Olea Walker, Marisa Cobb, Alvin Thorner, Terry Anders, Jill Fox, Conny Ford, Renee Davis, Lavelle Shaw, Javier Marquez.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Excuse me, sir. Did you say "Howard McRee"?

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: I believe, yes.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Or Richard McRee? My name is Richard McRee.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: There's so many here.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I've had my name misread before.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: That's all right. It's Howard.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's in the overflow room.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Okay. Shall I wait?

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Yes.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon. My name is Jill Fox. I've live two blocks from the shipyard gate for 17 years and have attended countless meetings on this. I'm asking that you not approve this EIR. Or if you feel that you must -- Because there are many, many good things about this project, so if you feel that you must approve this EIR, then I'm asking that you put into the overriding consideration something about comprehensive planning for the India Basis side of the shipyard. We are the north side along Innes Avenue, Hunters Point Boulevard, and Evans. We are the sandwich between the Hunters View Project and the Shipyard Project, and we are Area C, going under our own planning process right now. We feel that it's really important that we see the cumulative effects of all of these years of construction, especially on Innes Avenue. The lack of comprehensive planning will result in thousands of new homes past our neighborhood, but Innes Avenue is the only direct route between the shipyard and the rest of the city. I'm personally not opposed to the 49ers at the shipyard. I even have a poster in my front window to keep the Niners in town. But what I am opposed to is that the brunt of all of both the day-to-day traffic at the shipyard and the game-day traffic is going to be on my residential street. Whether there's a bridge over Yosemite Slough or not, the majority of traffic just logically is going to come down Innes Avenue to Third Street to get out. It's how people have been going there for 40 years. We need comprehensive planning for that area before we can say it's okay. They are removing,

according to this EIR, 51 parking places on a residential street that has no alternative streets. Innes Avenue is against the Bay and against the cliff. And it's not just homeowners like myself, but it's also a lot of people who live in the Westbrook Public Housing that have to park on Innes Avenue. The EIR is flawed to say that we don't need residential parking, and I would like to know another residential street in San Francisco whose parking is all being taken away for the benefit of new unknown residents. My community, the India Basin Neighborhood Association, has come up with some alternatives that will help the shipyard traffic flow and also the social flow between our existing community and the Hunters Point Shipyard. I urge you to come on a walking tour on June 19. I have invitations for everyone. It's free, open to the public, June 19, 10 a.m., Candlestick Park. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hello. My name is Roange Kent and I want to voice my support for this project because it will create approximately 10,000 new jobs for the community. The project has the potential to create 5,000 construction jobs. The indirect impact of services will create jobs for delivery drivers, lumber yards, cabinetmakers, flooring, and all things that will help put back to work in our community. When you approve this plan, we are not asking you to do the unthinkable, because you know, like we know, this is a very good project for all who are investing. Please vote Yes to certify the EIR.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon. My name is Tera Gray and I'm an Alice Griffith resident. I just wanted to say that I am all for this project. I'm basically tired of hearing about -- The people that are against this project -- wait, I take that back -- some do live in our community, some don't. But I think this is a good project overall because it gives job opportunities, but it also gives people an opportunity to build a foundation for our children and our families. I've lived here all my life. My family has moved away waiting for this project. But I'm here to stand my ground and say that I'm not going nowhere until this project gets approved. And everyone is again Lennar. I don't see why. Because as soon as you all get Lennar out of here and put somebody else in here, you all are going to find something else to say to stop the project. So I'm just tired of hearing about it and I'm all for the project. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Conny Ford. I am the vice president of the San Francisco Labor Council and part of the coalition of folks who two years ago looked at this up-and-coming project and sat down with the developer and said, We want more for the community. We bargained this CCBA, as we call it, and were able to achieve historic rates, which you've been told over and over again. We are very proud of that community benefit and excited about the implementation of 35 percent affordable housing, \$17 million in workforce money, as well as \$27 million to help folks in the community move into this neighborhood should they need extra support and means. In terms of the environmental cleanup in the EIR, you all know and I know that it's not the developer who is cleaning this up. It is not his responsibility. It is the Navy's responsibility. They have decided

that this place is one of the dirtiest Superfund sites in America. That's why they're spending \$700 million to clean it up. That's why they intend to spend at least \$300 million more. And we will hold their feet to the fire. We have meetings at the Labor Council with the Navy, with the regional EPA, with the national EPA to make sure that they know that they have to be accountable to all of us in the community, outside the community, as members of San Francisco. This project must go forward. Too many people in that area have been neglected for way too long. I come from the Fillmore. The Fillmore is another area that was neglected for many years. The Bayview has been neglected for 60 years. It is time to move forward to make sure the Navy and the EPA are accountable and continue to clean up that mess. And when they clean it, then we want to build it, and we want to build it with this development that will provide the opportunity and the growth for that neighborhood. All of our CBA has language that guarantees that the benefits of that neighborhood community benefits agreement will go to the neighborhood. Too many of us have had friends and loved ones and brothers and sisters who have been killed, who have been shot out there. We are impatient. We do not want to wait any more. We do not want to have another generation lost because this is not the perfect deal. It's not the perfect deal, but it's a darned good one, and I urge you to pass the EIR. Thanks.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Stormy Henry. I am here to support the EIR report. I'm a resident of Alice Griffith, like I've said, and I've been to countless meetings with you commissioners. I love to see your face, I really do, with the hopes that when you're listening to me that my words are not falling upon deaf ears. I'm here to say that we voted, my community has voted years ago for Proposition G. We have all these Prop F people, the first people who were up here, talking bull to you guys, lying. POWER ain't never knocked on the door at Alice Griffith asking me for no help. And I'm putting them on blast. They never asked me for no help. They have not talked to me or educated me. If that land out there is as dirty as they say it is, they never came down to Alice Griffith, where we have our own community center, and tried to set up meetings to tell us how damned dirty it is. Okay. So that's with that. They lying. They lying. I just want to put that out to there to my commissioners who I vote in this city, they lying. Jobs, 5,000 jobs, will be available; 10,000 homes under the current 32 percent affordability, that I'm already paying living in uninhabitable conditions, so why not. You've already got me living there in uninhabitable conditions. Fix it up and let me get my stuff and get going. Housing is a much needed thing in Alice Griffith, and it makes it more important that now that I have a job I won't even qualify for project living or 32. I'll become a home owner. If this report goes through and this project goes through, it makes me to be able to be a home owner. That generates money in my city. Will you take money away from the City if you keep me living in the projects only paying 32 percent of my income? It's just not fair. You talk about greenhouse gases and pollutions. We have two power sites that we shut down in Hunters Point within the past five to ten years. Nobody wants to talk about that, though. They want to talk about how much pollution is there. What about what we have cut back on? We have people in our community -- this young man right here wants to start MacGone Green. That's a cutback on greenhouse emissions. But guess what? This CBA that they have for this project, all this only, becomes possible if you let this happen. You want to talk against Lennar, do it on your own time. Don't do it on me and my family's time. Please do not do it on my time, my time and my family time. I'm taking off

of work right now to be here losing money hoping that same CBA is not just up in the air and just an empty benefit. I'm from the Fillmore, which is a very beautiful part of San Francisco. Make us be the bell of San Francisco too, not the ugly duckling. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Commissioners, my name is Thomas Tang, San Francisco Economic Development Group. They talking about economic. The economic today like in San Francisco, the budget very tight, so the more housing built, the more tax collect. So this way also many people waiting for the job. So like downstairs, I would say about half the people waiting downstairs, they are waiting for the job. So this project for me is very interesting and also very for the people who are waiting for a job have something. Lots of people talking about testing. So many years spend a lot of money for testing everything already. So from my opinion, I strongly support this project. Please, Commissioners, say aye to it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Commissioners, my name is Richard Lau. I'm a member of the American Legion Cathay Post. We are having lots of returning veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan. They get used to clean up toxic sites and emissions. And our returning soldiers from Iraq needs the jobs and jobs and jobs. And they probably will move in and settle down in our city and raise their families. So your first job as commissioners: Okay the CEQA so that our returning veterans can clean up -- these soldiers can clean up the Navy mess left behind, and then they can move in. And we are losing our teachers, firemen, policemen to the other area for the residents. When you build these tens of thousands of housing, they will move back in. And be sure that the new area have a good school. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: My name is Terry Anders of Anders & Anders Foundation, Commissioners. I'm speaking in favor of this particular project. I live in the Bayview. I am also speaking in favor of labor, the opportunities that will be afforded to people to be able to get jobs, the opportunities for people to be able to get into unions they've been denied access to, the opportunity for people to have home ownership that has been denied. I am in agreeance that naturally we cannot move forward unless this site is actually clean and it was habitable for people to actually build as well as live. So we couldn't actually be building unless we were in agreeance that it is clean. I am certain that those of you that are in charge of certain agencies, those of you that are in charge of certain districts are in with information that is necessary for us to be able to move forward as a community, for us to move forward as a city. The jobs that will be created also with the ships being able to come here where we could actually have some economic commercial revitalization in that area, that is something that could be and would be a benefit to that particular area. There's a lot of benefits for this to move forward. In relationship to those who have spoken saying that it is too dangerous, we can't do this, we can't do that, I am in agreeance that there is a lot there that probably needs to be done, but I'm also in agreeance that a lot has been done, so I am definitely in agreeance to move this forward.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Javier Marquez. I am here representing the fast-growing Latino population in District 10, and I'm supporting the approval of the Naval Housing Project, and I ask to please certify the EIR and focus on one area I feel that is most important to me, which is jobs. This project will create 5,000 jobs. I know several people in the construction trade that are more than ready to go to work. Carpenters, plumbers, painters, electricians, you name it, they're ready. This project will guarantee at least 15 to 20 years of job security, and that is a good thing. It is time to give District 10 what is long overdue, Ladies and Gentlemen, and that's economic justice. Speaking to those people who are trying to obstruct this project and that don't even live in District 10, they live somewhere in the Mission, they don't know what they're talking about. I work in District 10. I'm there 12, 14 hours a day. I know what the residents there are going through and what they need and what is it that they want, and that's economic, social justice. Please, support the EIR. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Gary Banks. I'm the pastor of MarketPlace Fellowship Church. I'm also a member of the Project Area Committee. And I'm standing here to ask you to move the project forward. I believe we've -- it's been a long and tedious process. Can you hear me?

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: No.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Okay. It's been a long tedious process. This just didn't happen overnight. It's been years and years of work and research. I was a part of the outreach project almost ten years ago delivering the conceptual plan, going door to door as we began to roll this project out. We have had plenty of meetings, we've discussed the DDA, we've talked about the EIR and the benefits package, and I think we really need to move forward. We're talking jobs, we're talking houses, we're talking businesses for residents. And the flight of African-Americans, I don't think we can afford a further delay. Let the developers do their job and let the Navy do its job. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Anthony Russo and I'm here to support the project on the strength that my kids and my grandchildren will be in a better school and a cleaner school when they're on their way to school in a couple of years. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hi. My name is Claire Bishop, and I'm a residence of Alice Griffith. I have patiently waited for this beautiful project to unfold, and I'm most excited about the 300 acres of park. As a single mother, this will offer me and my son opportunity to

experience what the other San Franciscans take for granted, an equal park to Golden Gate or Crissy Field. This is what every child dreams of: a safe place to play and throw rocks in the water, the simple things in life that are deprived from our community. We can change that. We can say yes to the kids in our neighborhoods who want legacy basketball and play Warner football in their backyards. This is the only project that consider for children in the process versus after the process. Please vote yes for it to certify the EIR.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hi. My name is Tiffany Carpenter and I'm just here to speak for the yes on the EIR. And actually I'm a resident of Bayview-Hunters Point since 1985 and I also live on Espanola Street. And I have no cancer. I just had a son two years ago. He has no birth defects. And all I have to say is: All this stuff that people are talking about, we have read on all of this and we do understand that there have been cleanup at the shipyard. We have family members that's out there cleaning up at the shipyard right now. So it might not be all the way clean, but it's somewhat clean, and it will get all the way clean. So could we just do this so we can change this community and have better lives for us and our children, please.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon. Thank you for the privilege of the podium. My name is Dr. Ahimsa Porter Sumchai. I'm the health and environmental science editor at the SF Bayview Newspaper and the founding chair of the Radiological Subcommittee of the Hunters Point Shipyard Restoration Advisory Board. Let me begin by saying that as one of the few licensed physicians who has testified before you consistently since the start of the EIR review process, I did take some offense at being excluded from the comments section of the health of Bayview-Hunters Point residents. Consistently I raised issues with regard to health, the risks of cardiopulmonary disease from toxic air contaminants. I believe that I am the only commenter who pointed out the lack of a succinct designated fire station within the project area and the high incidence of accidental and intentional injury in the district that should drive us to make sure that we site one. Succinctly, my concerns about the EIR are very well condensed in the comments of the Law Offices of James Berkland from the California State Parks Foundation. He identifies that the Draft EIR is inadequate and fails to comply with CEQA. The EIR must designate one lead agency. It is illegal for you to have both Planning and Redevelopment as lead agencies. The EIR is a project-level EIR not a project -- Excuse me. It is a program-level EIR not a project-level EIR. It fails to adequately describe the proposed project. The specific concerns that I have raised to you have also been delineated by this law office. The issues with regard to toxic air contaminants and air quality, the DEIR fails to quantify and properly mitigate significant fugitive dust emissions due to construction. The DEIR illegally avoids any quantification of toxic air contaminant impacts from construction. Again, I want to state my principal objection being Lennar's proposal to site 4,000 residential units on radiation-impacted, stadium-designated property immediately adjacent to radiation-contaminated property. This is outside of legal, ethical, moral, and regulatory standards and it will be legally challenged. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon. My name is Bradley, B-r-a-d-l-e-y. I'm in favor of the EIR. I've been listening to everyone who has been in front of me. You know, I must say, you know, as listening, let's talk about POWER. Who are they? It was said once before in front of me. These are different organizations that come to our community talking about what they have done. I coached Little League football for over seven years. I have never seen this organization. So let's stop that with all these scripts and everything. Let's speak from the heart. What is it that we want? Let's talk about transportation. Let's talk about toxins. We had the 15 Line come down Third Street, polluting in the air from the diesel and motorized coaches. We get the T Line, something that's going to benefit us, our kids, our elderly, with no smoke in the air. We benefit from that, so why must we keep crying. We talk about one thing. We talk about money, we talk about health. In that situation you weigh out which is it that you want, clean air or jobs? Let's talk about this project. This project here, going forth with this would help our community, would help our transportation. I would love to get downtown in an hour to go watch a movie, take my child. I would love for a train to come through my neighborhood every 20 minutes. We know we need this in our community. I'm from Bayview-Hunters Point. I worked at the shipyard for years. All these bloody noses that these people are saying that they have or being spoke for, why haven't anybody did anything about this? We have kids that play, we've have elderly, elderly that have got up and spoke. I don't see no tubes, I don't see no tanks, I don't see nobody huffing and puffing for oxygen. So what is it that we want? It's prime time right now. It's time for the city of San Francisco in the Bayview-Hunters Point to shine. Don't hold this down. Let's just get back to standards where we should be. We all benefit from this. Different communities coming together, different organizations, people of color, different color, let's unite like we should be and let's move forward with this project. The EIR, let's certify it and let's continue to beautify our community and let's be back on prime time San Francisco. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I respectfully ask that if you're going to have speaker cards and you're going to be calling people, that you maintain some kind of order with the line.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Some of us are trying to abide by it.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: I have asked people to come up in the order in which I call them. I don't know the people's names when they come up. I'm not turning people away. So thank you very much for your input. If you want to speak now, speak now.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC (Richard McRee): Okay. I will do that. This EIR is a very interesting situation, because this city, I've lived here for four decades and I've been very proud to be part of like planning for places like Levi's Plaza. And I'm really amazed that there's no discussion here that this EIR, the way it's set up, it's incredibly complete in many ways, but there's a glaring error where you're not considering an alternative of really keeping Candlestick. Nobody voted to get rid of Candlestick, and yet the only alternative, No. 3 -- and I mentioned this in my comments and I'm very dissatisfied with the reply that I got in the EIR. But the existing Candlestick represents a resource. And we're going to have -- The oil spill in

the Gulf is a result of decisions of people like we all make day by day. And by trashing a good stadium for the sake of having a new stadium -- pardon me, Carmen. I know that you want a new stadium, but I think it's time for the NFL to get along with the rest of us and say maybe we can conserve a lot of energy if we don't destroy the buildings we already have just to have something new. I know from my experience in Levi's Plaza that once the commission like this turned the project back and go said study it some more, it was a tremendous thing. They told us to save the Italian Swiss Colony building and Cargo West, and that kicked the whole project up to a much higher level. And I believe the same thing can happen here. There's nothing wrong with Candlestick. It is historic. The EIR, I say turn it back. Get a group like HOK. Bill Valentine at HOK is a wonderful designer. He could take Candlestick as it is and integrate it with the new plan. It would be terrific, and we would save, we would conserve enough energy -- and this is based on the EIR information, like I wrote to this board -- enough energy to run the Neiman Marcus store for 2,000 years. Because a stadium of that size -- And there are a lot of excuses given in the EIR for why this should not be considered, and given the political realities of this town, it's no wonder I'm the only architect and planner up here talking to you about this, but I've got to tell you, this is an opportunity for us to really address the oil waste in our country. We've got to stand up to AB 42, 32, which this EIR is supposed to address that. Well, it sidesteps it. Every comment that I made about conserving energy was blown off by a technicality that actually is really bizarre. I think that this group should turn it back and say, Look, let's take a good look at a fair alternative that keeps Candlestick. It's right next to the freeway, there's less transportation. Build a good fly over there and fix that community. There's no reason why there can't be a lot of good jobs in doing other things than requiring another two miles of tremendous pollution. I'd love to see the City and I'd love to see the NFL say it made a mistake. Let's save Candlestick.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hello. I'm James

Mabrey, Your All Day Every Day Janitorial Service. I'm a local tradesman of your Local 22. I have been for ten years. I grew up in the Bayview-Hunters Point all my life. I am a product of the entire environment and I am an example of change. I've been working in the construction trade for the last ten years, and I would say by repetition I created good habits, by getting up and going to work and, you know, becoming a citizen. And I vote in favor of this project, because if you want to change the environment, you have to give young men and women something positive to do with their time. And I would say if you were at work for eight hours a day, as an 18-year-old young man or woman, and after work you get up -- after work, you go to school after that. Not everyone is going to want to be tradesman or woman, but it's stepping stone. And I vote in favor of this project because it will give young adults a stepping stone until they find out what they want to do in life. Right now everyone is just sitting in limbo waiting on this project to start. This is a 20-year project. Who knows, we can have future businessmen, businesswomen come from this project. But we need change like now. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Before I begin I want to say thank you very much, because it's been a long journey and you've been with us all through the journey, and it's been because you have voted to continue and to keep this project moving that we're even standing here this afternoon talking about this project all over again. I want to say that I'm here to say let's move this project on. We have had too much debate, too much discussion. Is it perfect? No, it's not perfect. I don't think we're going to get anything perfect until we get to heaven. We're not going to have it down here. So let's move this project forward. There are jobs, jobs, jobs. All the other rhetoric I've heard -- I've lived in Bayview-Hunters Point my whole life. I was there when the old slaughterhouse was there, and thank God it's gone. I was there when the PG&E plant was going. Look at me. I don't have no respirator. My brothers and sisters don't have any respirators. We're not sick. I'm very healthy. I had a chance to play in the NFL, played college football. So if there's some asbestos or something in the air, I should be the one affected from it. I want to say this one last thing. If the people who are against this, we're talking about all these health issues, I've said down through the years let's get together and let's get that sewage-treatment plant. If we want to fight about something, that's the thing to fight about. But thank you, and I look forward to this project going forward, and I look forward to all these young men and women starting to work. I look forward to the QPE where we have finally got an opportunity to empower ourselves and help our community. And I'm just praying that God will continue to keep you behind us, and let's move this project forward. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: To the co-chairpersons of this joint committee, I'm Amos Brown. I'm here today first as pastor of the Third Baptist Church, the oldest institution of African-Americans in the Western United States, 158 years old. I've served as pastor of that fine church for 34 years. And I want to hasten to say I appeal to you, I beg you, do not be intimidated by simplistic, reductionistic thinking that would suggest that everyone in Bayview-Hunters Point is sick because of the shipyard. This weekend one of my revered members, a couple, Edith and Garnet Smith, will be celebrating 60 years of marriage. They live within spitting distance of this shipyard. I live at 111 Luna Ala Way, later 434 Bright Street, but in 2000 I came down with prostate cancer. Thanks to medical science, the power of God, I'm free. My wife in 1989 had breast cancer. We never lived in Bayview-Hunters Point. And I think that we must not be swayed, deterred, or intimidated by people who come forth with that fallacious argument. Who said anything about all of that pollution that comes from those jet streams? It's going somewhere. It doesn't stay up in the air. And, God knows, this community needs progress. I was on this Board of Supervisors in 1998 when Mayor Willie Brown and those of us who were trying to do something for that community again were told, Get back, it's not your time to do anything of advancement. This issue has been vetted hour after hour after hour, and we are about to make it a paralysis of analysis. It's time that we get with it, do the right thing. The community has spoken, the majority has spoken. And this is a development that I beg you to not say no to, but in the interests of civility, sense, sanity, and progress say yes, for nothing is more powerful than an idea whose time has come. And the time is right now for us to move forward with this development.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon. My name is Kristine Enea. I'm a resident of Hunters Point. I am an officer of the Bayview Project Area Committee. I was the technical chair of the Restoration Advisory Board for the shipyard, and I chair the neighborhood association in the neighborhood closest to the shipyard, including the current development. There are many of us who have been very involved in this process. We have negotiated many changes. There are many of us who are very informed. In any negotiation you come to a point where you have to decide whether to move forward or walk away. I do believe that overall the community is better with this plan than without it, so I think we do need to move forward. However, as a career-long negotiator, I will negotiate until the end, and I would like to ask your help today in correcting one of what I think is one of the major oversights in the EIR, and that is the failure to analyze the build-out of Hudson Avenue. If we hold out any hope of keeping the 49ers in this city, we need to solve the very challenging transportation problems along Innes Avenue. It's the only way out of the shipyard from the north. So I would defer to your expertise to see if there's some way to condition your approval on a supplemental EIR or anything we can get on the written record to require an analysis of the build-out of Hudson. I believe it's the right thing to do for the city, I believe it's the right thing to do for the neighborhood that's most affected. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon Commissioners. My name is Linda Richardson, a former Planning Commissioner and co-founder of the Southeast Alliance for Environmental Justice. I have spent about 25 years of my time living in the Bayview addressing environmental issues. I need to bring to your attention that about a decade ago, in 1998, the Planning Commission went through the same process that all of you are going through today with the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, the same shipyard development. We can talk about transportation. We address all the issues that have been made available to you in the EIR. At the end of the process, a exhaustive process, you approved the EIR. That approval led to the implementation of the Phase I. Here we are, thousands and thousands and thousands of hours of community meetings. You need to know that the Citizen Advisory Board, the Project Area Committee, two organizations that you have entrusted, two organizations that have been entrusted legally, have approved the EIR coming to you today. What do we need to do? The shipyard was closed in 1974. The people of Bayview-Hunters Point are begging and rely on you to help us to move this project forward. No more diversionary tactics. No more diversionary tactics. There are so much politics involved in the process in Bayview that you know that the majority of people in Bayview-Hunters Point support this project. I have with me a draft of a solution that was prepared by the former Planning Commission, and believe me, it is stunning. It is the same resolution before you today. So the shipyard is still there. We have to move forward. We have to start. Remember that the people in Bayview-Hunters Point have waited long enough. Any further delay is a sentence, and that is wrong. The people in Alice Griffith deserve justice. The best way that you can help the Bayview-Hunters Point is have the Navy clean up the shipyard as currently done, and we are now at Phase II. And I think also there was a correction earlier. Area C is also under the Bayview-Hunters Point Project Area Committee, and it is another project and we are going to be addressing all the issues that some of this committee have talked about today, like how to save Innes Avenue. I live about a block from the shipyard. So, please, no more further delay. We are counting on every one of you commissioners, because you have

seen us here several times. No more. We are tired of that. Please, move this project forward. Thank you for your time.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: My name is Ann Huey. I'm supporting this project, because this project have been so many, many, many years going on just talk, talk, talk. Now is the time to approve it. Because, you know, San Francisco, the economical is very bad situation right now. And so many citizens is coming in to San Francisco. It's beautiful and great city, but no more place to develop housing in San Francisco. This is good to develop in the Bayview-Hunters Point Shipyard development. And that would make up a lot of housing and work and school, and like the Walgreen or the other company, the big company, the work there would bring a lot of jobs for the people. And then there will be come up a lot of tax revenue to the City, so the situation won't be too bad. We need this. Please approve this project. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hello. Hi. My name is Ebony, and I want to voice my support for this project because it will create approximately –

SECRETARY AVERY: We can't hear you, ma'am. Can you speak up just a little bit. Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Okay. Sorry. I support this project because it will create approximately more than 10,000 new jobs for the community. It will also help with jobs -- It will help with jobs, better housing, education for our community and our kids. And hopefully you guys support it, because I support it.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hi. My name is Janita Towns. I approve of the project. The project will help me in many ways. I am a young mother of a two-year-old son. Me and my son is currently homeless, and if people that are against this project, they have somewhere to go. I don't. Are they going to help me find somewhere to go? No. So approval of this project will give me the place to say -- will give me a chance to say, I am Janita Towns, I have a house, I have a job, I have better health and education. It's time for a change, so let's make that change. And I support the EIR.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Commissioner, my name is Fred Noronho, and I'm really pleased to see the diversity of the commissioners. A lot of you will understand this. If you could just think, a lot of you are immigrants, people of color, and a lot of you I know come from very humble beginnings, where your families didn't have anything. It only had hope. Hope like: Is dad going to get a job, is mom going to get a job? And we sat there and we did what we had to do to survive. I was one of those immigrants that did that. Some of you African-Americans that are on this board did that as well. So don't take our hope, don't take

our dream. We want the same things that the people on other sides of this city have. I worked out of Allamand Brothers in the shipyard for many years working on boats over there, and I know what it's like to take -- not to have hope. And, thank God, there's people that mentored me. But, more importantly, I think we need to come up to the plate. You know, remember, Treasure Island has some of the same issues, and we don't hear anyone complaining about that. Why the Bayview? The Bayview deserves to have an urban development that we can be proud, safe. Lennar is committed to providing job for those people within community, providing retail stores there, make it vibrant, something that we can be proud of. The Bayview has been neglected for 70 years, and it has to stop. And I believe the federal agency, the state agency, and San Francisco is going to do the due diligence on the environmental report to make sure that it's safe. Lennar does not want a project that is going to cost them lawsuits. They are in business to make money. But if that train leaves -- if that train leaves, our community, the Bayview, will suffer for another 30 years. And I beg of you to please approve this project. Don't make this a political issue. We, the people, deserve better in this community, in the Bayview. We deserve hope, we deserve to have jobs for our families, we deserve to have places for our children to play. So I beg of you, don't let the train leave, because this, our community, will not change. And this is an opportunity for you people of color that are on this Planning Commission, that understand what it means to have jobs and hope and all of that, because we've been through it. We've been through it because we come from humble beginnings. A lot of you guys come from humble beginnings, so you understand. So please do not let this be a political issue. I know that you're going to do everything to make it safe for that environment over there for the Bayview. And, remember, there's no difference between San Francisco Bayview and the Treasure Island with all the toxins, and that has been approved ready to go. So please, I beg of you for your approval on this project. Don't let the train leave.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Buenos tardes. Mi nombre es Karina Bas. Good afternoon. My name is Karina Bas. I was born and raised in the Mission District. In my high school years I lived in the Bayview. I want to know if we are moving forward or if we're going to stay stagnant. Are we going to become a monotonous touristy place that only gentrals can come in and hipsters can come in to certain parts of our areas, like the Fillmore, Mission District? I hope not. I hope that the Bayview remains as culturally diverse as it is. I hope it becomes more enriched with education and proper employment. I would like for the local unions to be part of the development, not to outsource and to give our business to other parts of the country or other parts of the world. We, as a community in San Francisco, do care about each other, but we don't show it as we do. I say hello to people that I know, but I don't say hello to people that I don't know, because I'm afraid that they came from elsewhere, because I don't want them to think they should feel comfortable in my city. I want people to be employed who live in San Francisco. I want people that are disenfranchised to no longer have that title over their head. I want people to feel comfortable to go and apply as a manager at any location. Right now people in the Bayview and other locations in San Francisco that live in low-income housing and SROs don't have dental insurance or have no teeth to go say, Hello, my name is Karina Bas and I am good for this job, you need me for this job. I am here to say yes and approve, and I am for this development because it will improve our city. If we are looking for lucrative funds, okay, improve the Bayview, because that's where most of our

people come from. I'm a case manager for seven years, and at least half of my students -- at least half of my clients come from the Bayview. They come with issues; issues that -- I don't live in that community to go and tell people what to do, but I can help them with the few resources that I have available to me in the Mission District. Please, Commissioners, please allow for the cleanup of the Naval shipyard. I appreciate your time. Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hi. So inspirational. I love what she said, Karina. How are you, everybody? Good afternoon, Commissioners. I'm Gladys Soto. I'm from the Mission Linguistic and Vocational School and I'm here on behalf of our executive director, Rosario Anaya. She couldn't be here today, but she sent me, so I'm here on her behalf. She wants to make sure that all of you commissioners know what her feelings are regarding the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment. We already know this song, but we just doing it together. The Hunters Point Shipyard will be transformed. I cannot even believe a better -- I'm sorry, I'm from District 9, but I don't even believe there is a better, more beautiful district than District 10. The Bayview-Hunters Point is the most beautiful area in San Francisco, and if it can be transformed into a vibrant and exciting neighbor. Picture new homes, jobs, parks that residents desperately need and deserve and want. The community benefits are the best in the city at this time. Along with the affordable housing that is at 32 percent, there is an additional \$29 million for affordable housing specifically for District 10 -- oh, my God, this is wonderful -- and about 10 million for jobs training, 3.5 million for scholarships, and 10 million for schools. I'm not a politician, but it seems like the type of project that a city would welcome in an economically struggling community like the Bayview-Hunters Point. I like this project and I'm looking forward to the jobs both in construction and landscaping, to all of the open space and parks. Please certify the EIR that Hunters Point needs, and we need to move forward. Please, really, really, certify this project. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I wanted to say that in Spanish, but out of respect for the other people that are here I won't do it. But hopefully one day I will do it again. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Greetings to all. My name is Dedrea Smith. I'm a resident of Bayview-Hunters Point. I live in Alice Griffith. I want to first share that the way I came here is, my family, they came here because money was here during the time at the shipyard, so they worked out there at the shipyard, went on to become home owners, and some went on to be entrepreneurs as well. So I'm here to say that I'm asking, let the Navy go ahead and do what they have to do for us, cleaning the shipyard up, and allow the developers to do their thing for us, developing the shipyard. The issue we don't want to forget, though, is to start training the residents in 94124 so that they'll be able to do the jobs that they're talking about, these 5,000 jobs that's available. Could you go ahead and start getting that started so that we'll be able to do the jobs and so that the jobs will not have to come from outside of the community because we don't have the skills to do the jobs. San Francisco voted yes on Proposition G, so let's go ahead and move forward, Commissioners. We know that each one of you will make the right decisions for us: Yes on EIR.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good evening, Ladies and Gentlemen and the world. My name is Ace Washington and I'm going to speak quite fast because I've only got three minutes. But I'm here parallel to speak on an issue, African-Americans, and the future of us. I'm here to preserve. I know all the African-American leaders right now are shriveling and saying, Oh, here come Ace. He going to talk. No, I'm not talking about you all here. I'm talking about city government right now, because it has no color. There needs to be investigation on. People that's coming up here speaking that's city officials, call themselves leaders in our community, that are corrupt. Now, we know the police department and city government, you're corrupt, but we've got corruption in our whole community on the bottom level, and that's where I come into play. You know what I'm saying? I've been here most of all of you all. I think Mr. Lee over there, he okayed me when I was asked for press passes and all that kind of thing to be in there. And I'll be probably subpoenaing you because I got my laptop stolen in the press room and there's going to be an issue about that, because they don't know who I am and I'm from the press. I've here about 27 years. I've been documenting things. But let me just go on to say here, the issue is, I'm not here to say anything about this. I'm here to say that you guys are making a decision that was made 40 years by the Redevelopment Agency, the big giant that comes in, about the unfinished agenda. I'm here to regulate. You all African-American communities are responsible. And I'm not here to point my fingers at you. But who's going to read about this twenty years from now? Youngsters that are going to be affected, none of them are here. Who is representing them? Is any of that in the EIR? You all have to be responsible. They're not going to be around here in 27 years, Lennar and them and everything. You all got to understand about preserving. I'm here to speak about the African-American community. And if you all ain't standing up, I'm standing up for them. I'm here -- It trumps everything you're doing. I'm involved with the African-American Migration Report. I know I'm talking fast, but you all know what I'm saying. And it trumps everything. And I'm involved in everything. I'm documenting it. I've been doing it for 20 years. I've got your pictures. If I never take another picture, if I never do another video here, I've got enough to preserve to tell my youth what happened here. We've got writers here that's been doing it, but you don't listen to them, you don't to listen to me. But you ain't got to listen to me. I documented it and I'm bringing it forth. Cameraman, can you see me over there? Okay. What I'm saying to you all, I'm not here showboating. I'm telling you all the real deal. I am the regulator now. I'm not a community activator. I'm not a community this. I'm the regulator. I comes where there's dysfunction in the community. I'm the community regulator. Nobody pays my salary here. You can't tell me what I can do. I know what I'm here to do. I'm here to regulate for my African-American community. And if nobody going to stand up to do it, here I am. Minister right here, I got much of my teaching from this brother here off a tape that I'm reviewing on my show that opened my eyes to this is the most racist community in the city, of the United States. The urban renewal started here. This is the giant elephant in our community. All you educated fools. If you don't learn from the history, you're nothing but educated fools. Because we are going to tell our youth. And I'm here to tell them, Ace is on the job.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Charles Hayes.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Would you speak directly into the microphone.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I'm here in support of the project for a number reasons, aside from the fact that I'm a diehard 49er fan. It runs a little deeper than that. I just want to touch on the cleanup. You know, we trust our government to go out and protect the way we live, our way of life, to protect our children, but we can't trust them to come in and clean up a little piece of dirt. I don't understand that, you know. We need to give them a little more respect than that. And that's basically what I kind of wanted to touch on, because the cleanup is what's passionate to everyone in here and it's kind of passionate to me too, besides the fact that we want to get jobs. And I'm young and I represent the young youth and I represent change, because I am a product of my environment as well. So I do think that it is important for you to push this forward and I'm in support of it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon. My name is Reginald Rainer and I'm here to voice my opinion in support the project because of the jobs that it would bring and just the fact that it would give us, as residents, the chance to rebuild and re-beautify our community and give our children something to look forward to in the future. We need these jobs. The 2010 high school classes graduating all around the city as we speak, we need to put those babies to work so they won't end up in prison. Please pass this project: We need those jobs.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: How are you doing, Commissioners? I just wanted to say I'd like to see more of the youth into the -- Excuse me. I would like to see more of the youth in the Bayview be integrated into more of the unions, because there's a lot of money in the unions in San Francisco, be it trucking, carpentry, labor work, electrical work. We need to get some of them involved in this project. If it's nothing else to do for them, some of these trades organizations will surely take them. And, yes, in the trades, there's a lot of money in trades and there's a lot to learn in the trades. Don't be fooled. A lot of them don't know, though, because they're not taught about the trades here in San Francisco as much. And other cities in the Bay Area, as in Oakland and some of the East Bay cities, where most of the training centers are, they have a lot of power, a lot of power. It's a lot more power over there, is what I'm saying, as far as the unions getting these projects in those area. And I know they just put up that T Line. I was hearing that, you know, they didn't have that much of the community involved in that. But I think with Lennar coming in here, you know, they build luxury homes in luxury communities in the greater Bay Area. So when they come in here, I just want to see more of the youth, put something in place to get the youth involved in these big projects, even become project managers. You know, get them steered toward these project managers. And besides, they don't have to just be truckers and carpenter, but they can be in other management as well. But they need to know these things first, and a lot of them don't know because the schools aren't providing enough information about these trades. And I know firsthand because I'm a union laborer already, so, you know, I've been on numerous projects where they last for, you know, six months to a year. You know, the money you make, you can have three, four checks, you know. What I'm really trying to get at is the youth need to put their money in a wise place. San Francisco needs to invest in the youth in Hunters Point and give them a chance so they can

succeed, so they can be heads of projects, and so their kids can learn the trades as well. There are a lot of trades out there not involved, and I think they need to be involved in some of the trades. Electrical, for one. I mean, that's a really -- that trade there, a career goes a long way because it has a lot of math, a lot of formulas involved in it. But I'm running out of time, you know. Even the heavy equipment operators, they need more of those on these jobs, any of these jobs coming up. So let's pass this. I'm for this project.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon. My name is Shantanese Gaines and I live in Hunters Point on Harbor. And a lot of people getting up here saying that they don't approve of the project, but no one lives up there. And I'm 24 years old. I don't have cancer. I'm perfect. My son is three years old. When I was pregnant, I didn't have no problems. My son came out perfectly healthy. And I approve of the project. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Lokia Evans. We are all aware of the poor transportation to our side of the city. This project has steady transportation from one side of San Francisco to the other. This project will finally address the daily travel to District 10 families as they go to work and school. With this project I can travel from place to place in a reasonable amount of time. The project will assure that we have two buses, one at Candlestick and one at the shipyard. Come on, Commission, this is a win-win. The community wins, the City wins, and you win because you voted yes. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hello, my name is Latasha Beasley, and I wanted to say I approve of the project because we need these jobs. And my son is three years old and he's very bright and intelligent, and I want him to have a good education when he grows up. My dad and my mom stayed here all their lives. They're from the Bayview area. And I just want to approve this project so I can get a career and maybe I'll buy a home one day. Because these people that say that they don't approve of the project, they already own their homes. We don't have a home to own. We don't have our project. We need our project. We need our project for our education, our home, our health. We need this project, Commissioners. Please give us this project.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hello, my name is Tashara Johnson. I actually wrote something, but I'm just going to speak from the heart. Me personally, I feel this project is good. A lot of people talk about what can happen, what cannot happen, the shipyard is not clean, the shipyard is clean. Me personally, I haven't been down there, so I don't know. But if you put in the effort to make those things happen for us, then positive things come out. If you put in the effort to make negative things happen, that's what you're going to get back. I'm the mother of three kids, 15, 11, and 7; and I'll be damned if my 15-year-old be stand on the corner of Third and Palou selling drugs, drinking alcohol, pants sagging down, and has no

sense of direction. I feel this project will open up a floodgate of opportunities for all youth, all youth across the board: Mission, Sunnydale, Potrero Hill, Lakeview. Wherever the jobs are, the kids are going to follow. If you put negative energy in the streets of San Francisco, that's what our kids are going to thrive there. When you look around the city, you see kids from every nationality. It's not just black kids. It's now Asian kids, Hispanics, White, Filipino, whatever. There's always crime. Today I went to my son's graduation. He graduated from the sixth grade. I have a child who's on medication not because of the shipyard, not because of the toxins, not because their mother wasn't eating right. I have a child that's on medication because his attention span is so short. The schools are not teaching our kids enough. The schools are not guiding our kids enough. Everything that's going on right now, when you read it, it sounds good, it looks good, but until you open your heart and really take heed to what these people have to say -- I stand here for my family. I am in the community. I do believe the community will make a better way and it will happen for us. But like my shirt say -- I did not accidentally put this on -- I am a Supermom. And with this development going forward, I continue to be a Supermom. So please, I encourage you guys to open this up, because our kids really need it and I, as a parent, will really appreciate it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon. My name is Ashley Anderson. I'm a resident of Bayview-Hunters Point. And if this project -- when this project gets approved, like she said, it'll open up more opportunities especially for the youth and me. I have a three-year-old son, and I know when this project gets approved it will be a better future for me and him. So just please approve the project. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Tammy Ingle. I'm actually born and raised here in San Francisco, three years in Bayview District. I am the mother of a three-year-old. And with these jobs here, it will help us all, especially all single parents. It's for our children. We need housing, we need all this stuff, and I approve. Thank you. Please help us.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hello. My name is Dennis Lamsey. Hi, Commissioners. I'm voting yes on this too. I support the jobs and the park and the housing and also the cleanup. But it reminds me of back -- I'm a certified welder/carpenter, and it reminds me of when I first came into the trades, shipbuilding was booming, and I went to John O'Connell and took up a trade. And in there it had a guy standing there saying, "With a trade you are a king," and it had a guy with a trade, it had a hood on, and he had a crown saying that he's king. We've got a lot of black kings in Hunters Point. And I'm tired of all this racism. We need to get rid of that. If you can get rid of the racism and start, how would I say, cleanup, have the Navy clean this up, I think this will be a beautiful project. We do need the jobs. We know that there's 15 percent, 20 percent unemployment in Hunters Point. We do need these jobs for the community. Because I'm tired of walking in the community and seeing how my brothers and sisters -- We also need mental health, because with changes, a lot of people cannot change. With the

changes, they are starting to get mentally, how would I say, mentally lost, and I don't like to see that. I don't like to see homeless people, foster kids, kids having kids, you know, just to survive. There's enough money for everybody to benefit from this package, and I'm tired of us bickering, you know, the haves and the have-nots. I got a trade out of the shipyards. I was fortunate and blessed to be able to work on subs all the way up to the aircraft carriers. The last aircraft carrier I worked on was the Enterprise. We did a kill job at Hunters Point, but a lot of people probably didn't know about it because they snuck it in there. But we already know that the whole area at Hunters Point is contaminated, and all I'm trying to say is you need to clean it up and stop killing our people.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Tony Rodriguez, and I'd like, I guess, to make two points. One is that I'm a business agent for Local 483 Fire Sprinkler Union, and if this project goes through, it will provide a lot of work. We have members that live in the Bayview. We also work with City Build and other community-based organizations that try to provide work for people in the community. And a project like this would create careers for young people that are looking for careers in construction. But the second point I would like to make is that I've lived in San Francisco all my life, in the Excelsior and now in Bernal Heights. And the Bayview, since I can remember, has been a forgotten part of San Francisco. I never would go into Hunters Point or the Bayview. There was, for lack of a better word, it was a sad community. There was really nothing there. A lady just spoke about Third and Palou, and what do you see when you're at Third and Palou? I feel like the people, the community in Bayview, are being held hostage by this whole process. You've got an EIR that I think adequately deals with everything; you've got the Navy cleaning it up; and I don't see any reason to keep Bayview as a hostage anymore. You know, this project, you heard Conny Ford talk about what all this project will bring to this community, and I just urge you to do the responsible thing and look at the information you have in front of you and pass the EIR so this project can go forward. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Commissioners, Michael Theriault, San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council. I think when the Redevelopment Agency's recently-commissioned study finally comes out, it will be clear that the Bayview District or District 10 generally has among the highest densities of building trades workers in the city of San Francisco, along with my own District 11. And so this is a project that is very directly of concern to us in a variety of regards. I will single out two that have come up today in particular. One, the issue of toxins. I think that Lennar in its Environmental Impact Report addressed those very well. You've seen them present very convincing demonstrations on what they are doing at the shipyard to clean it up. When you tamp down all the rhetoric over environmental injustice, over BP, over diseases, that you see that the site is very directly comparable over a vast majority of its extent to what we already have in Mission Bay, where there are capped sites, where development is proceeding safely and successfully, where some of it is allotted to housing and some of it is taken away from housing because of the nature of the site. That's what we have here. It can proceed accordingly. On the question of the bridge, one real criticism I've heard here, it seems to me, is not an environmental criticism, it's an

aesthetic criticism, and that is that the bridge will alter personal experience of an alteration of the Slough that has not in fact taken place yet. But the bridge is actually a very critical part to the effective transportation system that Lennar will be developing in the shipyard. If you even take the numbers that were used by the opponents of the bridge, a minute and a half extra travel time around that loop behind the Slough, and multiply that assuming three trips in each direction an hour, 16 hours of travel a day for buses and a year's time, you're looking at almost a thousand extra hours of travel time and of greenhouse gases. In addition, the bridge will be critical to the eventual extension of a looping of the light rail system through the shipyard, something we all look forward to. And any of you who have been fishermen know that bridges in fact contribute to marine habitat. And those of you -- Just as a little aside, those of you who are birders, if there are any of you, I will say that my life list is at more than 300. You will know what that means. And that double-crested cormorants, which are mentioned in the EIR as potentially impacted by this bridge, in fact nest on bridges, as opposed to Pelagic or Brandt's cormorants. So the bridge can actually contribute to the environmental quality of the bay, not detract from it, if it's done in the appropriate way. So please pass this EIR and don't delay the project that we need so much for our workers and for the city. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Commissioners, Tim Paulson. I'm the executive director of the San Francisco Labor Council. We represent 150 different unions in town, over 100,000 men and women who do work under a collective bargaining agreement, but we're here on behalf of the entire community. We have thousands of our members that live in the Bayview-Hunters Point area, and we are very proud of the community benefits package that we did negotiate with Lennar that I know many of you have heard of, with the 35 percent, some affordable housing/workforce development issues, the good union jobs, the good construction jobs, and we're very proud of it. But today I do want to say, you know, on behalf of the Council that we believe that it's time and we're urging you to pass the EIR. We've been monitoring very closely the different hearings, both the Supe's, Redevelopment, with you guys, all about, you know, what is being done out there, and we are very encouraged by what has been happening over the years to clean up that shipyard and to make sure that these issues are going to move forward. So we're urging that you move this EIR and to get the project moving. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Alonzo Menelik Abdul Raheem Walker.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Could you speak directly into the microphone.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I'm a resident of Bayview-Hunters Point. I've lived in Bayview-Hunters Point all my life. I'm not opposed to the development and the cleanup, as long as it's done in a way that's to the advantage of the residents and not done to circumvent the true issues that stand before the health issues of this community, in Bayview-Hunters Point. This is a case study that was done over 15 or 20 years ago. I want to see if it won't have a parallel message that's being spoken about in this document. It is a document that was

presented to us by a renowned scientist, Wilma Subra, at a meeting that one of Lennar's people came to the meeting with a loaded gun. I think the supervisor at one time decided to make an apology to the Bayview-Hunters Point community for that incident. And the next document I'll read to you is that document that was being discussed at that meeting. "The residents of this city" -- No, excuse me: "The residents of this community face greater threats to their health and well-being than residents of other neighborhoods due to extreme levels of environmental toxins. The air has been used as a toxic waste dumping ground for decades. With less than 4 percent of the city's residents, this nine-square-mile area has one-third of the city's hazardous waste sites." Okay. In spite of the significant elevated level of health risk, the Southeast Health Community Center, which I am a member of the advisory board, is the only public funded healthcare clinic in the community, with extremely limited resources and no weekend hours. The only other healthcare option for low income residents is the emergency room at San Francisco General Hospital. That's another issue that needs to be addressed in not the Environmental Impact Report, but in, I guess, the DDA, about the Bayview-Hunters Point having a health center that will deal with the increased population as the direct result of those 10,000 homes that are supposed to be built in Bayview-Hunters Point. The next document I'll read from is from Mrs. Subra, who you probably know her. She is, I've been told, is in the Gulf now studying the environmental impact of the disaster that took place there. "According to the Environmental Impact Report, chemicals and radioactive materials are present in the soil and groundwater in various locations throughout Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II at levels that require remediation. The chemicals contaminating the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II consist of radionuclides, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), benzene, carbon tetrachloride, chloroform," and ones I can't even hardly pronounce. I suggest --

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: My position is that, yes, I'm in favor of the cleanup and job development, but make sure that before you start the development and the --

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Your time is up, sir.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: -- that we're displaced and not replaced (inaudible) hidden agenda for Bayview-Hunters Point.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, my name is Russ Sturgis. I live here in the city. I'm a 41-year member of Carpenters Local 22. We're on hard times and we know our members who live in the Bayview corridor are on harder times. When I started, we were lucky, we had BART, we had a lot of the downtown high-rises, and I'm sure their EIRs weren't perfect either, but people aren't falling dead out of them and they work okay. We need another generation of carpenters and other trades people coming in. The building trades are a stepping stone not only into supervision but into college and professional school and these other kinds of things. Please approve this and let's stop the delay. These people, that community, needs it; and the whole community needs it, as a matter of fact. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hello, my name is Jarell. I'm with POWER and I work in the Bayview community. I've been a resident in the Bayview area for all 23 years of my life. And I would just like to let you know that when I was doing outreach with the community from door to door, many times I would have people come in with nosebleeds, people who told me that they had chronic asthma -- especially my mom; her asthma has gotten a lot worse since we've been out there -- you know, child birth defects, miscarriages, breast cancer. There's a whole list of people that I talked to who had to put, you know -- who had to bury, you know, their wives or their daughters, you know. So how much longer is this going to last? And I feel that Lennar has really lied to my neighborhood, to all my, you know, my African and Hispanic and Chinese brothers and sisters from the Bayview area, around the jobs and the living conditions. For one, I don't think you would have as much support if they knew that private contractors were going to be bringing in people from out of town to take the jobs that have been promised to our community, as well as the living conditions. Okay? Because the people, they said that they're going to have to have at least 80 grand annual income to be able to move into these houses that they're about to be building out here on the shipyard. That's not right. That is no way, shape, or form affordable income -- or housing, affordable income housing. Okay? So I ask you to do what's right and go ahead and reject this EIR until there is a better plan that will better suit my community. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: To the committee, my name is Gary Lynch. I own the Monte Carlo Restaurant and Bar on Yosemite Lane. I don't know what to say about this project because things done happen so much in the future here in San Francisco, things over in the Fillmore and it seems like it's coming over our way. I understand the project that we have over in the shipyard, but there's projects in my area. You know, you've got a sewer pipe coming down from the sewer plant coming down through the Slough down there that's leaking. It smells every time the tide comes in. I mean, we've got more issues than that. You know, we need to clean up the community first before we talk about going over to doing another project. Now, I'm saying I'm for Lennar to do the contract. I don't know. I need something proved to me to let me know that we're going to take care of the existing stuff that's here. You know, I've got members coming to the club that smell this foul smell and all of the above. And they keep asking me and I ask the City, and the City tell me they don't know, this, that, and the other. But I know. The projects is being built around us. They've got a big project behind us, big pile drivers, everything else, knocking foundations off of the properties in our area. I mean, there's a lot of issues that's going around before this big deal we talking about with Lennar. So as far as me being for this being done, I don't know. I need somebody to help find out what's existing now before, you know, saying that I can agree we're going on to further things for the community. I mean, redevelopment is here to help the community, but you've got businesses there that's been existing over 20 years. Have anybody came out there and said, Can we help you guys make your businesses better so when we do go into this shipyard doing things, the people who's coming in, the contractors and everybody else, can apply and come and use these facilities? I mean, it's a lot more to think about than just, you know, going into one big project. This whole Hunters Point deal is the project, and that's as well as the kids being trained to deal with the toxins and all the hazardous stuff that's in there all the way up. I mean, you know, we need to have all the youth involved, not just the black kids over there, or just

Latinos. If you're going to send them into the yard down there with all those toxins, send everybody down there. Let them know we're sure. I mean, it'll make me feel better. That's all I've got to say.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. If the sheriff's deputies would stop anybody from entering the line for a few minutes, we are at the end of the lineup right now, and we are going to take a 15-minute break. Thank you. And then we'll continue.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Hold on just a second.

SECRETARY AVERY: The court reporter needs to start a new tape, if you could just hold on for a moment.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: The court reporter is starting a new tape.

SECRETARY AVERY: Okay. We can start.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Excuse me. I'll start again. Good afternoon, Commissioners. I'm Tim Colen with the San Francisco Housing Action Coalition. What we advocate for is smart growth, transit-oriented development, and especially more solutions towards housing affordability. We believe that this EIR is thorough, balanced, and exhaustive. It adequately addresses the environmental issues facing this project. On the question of the legacy environmental risk posed by the project, as a recovering environmental scientist, I believe that after \$700 million and 22,000 soil samples collected at this site in its characterization, assessment, and remediation, it is not factually possible to say that there are unaddressed risks to our citizens based on any science available to us today. On the issue of its orientation to transit and transportation, we believe that this project incorporates the best current understanding available to planners today to maximize the project's compatibility with the transit for a city. On the question of sea level rise, I believe that, although this is a relatively new environmental area, this is a relatively straightforward environmental -- or, I'm sorry, engineering calculation, and the EIR addresses it with the best science and most conservative assumptions used today. Finally, on the question of the proposed housing at this project, we believe that this Phase II project, based on its size and scope, represents a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to begin to deliver housing at all levels of affordability. We strongly support its mixed-income orientation, and the 32 percent affordability that's built into this is unheard of in private-sector projects. This is a fabulous level of subsidy to making housing more affordable, and it's not a proposal that should be squandered or taken lightly. In conclusion, we believe that the EIR documents a project that would put this city on a path that it would be wise to follow. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hello, Commissioners and more Commissioners. I'm Tony Kelly from Potrero Hill Democratic Club. A speaker a few speakers back said that Bayview was being held hostage, and I have to say that, sadly, I agree. I think they are being held

hostage by this project. Because today I think we have a rather tragic mess of an EIR that seeks to argue instead of mitigate the facts, it dismisses rather than addresses the issues, and it bullies viable alternatives in the public process. As speakers today have noted and as you've seen in thousands of pages of comments that maybe some of you have all read, the evaluation of alternatives in this document in this project is flawed, incorrect, and clearly biased. Time and again limited alternatives are raised and dismissed because they don't exactly match the promises in the project. Well, Commissioners, not only is that hopelessly circular reasoning, I'm not sure if the project can match the promises contained in the project. And the alternatives published don't really consider the universal alternatives possible under redevelopment. You have to remember, most of the promises in this project are paid for with our money. It's redevelopment. It's tax-income financed. It's our future property tax income being applied to this. So a proper consideration of alternatives would actually consider the alternatives available under redevelopment. In District 10, District 10 is 5300 acres. In the last few years 4100 of those acres have been either rezoned or under redevelopment. It's bringing in a new population of 100,000 people just between the Giants ballpark and the Niners' ballpark and McLaren Park. Is there truly, truly no alternative that can provide jobs sooner, that can build affordable housing sooner and in this proportion without the environmental impacts that this EIR admits -- without even getting into what the report denies, the four dozen environmental impacts that the report admits are unavoidable? Commissioners, you have to accept that there actually are. It is inconceivable that as this project is projected that there is nothing that can be built. That is an unfair calculation and it's unfair to the community of Bayview and everyone who has been waiting for a project to be built of some sort. These are all CEQA considerations. And they are wiped aside unfairly in an EIR that turns CEQA on its head to approve a deeply flawed project that doesn't serve the public good, the public process, or the public health. Just like the case of 555 Washington just a little while back, if this is the new standard for EIRs that we have to look at, we're really in deep, deep trouble. Please reject it.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hello, my name is Ron Stutts. This commission faces a logical situation now where you have to ask yourself if you're going to decide everything based on dollars and cents or common sense. One is of our own invention, which is not working very well anymore, and the other one is God-given and free to all of us. I suggest the latter. And I think that it's obvious that common sense says that you clean up a toxic environment first before you do anything with it. This is what -- This is the real bank that we, as inhabitants of this planet, rely on. We do not rely on money. That is merely a form of our relations in our work together, and this is due for a major alteration as it is. So do not, you know, get suckered into that logic. And I speak the same thing for the labor movement. You're hanging onto the wrong coattails. Okay? We need to look at this in a totally different way, think outside the box, and widen our scope of vision. So you cannot bank on that, but you can bank on a healthy environment. Today we have a monstrous catastrophe before us that is sending a message to us as to the importance of maintaining a healthy environment, a normal environment. The other factor that we should consider in all this is that whenever we do something with the community, it should serve the community who is there. It should not be attempting to surreptitiously remove people and bring in others who don't even live there. All right? You should serve the community. Ask the community what they need, a lot of which is

very obvious. And then you will feel very good and you'll see a lot of harmony between what is right now opposing factions. So reject greed as a motive in our activities, in the activities of this city, and embrace love as the cornerstone of life and our own activities. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Riccardo Contreras. Buenos tardes, Commissioners. I speak in my own language, in Spanish. (Remainder of comments in Spanish.)

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Linda Shaffer. I'm one of two representatives from District 10 serving on the City's Park, Recreation, and Open Space Advisory Committee, so I pay attention to what's going on in our parks. Today I'm speaking only for myself not for the committee, but I would like to address two elements of the proposed redevelopment project, both of which relate to parks and open space. Unfortunately, I think I'll only have time for one of them, but I'll give it a go. Number one, the so-called reconfiguration of Candlestick Point State Recreation Area. A couple of years ago I heard Mr. Claude Everhart give a very interesting history of how this state recreation area was originally established. And among the things that I learned was that a landfill area that once consisted of piles of rubble and garbage became designated in 1977 as the only urban state recreation area in California. This happened because of continuing activism and pressure led by the Friends of Candlestick Point, a group of ordinary citizens from the Bayview-Hunters Point area who had a vision. In a sense, then, this state recreation area is truly a people's park. There is even an official master plan for this recreation area, only part of which has been completed. The rest of the plan remains unfinished due to lack of funding from the State year after year. Now, in 2010, according to this redevelopment plan, 23 acres of land of this 170-acre people's park is to be sold so that high-end housing can be built on it. The incentive being offered for accepting this impact is that as part of the deal millions will be provided to improve and maintain the still undeveloped portions of the state recreation area. Among many excellent points made in the letter from the California State Parks Foundation is the comment that the project would adversely impact existing recreational opportunities. I have the reference if you'd like. In the responses the conclusion is reached there would be not be an adverse impact, that in fact there would be an increase in recreational opportunities because park acreage that is currently unimproved would become improved. Maybe the majority see this as a fair trade-off. Sorry. To me this reconfiguration is yet another example of injustice. Why is this land currently unimproved? Because in the past promises for improvement agreed to in an official document, the master plan, were never fulfilled. But what if the land had been improved? Surely there would be adverse impacts from the sale of the land. As I see it, the people are being asked to give up some of the acreage they fought so hard for years ago in order to get improvements they should already have. This isn't right.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Marcia Dale Winter.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Please speak directly into the mike.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I've been a 14-year member of the Mayor's Citizens Advisory Committee for the Hunters Point Shipyard and for a number of years the chair of its Planning and Development Subcommittee. Before entering into this activity I was on the board of SPUR and an active planner in International Urban Development. I have traveled around the world and seen many of the world's great cities, and San Francisco is one of the most beautiful cities in the world, and this project will be a gem in San Francisco. It brings too an unprecedented level of community benefits with it. It reaches the standard of open space for Greenfield new towns of the 60s and 70s, and this is an urban in-town development. Is it a perfect plan? No. There is no such thing, in my experience. Is it an excellent plan? Yes, it is. Will it be a gem in the crown of San Francisco? I believe it will. It has certainly undergone an enormous number of years of planning and its citizens' input, and I think everyone involved in this can be very proud of what this project brings to the city and to the community. And I thank you for your time.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Brother Leon Muhammad. Project Area Committee Educational Committee chair, former RAB community co-chair for the Restoration Advisory Board. One of the things that we want to impress upon you: If the shipyard was clean, then there would be no need to cover it. If it was clean, why cover it? The Navy stated to the RAB in their five-year plan that the reason why they had to do a base-wide cap is because the radiological elements are so intertwined with the naturally occurring elements that they would not have enough time to clean it up to be able to have an early transfer. That's the reason why they're covering the shipyard with a base-wide cap. Wilma Subra stated that if it was clean, there's no need to cover, there's no need for institutional controls. We brought in scientists, well-known scientists, a MacArthur Genius Award winner, an environmental warrior who was just on CNN yesterday, who also states to us that science determines the outcome. She is well-versed in her reputation and impeccable in her knowledge. And all we say is that we should look clearly at what this EIR is stating. It lacks credibility and it fails to ensure that critical issues which is pertaining to the health and well-being of human beings in Bayview-Hunters Point. Where are the scientists from Lennar? Where are the scientists from the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency? Where are the scientists from the Housing Department? Where are the scientists from the labor community? Where are the scientists from these people who will be able to sit down with Wilma Subra and address these pertinent issues? You know, when you talk about dreaming, those come to people who are asleep. We are a community that has been awakened. And we're not the only community people who have been awakened. We have a letter from Senator Yee, a letter from Senator Yee who states that he is asking you to strongly not admit -- to strongly not have the Naval Shipyard to be early transferred. He is stating it. We have this letter. It's circulating right now. And we also have an awakened senator, Mark Leno, Senator Mark Leno, who states, "Therefore, based upon the issues and concerns raised by community groups and environmental scientists, I urge you to not accept the final EIR." I also submitted to you the comments from Wilma Subra on her comments from the Planning in San Francisco and the PBS&J, and she states: "The RTC failed to accurately address the issues contained in the areas

of concern with early transfer submitted in January 12, 2010, comments. The RTC basically referenced existing sections of the Draft EIR that had been reviewed and previously judged inadequate to address the issues. The RTC did not adequately address the issues associated with redevelopment occurring during remedial activities. The redevelopment of the parcels during remediation are of serious concerns." This is a scientist. So we'd ask, bring this scientist, let's sit down. Because we deal with straight facts not fiction.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. I am Dr. Veronica Hunnicutt, Chair of the Hunters Point Shipyard Citizens Advisory Committee, and I would like to share some thoughts with you today. There's probably no proposed development project in San Francisco's history that has been as publicly discussed, reviewed, and analyzed as much and for as long as this project. Public review of the redevelopment of the shipyard and Candlestick Point has been ongoing in one forum or another for more than 17 years. Now, the organization of which I serve as chair, the CAC for the shipyard, has been leading the community-based effort to revitalize the Hunters Point Shipyard for more than ten years. We have had countless meetings, numbers of meetings. And we pride ourselves in serving as an outlet and venue for the community to advocate for their concerns and needs in revitalizing this area. The CAC has reviewed both the Draft and Final EIR and believe that the analysis that has been conducted is thorough, adequate, and comprehensive; and, as such, the committee has passed a resolution in support of the EIR. Now, when we look at this project, there are so many advantages not only to the Bayview-Hunters Point community and the southeast sector of the city but also for the City and County of San Francisco. Open space is desperately needed in this community, and this project is taking extraordinary steps to ensure that the community has equal, if not better, open-space amenities as are available in other areas of the city. The rebuilding of the Alice Griffith Housing Development -- If you've had a chance to go inside that development, you will know the dire straits which residents face. Massive transportation improvement will take place. And because I do not have time right now to address the Yosemite Slough situation, there are some interesting revelations that have been revealed in terms of possible impacts with entrepreneurs in the area. As I said, the community has worked tirelessly to make sure that development occurs in this area and that it benefits the existing community and the city as a whole. This project will provide an unparalleled scope and depth of public benefits, from parks and open space to jobs and economic development and affordable housing. And the Bayview community wants this development and they deserve this development. As Commissioner Richardson, who testified earlier, indicated, the Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Agency about a decade ago certified the EIR, which led to the implementation of Phase I.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: I'm going to finish it up. This is Phase II of the same shipyard project. Please certify the EIR. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good afternoon. Renee Saucedo representing La Raza Central Legal. The Latino community living in the Bayview-Hunters Point area standing together with our African brothers and sisters to say absolutely do not approval the EIR before you. I am speaking on behalf of my organization, but I'm also speaking as a mother of a one-year-old who is a proud resident of the Bayview-Hunters Point. We live at 1827 Jennings Street between Shafter and Thomas. And I'll tell you, I am outraged, absolutely outraged, that you are even considering this issue today. Fact: There are chemicals of concerns that are known to be carcinogens at levels above the acceptable human health risk. You are putting my one-year-old child at risk. You are putting all of our children at risk. Is it worth taking that chance? Absolutely not. We are telling you that we need in this city a zero-tolerance policy for development that puts people's health first and everything else, including Lennar's profits, second, or even last. Yeah, we'll work it out. Yeah, it's radiologically contaminated now, but don't worry. And tell your friends in the neighborhood and your neighborhoods not to worry. You might get cancer by the time you're 25, but that Planning Commission, they sure knew what they were doing. It's on your shoulders. One more person suffers from asthma, one more person dies in our neighborhood, it's your fault. Say no to this EIR. Why are you taking the chance? Why are you taking the chance and causing more people to die? Why? Because it's a community and a neighborhood of color, that's why. I am so angry at you, I can't even express myself, and I am known to express myself very well. I do not want our neighborhood and our children to get sick because you couldn't stand up to this rich developer. Shame on you. Shame on you. Shame on you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: We are now taking a 15-minute break. We will continue after the break.

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I, SANDRA BOSTOW, duly authorized Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 5770, do hereby certify: That the foregoing transcript constitutes a true, full and correct transcript of my shorthand notes taken as such reporter of the proceedings herein and reduced to typewriting under my supervision and control to the best of my ability.

DATED: June 8, 2010. SANDRA BOSTOW, CSR No. 5770

Special Joint Hearing

Thursday, June 3, 2010

San Francisco Planning Commission
and Redevelopment Agency

Continuation of a Public Hearing
on the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2:
Certification of the Final Environmental Report
and
Adopting Environmental Findings under the California
Environmental Quality Act in Connection with the
Adoption of the Project and Related Actions Necessary
to Implement Such Plans plus Related
Amendments, Findings, and Approvals

City Hall, Room 250

1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place

San Francisco, CA 94102

(Volume 2)

Reported by: Freddie Reppond

A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR THE PLANNING COMMISSION:

President Ron Miguel
Commissioner Michael J. Antonini
Commissioner Gwyneth Borden
Commissioner William L. Lee
Commissioner Kathrin Moore
Commissioner Christina R. Olague
Commissioner Hisashi Sugaya
Linda D. Avery, Commission Secretary

FOR THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY/COMMISSION:

President Rick Swig
Commissioner Darshan Singh
Commissioner London Breed
Commissioner Miguel Bustos
Commissioner Francee Covington
Commissioner Leroy King
Gina Solis, Commission Secretary

PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF:

Stanley Muraoka
Lisa Gibson
Mathew Snyder
Bill Wycko
Elaine Warren, Counsel

REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY STAFF:

Fred Blackwell
Tom Evans
James Morales, Counsel

MAYOR'S OFFICE OF ECONOMIC AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT:

Michael Cohen
Tiffany Bohee
Wells Lawson

OTHER CITY STAFF:

Amy Brownell, Department of Public Health
Jon Lau, Office of Supervisor Sophie Maxwell

FROM THE PUBLIC:

Mitchell Evans, Jaron Browne, David See, Eric Butler, Christian Mohammad, Angelo King, Sabiche Hyde, Al Norman, Gloria Berry, Nyese Joshua, Lavelle Shaw, John McCarthy, Rev.

Arnold Townsend, Arnie Stokes, Misha Wally, Sue Hestor, Sonny Loc, Dok Hu Jo, Su Ann, Susan Kelly, Kitty Lee, Eric Brooks, Aranjo Mims, Regina Douglas, Felipe Nuno, Simon Barber, Harold Lumar, Timothy Allen Simon, Bradley Wedemeyer, Kathy Perry, Mike Sislovik, Raymond Rivera, Chong Sing Chong, Annie, Kathy Davis, Manny Florez, James Gomez, Holly Wilson, Espanola Jackson, Wu Pok Bing, Richard Lau, Florence Kong, Ollie Burgess, Giselle Casada, Grace Martinez, Michael Theriault, Tony Rodriguez, Tim Paulson, Marcia Dale-LeWinter, Pastor Josiah Bell, Dr. Veronia Hunnicutt, Marie J. Franklin, Tony Kelly, Christine Ania, Saul Bloom, Jason Fremyou, Tim Colon, Martinez Pelosa, And unidentified members of the public

[The hearing resumed at 5:00 p.m.]

MS. AVERY: The joint meeting of the Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Agency is back in session. If I could everyone take your seats, other than the folks who are standing in line.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: People in the both the part of the front row and in the rear rows that are talking during the proceedings, it is extremely disruptive to those who are attending and to the Commissioners. If you are speaking, I will ask the sheriff's deputy to remove you. If you are clapping, cheering, or anything else, I will ask the sheriff's deputy to remove you. Please be respectful of the people who are making testimony to the joint commissions.

MS. AVERY: Thank you. Commissioners --

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Excuse me. I may repeat or call some names of people who have already spoken because many of you have come up from downstairs, not realized that your names have not been called, and have taken -- Would you get out of the center aisle if you're not talking? So you will have to pardon me if I call names that have already spoken. Obviously, you don't come up a second time. And at the end, if I have not called your name, there will be ample time for you to come up. All right. There has been correction of an item that was distributed to the commissions and entered into the record. And, Mr. Cohen, if you would proceed with that correction.

MR. COHEN: Yes. Thank you very much. For the record, Michael Cohen, director of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development. I was just hand-delivered a letter by Senator Leno's staff correcting a letter that was just read into the record. While this letter reiterates the senator's strong commitment to seeing that the shipyard be cleaned up to the highest level practical, it includes two significant changes. One, it specifically acknowledges the cleanup should be consistent not only with Proposition P but the 2004 conveyance agreement, which is a legally binding agreement between the Redevelopment Agency and the United States Navy which contemplates phased cleanup, transfer, and development of the shipyard. Secondly, it deletes the request that either commission delay certification of the EIR. So I will give that to the Commission secretary. She can pass that out.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. I will start calling the cards again. Please don't come up unless your name is called. Mitchell Evans. Chanston Gaines. Lee Williams. Sharon brown.

Clarence Johnson. MITCHELL EVANS: Good afternoon, Commissioners. I heard a lot of testimony today from both sides.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Your name, sir.

MITCHELL EVANS: Oh. Mitchell. Sorry. Let me introduce myself. I heard both sides of the argument today. I mean this is hectic right now. We spent almost seven hundred million - something like that -- for the past six years. And we need to press this EIR. And I really support the EIR. Part of my heart, right now, I'm graduating. Where do I go? It's summer, right? When there's looking for the future two years from now, where am I going to go? I have no work. I looked for work and need to support my family. If you don't support this, where am I going to go? To the street? To prison? Come on now. Wake up, people. This is serious right now, you know. Right now I know we are way behind budget, lot of junk right now. I don't know what's going on with politics right now in Sacramento, anywhere in the United States right now. I don't know what's going on. But you need to support this EIR. Bottom of my heart, I need to look for a job. I need to support my family. I need somewhere to go. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MS. AVERY: I would also ask you to turn off your cellphones.

JARON BROWNE: My name is Jaron Browne. Good evening, Commissioners. I want to first -- I want to submit a few things for the record. I know that all of you received two letters that we submitted earlier. I want to also -- I wasn't able to make copies of everything, but we have supplementing documents that are referred to in there. I wanted to just submit these to Linda Avery formally for the record. And I wanted to acknowledge that one of the core considerations that we really want to draw out at this point that I don't think came up in the earlier hearings is the question of greenhouse gases. And this is particularly significant to the entire country post-Katrina and to the city, which has really put forward the issue of wanting to see green development. And there's a contradiction, a greenwash happening if you're putting a UN environmental climate center at the same time that you're proposing a development that has an annual increase of 150,000 tons of greenhouse gases. The EIR incorrectly said that this is not significant and that I think is calculated based on a per individual calculation looking at residents, looking at stadium goers. But that's about a hundred thousand tons of greenhouse gas emissions a year, an additional 150,000 tons. That is irresponsible development and it's not -- it's not significant and we've looked at -- we're submitting case law. We're submitting a number of recommendations including San Francisco's own recommendations around development, but also CEQA standards. And it's a violation. It's not in compliance. The analysis is not in compliance with CEQA standards. I do want to also mention that we submitted documents from Wilma Subra. And we've been bringing her up because, again, I think it adds tremendous credibility to the claims that are being put forward. And I want to note that the response to comments, Wilma Subra, who has served on Superfund site committees for EPA, who has served on recommendations around cumulative impacts for 20 years -- she's a leading scientist from the EPA. I mean -- so this is not just someone we're pulling out of thin air. And right now she's the leading scientist addressing British Petroleum oil crisis. So thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Clara Bishop. Minister Christopher Mohammad. Ricardo Contreras. Charles Hayes. Rodney Taylor. Eric Butler. Jarrell Lee. David See.

DAVID SEE: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is David See. I'm board director at the Freedom West Homes located only two blocks behind City Hall. It is a community of over 900 residents with over one-third Asians and two-thirds African-Americans, whites, and Hispanics. Even though I'm a resident of Western Addition, I took concerned interest in the project in view of the large number of Asians, especially Chinese, who live in District 10. I am not an antagonist or protagonist of this project. But I have to advise great prudence and care by you Commissioners in casting your vote on this particular resolution. I have to look at the Bayview Hunters Point project from two standpoints -- environmental and cultural. First, environmental. A few weeks ago on TV, I chanced on an entire proceedings on this topic of the Planning Commission and were much impressed by the presentation on the draft environmental statement on the years of study was taken and number of data samples taken. However, later on I learned that a world-renowned environmental scientist, Wilma Subra, took issue with the report's methodology and that the safety conclusion is premature. Being somewhat of a scientist myself, I took the recommendation of a world-renowned scientist, even if most of the people who are working on EIR not otherwise. You see, I was trained in physics as well as somewhat in environmental science and engineering. You put intelligence and research conclusion of 100 David Sees versus Albert Einstein, you got to pick Albert Einstein. I also know the problems in group things, especially in scientific project that is so often characterized in environmental impact statements, because no matter how many of me working on the problem for how many years and how much money spent and how many data points I collected, if I'm taking the wrong framework and inappropriate approach, I won't get it right. It's just like garbage in/garbage out. The bright scientist, unencumbered by various extraneous factors going by his or her pure intellection, succinct observation, and clear framework, will see through it right away. So we should not take caveats from world-renowned environmental scientists Wilma Subra slightly. Go ahead and approve this EIR until the problems pointed out by her can be well accounted for. I don't want Bayview Hunters Point turn out to be a latter-day version of Love Canal, in which, similarly, the land was seeded for one dollar and houses built on top of a toxic waste site. In Love Canal, 30 years later, after years of unusually heavy rain, when children and dogs began to come home with chemical burns and later on health authority found that area residents had abnormal numbers of miscarriages, newborn deformities, cancer, blood disease, and other ailments. Secondly, culturally, I see problems as well. Few weeks ago I was in the dedication ceremony of the three-headed Buddha attended by Mayor Newsom at the Civic Center Plaza.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

ERIC BUTLER: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Eric Butler. and I'm speaking on supporting the EIR. From an environmental point I came to -- I come to these redevelopment meetings often and what I found I was hearing all the time was talking about the water -- the level and recede on water. So I took an interest in that and took some time to find what that was about. And I also found that in the past hundred years that the water rose 7 inches but in the next hundred years it would be like 55 inches and that the redeveloper right now already has in consideration on the redevelopment. So on the EIR part, I am for that and I hope you pass that. But I'm also an emotional wreck right now because I am very, very proud to see seniors from

my community, people from my community, organizations from my community. It seems like everybody just wants this job to go down safely, but the issues which they're bringing them up could have been brought up 10 to 15 years ago when all the hundreds and thousands of meetings and hours of meetings that at this point in the red zone we'd be about to score a touchdown that everybody wants to play defense. So seriously, that in my community from what I know of, I don't know too many people that have died from chemical exposure in the shipyards, but I have grandparents and I have uncles who have worked there who are still healthy now, still playing with my kids and everything, that there's more people in my community dying from gunshot wounds and drug overdoses, respiratory diseases that are due to the extent of the houses and the conditions in which they're living in. If you don't clean that shipyard, that will remain. If you don't clean the shipyard, they're talking about what will be brought out, it will remain. So that kind of sound kind of oxymoron to me. But this project needs to go forward, because it has to be gone and the mix of moving garbage you're bringing beauty to the neighborhood; you're bringing jobs; you're bringing education; you're bringing self-esteem; you're bringing in togetherness. And we still be together on this as this plan goes by, because if all these brothers and these people here that's advocating against this project is worrying about health, well, those health issues can be tweaked, just like anything else that can be tweaked -- a song that you create. You got to get the song right; you got to tweak the music here, change a verse there. That can be done but not at the expense of stopping the album from being produced. And right this here will stop everything from being produced, because without this project the whole community initiative is off the board. And I don't think not one of those programs got no community initiative for me -- the Muslim power or anybody else. Got no training program for me, educational program for me, daycare program for me, or no kind of idea for me. The only idea that be left for me is what's in my community, which is very, very not so positive. So I don't think you want 5,000 people who's waiting on these jobs to be focused on the negative way of employing theyselves and taking care of they kids when you have a legal, positive way to do it right now. So you either want a beautiful city, you want a positive cultural people, or you don't. But this is not the reason to stop it. This is way bigger than us. This is for San Francisco. So for San Francisco, I beg you, let's pass this, please.

CHRISTIAN MOHAMMAD: Members of the two commissions, you must know that I thought long and hard about even bothering to come to the meeting today, which is why I came two hours late, because my initial thought was not to even bother, because I'm talking mostly to political prostitutes. Some of you -- most of you really don't give a damn about the health of that community in Bayview Hunters Point. It's only a few of you who really care. And I know that. Particularly on the Redevelopment Commission. Most of you are bought and paid for the past few years. I'm clear on that. There's something -- infomercials that you see on TV where there's a disclaimer where they will tell you, look, what you're about to hear are from paid actors. Most of the people -- not all -- that you've heard from in support of the EIR are paid actors, bought and paid for by Lennar and the Mayor. And to see Senator Leno prostitute himself, after sending the community a letter today, to have Mr. Cohen from the Mayor's office, make a few phone calls and twist a few arms and come back and say we want to correct the record only tells me that this city is rotten to the core. There's no principles here. There's no moral compass here. There's no character here. Most of the people that run this town are political whores. I'm clear on that. But I want to warn you. Pass this. Let them develop. I don't give a damn anymore. Develop the shipyard. But I warn you the earthquake that the U.S. geological office is predicting will come to pass. That land fill will liquefy and it

will turn into toxic soup and it will become airborne and you will have a toxic cloud pouring over this city and you will regret it, because the generation that will live after your weak decision will be able to blame you and the weak mayor. And I want to say to you, Mayor Newsom, there will be a coalition of people following you up and down this state to remind you of your record. So if you stand on this, I hope that you'll be willing to pay the political price, because you're dealing with whores now. Lennar is a whore. Most of you doggone weak Commissioners have sold out to this development. You've already cut private deals. So whatever you decide to do, do whatever the hell you want to do.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Would you please leave the room. Thank you.

ANGELO KING: Are you ready for me?

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Please.

ANGELO KING: A lot of excitement here. My name is Angelo King. I'm chair of the project area committee. I'm on the environment commission. I live in the community. And you know what? I just got to say when you're hearing long enough, when you've been following this process as long as I have -- I cut my teeth on the 1997 stadium campaign -- when you've been here long enough, you got to see people change sides. And I remember when that same group stood up and supported Lennar on the first phase and how Lennar supported they school. And the same --

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: If you would please not interrupt or I will ask the sheriff's deputy to remove you.

ANGELO KING: Since nobody needs any facts or any papers to make accusations here, I'm going to make a few of my own. Look, here's the deal: I'm so tired of hyperbole and the things like this is Chernobyl, this is Love Canal, this is Katrina. This is the kind of crap we get in the community when you don't stand strong and look at the facts. The same stuff that the DTSC, the EPA, and every other state, federal organization -- when the EPA's final report comes out will say the same thing, that there are no long-term health aspects risk to the dust issue that was done and that the 22,000 soil samples and the 10,000 water samples. They are working to clean that damned thing up. And I get so tired of Lennar this -- this has become a running joke in my community. Oh, you trip and fell. Lennar did it. They blaming everything from our kids' academic -- and this is in public meetings -- they're blaming everything from our kids' academic failures to violence in the community on Lennar and dust. It's ridiculous. It's ridiculous. And then, you know, they talk about -- every time we find follow-up on some information, it's not always the same. The whole reason I didn't go see Dr. Subra is because the meeting was in the mosque; and every time we come to speak our mind about how we feel about it -- because obviously you can receive resources from Lennar and keep your integrity -- every time we do that we get -- we get threatened. There have been restraining orders put on them. And you, Redevelopment Commission -- Redevelopment Commissioners, you remember when we had to be escorted out of your commission for saying that there had been public meetings and that they refused public health nurses to come and speak to the families. Y'all remember I had to be escorted out because somebody jumped up and called me a slave and a sell-out and a gentlemen said he was going to punch me in the jaw. You are encouraging

this by not standing up to this. That's not Chernobyl out there. I mean some of the radiological we're trying to solve for is about the same as you trying to -- as the earpiece you have in your ear. So, look, the Navy cleans it up. The EPA is turning its attention to the cleanup of the shipyard. I want to work with these folks that want to see it cleaned up as great as possible. And thank you.

SABICHE HYDE: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Sabiche Hyde for the record. Recently of the San Francisco Sheriff's Department, director of community correction. I stand here today in support of the EIR being adopted as well as this project going forward. I want to speak to some heartfelt things specifically. I have some things written down, but I want to speak to just the contrivement, just the planning, just the heightening of fear that has just taken place. I don't appreciate it. You shouldn't appreciate it. You're in a position now to be a lot more structurally optimistic in passing this EIR and moving this thing forward. Again, the fear -- the contrived fear -- community miseducation, the community hostaging has to stop. We are all passionate, but we need to be respectful. We are all soldiers. We need to be respected. And, again, all this means, as the gentleman just talked about the hyperbole and all the different things that happened just by creating the passion and creating the falseness and the miseducation. It's like we need to move forward with this whole project. You have the ability to move forward. You have the ability to rehumanize Bayview. You have the ability to create a structural optimism within the Bayview community. You have the ability to stop seeing women cry. You have the ability to see economic resources being filtered through the community. You have the ability to, after almost four decades, to see a community rise up again. It's like I've read the EIRs. I went through every aspect of this in the last two and a half years. For the record, I was initially recruited to be supportive of that conversation and those people that just had the conversation around, well, where should you stand -- Lennar or not Lennar? After educating myself, after intellectualizing myself around this process, I believe that the EIR has not only has issues and challenges, but it also has solutions. We have to go with the solutions, not that we only have to go with solutions, but we have to remember there's human beings at Alice Griffith. There's human beings sitting up and down that corridor that don't have the optimism, that don't have the hope. We can do that now. We can do that as a community. We can do that as leaders. So I just say that to you. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

AL NORMAN: Mr. Chairman, Al Norman, Bayview Merchants Association. I don't know what to say. I mean everything has been said. I done heard every scare tactic in the book. I done heard you called all the names they been calling us for years. And all the things that you was accused of today they been accusing us of ever since all this stuff started. But I've live in Bayview Hunters Point for 63 years. Some of the horror stories about people getting sick and nose bleed, I have yet to see it. I have yet to -- ain't too much wrong with me. Ain't going to say nothing wrong, but ain't too much wrong with me. And the thing about it is, we trying to move forward. Okay. So you don't want to pass this. So you want us to go back to being relegated to welfare and killing each other, because that's what's going to happen. This project gives Bayview Hunters Point young people hope. And without you being able to pass this and all these little nay-sayers about the ground is poisoned and this, that, and the other. You the planners. You the redevelopers. We depend on you to make the decisions to try to make our quality of life a little better. And all that's going to happen if this thing ain't passed at this time

so these young people can move forward and get trained to do jobs there, it's going to go back to the status quo, where they end up starting to kill each other, starting to rob and steal and do -- because you took that hope away from them when they came to you looking for the hope and for you just to pass this EIR so we can go to the next step. We'll go with you all the way. We'll fight with you all the way to the end concerning this project. Lennar didn't ask to come here. We asked them to come here. We asked them to come here because we had no other economic vehicle to come here and help our young people come out here and be able to be trained and be able to get a job and be able to possibly afford to live in some of the housing they're going to build out there. So why you want to take this hope from them right now and we done came this far, because of a few nay-sayers that want to come down here and call you a bunch of names, that want to predict earthquakes that might come. But whatever it is we'll fix it at that time. Don't take this hope away from these young people. Don't take this hope away from my merchants out there who are looking to be doing business with this. Lennar was our financial and economic vehicle to build southeast San Francisco so we can look like all of San Francisco. Why at this late time and date? We've been waiting all these years to be a part of the rest of your city. We going to get this last-minute effort right here and listen to a bunch of nay-sayers who don't live in the community -- claiming to live there -- and doing everything they can to stop this project. I don't want my youngsters out there killing each other and having to go rob to feed their families because y'all took the hope away from them by not passing this project. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

GLORIA BERRY: Good afternoon. My name is Gloria Berry, born and raised in San Francisco. I am here to urge you not to certify the EIR before you, because it is inadequate and does not comply with CEQA standards. I repeat: It does not comply with CEQA standards. We want cleanup, not cover-up. The institutional controls in the air are neither enforceable nor will they protect the people from exposure to toxins. The plan in this EIR is to leave contaminants in the ground and ensure safety with institutional controls such as deed restrictions, forbidding residents to grow food or dig up dirt because of dangers in the soil beneath their homes. There must not be an early transfer. The EIR does not adequately address health risks or early transfer. Early transfer would allow the city to accept a transfer of the contaminated shipyard land before it has been fully cleaned. With the rush of this aggressive development schedule, early transfer allows the city to transfer dirty shipyard land to a private developer whose interests are primarily their own profits. I repeat: Whose interests are primarily their own profits. You see, I am a Navy veteran, 12 years of service, 10 of them were active duty. My last ship, the U.S.S Mt. Hood was in dry dock at the naval shipyard in Hunters Point. Now, I'm not going to speak in scientific terms. I'm going keep it real simple. However, one word I would like to use is the word "jettison." It's Navy jargon. You see, when OSHA would come aboard our ships to inspect them and we had any liquids or equipment that could be considered toxic or hazardous it would be jettisoned. It looks like this [indicating]. Another word. It consists of four letters. It is the word "wind," w-i-n-d. You see, whether you care about the residents or not of Hunters Point Bayview the wind, w-i-n-d, will -- not can -- but will carry these dangerous toxins to your neighborhoods. Toxins do know district boundaries. And, quickly, I just wanted to refer to the gentleman that brought up the EPA. Well, the EPA during 9/11 did not enforce usage of respirators, stating that conditions were safe. Tell that to all the widows of the firemen and the workers who were

down there who died. Tell that to the people who now have respiratory problems, lung disease, particles still in their lungs because the EPA said conditions were safe. In conclusion, this decision before you now is the most important decision facing the future of San Francisco. And I am calling on you to do the right thing and not approve this toxic EIR.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

NYESE JOSHUA: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Nyese Joshua. I live in Bayview Hunters Point. I am here before you this afternoon urging you as well to not certify this EIR because it does not comply with CEQA standards. Earlier we heard that comments were addressed. The problem is that the comments were greatly inadequately addressed. They are basically a series of blow-offs. For instance, with Wilma Subra's comments, the woman who is now dealing with the Gulf of Mexico issue, she was given two paragraphs in the comments and responses. Deregulating the shipyard is my main concern. As we see industry in the Gulf and how they handled putting the -- constructing those oil wells and now look at what the earth is facing because of deregulation. Institutional controls is also a big problem with this EIR. This EIR does not adequately address health risk -- that's not what I want to say. This EIR -- in terms of the institutional controls they are not enforceable and they are not safe. Right now they're arguing that if the ground were to open up back there, with people living back there, children playing back there, and so on, they don't know when they might get out there. That's in the current EIR. That's still an argument on the table as we stand. There's no firm plan for when people would come out there and fix the ground that might open up because of whatever. Even a tiny earthquake. We just had a tiny earthquake last week Saturday. Health risks related to the chemical concerns at the shipyard were not adequately addressed in this EIR. The issues of chemicals concerning the shipyard remain unresolved. And before my time is totally up, with regard to these agencies, June 1st, there was an article in the Examiner: EPA and Lennar at odds over asbestos dust. So the EPA and Lennar are not in agreement. The EPA did not declare that site safe. There's another article in your packages that states that the EPA employees were forced to lie to Region 9, which is over California, Hawaii. And this shipyard was named in that article and that study. The problem out there is that it's a toxic Superfund site. Development is not the problem is on that shipyard. Thank you.

LAVELLE SHAW: How you doing, Commissioners? My name is Lavelle Shaw, president of Alice Griffith Tenants Association. I've been down there 35 years. I'm also the city-wide vice-president of the public housing. I hear all these stories -- well, first of all, I want to say Mr. Christopher called y'all whores, I guess. He might be mad because he want to be the pimp, but we ain't going to let him. But we're going to move on to something else. I've been down there 35 years. 35 years I been down there. And you're telling me that we still have to live in the deplorable conditions that we live in. We still have to live in the rut that we live in because of these people who don't live in that rut, living in that deplorable conditions. And so I got to go back to my community and sit there and say, Hey, guess what? We got to stay here another 20 or 30 years and we got to do what we can do to survive. No. No. You need to pass this EIR. You need to give us a new leaf on life. And you need to not listen to all of these real actors over there, because whatever he says I'm not no paid actor. Lennar didn't pay me. Nobody paid me. I work for the City and County of San Francisco. Lennar didn't give me the job and nobody else got me the job. I got me my job. But I've been in my community 30-something years; and I'll be damned if I let some outsiders come and dictate to me what's best for my

community. What's best for my community is that we rebuild, we get jobs, we get childcare, and we get education and help in my community. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

JOHN MCCARTHY: I've been waiting about three and a half hours to hear my name, so I'll just start now at this point. Having been a direct participant in the HPS RAB since 2006 and interviewed for the RAB four years ago, my involvement goes back to 1993. My name is John McCarthy. I retired from the U.S. Army Reserve at the Navy radiological defense lab, their former field test site, which was Camp Parks, in '05. If this article in the Chronicle means anything, one should also consider if in the EIR on Phase 2 could even be legal yet. That's very doubtful. The cleanup -- and I'm a sole participant with what's left of the RAB process -- the cleanup at HPS -- the cleanup plan for HPS will still be a long way from adequate implementation, long after this EIR is signed off, if it were signed off in the foreseeable future. This is more at this point than a San Francisco issue. I'm bringing it up in Alameda County -- have been. They have a downwind hazard from here. For those of us who don't adequately comprehend the health hazards, please don't assume that -- don't assume what you don't know. The various regulation agencies are real. Our various regulations are real. Relating to a prior speaker, Hunters Point naval shipyard was a very complicated site. Phase 1 was the least complicated part of this transfer. Only one parcel, compared to Phase 2, which is multiple heavily industrial parcels. I first got involved 17 years ago, early in the process. The RAB, which has a purpose for being there, mainly the environmental and technical issues, is only eight years old -- less than that. They stopped two years ago. Now, there's a follow-on procedure, because things were complicated. Those complications are not going away, regardless of what the City does.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

REV. ARNOLD TOWNSEND: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Reverend Arnold Townsend. I'm going to try to be as brief as possible. I am sympathetic to how long you've been here. And I thank you for being willing to go through this process as citizen commissioners. Let me just say that I really came today and I wanted to talk about the importance of approving this EIR. I want to talk about how much I like what's been done in regard to transportation in an area that has been very difficult to get to and then to get around on public transit once you get in Bayview Hunters Point. And this project will go a long way to solving that. But after coming here and being greatly insulted, which ain't the first time I've been called names. But I just wanted to say that I discovered -- I think I heard someone say that patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel. I also think that when people run out of argument they resort to name calling and they resort to accusations. I believe the argument on this has been made clear by now that every time arguments have been brought up against this project, they have been blown away. Now, one thing I will say. There is some toxic stuff around this project that needs to not be covered but actually be removed. And that's the toxic misinformation and lies and the kind of threats that have gone around this development. That's the toxicity that needs to be removed out of any civilized debate that we're having. Debate is good. It's healthy. I believe it's what's made this probably end up being one of the most outstanding projects in the country because it's got so much scrutiny and so much oversight at this point. And that's important and that's a good thing. But we cannot let, because we feel

like we're losing, let our discussion resort to the kind of stuff that we've heard here today. I'm asking you to do the right thing. Look at the facts and approve this project and let's move forward. And, please, let's move forward with that bridge intact. Thank you so much.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm coming before you because I'm just concerned. I'm not on either side. I sit on the CAC and I abstained from voting for it because I didn't feel comfortable with the information. And it's not that everyone hasn't worked really hard at trying to get all of the data and everything. I just know that I've been a San Francisco resident all my life. I was born and raised here; and I didn't start having asthma until I moved into the Bayview community. I've had three miscarriages since I've lived in that community. And I'm just hearing about this stuff from -- well, I don't know what side. I'm just hearing that some of these toxins can cause these things. I had no clue that those are some of the effects, but this is what has occurred. This is what has actually happened to me. So my concern -- and I'm an electrician as well. We need work. Labor needs work. The first people that will be out there at that site are laborers; and they are the people who will be affected first and foremost. So although I know I need work and I know my brothers and sisters in the trades need work and I know the people in my community need to work, my first and foremost concern is that everyone is safe, because you can work for a certain period of time. But if you're not able to live your life later on, then, you know, what good is it? So I just hope that you guys make the best decision and understand that you have people's lives at your hands.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

ARNIE STOKES: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Could you speak directly into the microphone?

ARNIE STOKES: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Arnie Stokes. I'm here to ask you to send the EIR back, because I think it needs additional work. I'm a resident of Bayview Hunters Point. I've lived in Bayview Hunters Point for approximately 35 years or so. PG&E just closed down a power plant in Bayview Hunters Point; and they closed it down because it was producing very fine particulate emissions, so fine that you couldn't see it. But it was causing lung problems for the people of Bayview Hunters Point. So they finally closed down that power plant and they dismantled it, which is a good thing. I'd like to direct your attention to the EIR statement plan, pages 38 and 39. It states that there's plans for a new heating and cooling facility to be included in the project. Now, is this new facility a power plant? And, if so, what are its emissions levels? In other words, are we just going to tear down one power plant to rebuild another power plant that's going to have the same problems? There is not a mention of this power plant anywhere in the EIR. And if this facility is included in the project facility plan, why is it not discussed or analyzed in the EIR? And that's why I think the EIR really needs some additional work. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MISHA WALLY: Good afternoon, Commissioners, and the community. My name is Misha Wally. I'm a 21-year resident of Bayview Hunters Point. First of all, I would like you to take your time on the EIR. Do not approve it yet. It does not meet the CEQA requirements. Now, I hear the concern of the people that want the jobs. We are a neighborhood that has been disenfranchised for far too long. But this particular project isn't really going to bring the kinds of jobs we need; and there are many other ways to go about bringing those jobs. The main concern I have -- or one of the main concerns I have -- with the EIR is that it doesn't fully address protection of the fragile ecosystem surrounding the Hunters Point shipyard and Candlestick Point area. The Yosemite Slough issue is a very fragile ecosystem. It's a nursery for the fish in the Bay. We have seen the fisheries in the Bay collapse because we have not protected our wetlands and fragile marshes and sloughs. We see what's happening in the Gulf because we didn't take time to make sure that the oil drilling at such depth was carefully regulated; and so the whole fishing industry is collapsing in the Gulf. That's going to affect us. We need to protect what we still have left. Putting a bridge 30 pilings through that area is going to destroy it. And not only that, the bridge is right next to a probably at least 5,000-year-old Ohlone village site. I want to remind us of the way that the indigenous people of our nation believed -- live and still believe -- that we need to look out for not just ourselves and the next generation but for the next seven generations. If the people that came to the Gold Rush had done that, there wouldn't be mercury in the Bay and we could eat fish easily -- what's left of the fisheries. So each step that we take impacts not us, not our children and our grandchildren. It impacts people for at least seven generations. What's the rush? 6,000-page document that has to be reviewed in three weeks? Let's be reasonable. I ask you to take your time. Do not approve this.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

SUE HESTOR: Sue Hestor. I will leave you a copy for the Redevelopment Commission secretary so that my letter challenging Commissioner Antonini as part of the redevelopment record as well. The insanity of the schedule is not driven by the community. It's being driven by the Mayor's Office and the developer. If you had done a proper responses to comments, you wouldn't have so many people freaked out because of the inadequacies. You had really serious problems raised on the adequacy of the comments by the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society -- people who did really technical comments. Even though she is not here to say anything, I want to direct your attention to the comments by BCDC. BCDC is a responsible agency, which means that this is their EIR, too. And they cited all kinds of information that was lacking in the EIR that would enable them to do their review. They have to review the bridge through the slough. They have to review all of the open space along the park, because that is their jurisdiction. And they asked questions like -- esthetic questions on the bridge on the issues. They said that's one of the things that the law says we have to deal with -- provide information in the EIR. And they got effectively a pat on the head. And I'll tell you what pages it's on. It's on page 1795 their comments start. It was, Don't bother your pretty little head about this. We'll deal with it when we are taking the permit through your agency. An environmental impact report is different than a presentation for approval. An environmental impact report is supposed to be a tested document that is subject to public hearings and comments and responses -- the process that we're in right now. And it is not the same as saying, We will give you all of this at the last minute, and it will be one-sided and there will be no opportunity to test it. Looking at the BCDC comments, they are deadly serious about the

parks. Look at the comments by the people from State Parks about Candlestick Point. They were treated incredibly cursorily, shabbily, ridiculously by the staff. You should have tried to do a better job. This EIR has been rushed through the process. The EIR came out the day after one holiday and there were three holiday periods in the comment period. And you have a turnaround time on a document that's 4,000 pages long, 3,000 pages of comments; and you have to integrate those in the time period of three weeks; and the community had the same amount of period with another holiday in it. I guess we have holidays everywhere on this project. This EIR has really serious flaws. It has serious flaws on historical resources and definitely on wetlands. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hello. Good evening, Commissioners. I'm here to say a few things, but I'm going to speak from the heart first. I live in Hunters Point. Actually, I live on Oakdale, 1030 Oakdale. I've lived there for 17 years. There is nothing wrong with me. I've never seen nobody come to my house, knocked on my door, or anything. I have no idea what these people are talking about. Speaking for me, I am Latin and I live in that community. I have no idea what La Raza or POWER or anything of what these people are talking about. But I am here to state some facts. I just need to take a minute out to say there's no other project that offers 32-percent affordable housing when the law requires only 15. There's no other project that offers 256 units owned by HUD and housing. There's no other project that has taken us, the working-class families, into consideration when building market-rate homes. There's no other project that's giving so much to the community that has been overlooked by our officials for so many years. Ladies and gentlemen, who are we fooling here? We'll never have another great opportunity like this in San Francisco. So please vote yes. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Please. I'll call another series of cards. They may have already spoken. If not, please come. Tammy Ingram. Jenetta Towns. Siddiq Yahad. Daniel Solberg. Do Phat Jo. Wan San Jo. Denny Yang. Ann Huey. Carolyn Blair.

SONNY LOC: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Sonny Loc. I'm a radio commentator. And first I heard somebody talk about like greenhouse gas. I think that gas you breathe out is also considered greenhouse gas. Can you consider not breathing? And somebody say, no, it's like a global warming thing. Can you read the news? Those climate scientists, they release the e-mail. Global warming is fake. Think about Washington, why they close for one week. There's no government work because of lots of snow. And think about because of we need more regulation. Look at what happens to the Gulf of Mexico. Okay. So oil is leaking. You know what? What they call this? They call it like deep sea vessel. Do you know why they have this name deep sea vessel? Because they operate in deep sea. Why they operate in deep sea? Because the regulations say you cannot drill close to the shore. Is no good. But if this happened in shallow water, that stupid hole can be plugged in easily? Why? Because there's a regulation make it difficult to increase the risk of those people to drill the oil from deep sea. This is too much regulation is not no regulation. And somebody -- I heard a lot of people against it because they say we're not against prosperity, we're not against development, we're not against like a lot of good whole future, because those place are toxic. Okay. This place is toxic. Think about it. We have 250 artists stay there like for more than 20 years. Have you ever seen like a three-legs, four-eyes artist? And have you ever seen like

people? Have you seen any toxic count about your head? No, this place is not really toxic, 'cause the Navy, the government spent \$600 million and keep going up to clean up that shipyard. Not for one day, not for one year, just keep going and cleaning that up. Those people say, oh, look at those infomercial. It's a paid advertisement. How about look at the votes? We did on 2008, 60 percent more people say we support this project. Is that paid advertisement? Okay. You let this political whore. I think you try to use all those lies to get your political game. I think you are political whore, Mr. Mohammad.

DOK HU JO: Hello, everybody. Good evening. I can't speak English well. Can I speak Cantonese?

INTERPRETER: My name is Laura Chu. I am translating for Mr. Dok Hu Jo. I'm the president of the Chin Lin Association, which is a Vietnamese family association. Years ago, I've had to go fishing in the Bayview. Now, the land is wasted. Living in San Francisco is very expensive. There is a saying a foot of gold equals an inch of man. You cannot have waste. We need to have home. My children had to move to another state because they can't afford to buy in San Francisco. We have to take care of each other. We have to build more homes, build more businesses. Then there will be racial harmony. We are low income, but San Francisco is a very good town. I hope you will support the project so that my children can come back and live in San Francisco. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

SU ANN: Hi. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Su Ann, but I can't talk English well. I can talk Chinese Cantonese.

INTERPRETER: My name is Laura Chu translating for Ms. Su Ann. I have lived in San Francisco for 27 years. My children grew up in San Francisco. I think the project, the development, is good for San Francisco. It will bring tourism to San Francisco. It will bring jobs, which is good for San Francisco. That's why I support the project. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Marie Smith. Tommy Tang. Fred Maroney. Pastor Gary Banks. Linda Montoya. Francisco Mayoral. Ashley Anderson. Mario Butto. Charlie Lavery.

SUSAN KELLY: Hello. My name is Susan Kelly. And I moved to the Bayview in May of 1977. And shortly thereafter they had a model of redevelopment for the Bayview. And in all this time nothing has been done. Jobs have come into the Bayview. Certain development has materialized. Jobs were promised to the neighborhood, but they were not materialized. With this project we're hoping that jobs will materialize. With the cleanup that's still needed in the Bayview, why isn't the people in the neighborhood trained by hazmat to clean up some of the problems that we're having in the neighborhood? It still needs to be cleaned. Why not use some of the people who need jobs to clean up the problems that we have and be trained properly by hazmat to do it? That would ensure the jobs will stay in the Bayview Hunters Point, unlike the other jobs that were promised to stay and did not stay.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Gladys Soto. Kitty Lee. Eugene Wong. Tiffany Carpenter. Marlene Tran. Christina Sandoval.

KITTY LEE: Hello. My name is Kitty Lee. I'm a Realtor in San Francisco for more than 30 years. And I always watching the San Francisco develop. And then I realized Hunters Point, because I usually go up there, bring my kids and then fishing or having the boat -- pleasure boat sail around that area. But then that shipyard's been vacant for so long. And as a Realtor, I would say the owner of the -- ownership -- that means when you own some place which is upgraded and had developed and then not only that area, just the Hunters Point shipyard, but around that area is all be upgraded. And then in our Realtor we always avoided to show Bayview or Hunters Point, that area the housing, because the area is not like Western Addition in San Francisco before. It was also very not maintained well. But recently they have new houses and new shops. So it's been very well. Everybody can see it. And also the Mission and Market -- that area, they also develop and nice condos. And this shipyard area -- the plan I look at it. They going to have the affordable housing and school and the shops and every project, every available facility there. So I would like to have Realtor in the future be proud of ownership and to show that area and especially become most desirable scenery for the tourist, increasing the income for San Francisco. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Sue England. Russ Sturges. Eric Brooks. Mike Lyons. Bradley Wedemeyer.

ERIC BROOKS: Good evening, Commissioners. Eric Brooks. I'm here officially representing the San Francisco Green Party and the local grass-roots organization, Our City, which together represent over 12,000 people in San Francisco, most of them voters. So any of you that are thinking about a political future or anyone watching this hearing thinking about a political future, those are voters that are going to be informed about what goes down in this hearing room today. And so just keep that in mind. Now, as to the EIR itself, first of all, two and a half weeks is not anywhere near sufficient amount of time to put in a written comment. I wanted to do written response to the comments and responses and was unable to do that. I'm an organizer, along with almost every environmental organizer in the state right now that's working to stop Prop 16 on the state ballot. We are totally overwhelmed with that task. I did not have time to do a written response. So that's critical. As to -- I did look over the comments and responses and saw them to be completely inadequate, glossing over almost every single criticism of the plan and the EIR. Specifically in regard to my comments, I made eight pages of comments, clearly laying out the problems between the sea level rise and chemicals onsite, sea level rise and liquefaction. Sea level rise and liquefaction in this document -- the interactions are not mentioned anywhere in the document to any great extent. They're not covered to the extent that they need to be. And if you look at my comments, you'll see that. I -- at the beginning of my career back in '85, the very first environmental campaign that I worked on was Superfund reauthorization. And we won that campaign in '86. And when we won that campaign, the one thing that was clear to us was that the law was not strong enough, even though we got it reauthorized. And I can tell you that you cannot -- I've followed this because it was my first successful campaign -- I followed this my whole life. You cannot cap a Superfund site and have it work out and be safe for the community. It is not possible, especially with the projected sea level rise that's going to happen. Even the sea level rise as projected under the EIR would create havoc if there were problems like an earthquake out

there. So this EIR is completely inadequate. It needs to be rejected. And you at least need to continue this for a month or so that we have time to put in written comments on it so we can really fully address the inadequacies. The handful of written comments that you got back are not enough. We need everyone to be able to address it. Thanks.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Dewitt Lacy. Christine Inia. Marsha Dale-LeWinter. Gregory Reed. Doris Vincent.

ARANJO MIMS: Good evening. My name is Aranjó Mims. I think I'm on the list; is that correct? I'd like to address the Chair, if I may. I've been here since 1:00 o'clock. And according to your list, you covered Hunters Point. And most all the time I've been here you have talked about the shipyard. I wonder if you're going to send out another notice and we discuss about the shipyard, not about Hunters Point. Hunters Point is not the shipyard. We talking about the housing. Question. May I have an answer, please?

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: We don't respond to questions. Everything is in the materials.

ARANJO MIMS: Okay. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Reginald Raynoff. Deshera Johnson. John O'Flynn. Linda Shaver. Dennis Lunsey. Amy Tang. Ouia Wang. Annie Lee. Don Ken Yi. Regina Douglas. Dong Jao. Raymond Rivera. Michael Slivek. Martin St. Estrenza.

REGINA DOUGLAS: Good afternoon. My name is Regina Douglas. I stand here to represent myself as well as my community under the title of Better World Fellowship. I was born in Bayview. I have lived, worked, studied, educated, raised my children, and am there still about the rest of my life. This is a very hard -- this is a very hard decision for me, because I speak and go to many, many meetings; and I listen to many, many of these presentations. But standing here right now -- and I know I may lose some supporters -- but I cannot conscientiously support moving ahead at this time. The reason is because there's too many truths and scientific truths that I just recently became aware of. Now, if I only got the information in the last couple weeks and you only got the document in the last couple weeks, we're not ready. I am not okay with you asking Bayview to sacrifice our health for development, for jobs, or for anything, because without my health I can't even go to work. And that happened to me just recently as this past -- at the end of last year. And with MediCal and what we're facing, we cannot take these chances. Please, I ask you, do not at this time pass this environmental impact report.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Felipe Nuno. Gerardo Blum. Charlie Sito. Sonny Loc. Simon Barber.

FELIPE NUNO: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Felipe Nuno. I am a carpenter from Local 22. And I'm here to support the development of Hunters Point shipyard. And we need these jobs. And I'm here on behalf of my local fellow brothers and sisters to ask you, please, give us these jobs, because we desperately need them. The community needs them. And it will help build the economy. And I was thinking while these people were talking about

that there's all this stuff in the air is going on. And if we have rockets that can go out into space and we have this technology such as the atomic bomb that could destroy cities, then we have the technology to clean up the air, whatever is polluted out there. And please give us these jobs, because we need them. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

SIMON BARBER: My name is Simon Barber. And I've lived in the Bayview since 2005. And I bought a property in 2007. I am here on behalf of a neighborhood association. The person who runs it, Shirley Moore, can't attend due to another commitment. The association are a group of people who live on Jamestown Avenue at the top of a hill. And we're all concerned about the height of the properties that are going to be built that may obstruct the view of the Bay and may overlook our properties from behind on the upper part of Jamestown. We would like to have a height limit written into the proposed plan to prevent developers from being able to build buildings that are 30 or 40 feet tall in order to make sure that we maintain the good views of the water for everyone in the Bayview Hunters Point. And that's all I have to say.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

HAROLD LUMAR: Good afternoon. My name is Harold Lumar. I'm a member of the carpenters Local 22; and I'm here in support of the EIR. You know, I like to say it's very nice to see the diversity of people here. This is what is going to help keep San Francisco like that -- diversity. It's a beautiful city. And, also, I want to speak in behalf of my brothers and sisters who are losing their homes, losing their jobs. And this project is going to be done by responsible contractors. And it's great to see that it will come through. So, please, I support the project. And, hopefully, you'll think about it. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Tim Simon. Dennis Lunsey.

TIMOTHY ALLEN SIMON: Good evening. My name is Timothy Allen Simon; and I serve on the California Public Utilities Commission, but I'm here today to speak as a resident of Bayview. I live on Jamestown Avenue, as the prior speaker. I also want to express his concerns about any height limitations. I share that same view and that is a concern of mine. But I want to support the Lennar project in moving forward on the EIR report. CEQA is an act. It is a document that is often utilized for a multitude of reasons, including the excessive advancement of NIMBY-ism. And living in the community, I feel that this is a formidable project that enormous research has taken place to advance it. And it's time. It's clearly time. I also want to say that I support the First Amendment. And downstairs, while I was watching, I heard Minister Christopher Mohammad refer to you as political prostitutes or political whores. And I just want to say that speech is a right and the fact that he was asked to be removed for statements of that nature are concerning to me. If all you have been called are political prostitutes in this capacity, I can tell you as an appointee myself, you're not working hard enough. Okay? It's a very common reference for this kind of work. We all know this. And be that as it may, I disagree with Minister Mohammad. I want you to approve this report, move this to the Board of Supervisors and let the next tribunal evaluate the legitimacy of this project. The Bayview Hunters Point needs this. It's time that we have the same quality of life

as other taxpayers in this city. And this type of infrastructure investment, this type of diverse collection of housing, retail, and commercial is exactly what the southeast sector of this city needs. And it's your responsibility to not fall prey to the NIMBY-ism and to continue to move this much needed project forward for the community. Thank you for listening.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you, Mr. Simon. And if I may, before you leave the front, the request to leave the room was because of the commotion at the door that was disruptive of the following speakers. Fortunately or unfortunately, Commissioners in this city are used to name calling. We understand that it is everyone's right in the public to do so. We may take personal umbrage at it, but we do not correct speakers for it.

TIMOTHY ALLEN SIMON: Well, Mr. Chairman, if I may, since I didn't -- I did view this on the television screen in the spillover room; and there will be those who view this on the government channel. It came across as removal because of speech. So I appreciate you --

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: I had asked that there be no disturbance and there was a disturbance.

TIMOTHY ALLEN SIMON: I appreciate your clarification on that point and the fact that it's on the record, because, again, from television viewers, it appeared to be a chilling restraint.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you very much for bringing it up. Thank you.

BRADLEY WEDEMYER: Good evening, Commissioners. I bring you the good news. I think I may be the last speaker. My name is Bradley Wedemeyer and I'm an architectural historian. And before I address the historic resource issue, I just wanted to say that I think the delay that's been caused can be blamed on the Navy and can be blamed on many other places than the people who are here speaking for the cleanup to be done right and for the EIR to be done right. Unfortunately, we've lost a number of years that the restoration advisory board could have been continuing to see that the cleanup be done right. It was shut down illegally by the Navy and not replaced. As far as the EIR, our San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission, when it first heard the EIR, it rejected it because it was completely inadequate in that area as an analysis of the historic resources. There were arbitrary selections of era -- one era; and other buildings were completely given short shrift. And it was basically a clear and build and ignore the history. And this is the finding of your sister agency -- or commission, rather -- the Historic Preservation Commission. And since then there's been some attempt at addressing that, but it hasn't changed the basic facts that more extensive survey and a more extensive review has not been done and considerations of needed analysis of the historic building resources. I am sorry that there's a divide-and-conquer sort of attitude in the city, where people in the community are so deprived that people are forced to jump at any short shrift of planning. And the adequate review of planning requires a significant period. And we haven't seen that. We have seen less time for an EIR for an entire district of the city than we have for portions of some buildings have a longer review period than for the Hunters Point project. And I really find that troubling and I don't think this report is sufficient and I think it needs more work. And people are not just trying to stall a project. They're trying to have it done right. That's what the RAB was doing. That's what the community has been doing. And unfortunately the powers that be are playing a divide-and-rule technique of pitting us against each other. We all need jobs. We should be building housing for the people that live in the

neighborhood, not projecting a majoritarian majority community that's going to have a tremendous change in the balance of the population in that district. We've seen the Divisadero and the Fillmore change; and that's going to happen to Hunters Point.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

KATHY PERRY: Good afternoon. My name is Kathy Perry. I'm a long-term resident of Bayview Hunters Point and I actually was born in San Francisco in the Fillmore District. I'm here today to say that I would like to urge you all to support the EIR and to pass he this project through. I have been working in Bayview Hunters Point for many, many years and more recently very closely with Alice Griffith residents. And the fact that the City was able to negotiate the rebuild of Alice Griffith is very important, not only to me but to the people that live there. I've also been looking for an alternative. And I don't see any other economic engine that's as big as this that has the potential to not only provide jobs but to provide transformation for those that are living in Bayview Hunters Point who want to create opportunities for themselves. At this point I'm working with some women in Alice Griffith. And they have dreams. They want to have small businesses. They want to do daycare. And this project represents an opportunity for them to do just that. If we don't have any other project available, how could you not push this through? I'm very tired. I've raised my kids in Bayview Hunters Point. They've not had any opportunities. They've had to go outside of Bayview Hunters Point to get any opportunities. Now I'm a grandmother and I don't want to see another generation of kids not have opportunities. So I urge your support for this. And I thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MIKE SISLOVIK: Good evening. My name is Mike Sislovik. I'm a member of Local 104. I'm in favor of the EIR getting sent through. My opinion is that it's all beneficial to development here in the city. I mean the other option is to sit there and leave it as it is. I mean there's -- I'm a San Francisco resident, native. I was born here. And there's residents of Hunters Point that are opposed to it and from a view of what option you have there is to stay how it is. I mean it's dilapidated. It's screwed up. And if we can fix that or make it better, I think it is going to benefit everybody. I mean there's going to be jobs for everyone -- for a lot of people. A lot of people are out of work now. I'm a little nervous. My first time doing it. But I think it really will benefit San Francisco. I mean the Bay is a waterway to San Francisco. It represents us. Hunters Point, how it's looking now, is not a good representation, you know. I mean look at the ballpark. It came out great. It was professionals that came in there. They did a good job. Everyone likes to go to the ballgame, I'm sure. I mean we're enjoying that now. And that's the same way. You didn't hear anything about that when we were building there. We had jobs. And I think it came out great. I think this is an opportunity. It can come out the same way if you let professionals come in there and do their jobs and help us help you, you know. That's my take on it.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

RAYMOND RIVERA: Hello, Commissioners. My name is Raymond Rivera. I'm also a native San Franciscan. And I come to speak to you on behalf of the environmental report. But more than anything, I would like to see a lot of the residents in this neighborhood get

employment and opportunities to get into crafts. I know we no longer have a trade school. I grew up here and I did attend the trade school in San Francisco. I know right now this would be an opportunity for a lot of individuals in the community to get jobs. The bottom line is there aren't good-paying jobs that are, you know, union anymore in San Francisco. We're changing. We are becoming a service industry. And we need these jobs. Unfortunately, it's not a perfect thing that's happening that. But we have a company that's willing to step up to the plate, handle this big project and make it happen. It's not going to happen in one day. It's going to happen over time. And if it's not right, it can be made right in time. But the bottom line: Let's get people in the community working. Let's make this happen right now. We have opportunities for young families who are forced out to have maybe an opportunity to stay here. I'm hoping that you guys will approve this and move on. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

CHONG SING CHONG: Good evening. My name is Chong Sing Chong. May I speak Chinese? I'm going to speak Chinese. [Speaker spoke in Chinese]

INTERPRETER: Laura Chu translating for Mr. Chong Sing Chong. I am a new immigrant. I've been in San Francisco for ten years. I live in the Bayview. I know that area very well. What it lacks is development. That's why I think development is good. It's going to provide jobs, houses. I want to buy a home in here. And I want my children to play and have a home in here. It's going to -- I wanted to -- I can envision that it's going to look like Fisherman's Wharf; and I really would like my children to live in a home. That's why I support the project. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

ANNIE: Hello. Good afternoon. My name is Annie. [speaking in Chinese]

INTERPRETER: I just want to say something. They are immigrants and they are very shy. And it really takes a lot for them to come and express themselves. Laura Chu translating for Annie. I support the project because I need work. I'm a new immigrant. I hope you support the project so that I'll find work. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Hi. My name is [inaudible]. I live in Bayview for 30 years. Okay. I sit here almost three hours, all to say that the shipyard is a lot people is not healthy and cancer. I live there 30 years. I still support the EIR shipyard project. It makes more jobs and safety. We need this. The city needs change. We need to make more opportunity to make it easy for people to get a job. And the City budget will go up. And there will be a lot of space for people to walk in the afternoon, like Fisherman's Wharf. So I support this project. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Are there additional public speakers? If you'll line up in the center aisle, please.

KATHY DAVIS: Hi. My name is Kathy Davis. I work at Bayview Hunters Point multipurpose senior services. And our seniors were here earlier. They had to leave because they can't wait it out as long as I can. I am here because I don't know what else I can say other than the fact that the toxins are already there and the toxins need to go and we need to do whatever effort it's going to take to move that process so we can develop Hunters Point. I've worked for this agency for 30 years. There are a lot of people who can't come up to the mike anymore because they're gone. They waited and they waited and they waited. It is time to move on. It is time to make this happen. It is time to give Hunters Point its due. And if you want to clean up something toxic, then let's get Alice Griffith cleaned up. Let's make the community what we really want it to be. And I've been meeting-ed to death. I've gone to 30 years of meetings. I don't think this process was vetted in three weeks. It's been vetted over a long period of time and people are getting tired. It's just time to move on. So that's the only extra argument I can bring to what everyone else brought to the table, that it's time. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MANNY FLOREZ: Okay. I'll make it quick, 'cause I'm hungry. President Miguel, President Swig, fellow Commissioners, folks, Manny Florez, Carpenters Union Local 22. Okay. You've heard it all. Okay. You heard some good speeches. You heard some bad ones. What I didn't care about was the name-calling. So don't take offense at that, 'cause those people that did the name-calling need to look in the mirror, seriously. And a couple of comments. And I too -- I've got an 11-year-old son. And I'd be concerned too, these people about the situation out there with the toxins. But you know what? We have the United States Navy, not Lennar. Okay? Over and over again. They're the ones. We're going to knock them down and tell them, You guys ain't no good. I don't think so. We've had committees. We've had people looking over them. Okay. We've had agencies. We've had oversight committees looking at this EIR. You've heard it all tonight. I can't express it anymore. And my brothers and sisters in the balcony, you can stand up, brothers. We all want to see a safe environment out there. Because you know what? Brothers and sisters here from the building trades are tired, but we're going to keep fighting. And thank you. We wait for your approval. Thank you.

JAMES GOMEZ: Good evening, Commissioners. I thank you for allowing me time to speak today. My name is James Gomez. I'm a proud union member of Painters and Drywall Finishers, Local Union 9113 here in San Francisco at 555 Deharo, located in D-10. I represent hundreds of workers that need jobs and they need jobs now. I stand and rise in support of the EIR, in support of this project. And I also would like to submit on behalf of the State Building and Construction Trades Council of California and over 300,000 members. I strongly urge you to certify the environmental impact report and approve the Hunters Point shipyard project. And I'd like to submit this as a record. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Is there additional public comment on this item?

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Commissioners, how are you guys doing? I'm from the Bay Area. God bless San Francisco. San Francisco has always been the -- was the fifth economy of the world. Now it's the eighth. All this spin-doctoring on chemical plumes. We all know the economy. We all know we're in a depression, as far as I'm concerned. Millions of people

leaving their homes -- have lost their homes. Banks foreclosed. Went out of existence. We are fighting two wars. God knows where the money is going. Billions every week or every month to contractors over in Iraq, Iran. No oversight. Cities, counties, states paying the bill since our federal government can't support their mandates that it betrayed on us for many years and we have to reduce. I've never seen where we've been -- where we are. It's all about jobs. Mare Island nuclear submarine base built houses. If there wasn't a residential meltdown, there would be more houses on Mare Island, which is a jewel in the Bay Area. But because of the economy, the squandering of our wealth. This is no joke. People are hurting. The middle class don't even exist anymore. I'll be surprised if any of us vote this primary election, we're so distraught. The demise of what's happening to us. We can't even focus. We're scared we're going to lose our jobs, if you're lucky to have it. I've been out of work for nine months. I can retire. Thirty-one years. Straight out of high school, I started my trade, which I love. Look at this building. You would never see it in the Bay Area. I was part of this. Look at the woodwork. That's what we do as tradesmen.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Is there additional public comment? If not, public comment is closed. We will take a fifteen-minute break. I wish to remind everyone that, following our return, we will have comments from commissioners from both commissions. Following that, there will be votes. And then we will proceed to the second half of this hearing. Thank you.

[Break from 6:43 to 7:14 p.m.]

MS. AVERY: San Francisco Planning Commission and Redevelopment Agency is back in session. I would remind everyone to turn off your cellphones, your pagers, any electronic devices that may sound off during the hearing.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: I understand that because of the line outside and the fact that the room was full, there are a very few people who were not able to get in prior to public testimony being closed. So I will reopen public testimony and ask anyone who presently wishes to give public testimony on the item we are discussing to line up in the center aisle. Anyone who has not spoken before?

MS. AVERY: And this is on verification of the final environmental impact report, not on other entitlements for Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 project.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Those will come later. If you'll approach the podium over there. Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: You said this is not the discussion on the Candlestick Point?

MS. AVERY: On the certification of the final EIR.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Well, can I just ask one quick question? I just want some clarity on the map of the area they plan on redeveloping down there, because I'm getting two different types of information regarding that. I'm getting two different types of information regarding the development of Candlestick Point. One of them said that a certain area would

not be affected, but another said it will be affected, from this map that was mailed out to the residential area, which is this one. So I'm just trying to see the dark spot. What is going to happen with the homes and all the area in that location?

UNIDENTIFIED STAFF MEMBER: If I may, maybe we can have one of the staff behind you clarify on the map what area is affected.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: It has some space shaded.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Is there additional public comment on this item from anyone that has not spoken before?

MS. AVERY: On the certification only.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Yes. If you'll bring the mike down and speak directly.

HOLLY WILSON: Yes. My name is Holly Wilson. And I, too, looked at the map. It's not very clear. Okay? And I would like a clarification of that also.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Why don't you put it on the overhead.

TOM EVANS: Good evening, Commissioners. Tom Evans, the lead planner with the Redevelopment Agency. Just for clarification, the map that went out with the notice for the hearing for the redevelopment plan to begin this evening outlined two redevelopment project areas. Outlined in the hatching here is the Hunters Point shipyard, the entire project area, both Phase 1 and Phase 2. And outlined in the shaded area is the entire Bayview Hunters Point project area, Area B, which was adopted in 2006. And so by CRL, we are required to send out the notice about the project boundary area of the affected project area, although the amendment that we're discussing later tonight only affects a certain portion of Bayview Hunters Point and shipyard project areas.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Before I reclose public comment, is there further public comment?

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: The shaded area it appears to be involves the homes in the Bayview. Okay? The Hunters Point and Navy yard, they were one thing. But then they combined Bayview Hunters Point -- Bayview with Hunters Point -- which was never supposed to be combined. Hunters Point with the projects up on the hill -- apartments, they call them now -- Bayview with the homes below. Now, this map, it seems to me, includes homes in the Bayview, which will be taken over by the redevelopment. Am I correct on that? That's what we want clarification on. And if certain areas of the homes are involved, we want to know what area.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Actually, you will have a presentation by staff during the next part of this hearing that should clarify all of that. Is there further public comment? Going, going. Public comment is closed. Commissioner Antonini.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Thank you all for your comments. As you probably know, the EIR does not address whether a project is a good one, but rather that'll be taken up during the substantive part of the project approval. The question that's before us is whether the City has sufficiently and thoroughly analyzed the potential physical impacts of the project, not preexisting conditions but the impacts of the project. There's been talk about the periods of time for comment. And actually we have had, as you know, the DEIR since November 12th, 2009. The period for comments and response has been shorter, but what has happened is many of the same things that were brought up in December are being brought up again. And I think the responses are quite adequate by the staff. And, of course, much of the commentary dealt with some -- did not specifically address the project. And other parts of the comments dealt with their preference for certain options rather than dealing specifically with the accuracy or completeness of the DEIR, which I think it quite well responded to, even the recent comments. Planning-Commission-and-Redevelopment have held a number of meetings on this issue, as has been mentioned; and it's quite surprising. We scheduled, I believe, three additional planning sessions in the months of late April and in May. And the attendance was fairly good, but a lot of people who spoke tonight, particularly with concerns, were not there. And that was a little disappointing because we had scheduled these things precisely for people to come, voice their concerns, and perhaps maybe we could have had a little shorter session today. But, you know, what can you do? This is also supported by the Bayview PAC and Hunters Point CAC have endorsed the project. And, of course, the city's voters, as has been pointed out by, I think, a 68-percent margin approved this via Prop G. And I did read everything completely and I think that I wanted to comment a little bit about some of the confusion between the Prop P and the conveyance agreement. They are actually things that work together. They are not at loggerheads with each other. In fact, Prop P is, again, a policy statement, whereas the conveyance agreement of 2004 is a binding agreement, has the force of law. So what really happens is the conveyance agreement carries Prop P to a different level. And so -- and some of the language is Prop P says is to remediate to the highest levels possible to allow reuse of property where it's technically feasible and does not make implementation of reuse plan economically infeasible. And the conveyance agreement says remediate and convey this land to the City as quickly as possible in a condition consistent with the City's reuse plan. So, again, I don't think we're dealing with an adversarial situation. Also, I was quite happy with -- there's been a lot of talk about the cleanup. And as was mentioned, there were 22,000 samplings taken. Over \$700 million so far, from what I understand, has been spent on this cleanup, the most of any site in the United States by far. And it was made during the testimony which didn't come up tonight, is that when something that is obviously hazardous is found, it has to be removed completely. If there's something that is found that could be hazardous, if there's 30 years of exposure -- most notably as an example naturally occurring asbestos in the serpentine rock, for one example, then those are things that can be covered, okay? For practical purposes, it only makes sense. And, of course, if it's found that this has not been adequate, then the obligation is for the Navy to take care of that cleanup on their dime in the future if it has to be done. And, of course, I don't know, as was said, you have everyone with oversight. You've got the EPA, you've got the State. And if you don't think they're stringent enough, you've got the City of San Francisco, all having to sign off on this cleanup venture. Then there was a great analysis in the EIR in regards to there's a lot

of testimony tonight about health effects. And actually what they did in there is they went through general health conditions in the city at large and Bayview Hunters Point in particular. And, of course, as you might expect, most of the conditions that were found were not the result of environmental exposure to things but rather other causes. And for those that were in relation to something in the environment, obviously, cleaning something up is a lot better than not cleaning it up. And so I think it only makes sense that we proceed with the cleanup. There was a lot of talk about the Yosemite bridge. And I think it does not divide the parks, it does not divide the neighborhood in half. And, you know, there was talk about the sea level rise and there's plenty of space underneath the bridge, even if there were a rise to the highest anticipated level. One interesting point that was made by one of the commenters that you could have an alternate route around. And I think that route that is traced would probably necessitate the taking of some private property, which actually the redevelopment agreement, if I read it correctly, prohibits or seriously discourages taking of any homes by eminent domain and discourages the taking of commercial establishments, if there's any avoiding it. So, again, to make that route, which I don't think would be that fast anyway, would involve some disharmonies with our agreements. And I think the eight or nine minutes -- if you've ever driven that -- and you can't even drive from some of the points that are in question here -- it probably -- if you could race around there as fast as your car could possibly go, to probably be able to do it in like, you know, eight or nine minutes maybe. I think that -- so I would say that realistically you really don't have an option. And so -- but that's interesting in regards to that. And, finally, in regards to the slough itself, there seems to be commenters who are saying that it's a natural haven filled with wildlife. And I'm sure there are birds and there are reptiles and all the things that they say and eelgrass and all that and others who are saying it's terribly toxic. So I'm not quite sure. But I think that cleaning it up will only actually help to promote natural life there, much as I saw this weekend I was able to go up to Northern California and I saw a beautiful project up there where they worked at Turtle Bay in Redding and the same kind of thing. They put a bridge across there and they restored it into a park and I saw some pictures of the way it was before and it shows how we can work in harmony with nature and create a better environment. The salmon runs have actually increased on the Sacramento River because of some of the management that's been done with the temperatures and the lakes and they have four separate runs per year on that. So to say that we can't work in harmony with nature, I don't think is correct. Couple of things briefly. There was some mention of Plan C, the India Basin. And as most of you know, that is a separate DEIR. We just finished the notice of preparation and a DEIR will be coming forward. And certainly that has to be addressed, but that's not before us tonight. And that was separated out for very good reasons, because there is a higher population in that area than there is in the area under consideration and there's a lot more private property. So it makes sense that that be a separate DEIR. And we can deal with some of the concerns on that one. There was another comment about having two agencies, two lead agencies. Actually the lead agency is the City and County of San Francisco. And so this is a project -- a plan certification not a project certification. So, again, it's perfectly in agreement with what I understand to be the CEQA regulations and I don't feel that that's that much. And someone else commented on the historical issues. And there's Alternate 4-A, which we may discuss later on, which certainly deals with the historical aspects quite adequately. And so that's a good point. Finally, the Candlestick Point recreational area will remain essentially the same size, perhaps even get slightly larger. But what will be more important is the part of the land that is used as park land, unless you consider parking lots that are hard to be -- hardly accessible during most of the time as park land. And that was the reconfiguration that State Bill 792 allows us to do. And makes sense, because we're

able to increase our traffic and our transit access into the area, which you're certainly going to need if you're going to have all the development there. And in return you create more park land in another part of the site that is previously undeveloped. And, you know, finally I think that the EIR is very thorough. I've read the whole thing and I think it is accurate, complete, thorough, and comprehensive. And I think that as you read all these documents and as you read the comments and then you read the responses, that they answer the questions. And if you have read all the comments and responses as well as the document in the DEIR, then virtually every comment that was made tonight is answered. And so I think it's an extremely good document. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Commissioner Borden.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: May I ask a couple of questions of the environmental staff just to -- couple questions. First off, can you explain to me -- you said that there was previously an EIS or EIR document done, particularly on cleanup and the contamination, because I know there's been a lot of discussion about the cleanup, but this EIR did not look at the cleanup. It looked at the project. And can you just talk a little bit about the previous document. And you said there's another document coming forth. And I just want to understand that.

MR. MURAOKA: Yes. Stanley Muraoka with the Redevelopment Agency staff. There were actually two previous documents. There was a Hunters Point shipyard redevelopment plan EIR that was completed in 2000. And then subsequent to that was a Navy document, the Hunters Point base reuse EIS. And both of those documents looked at the cleanup of the shipyard. At that time what was contemplated is the existing Hunters Point shipyard redevelopment plan that called for development of both Phase 1, which is currently under construction, and different land uses for Phase 2. And the Navy, for their part, followed along and they looked at the base closure and base reuse under a number of scenarios, including both the proposed redevelopment plan and essentially a no-project, where the Navy retained ownership of the site. The Navy is under federal orders to clean-up the shipyard, regardless. And so that was studied extensively in the Navy's EIS document and currently going through a cleanup process that has oversight by the federal EPA and by DTSC and our own Public Health Department under those federal cleanup standards. And so that was something that was evaluated in that document. The cleanup is undergoing. And so what we have reported in the current EIR are the current efforts that are being undertaken primarily by the Navy with the federal and state and local oversight to clean up the shipyard to the standards of the EPA. What this project proposes is to follow along with the Navy's cleanup. And if you recall, in the project description section of the EIR, the project depends on the Navy conveying the property to the City. The project cannot occur until that happens. Now, there has been some discussion about early transfer. And that was a remark that some people have made. The early transfer, regardless of who ends up actually doing the cleanup, has to be completed to the EPA standards; and the Navy is ultimately the responsible party for that cleanup under the federal regulations.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: And in this current EIR and anything that we're looking at, early transfer is not something that we are voting on?

MR. MURAOKA: No. The effects that are evaluated in this EIR are the effects of developing the project. In terms of the timing, what you have reported in the EIR is the time for

development of this project. And, again, it's all dependent on receiving the land from the Navy in order to proceed with that portion of the project not Hunters Point shipyard.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Sounds like it might be useful to recirculate that document to the public or put that on some Websites, because I think that would help people be able to put the two pieces together better.

MR. MURAOKA: Yes. It certainly is a document that is available through the Redevelopment Agency and through our Website. And we can certainly publicize it in response to your concern.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: I'll let Commissioner Sugaya.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Yes. Mr. Muraoka, somewhere in our materials -- I don't have it in front of me -- there was a comment with respect to this EIR and another EIS that maybe the Navy is going to undertake after this particular EIR is approved. I have read that somewhere in the stuff that's been circulated.

MR. MURAOKA: Yes, Commissioner Sugaya. The Navy is currently preparing a supplemental environmental impact statement on base reuse. The reason for that is that this project, the Candlestick Point shipyard Phase 2 project, proposes a change in the land uses on Hunters Point shipyard primarily to accommodate the 49ers stadium, because the existing base reuse plan that we had adopted and the Navy evaluated did not contemplate a football stadium. And so we have proposed changes in the land use plan for Hunters Point shipyard that my colleagues working on the redevelopment plan amendment will describe to you later this evening. In order for the Navy to clear that change in land use, they have to revisit the environmental effects in a supplemental environmental impact statement document. They are currently preparing that. It is lagging the EIR by I would estimate six months, but that is something that will come forward to the public in the very near future. I do want to say that the Navy, separate from the City and the Agency, had conducted a public scoping meetings for that SEIS document. And they have held a number of community workshops. I understand from Navy staff that they will be holding additional workshops in the community.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: So that portion of the project -- the shipyard-specific -- Candlestick Point-specific area -- could not move forward without that EIS being completed?

MR. MURAOKA: The project as we propose is based on a land use plan that is different than the one we have currently. And so that's the reason why we at the Redevelopment Agency are proposing an amendment of the Hunters Point shipyard plan. The Navy for their part, in order to essentially convey the land to the city, has to update their EIS.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: So they can't convey the land to us until they've updated that EIS and then we've had a hearing on that document and then certify it -- however their process works?

MR. MURAOKA: Correct.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: And it would come before the Planning Commission, would it because -

MR. MURAOKA: The EIS is a federal document for the Navy and so it is processed through Navy decision-makers.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: So perhaps we could have -- I know we did this for the Presidio. Perhaps we could have an informational hearing at the Planning Commission when that document's available, because that deals, I think, with -- a lot of the comments that we've heard today are specifically about the cleanup and that's I think having a public forum here at the city, we could actually allow people to talk directly to the Navy and EPA about that.

MR. MURAOKA: Yes. We'll work on that.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Yeah. If I might, I'd like to second that. As soon as a draft or at some point if the -- to either EPA or planning staff, if the Commission could get a draft copy, that would be really great. If people are wondering what's happening here, Ms. Moore and I only have one vote together so their a table.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: All right. So I have some specific -- I'm going to talk specifically about the EIR and some significant unavoidable impacts. Can you talk about the air quality issue related to BAAQMD and how they can't be mitigated, basically whether there would be other options around that? Sounds like they're not, according to the EIR. That's because development in general would result in that because greenhouse gases are mostly caused by cars and people that are there. Can you just talk a little bit about that?

MR. WYCKO: Bill Wycko from Planning staff. As you may be aware, although the news media seem to not really cover it, the air district actually did adopt guidelines yesterday. And some areas were addressed, primarily greenhouse gases and toxic air contaminants. At the time we published the EIR, the thresholds and the methodologies were very much in flux. Thresholds are now established, although not in effect until January 1st, based on the air district's action yesterday. We applied the standards in this document. The methodologies, as they're written, guidance. There were discussions with staff throughout our work in progress. That's a large part why they're not effective until January. So what we did was we concluded that there's a potential significant impact, because at the time that the EIR was published there's really too much uncertainty as to where this would land and when they would be adopted and what the substance would be. And in the subsequent analysis that we did, based on the subsequent guidance that they gave us, we did identify some very limited geographic impacts, particularly around the Alice Griffith area, not related to this project but related to an existing use that has fairly substantial emissions. There are emissions that can reasonably be expected to be cleaned up but not through anything that the City -- because of the uncertainty of time of publication and because of subsequent analysis, we do call potential adverse air quality impacts.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Can we do better as a consequence then than we anticipated or the same?

MR. WYCKO: Pardon?

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Can we do better or same than what we anticipated?

MR. WYCKO: The standards are actually pretty much the same. I mean there's been some refinement in the methodological guidance, but it's still got a ways to go.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Then the issue of cultural resources. That was another area of significant and unavoidable impacts. And I know there's an alternative in which historic resources are contemplated as -- and a preservation alternative. Can you talk a bit about what sort of substantive difference in the public and in the development with preserving those resources versus not preserving those resources?

MS. GIBSON: The comments and responses document adds a new alternative, a variant alternative and several variants -- Alternative 4-A and that alternative allows for the full development program that is included in the proposed project. And so it also layers on it the preservation of the potential Hunters Point commercial dry dock and naval shipyard historic district. And in order to do that it does shift some of the -- shift some of the development to other areas of the Hunters Point shipyard in order to accommodate the retention of the historic structures.

MR. MURAOKA: To add to what Ms. Gibson has said, specifically some of the R&D square footage wouldn't shift, because under the proposed project it's essentially slated for some of the buildable areas within the historic district. And so with full preservation, those potentially historic resources, the R&D would shift to the land adjacent to that district and with the result that some of the heights of the proposed buildings would increase in order to accommodate that square footage?

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: [unintelligible]. Okay those were some of my questions based upon the EIR analysis. I know what's been said repeatedly and I think that what's hard for the public is today we are not actually talking about the cleanup and the contamination. There are federal documents that deal with that. And there's another federal document on that issue. And I know that's really confusing because people think that we're voting on that issue. And I think that it's important to make that distinction and that's one of the reasons why I wanted the staff to talk a little bit about those documents and have the -- let the public know that there's an opportunity in the future to really dig down deep with that issue, because I think that is the core of the issues that I've heard. I've heard there's three major issues -- the full cleanup. And I think the EIS document and the further analysis is going to deal with that issue. I've heard no early transfer, which is not being contemplated in the EIR or any of the documents that we're reviewing today. We're not making any determinations about early transfer. And then, obviously, the last thing we heard is that people don't trust the developer, which, again, is nothing that we are approving or dealing with today. So the issue of -- a lot of the issues that people brought up related to the cleanup. It seems that there needs to be -- some of our legislators have expressed concerns with the Navy. And it seems to me that there needs to be some conversations going on with the Navy and the EPA and hearings going on there. And our legislators should be taking the issue up with them, because the standards for cleanup are federally set. And I think that someone said that the Superfund site legislation doesn't go far enough. But unfortunately we're not in the position at the Planning Commission to make them

do that. And we are, again, voting on a project level EIR, like we do on so many other projects in the city. So that is a difficult thing for people to understand, but a distinction to make. As it pertains to the toxins, I think it goes without saying that everybody wants them cleaned up and that a project of some sort moves us in the direction of cleaning up the toxins; and it has been the reason that the Navy has even bothered to clean up the shipyard at all to date. So I think that cannot be overlooked. The issue regarding the capping, unfortunately, is a federal issue. It's the current standard. Emeryville is a very great example. There are people living in houses there and there's development there and maybe people who have gone to IKEA over there. But Emeryville is exactly the same scenario that's being proposed in Bayview Hunters Point. And to my knowledge there's not been any sort of major new health risks and hazards that are going on there. And unfortunately -- I grew up on the East Coast. This is a pretty common way of approach of dealing with things. And it may not be an approach that we like, but this is something we really need to take up with our federal legislators. I know we have a lot of support from them that's been supportive of this project, which is why we've gotten \$700 million to clean it up. Because I think that this issue has to be worked on with them because they are the people that are actually doing that work. Going through some of the other issues, in terms of the bridge and the Yosemite Slough, in looking at that, I walk -- I live near Crissy Field; and there's a bridge actually in Crissy Field, a pedestrian bridge that many of you might be aware of, that had to connect over the wetlands for the restoration to provide pedestrian access along the waterfront to the Golden Gate Bridge. And that pedestrian walkway and bike walkway is essential for people being able to enjoy the waterfront at that level. And so I kind of see it akin to that when I look at this bridge. I've been around and around -- do I like it? Do I not like it? But every time I walk to the Golden Gate Bridge, I'm reminded of that were it not for that bridge over the wetlands, I would not be able to have that walk in the morning. And so I kind of find it akin to that. Somebody brought up the issue of maritime uses and I know Pier 70 in its plan plans to address some maritime uses. And, I guess, the largest dry dock on the West Coast is located at Pier 70. And I think that, obviously, the EIR does not necessitate having to address that if that's not part of the plan. But I think I just wanted to bring that up. The state park, if it has toxins, then, obviously, being part of the plan, the cleanup of that park would be part of it. And that's actually a net benefit because it means right now people are running around playing on a park that's toxic; and that is obviously not for the best. The issue of public safety. In no development can we ever a hundred percent ensure people's public safety. And I know a lot of people are concerned about cancer. I was personally born with asthma. My dad is in remission from two forms of cancer. Both my grandparents on my paternal side died of cancer. Cancer unfortunately is rampant in the African-American community. There are environmental factors which we don't even know the magnitude of them all. And then there's hereditary and other factors. So I'm very personally concerned and very passionate about this issue, because I myself am at high risk for cancer and I try not to engage in activities that will give me further exposure. But I guess the point is we can't point to a particular project or a plan as the cause of these things, because unfortunately science has not even caught up to what are the causes of cancer. The highest breast cancer rate in the country is in Marin County and you wonder how that could be. They don't have any Superfund sites in the area where the cancer is. So that's kind of interesting. But I think that there is a lot of work to be done on this issue. And again, I take it this is going back to the EPA and standards that they set and Superfund site standards in kind of getting tighter guidelines put in place if that indeed is the issue that we've determined. Going on to look -- somebody brought up the issue of Hudson Avenue. And I imagine that will be addressed in the transportation study, which I think is coming later. In terms of unavoidable

impacts, every single EIR that I've seen have unavoidable impacts, but the statements of overriding considerations usually outweigh those impacts. I think if you look throughout the document the crux of the plan that's been evaluated really has been very minimally updated from the 1996 plan. I mean some of the major changes from the plan are related to the stadium and the jobs and new initiative. But this is a plan that's been around since 1996, when the first environmental study took place was released in 2000. So it's not as if we're just today looking at this project, because I think that there's a lot of background that supports that, in addition to a 2004 conveyance agreement. The issue -- all the issues that have been brought up here really have a lot to do with very impassioned emotional issues. Now, I personally know what it's like to be in a place where you feel like you've been disregarded and disrespected and rejected and now people are throwing you something and you're suspicious of whether or not it's worthy. But I think what gives me solace is that the PAC, the CAC, 280 meetings, a lot of people have discussed and vetted this plan; and actually looking in the EIR, this EIR is not essentially different than the previous documents we've seen in like the Eastern Neighborhoods EIR, which was also very long and rezoned 20 percent of the city. And we did not take extra time to review that document and that actually had even more complex different neighborhoods that we're looking at in this. So if this EIR were dealing with the toxins and cleanup, maybe we'd be having a different conversation. But this EIR is really looking at project impacts. And looking through the document and looking at the analysis, it's very similar to other documents that we've seen. As with all EIRs, people don't necessarily agree with what the determination of the comments -- the responses to comments. Right. Everybody might agree that there's an issue, but people don't always agree whether or not there was response to the issue as to their liking. And CEQA only requires that comments and responses deal with significant environmental issues. So while there are lots of issues that people have thrown out, not all of them rise to the level of significant environmental issues. I just want to close and just talk -- finally just to get on this issue of the toxins, because I think it can't be underscored enough that it's the EPA, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, and San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control that really a lot of these issues need to be directed to, because we just don't have jurisdiction in that area. The standards are the standards as they are at the federal level and this plan is not dealing with those standards. This plan is dealing with the standards that exist in looking at the impact of the development. There were five alternatives looked at -- well, actually, I should say five-plus alternatives, because of Option A there. And then there are five variants. And so I think, when you look at the range of development from I think it's 5,000 housing to 10,000 housing units and the shift of what's been examined here, I'm not really sure that more time would give you anything different in that regard, because the issue with the toxins and substances, again, have to be dealt with in the EIS process. And they won't be dealt with in this process. So if I felt that delaying a decision on the EIR would substantively change the outcome of the environmental issues, if I felt that there were environmental issues that were brought up here that cannot be dealt with through the ultimate approval of the project configuration, which is what a lot of people have discussed, then that would be different. But in this view what we've heard today are issues that are not under this EIR's jurisdiction and are not things that cannot be remedied through the ultimate approval of the project itself and in the configuration that we find most helpful. So, to me, this document has examined the project and its alternatives and the range of alternatives that is required under CEQA.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Couple of questions for the staff. There were issues brought up about our response to the state land commission's response to BCDC. I've taken a look at it,

through the 7,700 pages, and I want to the staff's comments before -- I meant regarding our response to BCDC and state lands. I'd like staff to provide us some background on our response.

MS. GIBSON: The letter from the state lands commission is letter No. 93; and that is a four-page letter that we divided up into five discreet comments. And for the BCDC letter, that is letter No. 103; and that consisted of about ten pages of comments with that we've divided into roughly 27 individual comments, to which we provided additional responses. And in both cases we addressed each of the comments with detailed responses. We did not just note them as "comment noted." For BCDC, I think that the suggestion was in the public comment that the responses were cursory and did not respond to the information that BCDC noted it would require. And we'd like to note that the BCDC permit review process is ongoing. And it's the fact that they require information for their purposes that is different from what we need for purposes of environmental review. There's oftentimes more detail in design that's required through the permitting process and the design is -- can be evolved or be refined over time. So the fact -- the fact is that we did provide detailed responses to those letters. And if there's more specific questions, I'd be happy to answer those.

COMMISSIONER LEE: So, generally, with all other EIRs, or draft EIRs, when we get a letter from state lands and/or BCDC, what we normally do is respond, as you have done. But when the permitting actually takes place, this is where the backup information that BCDC requests is when the project sponsor has to provide it? I'm trying to understand the process. Do we adequately address the BCDC's questions? Our EIR addressed 18 different topics. Some of them overlap with BCDC. But I guess the question is those information requests from BCDC are not required for CEQA approval but it's only required when you take out a permit?

MR. MURAOKA: Yes, Commissioner Lee. There are actually two aspects to both the BCDC comment letter and the state lands comment letter. The first aspect is where they make comment that is relevant to the EIR analysis. And so, as Ms. Gibson explained, that's where we respond to essentially their comment on our investigation and disclosure of the environmental impacts of an action that would affect the BCDC or state lands. The other aspect of their comment letter deals more with their permitting process. And that is a regulatory process that they undergo to essentially, in BCDC's case, they would be asked to review and allow the Yosemite Slough bridge. But what the EIR discloses in the analysis is what would be the environmental consequences if that bridge were to be constructed. And so there are a number of different discussions of the bridge spread across the various impact categories in the EIR as well as in the comments to responses document about the environmental effects. The permitting process itself is a separate process. Agency and City staff have initiated discussions with BCDC staff on specifically the bridge and how that would be refined through the permitting process. And that, as Ms. Gibson described, is a process that is ongoing. Similarly, the state lands letter talks about the public trust. And part of the project is to create new open space and new park areas and to remove some park areas that are currently part of state recreation area. It should be noted and disclosed in the EIR that there are portions of the existing Candlestick Point state recreation area that under their master plan has been planned to be improved for open space and recreation uses that have yet to be improved. And so this project proposes as part of its program to do just that, to improve the open space. The state lands letter comments on whether or not these proposed improvements

would be consistent with the public trust or not. There is a separate process from this EIR; and that is actually the state lands agreement. The agreement on mapping or remapping, if you will -- the land that falls into this public trust -- that is a separate process from the EIR. The EIR discloses the environmental impacts of the improvement to these lands. Where the state lands would actually end up being mapped is something that is currently being negotiated between the state lands commission and the City.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Right. Thank you. See, my thinking is we've had all these hearings. And I don't think the public understands that, when you look at an EIR, we don't have to determine the adequacy of the level of cleanup is adequate or not. That's always been my understanding. What we're looking at with the EIR is also my understanding, based on all the EIRs, if you do the cleanup what is its physical impact. Am I clear in my thinking on this in this statement?

MS. GIBSON: You're correct.

COMMISSIONER LEE: All right. A couple of items were brought up about the cleanup and seismic. The first thing about seismic is that south of Kearny Street where the B of A building is, all of that west [sic] is all landfill and that the landfill used to be a shipyard. And we have things come in and also has a lot of toxins. As a matter of fact, in '86 I worked on Delancey Street on the Embarcadero. They're on a brownfield site. They're on a seismically landfill active site also. Some gentleman brought up the whole issue of if you have an earthquake. I have a couple of comments. One, like City Hall, we use base isolation to protect City Hall. It could move like 20 feet north, south, east, or west. On Moscone Center uses different techniques because it was later upgraded later. And you have better technology. With the Hunters Point shipyard you do have parts of a landfill. You actually have a hill there that's Franciscan rock, is more solid than the soil that we have in that area. But that part of landfill, I think people have to realize the later you build we have tougher building codes than we had in 1906 or in 1989. And I think the public has to understand that we build now, building inspection through different standards. And the seismic subcommittee instituted new building regulations. Regarding the brownfields and people saying this whole issue about capping. We've come a long way. I'm probably one of the very few people that actually toured Love Canal. I've been at Love Canal. I understand some of the problems they had. But also understand what the federal government is doing at the Hunters Point shipyard. If you look, there are four areas I looked at for certifying an EIR. You have to look at it first as is it adequate, is it accurate, is it comprehensive, and do we really look at all the alternatives in equal weight. And I take a look at the EIR is stacked right here. But what people don't understand with the EIR here is that aside from the 7,700 pages, they refer to 20 other sample data that the federal government or someone has taken -- samples of what has taken place. What people also need to understand that I was federal OSHA inspector setting Saturdays for benzene and lead. It's gotten tighter over the years, but at all regulations that we had in California actually was tighter years ago than federal EPA. And notwithstanding that, we have a local law -- when Supervisor Bill Maher was supervisor, he added if you move greater than 40 cubic feet of soil, which is about one household, underneath you have to do additional soil sampling. About 20 years ago, the health department hired someone, a civil engineer that's also here, that also has another level of oversight here. And so when you take a look at the different levels of oversight and the 20 samples, the 8,000-plus pages, plus I think there's at least another 10,000 pages of technical documents; and that 10,000

samples really has no relationship with the EIR. Then I don't know if we didn't do our job or the City to explain this to the general public, but when we look at this remember you're looking at alternatives, that you address the alternatives, what physically it's going to look like. When I went through some of the other documents previously reported, these documents on, I took a look at what is the possible exposure, what is the risk assessment, what is risk management. And when we get into the next part of it, we have made a lot of assumptions with greenhouse gases. It's not an exact science. And I think actually the staff has taken a very conservative view about the carbon footprint. Scientists will have different disagreements over carbon footprint. What are you going to use this carbon footprint? Are you going to use CO2 noxious gases? What are you going to use it on? I think the other thing that we may have also recent over kill is people bring up the issues of radiation. I guess there was a health physicist from the Presidio. I took a look at that section. These are [unintelligible] that are buried. It is no different than if you have a bottle of something that has lead around it you will have no exposure. I don't know if maybe we did not do a good job explaining to the public here this stuff is buried and they're under federal regulations -- OSHA regulations -- for cleanup. Those who handle asbestos they have to go through what they call here a training. They have to be monitored also. That there's oversight by Cal-OSHA. And so what I've gone through each what-if situation, what risks we may have from each one -- the organic, volatile. I think about where -- when we talk about winds, San Francisco is lucky. The winds go from west to east. Most of our pollution actually goes over to Oakland and Alameda, because that's how it is. This is how the water works. This is how the natural environment works. Wind goes from here over east. I've been on Hunters Point shipyard. I've toured it. I've been to the officers club. I've seen a lot of places. I served the restoration advisory board over 20-something years ago, appointed by at that time Dianne Feinstein. So I'm very comfortable with the EIR. And if there's no one else going to speak on Commissioners, I want to move that we certify the EIR.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Second.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: First of all, I'd like to thank everyone for their testimony. And there are only a few comments on what I'm going to concentrate on, which is historic resources. Not that I'm not concerned about other aspects of the EIR, but this is what I know most about. And I think the document is flawed. That said, we have some communication from the historic preservation commission. It's a brand-new commission, probably under most people's radar. But I'd like to ask staff, the Planning Commission members -- all of us -- received at least three document, I believe, last Friday that were hand-delivered, mine to my home. It was a real estate analysis. These were all associated with Alternative 4-A. There was a real estate report from CBRE, or whatever their initials are. There are two documents that were more design oriented. In the letter that we received from the HBC today, it says that they only received the CBRE feasibility study on the day of their hearing, which was yesterday. If we received our documents on Friday, why didn't the HBC receive their document either on Friday, or two days, when the agenda was put out?

WELLS LAWSON: Okay. I think it's good evening at this point. This is Wells Lawson. I'm with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development. I'm going to try to respond to Mr. - - Commissioner Sugaya's question. I did want to clarify that the documents that were provided were provided to the Commission -- to the Planning Commission -- and to the Agency Commission and to the Historic Preservation Commission as a courtesy. They are documents

that have been in the file for purposes of findings that were made subsequent to certification of the EIR. So they're not actually part of the final EIR package. They're on file at the Planning Department and at the Redevelopment Agency.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: However, the HPC had this as a scheduled item. So it seems strange that some of us received the material ahead of time to read for a meeting that was going to take place after the HBC and they didn't receive it until the day of the hearing. It's just a comment. Thank you. I think that my problem with the evaluation I think stems from the approach and the attitude of the plan with respect to historic resources. The context statement that was prepared by CIRCA sets forth, I think, very well the reasons why this shipyard is extremely important, not only to the city but to the region, the state, and the nation. Yet, despite all of the evaluation that was given to it and the amount of importance that's been attributed to it, the plan and the proposed development hardly recognizes this as that kind of resource. Therefore, the evaluation -- not therefore -- but the evaluation contributes to this because the resulting historic district, in my opinion, is extremely narrowly constructed. It leaves out scores of buildings which should have been included as contributing buildings. They dismissed scores of buildings based on the fact that they're not architecturally significant or distinctive. These are some of the criteria that barred standard criteria. They say that these individual buildings did not in themselves contribute to a significant event; that they did not -- are not associated with significant people -- designers, Navy commanders, or something like that. However, the context statement, I think, sets forth the importance of the base as a whole. And it would seem that what was proposed is too narrow and doesn't encompass what, I think anyway personally, a historic district out there should be. The evaluation, in my opinion, of individual structures and objects should have been with respect to their contribution to the overall understanding of the shipyard and the historic district then constructed around that. Each building out there has its own purpose, of course, but this individually contributed to the functioning of the shipyard as a whole. If you don't have a machine shop, if you don't have an admin building, you don't have warehouses, the place wouldn't have functioned. Yet all these buildings are dismissed as not being important to the shipyard. Quoting from the National Register and California Register with respect to historic districts, it says, A district derives its importance being a unified entity even though it is often composed of a wide variety of resources. The identity of a district results from the interrelationship -- interrelationship -- of its resources which can convey a visual sense of the overall environment or be an arrangement of historically and functionally related properties. It doesn't say that an historic district is a microcosm of that shipyard, which the EIR sets forth as reasoning why this historic district as proposed apparently exists. A different approach was taken in the evaluation of Pier 70, which is Port Authority property. I think that evaluation used a more encompassing approach rather than one which focused really on several key and important buildings; that is, of several of the dry docks and then the immediately associated buildings right around it. They kind of remind me of the type of thing that used to take place in historic preservation and the National Register especially, which was to recognize only those buildings that were high-style architecture that were designed by known architecture designers or that were associated with very famous and rich and political people perhaps. That kind of thinking has changed over the years, where now we recognize what are called vernacular buildings, not high-style architecture. They could be cabins. They could be a suburban house, for that matter. And properties that are associated with workers and the labor movement, especially. The whole National Register nomination that the Port Authority had conducted for the northeast waterfront depended heavily on the analysis of labor and labor's

contributions to San Francisco's waterfront. Several statements are curious, because in the EIR, it says, as of July 2009, only a fraction of the original buildings and structures remain on nearly 500 acres of available land. That would seem to point out to me that's what left, doesn't that make them even more important? Another quote, As important as Hunters Point was to the World War II naval campaign, it gained significance in its own right in the post-war period through its role as home to the naval radiological defense laboratory. While not as impressive architecturally as the earlier dry dock buildings -- the very early dry dock buildings -- these later military buildings and structures carried out operations critical to the United States' success during World War II -- carried out operations critical to the United States. After the war the shipyard continued to contribute to the success of military campaigns both as a shipyard and home to rad lab. So I think that argues for a more inclusive approach to the historic district than attempting to create the smallest boundary possible. Another quote, While almost all of the information contained in this document -- which is the EIR -- concentrates on the contributions of the dry docks to the overall development of the shipyard, it is important to recognize the residential portions of the military facility that predated World War II. So if that's the case, why weren't they included in the list of pre-World War II significant property types? Property types are part of the context statement. I don't want to go into a whole lot of detail about it, but it's the kind of resources that the context statement found to be -- considered to be -- important to defining what that historic district should be. Several of the things under the World War II theme in the context statement -- the property types include administrative, yet the main administrative building, which is 101, is excluded as a contributing resource. It says Building 101 itself does not appear to have made a significant contribution to the ship repair function. Though it was the onsite headquarters for the shipyard, most operation functions were directed from Mare Island. I guess if you followed that logic, we could say the operation headquarters in Mare Island wasn't important either because they were getting their directions from Washington. So you could take -- why is Mare Island administration building on the National Register of Historic Places? The same can be said for such things as railroads. It's acknowledged later on in the district nomination itself that -- and I'm quoting -- even today rail line spurs -- can't read it -- spurs and beds remain scattered throughout the project area as reminders of the importance of railroads in the everyday functioning of the shipyard. It doesn't say that these houses and railroads and other objects have to be significant for the specific event. The event is the shipyard itself. Doesn't have to be associated with a particular person or designer. And that's my argument, I think. In addition, the historic preservation commission had some questions about whether there were other resources in the area and whether some of these buildings and structures at the naval base can be rare examples. There was a further investigation at that point of buildings at other shipyards. And they concluded that there might be better examples at Mare Island and elsewhere. However, I think that when they looked at Mare Island as a historic district, which is on the National Register, as I said, they didn't go around and say, Oh, well, here's a better example of a warehouse over here at the naval shipyard at Hunters Point and we'll just leave that one out. It just doesn't make any sense. And it also does not make any sense if the rad lab was so important to the United States and located on the shipyard that those buildings associated with that function and operation weren't also included, because the historic district is less comprehensive, then I feel therefore the alternative become inadequate since they're based on a extremely restricted district. We're talking about the dry docks and I believe nine other structures in the immediate area. If subalternative 4-A, which purports to save the buildings that are proposed for demolition, is now part of the environmental report as part of response to comments, then I think it should be adopted as the preferred

project. And what I mean by that is that the analysis says that the remaining portions of the plan and the buildings and proposals will remain as is except for what Mr. Muraoka said might be possible increases in height here and there for R&D. But my argument is why can't you use the existing buildings for R&D and not have to face that possibility of increased height elsewhere? If the -- There's been a motion and a second; is that right? I'd like to amend the motion. I'd like to extend the concept of the Port of San Francisco's history walk to place interpretive exhibits along the shoreline. I know there's a proposal for a cultural park, but I think that if we had some additional interpretive exhibits along the shoreline where the shipyard is, that would be something we could add to the mitigation measure itself. I'll make the motion in a second, because I have a second addition to the mitigation monitoring program, which is to -- I think people should agree with this one. In the context statement or in the evaluation report, it's noted that -- I think it's Building 813 is not part of the historic district, but it was associated with the rad lab; and there was a suggestion that that needed further investigation and evaluation as an historic building. So I'd like to add that condition to the mitigation monitoring program so that can move forward. So I'd like to make a motion that to amend the approval to add not a Port history walk but a Hunters Point shipyard history walk in addition to the cultural park. And also to add evaluating Building 813 for its historic significance.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: I'll second your motion.

COMMISSIONER LEE: I'd like to have staff's comments.

MR. WYCKO: Bill Wycko, department staff. This would not be a mitigation measure. I think the concern would be best addressed as part of the project adoption. We did not identify this as significant impact. And so, therefore, there's not a mitigation. In adopting alternatives, you can modify that alternative to incorporate the features that you're talking about. So I don't think it's relevant to the certification action.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Okay. That's fine.

MR. WYCKOFF: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: So we can do it as part of the plan approval?

MS. AVERY: Okay, Commissioners, you have put a motion -- a modification to a motion on the floor with a second. Is that motion now removed?

COMMISSIONER LEE: Yes.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Again, I'm calling only on Planning Commission members because they're the only ones signing in. So if Redevelopment Agency Commissioners wish to comment, if you would ring in, I will call everyone in the order in which they ring in. Commissioner Antonini.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Actually, my question was answered by staff as to the point that modification would be more properly taken up during the second part of our hearing, not during the EIR. So that's fine.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Commissioner Moore.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: I have a question for environmental staff. And that is the use of the word "lower Bay," as identified as a body with impaired water quality in the entire EIR -- and I went over the EIR again to find the boundary definition of lower Bay. And I could not find any map which showed me what the lower Bay is. So when you talk about water quality, it leaves a very large question mark, what exactly it pertains to. The reason why I'm asking is to the issue of Yosemite Slough in Section 3-M-16 is treated with omitting the fact that apparently there is an environmental investigation spearheaded by EPA going on. Nobody has mentioned as references, even in your EIR. And I'm wondering why. I know that you're excluding the slough from the EIR as not part of the project. But because the slough is a water body and not a piece of land, where water is indeed a moving body which goes into your project area, I'd like to know why you have chosen to do that.

MR. WYCKO: Bill Wycko again. I'm not sure if I'm the best person, but perhaps I can start. My understanding is that the issue you're talking about is addressed through the redevelopment plan. In some ways it may be analogous to include the responsibilities that are assigned for shipyard cleanup that are assigned to EPA. My understanding is that this issue is addressed in the redevelopment approval actions; and what we dealt with was the water quality issues specific to the project specific to the bridge. So, unless I'm misunderstanding your question --

COMMISSIONER MOORE: No. I think you understand my question. But perhaps Mr. Muraoka could answer it more precisely. If it is described somewhere in mitigating measures, I think it needs to be stated as a problem in your project description. Would you have another comment to that, Mr. Muraoka?

MR. MURAOKA: My comment is consistent with Mr. Wycko in items of what we evaluated as a project impact. There are overall impacts to water quality that we do report on in the EIR that would not be a project-related impact. Is that what you're alluding to?

COMMISSIONER MOORE: I'm talking more about the existing condition.

MR. MURAOKA: Existing condition. We reported in the EIR document about existing conditions within the project and the vicinity. We did not specifically report on conditions further out in South Basin. And actually that is not part of the proposed project. The project is essentially a landslide project, except for two areas where it does get within the water. One is Yosemite Slough and the crossing of the bridge. And there is a project boundary there. There is a larger study area primarily for biological impacts that was evaluated by our biologist for impacts in terms of ecosystems and habitat areas. And then the other area where we evaluated conditions within the water was the shoreline improvements that are proposed as part of the project to reinforce the bulkheads within the shipyard and to make shoreline improvements within the area of the state recreation area.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: So if I hear you correctly, in the future any additional cleanup work on the slough would be simultaneously monitored by all involved agencies, including yourself.

MR. MURAOKA: That's correct. Our involvement in the monitoring is specific to the area where there would be both construction impacts which are of a temporary nature that are larger than the actual project boundaries that will cross into the restoration area and, also, in terms of what will be permit conditions within the slough.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: I appreciate your comment. My second thought is, again, related to Yosemite Slough. I think it would have been very helpful to the Commissioners sitting here to see a visual simulation of the bridge. I think as a political development, it is indeed an object which people would like to see. I appreciate Commissioner Borden's comment on the Crissy Field bridge. This is a more massive and more extensive bridge because it carries significantly higher loads, will be visually more prominent. So I do think there is indeed something amiss not showing that. And even if it deals more particularly with BCDC, I think us commenting on the appropriateness of the esthetics, we would have liked to see that. Which brings me to another point that generally I think the EIR is very good in esthetics, visualization, and analysis; but one area which I would have personally liked to see more clearly expressed and committed to is the impact on height with buildings imposing against the backdrop of San Bruno Mountain, particularly as you're looking at it in View 16, southwest from Mariner Village. You're barely showing that. It doesn't quite break the ridge line, but I think it would have been really great to see a commitment from the developer to keep the entire mountain range intact. And I believe that the project would be stronger if indeed you would do it -- what your project philosophy tries to say -- tries to simulate, the hill topography of the downtown San Francisco and find a way to replicate it in your project. Here I think you're missing that a little bit. But that is an esthetic comment and I hope that can be caught as you're moving forward. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Commissioner Singh.

COMMISSIONER SINGH: Thank you, Mr. President. We started this project for the last ten years. And there are so many hearings and I don't know how many more hearings we need. It's going to be 10,000 homes and more, 30 percent below market, affordable homes. And I think there is the minimum situation. And so even we approved today, still is going to go to the Board of Supervisors, who has the final authority to approve it. So I move this motion.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: There is a motion from the Redevelopment Commission. Is there a second? Commissioner Covington.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to second the motion.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: And I would also like to thank everyone who came out this evening. It's very important that we hear from you. This has been a long and tedious and grueling meeting and I appreciate your steadfastness. I also want to point out that people of goodwill can disagree. That is always possible. And I think that happens frequently. I don't hold any ill will towards anyone who does not agree with me. And I do not hold suspect their mental

capacity because they don't agree with me. I wanted to -- before I forget to do so, I wanted to point out something extremely important. The last two ladies who came to the podium were concerned about the map that was presented to them. And I want to make very, very clear that there is no provision for eminent domain for private homes in the Bayview -- absolutely none. There is no caveat. There's no only if these conditions exist -- there is no provision for eminent domain in the Bayview for private homes. Now I will go to the business at hand. What we are tasked with today is to certify that the final EIR is adequate, accurate, and objective and has been completed pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act -- CEQA -- and the state CEQA guidelines. I submit to my fellow Commissioners on both sides of the aisle that this is indeed the case. I feel that that these documents -- all 7,700 pages -- lay out in great detail all of the things that are being proposed and that be looked at exhaustively by a great many learned people here and elsewhere. The CEQA standards are addressed. I think that a number of speakers said that the draft EIR does not comply with CEQA. I feel that it is. We have had many people express concerns about the level of cleanup. I was happy to hear some of my Commissioners mention that this is up to the Navy. The EPA has the oversight for this cleanup. It is not just the Planning Commission, the Redevelopment Commission, the City and County of San Francisco. There is oversight on the part of the state, there is on the part of the federal government meant. We will do our part. There is not a Commissioner in this room who does not want that site cleaned up so that when we retire we might want to move there and enjoy the amenities that are now going to be in the southeastern section of the city. Yosemite Slough. I tell you I learned so much in these documents. I did not know there was such a thing as eel weed. Had never heard of it and know quite a bit about flora, not so much about fauna, but about flora. And I didn't know that there was a burrowing owl in that area. I was not only happy to know that the things exist, but that their future survival has been addressed in these documents. So I'm very satisfied with that. As to parking issues, now, parking and traffic for 51 parking spaces that are basically discussed is being eliminated, Parking and Traffic Commissioners will definitely want to hear you talk about those issues. So this is not the last go-round for that portion. I wanted to reiterate this is not an early transfer. And that this process and release of documents have not been rushed. Ten years is not a long time. And I would suggest to you that if you were to ask members of the PAC and CAC if any of this has been rushed, they would say this is the slowest rush job they've ever seen, because they have met ad nauseam about these items. They have come before the Commission, taken time out of their family time to come, and speak to us in the evenings about these issues. I really appreciate the stick-to-it-iveness of the PAC and the CAC members. This is the kind of work that can potentially make you a target in your own community. And to be able to stand your ground with people who disagree with you loudly and profanely is quite a feat. So I salute the members of those two bodies. I agree that the height limit should be looked at and really reviewed in detail so that those people who now enjoy views hopefully can continue to enjoy views. When we are working with 702 acres of land, it seems that we should be able to figure out a way to do that. I wanted to say, also, that I learned that Professor Stefan Ramsdorf of the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research in Germany has come up with a semi-empirical approach to predict sea level rise. And for those of you who are much, much better at math and formulas than I am, I refer you to page number 97 of Volume 7 of the EIR. This is the level of detail that has gone into this presentation I think. Very, very, very little has been omitted. Very, very little has been undebated. The sea level rise and the mitigations going to -- going into the next one hundred years or so -- I think are good. And I wanted to emphasize that. There was also some discussion about new parks. And the letter from the California State Land Commission. There is

something here that I think it is important to point out. And that is that in this letter, on page 3 -- it's a four-page letter. I encourage you to read it as well. It says, according to the proposed plan, various parks within the first two developments would offer a full range of passive and active uses. Uses would include community gardens, basketball, tennis and volleyball courts, shaded pavilions, children's playgrounds, and restrooms. I think all of these are fabulous uses. But it goes on to say that it is important to note that these are local uses. These are not the kinds of things that the public office for land handle. They handle open space. They handle things for all of the citizens of the state. And these are local things that people want to do. Playing volleyball. So that they could not have an either/or. We either have state land or we have recreation and parks. We have plenty of both, which is a wonderful thing. It's more than 200 acres of park land -- new park land. Our children need this space to run around, to be healthy, to be active. A healthy body does not begin when you're middle-aged. It starts when you're young. The more you exercise the more, you get out, the better off you are as you approach your 60s and 70s. This is proven. And I look forward to visiting these parks and community gardens. So, again, I have seconded this nomination -- excuse me -- not this nomination -- the hour is late. I'm sorry. I second the Agency adoption of the EIR and I would be happy to chat with any member of the public after the meeting if you would like to speak to me. I'm always happy to talk to people, as my fellow Commissioners know. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you. Commissioner Olague.

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: Yeah. I'll be brief. Who laughed? I will. I'm going to be really brief. I did want to acknowledge some things that have more to do with process maybe that I think need to be sort of brought up again, like maybe it's water over the bridge at this point. But I did want to clarify that I think some of the concerns that the public raised about the time spent with the document were completely legitimate. A lot of people were saying, Well, it's a 20-year plan. It's a 10-year plan. We've been going to thousand dollars of meetings. That's not the point. The point of that is the draft EIR was published November 12th of 2009, just before the Thanksgiving Day holidays; and then the ending of the comment period was just around Christmas time. So I think even at that time these draft documents were made available to the public it was hundreds and hundreds of pages of very dense material that had to do with a very controversial project, with data and information that I think is pretty hard to get through. So I think that some of the concerns that the public raised about the amount of documents that we were forced to get through with the amount of time, I think, are completely legitimate. And so people wanted to mention it, but that's fine. Also, the comments and responses document. I only had three weeks with it. And, you know, I have a full-time job and it was really hard to get through all the documents. And then in addition to project documents, we also had constant amendments and changes to the documents. So it was kind of hard to track all of it. So it actually what's, for me -- I'm going to speak for myself, not for the other Commissioners, because I've heard many contradictions on this -- it was a very difficult process and really hard to get through all these documents. So I think it's -- it's fair that some people -- it had nothing to do with the amount of time and the number of hearings. It had to do with the very limited time that many of us had to spend with these documents. And this is just -- you know -- I don't know -- maybe a third or a quarter of the documents that we had to go through. I think that there was some mention earlier of SB 792 and the cultural resources. And I'm wondering whether someone from staff could explain to me what SB 792 is and how that relates to at least research and conversations that were had

with the Ohlone people. Also, since we're here, POWER submitted some documents that I thought had legitimate concerns. I just wanted to raise that for the record. Another consistent concern that I see raised in many of these letters, including those from Senator Leland Yee and Senator Mark Leno, even the one that wasn't amended and the one that was amended. There isn't one from Leland Lee that's dropped from the sky, so I don't think he amended his letter. There was also the same comment raised in letters from the Sierra Club and the Potrero Hill Democratic Club. And they all relate to the fact that, I guess, Proposition P supports a cleanup as opposed to a capping of certain parcels. And the present EIR fails to present an alternative to an alternative that includes the full cleanup and removal of contaminants from parcels. This is as required by Prop P. So that seems to be raised in several of the documents from the public that we've received. So I just wonder if you have any responses to either of those two things.

MS. GIBSON: I can respond to your first point regarding -- you mentioned SB 792 in regard to cultural resources. And I believe perhaps you meant to reference SB 18.

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: Yes. That's right.

MS. GIBSON: SB 18 has to do with consultation with Native American groups. And San Francisco is a charter city and is not subject to SB 18 section however. And, also, SB 18 is separate from the CEQA review process. It's a separate process. But nonetheless --

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: It seems to me that it still relates in some ways to the cultural resources.

MS. GIBSON: It had -- it does address cultural resources and specifically consultation with Native American groups when the -- there is amendment of a General Plan -- a General Plan amendment. And so in this case the city, as a charter city, is not subject to it. But we have undergone and are in the process of consulting with Native American groups. There's been -- the City initiated, through a letter to Native American groups that are officially listed with the Native American Heritage Commission as well as others who have requested to participate in the process. We've held meetings and have had other meetings that we've invited folks to attend. So the process is ongoing and is, again, separate from the CEQA process.

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: And you think -- you would say it's separate, even though -- did it all relate to the cultural resources that were documented for the -- and reviewed in the EIR?

MS. GIBSON: There is a relationship in that --

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: And even the historic resources?

MS. GIBSON: The subject of the consultation is in regard to identification of archeological resources on the project site, discussion of the -- in the event of discovery of these during the process, having Native Americans participate in the reburial of them if possible, or other treatments for them. So ensuring that they are engaged in the process during construction and prior to construction.

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: And you don't have a response to my second point that was raised in all these documents. That's fine. Okay. Well --

MS. GIBSON: We can respond.

MR. MURAOKA: Commissioner Olague, we have Amy Brownell with the Department of Public Health, who has been working on cleanup at the shipyard for --

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: My question really related more to Parcel P [sic] and the lack of an alternative that was reviewed in the EIR, which was raised by the Sierra Club and other community organizations. So that was probably what my point was -- about Prop P. If you could just address Prop P, that would be great.

MS. BROWNELL: Commissioners, Amy Brownell, with the San Francisco Health Department. I've been working on cleanup of the shipyard for 17 years. Proposition P called for the Navy to clean up the shipyard to an unrestricted residential level or to the maximum extent feasible. Because the Navy cleanup and decisions made by regulatory agencies who are overseeing the Navy cleanup are not part of the project -- that's not what is analyzed in the EIR, the Proposition P and the subsequent board resolutions are not directly applicable to the project and to the EIR. However, I can state after all these years of monitoring what's going on, they are cleaning up to the maximum extent feasible, especially for parcels that are transferring next year. The level of cleanup and cleanup standards that they are using they have determined in their records of decision in their process that that is the maximum extent feasible and the best cleanup that they can provide. And --

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: So Prop P is more or less a policy statement? Is that what you're saying?

MS. BROWNELL: Correct. Prop P is a policy statement --

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: That's good. I think my question was answered. Thank you. As far as -- you know, I think that someone mentioned idea of retiring to this new development in the Bayview. And I would argue that on my salary I don't think there is going to be a possibility for me to even afford one of the affordable units, unless there's, like, dedicated senior housing for very low-income seniors available onsite. So I think that some of even the affordable housing units that are being considered are still out of reach for many of us who are renters and live in San Francisco.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Commissioner Breed.

COMMISSIONER BREED: Thank you. I will definitely be brief. A lot of the points or questions or concerns that I had were actually addressed by Commissioner Borden and Commissioner Covington. So I want to thank you all for bringing up some really great points. I want to thank the public for coming out and hanging here in this late hour, although we still have business to move forward with and I know some of these things that I say will be repetitive and I'll try to go as quickly as I can. The transportation situation and the EIR -- the draft EIR -- was really important to me. And I think one of the biggest concerns I had was the

issue around Innes Street and lack of details around the impacts of Innes Street in particular, because of the route into the shipyard. And so the comments from a number of groups and individuals about how transportation was a big issue. And, in addition, the comments from the Commissioners from the Redevelopment Agency around transportation was a significant issue; and some of those questions were addressed. But I don't feel as though they went far enough. And so I am looking forward to not only approving this draft EIR and moving forward but delving into the actual Bayview Hunters Point plan in order to make sure that we address community concerns appropriately, for example, the community benefits package and all of the opportunity that will exist. I am ready to dig deep into the benefit panel and dig deep into the plan as a whole. The EIR is to study the impacts. And we have said this over and over again. And there are so much to discuss with this proposed plan in the future. And right now I am definitely prepared to move forward on the draft environmental impact report, because I do feel wholeheartedly that it has not only met the requirements of CEQA but has exceeded the Redevelopment Commission -- and I'm not sure if the Planning Commission did this -- but we did extend the comment period until -- I think we did -- instead of 45 days, we had 60 days. We had an additional public hearing. And so we went above what was required, although I understand that this is a lot to read. These documents are lengthy. They're detail-oriented and, you know, it was very difficult to get all of this, in addition to having a full-time job and graduation time and everything else. I mean it's just been really hectic. And so I would like to see us moving forward, especially with looking into the Bayview Hunters Point plan, which has been discussed in the draft form. We have a draft of the plan. It's already public. It's something that we can start looking into now and talk about and meet and prepare information so that we can deal with that on a more thorough basis. But as far as this draft environmental impact report, I think it is time to move forward on this matter. And then I just also want to add that there's an edible garden at Alice Griffith. It's an amazing garden and there is also a number of residents out there that were not -- And you know what? The whispering in the audience is really bugging me right now, because I'm, like, right here. So can I just have some quiet so I can make my comments, please? Thank you. So basically one of the concerns -- I actually met with a number of residents there as well as a number of the residents who are very close to the shipyard -- people who are coming to the meetings, who don't have a desire to come to the meetings, and who really are skeptical about even moving this process forward and not understanding clearly of this environmental impact report. And I've said this in the past and I'll say this: In moving forward, we need to make sure that we are over the top on community outreach as it relates to this project as a whole. This is like no other project that exists. And so we need to treat the reporting, the approvals, the hearings, and everything else like nothing we've ever done before. And so in moving forward, I want to continue to stress that we do that and we continue to use different means of community outreach in the community and moving forward. So with that, I want to support moving this project forward. And thank you so much.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Commissioner Busto.

COMMISSIONER BUSTOS: Good evening, everyone. Thank you, President Miguel. First, I want to thank you, Commissioner Olague, for bringing up the issue of the Ohlone community. As everybody knows on the Redevelopment Agency, that has been one of my things that I've been pushing, to make sure that we do talk to our First Peoples here. It was their land and they deserve that respect. I may sound like a broken record, but I was born and raised here in San

Francisco in the Mission District. And I say that because I'm proud to be a native San Franciscan. There aren't that many places in San Francisco where you find a lot of natives and I know there are a lot in Bayview Hunters Point. And sort of what frustrates me is that you have people who come -- I have people who come to the Mission that say they're from the Mission, but they're not. And I know that there are some people who came today saying they were from Bayview and they're not. So what I usually do is try to listen and if I see those who live in the community, those who work in the community, what they're saying. I heard two very distinct things. One, we need to clean up. That was made loud and clear. And, two, we need to move forward. We need to do something. We can't stay paralyzed. We've got to move somewhere. I mean it's -- this is a community that, you know, prior to dot-com, prior to gentrification, no one paid attention. And they deserve -- they deserve to have parks. They deserve to have housing. They deserve to have jobs. They deserve to be able to say, You know what, we have a great retail location to go to. And you know what, in San Francisco, there's always an opposition to something. You can build a church and there will be an opposition to it. So what I'm trying to say is, You know what, we're hearing you. I think all of us here have said we have to clean up and we have to make it right. But when we talk about historic preservation, I love architecture, but we also got to talk about the historic preservation of the community and the people that have been there when no one else cared, when many of these community groups, whether they be local or national, didn't even bother. There were communities of people there that stuck it out. And so what I'm trying to say is that we need to move forward and let's -- let's keep our eye on the cleanup. Let's keep our eye on the benefits. Let's keep our eye on the work and make sure that it goes to San Franciscans. Let's keep our eye on making sure that everything is done to the best and the right way, because it's the right thing to do. So I move -- it's already been moved. I support moving this forward so that we can take steps towards cleaning this place and creating wonderful change for the community that deserves it and deserved it a long time ago.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Commissioner King.

COMMISSIONER KING: Well, I've been here since the beginning. I was here ten years ago, twelve years ago, when we first selected Lennar to come. And I think pretty much Commissioners listen to the people. And now I think it's our job to make the commitment. So I want the call to question, because I think we've covered it and I've covered it. And we voted unanimously the last time. Hope we can do it this time, because I think we can look -- we're looking out for the public. Everybody can see it -- the whole thing. So I want to move it. I want to call for the question and hoping we can get a unanimous vote out of it.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Commissioner King, your president and myself would like to make just brief remarks, if that's all right with you. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KING: Because I think we're beating it to death a little bit now.

PRESIDENT SWIG: We probably are beating it to death. And I'll be brief. I'm also a native San Franciscan. I grew up in the northwest corner of San Francisco, so the southeast was foreign territory to me. But one thing I deeply appreciate about this process and my participation, the Development Commission is the opportunity to learn about one of the most sacred neighborhoods in San Francisco. And I appreciate people like Espanola Jackson, who

has personally taken the time to introduce me to her neighborhood, guide me around her neighborhood so I can get to know the neighborhood enough to make competent decisions. It was stated the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood is a forgotten community which is held hostage. That's arguably true; however, I think not by myself or my fellow Commissioners. While that should be the impetus to move the overall project forward, the approval of the EIR is predicated on a myriad of other issues which are referenced in the EIR document itself. The completion of the EIR has been a mammoth task which has made a deep impression on me at least. So first I'm going to add on to Commissioner Breed's thank you. The CAC and the PAC -- boy, they deserve huge amounts of thanks. The hours -- hundreds and hundreds of hours that they've put into dealing with their community in a conscientious and competent fashion is fantastic. Its countless contribution of hours and their passion and the -- their willingness to put their feelings and their passions on the line has been hugely important. The professional staff, the Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development. I was teasing Tiffany about the bags under her eyes because I know that the Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development has been working into the early morning hours, where we may see the early morning hours today. But the public should know about this group just does it until they get it right. And the same with the Redevelopment Agency. And so I don't have to make this statement again in the next session -- in reviewing the documents that we'll see in the next session -- the City Attorney's office has pulled off some amazing feats to be properly prepared for activities that we are benefiting from tonight. There have been countless consultants and advisers who, although many of them have been paid, which deserve -- they deserve high amounts of praise for their focus and their diligence. Commissioner Covington referenced the fact that we hear nice things said at the podium and some not so nice things. That I really applaud all people who step up to that podium, whether they insult me or not, I don't care. What's more important is their communicating feelings -- their feelings. They're communicating their point of view as part of the community; and that's critically important and what makes this system fantastic. So I thank those who stood at the mike, regardless of what you said. Thank you for taking the time to show up and spending hours here. And, finally, especially the BVHP communities for their persistence over decades now to not only put up with this process, but some -- in some cases some very unfathomable living conditions, which I hope change as soon as possible. We Commissioners have received cartons, binders, and pages of documents which have been provided. Copious documentation of the redevelopment and rebirth of the southeast section of the city of San Francisco. And maybe it is the point of analysis paralysis, as Reverend Brown referenced earlier this evening, but it's well worth it because we know that we have looked under every pebble, every stone, everything that we possibly could to make sure that we are acknowledge and thorough in this process. Speaking for the Redevelopment Agency, we have heard hours of public testimony as well as read unlimited notes and documents from both professionals and staff and through community meetings. And we have made best efforts to respond and understand all of the public's concern and we'll continue to do so. My studies of the aforementioned cartons, documents, and pages were extraordinarily educational for me, thoroughly based on my earlier review of the DEIR. I found -- based on my review of the earlier DEIR, I found the responses to the concerned parties detailed, constructive, and complete in their substance. My previous concern related to environmental impacts and transportation; and those have been satisfactorily answered. I also - if I was making specific comments, I would ask you to refer to Commissioner Antonini and Commissioner Borden as well as Commissioners Breed and Covington's comments, because I share them all. So I won't be redundant. And I take my vote very seriously, as I realize that

the approval of the EIR allows a significant change in the southeast sector of this precious San Francisco land. Benefits of change will considerably allow improvements of the physical environmental and economic quality in the area. And I am confident that the EIR meets a satisfactory standard. And, therefore, I emphatically support its passing to allow moving forward with the redevelopment of the area. Just quickly and finally, with regard -- just some details -- with regard to the continuing cleanup, if you attended our Redevelopment Agency Commission couple of weeks ago, you heard Mr. Dacosta request that we get commentary from the Navy the next time that we have an educational seminar on the cleanup. We had one two weeks ago and we'll continue to get updates as the shipyard goes through its continuing cleanup. And we do listen to the public and we'll invite somebody from the Navy to show up and give us their point of view as well the health department and other involved parties. It is time to move on. I don't believe that this has simply been vetted in three weeks. It's been vetted over ten, fifteen years. And I really share Commissioner Covington's point of view that I'd like to see it before I'm gone. And what I'd really like it to look like -- a gentleman referenced the fact how much he loves the ballpark and that area and south. Mission Bay, that's a huge success. That development is hugely successful. It converted what was an unproductive area of San Francisco into an amazing new neighborhood. And I can only hope that BVHP converts into an equally amazing new neighborhood. And that concludes my comments. I'd also like to thank my fellow president for running the first half of the meeting. I can only hope that the second half I can survive. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Thank you, President Swig. I have to go back to the Reverend Aurelius Walker's comment that he has attended well over 200 meetings; and I'm sure he has, as have many of the people who spoke today and are still here today. I had the pleasure of attending some of those meetings in the Bayview of both the PAC and the CAC -- nowhere near 200 -- because I wanted to hear the questions raised and I wanted to hear how it was coming along within the community itself. The comment that came earlier today that this is a long neglected area of San Francisco is undoubtedly perfectly accurate. This is a project that can reconnect the Bayview Hunters Point and Candlestick Point areas to San Francisco. They literally have been disconnected for decades. It's wrong. It shouldn't have happened. It did happen. It was a result of many, many things -- of having different types of industrial areas, of having different types of thinking that created situations such as Alice Griffith; disconnecting entire communities from their neighborhood, from the street grid, and literally isolating them from the city in general. I think we today understand how wrong this has been over the years. I have some knowledge of the happenings in District 10, having lived in that district for some 34 years, although not as far out perhaps as Bayview Hunters Point; but I interface through organizations with people from that district all the time. We don't always agree, but I greatly appreciate their thoughts and I certainly appreciate the public that came forward today. Sitting behind the gavel, I play a little game on major projects and I count the speaker cards. We had 125 today, in case you're interested. I have literally read the material that is sitting in front of Commissioner Borden. It was sitting in my office that's in my home. A couple of my young grandkids still don't believe me when I said that I did it, because it's always beyond the young ones. I find that the EIR conforms to CEQA, that it is adequate, that is objective. And I have made comment on so many EIRs that they sort of pushed on the objective end. But it is comprehensive. I think it covers the subject matter. I think this project has a long way to go, that this is the start. It's about time it got started, both for years and for tonight, at some twenty minutes after 9:00 o'clock. So I thank President Swig, I thank the input from the

Commissioners from the Redevelopment Agency. As I said at the very beginning several hours ago, I think it gives us a chance to at least communicate and understand what each other is thinking. The staff has been excellent, not just tonight but in answering questions as we've come along on this. Ten hours of special hearings, informational hearings recently at planning, and questions being answered continuously. There will be more interaction with the public over the next number of years as something happens to the benefit of the communities in the southeast area of San Francisco. And I look forward to being a part of that. Secretary Avery, if you would call the--

MS. AVERY: Planning Commissioners, there's a motion on the floor to certify the final environmental review document. On that motion, Commissioner Antonini.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Borden.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Lee.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Moore.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: No.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Sugaya.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: No.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Olague.

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: No.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Miguel.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Aye.

MS. AVERY: That motion passes 4 to 3, with Commissioners Moore, Sugaya, and Olague voting against. Thank you, Commissioners.

MS. SOLIS: Commissioner Breed.

COMMISSIONER BREED: Aye.

MS. SOLIS: Commissioner Covington.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: Aye.

MS. SOLIS: Commissioner King.

COMMISSIONER KING: Aye.

MS. SOLIS: Commissioner Bustos.

COMMISSIONER BUSTOS: Aye.

MS. SOLIS: Commissioner Singh. Vice-president Singh.

COMMISSIONER SINGH: Aye.

MS. SOLIS: President Swig.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Aye.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: I will now turn the gavel over to President Swig for the five o'clock portion of this meeting. We have to switch some equipment up here, so we're going to take a five-minute break. Thank you.

[Break from 9:21 to 9:32 p.m.]

PRESIDENT SWIG: Okay. Good evening. It's now 9:32, where it was supposed to be 5:00 o'clock in the afternoon. And I'd like to get started again and remind you that this is the special joint hearing of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and the San Francisco Planning Commission. Welcome again to the public and radio and TV listening audiences. For those who are -- didn't get the announcement at 1:00 o'clock this afternoon, please turn off all pagers, cellphones and other sound-emitting devices during the meeting. If you wish to speak, please fill out a speaker card for the item which is called and the item on which you address either of the commissions. Please state your name -- very important -- state your name for the record before you make your statements and please limit your remarks to three minutes. And this portion of the agenda is not intended for debate or discussion with Commissioners or staff. Please simply state your business you wish the Commission or staff to be aware of. If you have any questions you can follow up with staff or Commissioners during the break or after adjournment. There will be a break absolutely at 11:30 p.m., as many of us have cars in the Civic Center parking garage and we wish not to have housed for the evening. It is not appropriate for Commissioners to engage in debate or respond on issues not properly set in a publicly notified meeting agenda. And, for press and the public, please stay within the designated seating area. You have the speaker podium. And members of press are requested to film or record the Commission meeting from the side area of the designated public seating area to my right and your left. And the filming or recording equipment should not interfere with the public's view of participation in the meeting as well as presentation materials before the Commission. These guidelines are in the spirit of promoting open and orderly public meetings. And your continued interest in both the Agency, the Commission, and the Planning Commission meetings is welcomed and greatly appreciated. Before I ask Madam Secretary to

call the first item, I'd like to let you know what's going to occur so it catches nobody by surprise. First of all, we will have the reading of the Planning items. Then we will have the reading of the Redevelopment items, as they are separate from each other. Those are Items 2 through 9. Then we will hear public comment at the same time on all items, both Planning and Agency items. And then, as we did in the last session, we will have a common session for both Agency and Planning Commission comments and questions on the Agency and -- on all items. Then President Miguel will ask for a call on the Planning items and there'll be a roll call and a vote. And after that is complete, the Planning Commission may adjourn, if they would like. And then the Redevelopment Agency will go through our call on our items and at the end of that we'll adjourn. So I think I got it right, Madam Secretary. So with that, would you please call the agenda items?

MS. AVERY: Thank you, Mr. President. For the Planning Commission, we'll hear Items 2 through 9. Item 2 is a consideration for a motion adopting environmental findings and a statement of overriding considerations under the California Environmental Quality Act and State guidelines in connection with the adoption of the Candlestick Point Hunters Point shipyard Phase 2 and related actions necessary to implement such plans. Planning Item 3 is consideration of formulating a resolution to approve amendments to the Bayview Hunters Point Area Plan, the Transportation Element, the Recreation and Open Space Element, the Commerce and Industry Element, the Land Use Index, establishing the Candlestick Point Subarea Plan, the Hunters Point Area Plan along with other minor General Plan Map amendments. Planning Item 4 is consideration of formulating a resolution to approve amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code by establishing the Candlestick Point Activity Node Special Use District, the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Special Use District, and to establish special height provisions for the Candlestick Point Activity Node Special Use District and the CP Height and Bulk District, and special height provisions for the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Special Use District, and the HP Height and Bulk District. Planning Item No. 5 is consideration of formulating a resolution to approve amendments to the San Francisco Zoning Maps by amending sectional maps SU09 and SU010 to establish the Candlestick Point Activity Node Special Use District and the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Special Use District; amending sectional maps HT09 and HT010 to establish the CP and HP Height and Bulk Districts. Planning Commission Item No. 6 is consideration of formulating a resolution to approve the Candlestick Point design for development document, the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 design for development document and corresponding technical amendments to the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 1 design for development document for the Candlestick Point Hunters Point shipyard Phase 2 development project. Planning Commission Item No. 7 is a consideration of a resolution establishing findings of consistency with the General Plan of the City and County of San Francisco and with Section 101.1 of the City Planning Code for the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 development project, including amendments to the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan, the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan, and for various actions necessary for the implementation of the project. Planning Commission Item No. 8 is consideration of a resolution establishing findings of consistency with the General Plan of the City and County of San Francisco for proposed amendments to the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan and the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan, as part of the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project, recommending the approval of the amendments to such redevelopment plans, and making office allocation findings pursuant to Planning Code Sections 320-325. Planning

Commission Item No. 9 is consideration of formulating a resolution to providing a Planning Cooperation Agreement between the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and the San Francisco Planning Department for Zone 1 of the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Madam Secretary, thank you. And before the Redevelopment Agency items are called, let me clarify what must have been a Freudian slip. After the Redevelopment Agency items are called, we'll have a staff presentation. I think it was kind of wishful thinking that maybe we'd just go into dialogue and public comment, but we'll have a staff presentation on all those items. Madam Secretary, would you please call the Redevelopment Agency/Commission items.

MS. SOLIS: Thank you, Mr. President. Agency Action Item B, adopting environmental findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, including the adoption of a mitigation monitoring and reporting program and a statement of overriding considerations, for the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project; Bayview Hunters Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Areas, Resolution No. 59-2010. Agency Action C is approving the report to the Board of Supervisors on the proposed Redevelopment Plan Amendment for the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area and authorizing transmittal of the report to the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, Resolution No. 60-2010. Agency Action D is approving the proposed Redevelopment Plan Amendment for the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area and making findings under the California Environmental Quality Act; and recommending adoption of the proposed Redevelopment Plan by the Board of Supervisors; and submitting the Agency's recommendation, including the proposed Redevelopment Plan, to the Board of Supervisors; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area, Resolution No. 61-2010. Agency Action E is approving the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Design for Development and corresponding technical amendments to the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 1 Design for Development; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area, Resolution No. 62-2010. Agency Action F is approving the report to the Board of Supervisors on the proposed Redevelopment Plan Amendment for the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan Amendment and authorizing transmittal of the report on the Redevelopment Plan Amendment to the Board of Supervisors, Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area, Resolution No. 63-2010. Agency Action G is approving the proposed Redevelopment Plan Amendment for the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area and making findings under the California Environmental Quality Act; recommending adoption of the proposed Redevelopment Plan by the Board of Supervisors; and submitting the Agency's recommendation, including the proposed Redevelopment Plan Amendment, to the Board of Supervisors; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area, Resolution No. 64-2010. Agency Action H, approving the Candlestick Point Design for Development, Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area, Resolution No. 65-2010. Agency Action I is authorizing the Executive Director to execute a real property transfer between the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco and the City and County of San Francisco for certain City property at Candlestick Point; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area, Resolution No. 66-2010. Agency Action J, authorizing the Executive Director to execute a public trust exchange agreement between the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco and the City and County of San Francisco, the California State Lands

Commission, and the California Department of Parks and Recreation in furtherance of the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project; Hunters Point Shipyard and Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Areas, Resolution No. 67-2010. Agency Action K, authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Park Reconfiguration Agreement between the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco and the California Department of Parks and Recreation for the reconfiguration of the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area in furtherance of the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Areas, Resolution No. 68-2010. Agency Action L, authorizing the Executive Director to execute a Disposition and Development Agreement between CP Development Co., LP, and the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco, the "Agency," and an Interagency Cooperation Agreement and a Tax Allocation Agreement between the Agency and the City and County of San Francisco, and a Planning Cooperation Agreement between the Agency and the Planning Department of the City and County of San Francisco for the development of Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard; Bayview Hunters Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Areas, Resolution No. 69-2010. Agency Action M, making findings pursuant to Sections 33445 and 33445.1 of the California Community Redevelopment Law for the funding of installation and construction of public improvements related to the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area; Hunters Point Shipyard Project Area, Resolution No. 70-2010. Agency Action N, making findings pursuant to Sections 33445 and 33445.1 of the California Community Redevelopment Law for the funding of installation and construction of public improvements related to the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area; Bayview Hunters Point Project Area, Resolution No. 71-2010. Agency Action O, commending the Hunters Point Shipyard Citizens Advisory Committee and expressing the intention of the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco to consult with the Committee on the implementation of the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project, Resolution No. 72-2010. Agency Action P, commending the Bayview Hunters Point Project Area Committee and expressing the intention of the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco to consult with the Committee on the implementation of the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Project, Resolution No. 73-2010. Mr. Director.

MR. BLACKWELL: Thank you, Madam Secretary. Well done. You should get yourself a glass of water there. The staff presentation for these items will be led by Michael Cohen, the director of the Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development. And he will be presenting in tandem with staff from both the Planning Department and the Redevelopment Agency. Mr. Cohen.

MR. COHEN: Thank you. Good evening. For the record, Michael Cohen, director of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development. As Director Blackwell indicated, I'm going to give a bit of an overview and then we'll have staff from Redevelopment Agency, Planning staff as well as staff from Economic Development to walk through the specific items that are before you today. I'm a little bit torn. I know it's late. And, frankly, in the comments from Commissioners in both commissions, you covered a lot of materials I was going to talk about. But by the same token, we have been at this a long time. There's a lot to cover here. So I hope you'll indulge us a little bit in that regard. First, I want to talk a little bit about process. And on a project which is as complex and important as this one, and particularly in a community like the Bayview

Hunters Point, process does matter. And I have to say I am immensely proud that this project has been directly shaped by the absolute best kind of community-based planning. You probably heard it from me before, but we have been iterative, we have been thorough, we have been inclusive, and we have been completely transparent in our process around this project. Perhaps most importantly we did not come to the community, we didn't come to policy-makers like yourselves or other City departments at the end of process with a fully baked plan and say, Please tell us what you think, review, and comment. Quite to the contrary, we engaged key stakeholders on this project from the very beginning and we said, Engage at every step of the process. The basic underlying redevelopment plans for these areas were conceived even before a developer was selected, in the case of the shipyard all the way back to 1997. Those plans identified opportunities and constraints and they set forth general policy goals and objectives for the revitalization of these long-abandoned lands. Then we engaged in a public debate about whether to select a massive developer and how. And the community ended up playing a very active role in that competitive bidding process. Then with our development partners and community stakeholders we spent years refining these goals and objectives into more specific plans. Those efforts initially culminated in 2004 with the approval of the Phase I DAD and then continued on to the redevelopment plan amendments and the project approvals that are before you now. In addition, from 2000 to 2004 -- and this was really at the direction of then brand-new supervisor Sophie Maxwell, City staff, and a number of local and environmental justice leaders collaborated on negotiating a legally binding agreement with the Navy that governed the cleanup standards for the Navy's transfer of the shipyard. That agreement was approved and signed in 2005. I actually want to pause for a moment. One of the folks who participated in that is a long-time Bayview advocate by the name of Jesse Mason. Some of you may know Jesse has been quite ill, so we just wanted to send our thoughts out to him and his family. The really intensive community-based planning on the combined development of the rest of the shipyard and Candlestick Point together began in earnest in 2006. That process led to the creation of a comprehensive conceptual framework document. It laid out all the essential land use public benefits and financial elements of the project and after extensive debate and discussion was endorsed in 2007 by the CAC, by the PAC, by the Redevelopment Agency commission, and by the Board of Supervisors. Then in 2008, this project took the rather extraordinary step of going to the voters via Proposition G. It was debated in every district in San Francisco. I know that because I did them. And it was overwhelmingly approved by the voters in every district in San Francisco. Among other things, Proposition G made it official city policy to move forward with this project as expeditiously as possible. Someone reminded me that tonight happens to be the two-year anniversary of the passage of Proposition G. From that time, over that two-year period every single element of the project, which had been laid out in the conceptual framework, which had been refined and laid out in greater detail in Proposition G, was then broken down -- the transportation plans, the affordable housing plans, the open space plans, the urban design plans, the infrastructure plans, the economic development and workforce, and financing plans -- all were broken out separately and went through more and more and more of discussion, debate, revision, and amendment. There were hundreds of hours through the PAC and the CAC. They have a committee structure, because every PAC and CAC member can't be an expert in everything. So they picked subject matters that they're most interested in and they dived deep through that structure. And I want to second the comments that were made earlier. We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to the PAC and CAC members. They served without any financial benefit. They served tirelessly and they have the courage to stand up and be counted. But we didn't just stop -- and we hear all the time that the outreach could be better, and it's true. We

never get perfect coverage in our outreach, but we tried. And one of the things people said to us was, you know, everyone won't come to a PAC or a CAC meeting. So we took our meetings to the residents of Alice Griffith. We had regular meetings at Alice Griffith. We had regular meetings with the artists. We had weekend workshops. We had meetings with all the neighborhood groups surrounding the site -- in Visitacion Valley, India Basin, Morgan Heights, and beyond. As was mentioned previously, that community-based planning process achieved a major milestone last week, when both the PAC and the CAC overwhelmingly endorsed the project documents and the project approvals that are in front of you. In addition to this extraordinary level of community-based outreach, something that gets less attention but is in many ways also very important to a successful evolution of a project, is that from the very beginning there were dozens of City departments and agencies that were brought in to help shape the project. The MTA, DPW, the Mayor's Office of Housing, Rec and Park, the Department of the Environment, the PUC, the Workforce team within my office. And, of course, Planning and Redevelopment have taken the laboring oar. Each of these departments has valuable expertise that was incorporated in these project documents. Each of these departments represents a point of view that was reflected in these project documents. And each of these departments has a commission who held many, many, many more public meetings and who provided us direct policy guidance on the development of these plans. As a result of this thoroughness and inclusiveness, we have also achieved near total transparency. Anything anyone wants to know about this project has been discussed in public. Usually it's been covered on TV or the radio. We have all of these documents in the main library and local library in the Bayview. They're all on the Internet. If you want to know about this project, there is a resource available to you. Ultimately, we understand that not everybody is going to support this project, that it is -- it's unreasonable to expect that on a project this big, this complex, especially in a city like San Francisco. But the notion of the project is somehow moving too fast without enough public participation is, I think, just utterly contradicted by the facts. Interestingly, over the last year or never, as these plans have matured -- and I think both your commissions may have experienced this -- we have received relatively little criticism on the key elements of the plan itself. I think this is largely because these plans so faithfully honor the prior iterations of community input and policy guidance that underlie the plans themselves. In fact, last time week Angelo King, who is the chair of the Bayview PAC, remarked that as he was going through these thick binders of project documents that he took comfort from the fact that everything in those binders he'd seen before and in many cases he had seen them for many years. Instead, most of the concerns which have been articulated about this project have largely centered on four things -- cleanup, which we talked about a lot before; Lennar; the 49ers; and fears of displacement. And I want to briefly touch on all four of these. The point was made, I think, very clear that the cleanup of the shipyard is the responsibility of the United States Navy. It's under the jurisdiction of the EPA with support of a whole host of other regulatory agencies. But I will say -- and we presented recently to the Planning Commission, the Redevelopment Agency Commission, to the Board of Supervisors, to the PAC and the CAC, just earlier this week to the Department of Public Health Commission what the status of the cleanup is and why we have a high level of comfort with the way things are progressing and how they will continue to progress. For one thing, the shipyard is the beneficiary of this incredibly overlapping set of regulatory jurisdictions at the federal, state, regional, and local level. And this is important, in part because if you're a skeptic and you don't necessarily believe the City's Department of Public Health or Mitch Katz and Amy Brownell and the work that they've done, you have to actually believe that EPA and DTSC and BAAQMD and CDPH and Regional Water Quality

Board and everybody else have gotten it wrong too. The second thing, that after 20 years and tens of thousands of soil and groundwater samples and studies, we know so much more about the condition of the shipyard now than we did before. We actually have the knowledge to begin to demystify the cleanup and to understand and articulate why it is safe. And after 20 years and over \$700 million spent, vast portions of that cleanup are effectively complete. We also take comfort in the fact that the standards that the regulators used for the cleanup are very conservative. We hear a lot about caps and covers, but the key point -- and it was made I think by a couple of speakers -- is that everything that has to come out of the ground comes out of the ground. The regulators' standard for what can stay behind, which is true at every former industrial site anywhere in the United States where you have low-level industrial materials that are widely spread, the standard they use is that you could be exposed to those low-level materials every day for 30 years without having a health risk. But because EPA considers 30 years short-term, they impose the additional added protection of saying that the buildings and the roads and the parks and the project itself will provide a further barrier that will allow people to use this land safely indefinitely. In this regard, at the time that the shipyard is developed, it is essentially comparable to other brownfield sites all over the Bay Area -- includes Emeryville and includes Mission Bay and includes almost the entirety of the city of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. That is not a new idea. This is not a radical idea. This is what is happening all over America as we speak. I also mentioned earlier that back in 2004 the conveyance agreement was entered into after extensive vetting, public discourse. It provides a process whereby if and when the regulatory agencies certify in writing that the property is safe for its intended use under our redevelopment plans that the City will accept that property. As to Lennar, all I can say is this: When Lennar was selected through the competitive process in 1999, they were selected for two primary reasons. One was because they had experience with large projects. But the other was that they had the financial wherewithal to stay the course over the long haul. And they have. Over the last 11 years Lennar has spent a lot of money on both Parcel A and on this project. And even in the face of the worst economic crisis since the Depression in this country, they did not abandon this project, as so many developers did to so many projects in cities all over the country. Another concern that we hear a lot about is why are we working so hard on this project if the 49ers may move to Santa Clara. And the answers there are two-fold. First -- and I think Mr. Policy alluded to this in his public comment -- regardless of what happens next week in Santa Clara, there is a significant amount of uncertainty about whether the 49ers can finance a stadium there. And it is very likely that it will be a number of years before we actually know where the 49ers' new stadium will be. Second, Proposition G, the conceptual framework, and numerous other formal declarations of City policy directed us to do two things. On one hand, they directed us to preserve a world-class opportunity site for a new 49ers stadium, which with the help of the NFL and Carmen and others, we've done. But those policy directions were equally clear that this project is so important, that the public benefits at stake are so great, that we must move forward with this project with or without the 49ers. For that reason, our work on this project has involved creating both a stadium and a nonstadium alternative. So that's all right. We can skip the visuals, if it's going to come with music, although I kind of liked it. Anyway, so we have -- because we have this directive that we have to do this project with or without the 49ers, we took a rather extraordinary step, which is these document plans have both stadium and nonstadium alternatives. Now, you'll see quite intentionally that the vast majority of the project is the same whether the 49ers come. And because there is sufficient development that needs to occur in areas outside of the area where the stadium would be, the project documents anticipate really five to seven years when we can reserve the current site for the

stadium to see if that opportunity can come to fruition without slowing down, because we have enough work to do in the vicinity. But at some point, if the 49ers fail to avail themselves of this opportunity, we'll move forward with the nonstadium alternative. The nonstadium alternative in the entitlement provides a range of much more commercial use or mix of some more commercial use and residential. Finally, as to the fear of displacement. And this is a very legitimate fear. It's one that needs to be respected. It is important that this project is in some respects 180 degrees different than the failed urban renewal projects of the '60s and '70s, first because these lands have been abandoned for so long there's actually no one here to displace. As a community member said at the PAC meeting the other night, the only thing being displaced by this project is toxins. Second, the ground-up community-based planning on the project that I described earlier stands in stark contrast to the old school, old style, top-down urban renewal planning of decades gone by. And as a result of these plans being so well shaped by the community, they have a laser focus on making sure the project provides direct tangible benefits for the community, especially around jobs and job training; economic development opportunities for local businesses; housing across a range of income levels, including the complete rebuilding of Alice Griffith; and basic amenities that the rest of San Francisco takes for granted, like ample transit, good parks, and diverse retail options. Clearly, 30 years of doing nothing with this land hasn't done anyone any good. You know, it is true that these project documents don't answer every question about where every street and pocket park will go over the next 25 years. And I think some of the Commissioners' comments earlier were right on, that this is going to be a very involved and iterative and transparent and inclusive process for many years to come. Nor will these plans solve every problem and challenge facing the Bayview Hunters Point. What these plans do is they provide a thoughtful process for these details to be refined over time. And, most importantly, the project approvals provide a structure and a framework for a massive investment of capital into southeastern San Francisco with strict requirements that prioritize delivery of key public benefits around parks, jobs, and affordable housing at every stage of the development. And these ground rules apply to whoever is developing onsite. And if our experience from Mission Bay is an example, over the years we'll have many. A lot of work has gone into getting to this point. I appreciate Commissioner Swig's comments about the City and Agency staff and others and the community members who have worked so hard. I think the genesis of that effort is to get us to the point -- and I think we are there now -- where we can finally move beyond renderings and charts and designs and to try to move into something much more tangible. There is clearly some latent, locked-up opportunity for this community and for this city in 700 acres of waterfront land that has been abandoned for a very long time. And I think that we are finally at the time where we can begin to try to harness that. So, with that, let me introduce Tom Evans, who is the lead planner from the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Cohen. Good evening, Commissioners. For the record, Tom Evans, Redevelopment Agency staff. Before you tonight are two sets of documents really key to the implementation of the redevelopment program and the land use program envisioned by the Prop G development plan. Those documents include redevelopment plan amendments for the Bayview Hunters Point redevelopment project area and the Hunters Point shipyard redevelopment project area and their accompanying reports required by the California redevelopment law. The second set of documents are more specific design documents called design for developments in the corresponding project areas, one for Candlestick Point and one for Hunters Point shipyard Phase 2 and, as mentioned in the rezos, technical amendment to

Phase 1 design for development. So let me move first to the redevelopment plan and amendments. The first key item to any plan amendment -- amended by law -- is to establish redevelopment plan or revised redevelopment programs to address continued blight in the project area. This is through both revisions to the land use program and to revisions in the redevelopment program and financial investments. The redevelopment plan for both the shipyard and Bayview Hunters Point amend the land use controls and supersede the planning code that would be applicable specifically in Candlestick Point. The second key thing of plan amendments is relative to the redevelopment program is we need to amend the tax increment limitations provided in the original redevelopment plans. The shipyard -- we need to amend not only the tax increment indebtedness cap, but also an ultimate tax increment cap that is laid upon all base reuse redevelopment plans. In B we are increasing the tax increment cap to account for the increased development proposal before you this evening. The next piece of the redevelopment plan is -- that both redevelopment plans share -- are a focus on the development controls that are applicable to the project. By superseding the Planning Code we wanted to make sure that certain development fees and certain development controls that would normally be controlled by other City documents are classified and that additionally certain fees in particular that would be duplicative to the community benefits or otherwise baked-in project programs are not subject -- the fees are not subject to -- in these project redevelopment areas. Specifically to Hunters Point shipyard, there's a focus on the research and development office allocation and providing an upfront prioritization for an initial 800,000 square feet of commercial development on the shipyard. And then specific to the Bayview Hunters Point plan amendment, the next slide would be P-2, some of the public comment earlier is that the Bayview Hunters Point project area is a large project area. It includes nearly 1500 acres of the Bayview Hunters Point community. The project and most of the plan amendment pieces before you tonight really address the areas shown in gray in this Candlestick Point area. And we -- in order to be very clear about what is affected by this redevelopment program, we create two zones. They are simply named Zone 1, which is the Candlestick Point and Alice Griffith area. And then Zone 2, which is the rest of Bayview Hunters Point project area B. It's important to be clear that the policies for Zone 2 regarding land uses and entitlement and eminent domain are unchanged by this plan amendment. There are some amendments to the plan overall. One of the key things is that the concept of activity nodes that was key to the Bayview Hunters Point PAC and the plan has actually been lifted up to address all the project elements, including affordable housing, community benefits, and economic development. And that the activity node for Candlestick Point has been sustained to include the Alice Griffith project. There have been some minor additions and revisions to the community enhancements and affordable housing programs in response to the project's evolution and the revitalization programs already under way. For example, during discussions with the PAC just last week, we amended some of the language regarding community enhancements specifically to address an enhanced focus on improving and expanding Southeast Health Center. So moving on to the companion documents to the redevelopment plan, the CRL -- community redevelopment law -- the California redevelopment law requires that we provide a document that outlines very clearly the rationale for a redevelopment plan amendment. These reports build on the program reports that have already been distributed to the redevelopment commission and all the affected taxing entities in the project areas. The report documents the continued existence of blight in the project area and it provides tax increment projections based on the enhanced land use program for the project. The report also needs to describe the redevelopment program and clearly lay out the redevelopment program's feasibility. And then finally -- this is very key to one of the

documents that have just been passed out to you this evening -- we need to update the implementation plans. And there's a small set of correction pages for the implementation plans that were just distributed to all the Commissioners. Just to make sure we were very focused on public improvements that would be potentially invested into by the redevelopment plan as proposed, the second set of documents are the design for development documents. And those are, first off, documents that provide an overall urban design vision that's first defined by the public ground, parks, and streets and then further defines what the private development can be around those public ground improvements. The design for development acts as a planning code in providing detailed design standards and guidelines for both street layouts, open space, and development blocks. It further establishes overall strategies regarding land uses and how those land uses and how building types relate to the streets and parks; and then very specifically establish building height and bulk limits, setbacks, building modulation, frontages, and standards regarding signage, loading, parking, and many other key details of the urban design environment. One thing to note is the D for D do provide for Candlestick Point a certain amount of tower zone flexibility. So we have not fixed the location of towers. We have been very focused on a number of competing interests in designing the tower locations, including views to parks, views to bayview hills, and some of the regional views mentioned this evening. The design for developments were basically followed after an urban design plan that was endorsed by both the PAC and CAC and has been amended and revised with substantial input from the CAC and PAC. The documents were reviewed jointly by both Planning staff and Redevelopment staff. We've gone through many, many drafts of this. And future amendments to that D for D documents would be brought before both commissions. One key piece of the resolution related to Hunters Point shipyard D for D is to provide technical amendments to the current D for D that applies to Phase 1. The parallel amendments basically strike out all references to land uses such as industrial or office use and also correct the general street layout as a context in Phase 2. There's a couple of small errata sheets provided to the Commissioners regarding the Phase 1 design for development just to clarify that none of the changes to that document change the entitlement for the Phase 1 development. With that, I'll turn it over to Mat Snyder, who is going to walk through some of the companion General Plan and Planning Code decisions before you.

MR. SNYDER: Good evening, Commissioners. Mat Snyder for the Planning Department staff. As you know and just heard, this project is located within two redevelopment project areas, which generally mean the Redevelopment Agency will take the lead on implementing these projects, but there will be an ongoing role for Planning, starting with this evening. There are eight remaining actions necessary for the Planning Commission to take to enable this project. And I will now go through those in the order that they appear on your calendar. Action Item No. 2 are the CEQA findings. These include findings of overriding consideration and the adoption of the mitigation monitoring reporting program. Action No. 3 before you tonight are the General Plan amendments, which are to ensure consistency between the redevelopment plan amendments that are also before you this evening, the project itself, and the General Plan. You initiated these amendments on your March 25th hearing, when a draft ordinance along with background materials were forwarded to you. The proposed General Plan amendments are generally consistent of three components. The first component is the creation of a subarea plan for Candlestick Point and an area plan for Hunters Point shipyard. These plans are designed to describe in very general terms objectives and policies to designate high-density and mixed-use transit-oriented neighborhoods in these two subject areas and draw upon existing themes and

policies contained both within the General Plan elements and with the Bayview Hunters Point area plan specifically for these two areas. The second component of the General Plan amendments are to amend the Bayview Hunters Point area plan. You last updated this area plan in 2006, when a majority of the Bayview neighborhood was incorporated into the Bayview project area. Amendments before you today, like those before you in 2006, are updates in nature. The general theme and thrust of the plan remains the same; however, discussions throughout the plans have been updated to reflect that four years have now passed and also to reflect what is now envisioned for Candlestick Point and Hunters Point shipyard. The third component of the General Plan amendments are some very minor elements to the General Plan elements. These include text amendments to the transportation, the recreation and open space, and the commerce and industry elements as outlined in the ordinance. Also, amendments are proposed to maps throughout the General Plan so that they can refer to the area -- excuse me -- related area and redevelopment plans for both Candlestick Point and Hunters Point shipyard. And then, also, I might also mention we are updating the land use index to reflect the changes that are before you tonight. Action Item No. 4 and 5 on your calendar are the Planning Code text and Planning Code map amendments. These work together. The text amendments establish and describe use by special use districts and height and bulk districts that will specifically refer to the respective redevelopment plans; and then the map amendments will establish those new special use districts and height and bulk districts on official city maps. Action Item No. 6 before you are the General Plan and Planning Code, Section 101.1 findings. We've structured your approvals this evening to make sure that findings which are required for most of actions before you tonight are at a single location so that all other actions refer back to the resolution within that action. In preparing the resolution, staff did a thorough analysis of all of the elements and found on balance the project and its related approvals are consistent with those elements. Action Item No. 7 include the redevelopment plan amendments for both plans, which Tom Evans just described to you. Incorporated into these approvals are findings regarding the office components, that they're consistent with six of seven of the required office allocations found in Planning Code Section 320 through 325. These findings find that up to 5 million square feet of office development contemplated in the shipyard plan and 150,000 square feet of office development contemplated in the Bayview Hunters Point redevelopment plan promotes the public welfare, convenience, and necessity. The findings in the redevelopment plan also provide and prioritize the first 800,000 of that square feet of office development within the office cap program in the city. Action No. 8 of this approval is the cooperation agreements between the Planning Department and the Redevelopment Agency. This agreement follows the same general structure as those you've recently approved for Visitacion Valley and the Transbay and they follow the model with a more shared jurisdiction between Redevelopment or cooperation either with the Planning Department for those project areas. Again, Redevelopment will not be responsible for implementing the projects but will be engaged on key phases of design review, including for streetscapes, open space, major space in the first phase of building the design. Finally, Action Item 9 on your calendar is approval of the design for development documents. You had two informational hearings on these documents in the last two months; and you just heard or were reminded about their structure and their purpose from Tom Evans. As specified in the redevelopment plan amendments, you are required -- your approval is required for these amendments and any amendments to these documents acting as the Planning Code will also require your approval in the future. And with that, Commissioners, we're recommending approval for all of these actions. I would be happy to answer -- this concludes my presentation and I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have. Thanks.

MS. BOHEE: Good evening, Commissioners. Tiffany Bohee with the Office of Economic and Workforce Development. In order to implement to project's land use plan and program and all of the related public benefits -- the housing, the jobs, the parks, and other additional community benefits -- the Agency will need to assemble land at both Candlestick Point and the shipyard by entering into various agreements with the City and the State. The first of these agreements is the recreation area park land transfer agreement with the City, including the recreation area, Parks Department, and the Department of Public Works. Prop G, overwhelmingly approved by San Francisco voters, specifically authorized the transfer of property at Candlestick Point to the Agency, including land currently leased to the 49ers for stadium events, provided that there is a binding commitment to replace that transferred property with other property of at least the same acreage that will be improved and dedicated as public parks or open space in the project. And the project does provide that binding commitment through the disposition and development agreement, as authorized under Senate Bill 792. The public trust exchange agreement with the City, including the Port, and State Land Commission, and State Parks, will reconfigure the existing trust and nontrust lands at the site. They're existing strip singers and not useful for the public trust purposes at this time. We can fully realize the public trust and at the same time implement the development of the project. Following this public trust exchange, the entire water shoreline within the public parks of these two areas as well as other land will be subject to the public trust. These improved areas will enable the Bayview community and the general public to use and enjoy this incredible waterfront resource that's remained fallow for so many years. The state park reconfiguration agreement with State Parks and State Land will provide the best opportunity for Candlestick Point state recreation area to realize its full potential. Currently, as you heard, there are vast areas of state recreation area that are rubble and dirt parking lots. Other areas are quite narrow and don't provide for sufficient public access. And given the state's current budget crisis, there is little reason to expect the situation will change without dramatic intervention. Fortunately, the project, through the implementation of the State Parks reconfiguration agreement, will provide that dramatic intervention that the state recreation area needs. The agreement provides for the transfer of about 26 acres within the state park currently used primarily for parking lot areas to the Agency. In exchange, the Agency will transfer to State Parks land at Candlestick Point that will be used to enhance public access. And, importantly, the Agency will also provide the State with a total of \$40 million of park improvements for state recreation area exclusively for the state recreation area and \$10 million dedicated for operations and maintenance of the park. And this agreement was brought about through discussions with Sierra Club, Audubon, and Friends of Candlestick Point. Under the DDA, the developer is required to perform all actions that are required for the agency to fulfill its obligations under the park agreement as well as the state lands agreement, including payment of funds due the State Parks. The State Parks agreement also includes restrictions on private vehicle use on Yosemite Slough bridge. This is an additional regulatory layer on top of the City's restrictions on bridge use that would be incorporated when it's accepted as a public improvement. The park agreement also establishes a process by which the agency would consult with State Parks on the bridge design to ensure consistency with the objectives of the Yosemite Slough restoration project. The Agency's disposition and development agreement, or DDA, with CP Development, which is a joint venture between Lennar and Hillwood, Scala, and Epstein, sets forth the developer's rights and obligations within the scope of the redevelopment plans and the design for development. And it sets forth their obligations related to that development. The DDA is an umbrella document that obligates the developer to comply with

the terms of all of the things that we've been talking about with you and the Bayview community -- the below-market-rate housing plan, the financing, the transportation structure, and open space program, the Bayview Hunters Point employment and contracting policy, and other documents. The DDA serves as a phasing road map for development of the project and requires that that development be delivered, as set forth, on a determined schedule of performance. The phasing road map contemplates that development plans within the project site will be more refined through a series of major phases and subphases and, importantly, creates the link between the developer's build-out of these phases with their obligation to complete the parks, the infrastructure, the transportation, and to deliver the affordable parcels and other public benefits that correspond to that build-out. The developer's role under the DDA is a horizontal land development model. What I mean by that is land is the asset that's being improved and sold. The developer's role is to build the horizontal infrastructure improvements, provide the various community amenities and public benefits; and in return the developer receives the right to develop or sell that land for vertical development. The purchasers of this improved land, or vertical developers, will be obligated to comply with the terms of the DDA. We are not executing multiple DDAs as the improved land gets sold, similar to Mission Bay. The DDA requirement will run with the land. The transfer of the land under the DDA occurs only after major phase and subphase applications have been approved in accordance with the DDA design review and document approval procedure, or DRDAP, and after the developer has fully satisfied the conditions to close of escrow, including providing the financial guarantees for the Agency to complete all the infrastructure and related public benefits for that particular subphase. We have a powerful tool in the right of reverter. The land transfer to the developer within that given subphase will be subject to a right of reverter in which the Agency can retake ownership of the land if the developer fails to substantially complete the infrastructure related to that subphase. And consistent with Proposition G, the project provides an opportunity site for a world-class stadium for the San Francisco 49ers on the shipyard which could accommodate two teams. The DDA provides for the condition under which the developer will be obligated to prepare the site and related infrastructure for the new stadium. We have a phasing plan for a stadium condition as well as a nonstadium condition. Importantly, in either scenario, the rebuild of the Alice Griffith public housing development is in the first phase. We've discussed a number of these key DDA components with you through various and numerous presentations at the Agency Commission, the Board, as well as the Planning Commission. The things that you and the Bayview community care about -- the housing program that provides for 32-percent below-market-rate housing, including the rebuild of Alice Griffith; to low-income housing for seniors and special needs; to housing for working families; the local hiring and workforce and contracting program; parks and open space; and other community benefits -- are all part of the DDA and the developer's obligations. The mechanisms for how we pay for all the horizontal infrastructure improvements, the affordable housing, and the related public benefits are set forth in the financing plan. A draft of that financing plan was approved by the Agency Commission and the Board earlier. In total, the project's costs are approximately \$2.4 billion. We are able to accomplish this tremendous program through the use of upfront private developer capital and the tools of redevelopment. That is tax increment and Mello-Roos Community Facilities District Financing, which are special taxes on the private property owners, but not on the affordable housing development in this case. Similar to Mission Bay, the agency will enter into a tax allocation agreement with the City in which the City authorizes and approves indebtedness by the Agency for the purposes of financing public improvements for the project. Tax increment generated by the project after the mandatory set-aside, as required by law, will be

dedicated or pledged to finance these public improvements. In order to realize the project's public improvement development program under the DDA, the Agency Commission and the Board of Supervisors must adopt findings required by California Community Redevelopment Law in order to commit tax increment for the construction of these public facilities and public improvements. These improvements, again, are public infrastructure, the parks and open space, and the necessary transportation facilities that will benefit the redevelopment project areas. It will help eliminate blight and improve the quality of life for existing and future residents. Additional findings are required under California Redevelopment Law when tax increment funds are used for public improvements outside the project area. These findings determine that that investment of the tax increment are of primary benefit to the project area and will assist in the elimination of blight. Funds from Bayview Hunters Point Zone 1, which is the Candlestick Point portion of the project, are proposed to be used for improvements outside the Bayview project area, including: utilities and horizontal infrastructure improvements on the shipyard that are needed to deliver a stadium pad; improvements to address Harney Way and Palou in the heart of existing Bayview; and necessary transportation improvements, including the bus/rapid-transit infrastructure and facilities along Harney Way and Geneva Avenue, improvements to the Bayshore Caltrain station as well as the rebuilding of 101/Harney Way/Geneva Avenue interchange. In addition, the funds from the shipyard project area are proposed to be used for infrastructure and roadway improvements just outside the bounds of the shipyard on Innes and Hunters Point Boulevard. All of these public improvements, both inside and outside the two redevelopment project areas, could not be built without the use of tax increment financing. This development will be built out over the course of 20-plus years. To facilitate that orderly development of the project, we're entering into an interagency cooperation agreement with City departments that provides a process for improvements of subdivisions, public infrastructure, and other City permitting consistent with the project's major phase and subphase development. As Mat Snyder described earlier, the Agency is also entering into a cooperation agreement specifically with the Planning Department to provide for ongoing interdepartmental coordination for horizontal and vertical improvements. In summary, the Agency Commission will consider adopting 15 resolutions today. The first is the adoption of environmental findings for project approvals and implementing actions that we've just described in conformance with CEQA and state CEQA guidelines. The resolution includes the adoption of a mitigation monitoring and reporting program as well as the adoption of a statement of overriding considerations. The balance of the remaining resolutions deal with the permitted land uses and development requirements through the redevelopment plan and related documents; the land assembly and land transfer agreements with the City and the State; the project's disposition and development agreement and related financing and primary benefit findings for use of tax increment; as well as the necessary cooperation agreements with the City. The development of this project has been fundamentally shaped by the hard work and input of the Hunters Point shipyard CAC and the Bayview Hunters Point PAC. The CAC and the PAC, as you heard, overwhelmingly endorsed the project last week. And that endorsement was the product of hundreds and hundreds of volunteer hours in meetings and workshops with the City, the Agency, and the developer. Staff recommends that the CAC and the PAC be commended for their tremendous efforts and we look forward to continuing to consult with them as the project is implemented. At this time I'd like to turn the presentation over to Jon Lau of Supervisor Maxwell's office to address the Commissions.

MR. LAU: Thank you, Mr. President, for the opportunity to speak at these proceedings. And good evening to the Commissioners of both bodies assembled here tonight. I'm Jon Lau with the office of Supervisor Sophie Maxwell, who as you know, represents District 10 in the southeast part of town, the area in which this project is located. I know you're in the midst of a very long session, so I simply want to read a brief statement from the Supervisor and then I'll be out of your way. Her comments are as follows: I want to first thank everybody who has participated in and contributed to the dialogue about this project. That includes Commissioners; staff; and, most importantly, the many community members who have shared their views at hundreds of neighborhood meetings, advisory group sessions, and commission hearings on this topic over the years. Your focus, concerns and hard work have shaped this project over time. And the input both from supporters and those who have opposed has made this a better proposal. We have before us a stronger project because of your efforts. I have pushed hard for the renewal of our southeast waterfront during my ten years in office. But the conversation about how to accomplish this has lasted much longer than that. Since 1974 those of us in the southeast have dreamed and hoped and brainstormed about how to fill a hole that was created in our community. Since that time much has transpired. And by continually fighting for it, we have accomplished much in the way of preparing the shipyard for reuse. And so now it is time to move forward, time to take that next critical step in turning the hopes into reality and to advance what we have already started with the renewal on the shipyard. In the end, this project represents an opportunity -- an opportunity to transform a wounded landscape into something productive and positive for the immediate community and the city as a whole. Throughout a lengthy and rigorous public dialogue about rebuilding the southeast waterfront, we have identified a long list of community needs and objectives. The desires of a broad array of constituents, from open space advocates to labor and the residents of Alice Griffith, have created a very high bar that this project must meet in terms of public benefits. This project represents an opportunity to satisfy many of those needs. I feel that because of the input of the many voices in the process and because we have before us a project that is real and that is deliverable, we can address the vast majority of these multiple community objectives. It is these public benefits that constitute our rate of return -- the City's rate of return on the project. And we expect and demand a very high return on our investment in this project. The affordable housing, the expanded parks, the new jobs, the faster and complete remediation of the shipyard site, and the sustainable development standards are all tangible benefits that we will see and feel and participate in. In closing, Commissioners, the technical tools of redevelopment offered in this project are familiar ones. The use of tax increment financing, Mello-Roos bonds, and developer contracts including agreements with the very same development partner have formed the mechanics of recently approved or pending redevelopment plans in San Francisco, including Mission Bay, Transbay, the Schlage Lock site, and Treasure Island. It is time we put these tools to work in the community that needs their benefits the most. So thank you again, Mr. President, for the opportunity to speak to you tonight.

MR. COHEN: Okay. That is about as fast as we could do it. I apologize that it went on a bit, but there's a lot of ground to cover. And when you're done with the public comment, we'd be happy to answer questions or if you want to ask them now -- either way.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you, Mr. Cohen. Thank you to the other presenters. We will now have public comment. It's 10:40. We will take a break either after public comment or at 11:30,

whichever comes first. My process is different than President Miguel. I ask the Commission secretary to call the cards. By the way, how many cards do we have? MS. SOLIS: Twenty.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Twenty. All right. Here we go. Madam Secretary, the speaker cards, please.

MS. SOLIS: First speaker is Espanola Jackson, followed by Lim Pick Lam. Then Ya Quang Sang. Then Si Yang Li.

ESPANOLA JACKSON: Espanola Jackson. A long evening. I would like to say that -- I started to go home, but when I found out that there was going to be an addendum to what has happened before -- you know, no one talk about the RAB board that was set up by the Navy, the restoration advisory board that made this decision on when the land of that shipyard was to be transferred to the City. Some games have been played, because the RAB did not make any decision because they was overlooked. But I would like to say that Proposition M, when it was passed, it was about the height limit. And I want to make sure that you all stick to the height limit that was voted on. I believe it was '74 or '76. My memory go back a little bit. I want to also say that in 2001 I had made a suggestion to the City and I talked to some of you Commissioners as well about meeting with our legislators, because they was sending \$10 billion a month to Iraq. And I said if they will set aside a one-time \$10 billion, we could clean up that shipyard. But none of those suggestions ever happened. Now, I said this last week. We have been talking about a conceptual plan. A conceptual plan is a dream. And I said I hope when you all wake up from the dream, it really don't bite you too hard. I heard one of the people here mentioning Bayview Hill. I want you all to know -- I don't know why Bayview Hill was mentioned, because it's never been mentioned before. Bayview Hill is a shellmound for the Muwekma Ohlone tribe. Please, don't touch it. Leave it alone. Also, I would like -- I tried to make quick notes here -- oh, Candlestick Point. There has not been any discussion on -- made it earlier about the cleanup. Who is going to clean up Candlestick Point? Because I told you all before that used to be the city dump. It is a very toxic area. And I gave you information about what's there in that land. And it's stated there by EPA that not even children should be going out there to that park. But everybody wants to go out there to Candlestick Point. You know it's sad that people are not aware of what is out in those areas, because they saw it was vacant and they said, Well, it looks good, let's build. So you all need to do something. And the first DDA -- what happened to that?

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you, Ms. Jackson.

ESPANOLA JACKSON: You didn't do nothing. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Please. No public demonstration. Thank you very much. Next speaker. [speaking in Chinese]

INTERPRETER: My name is Laura Chu. I am translating for Mr. Wu Pok Bing. Commissioners, I am the president of -- my name is Wu Pok Bing. I'm the president of San Francisco Chinatown -- I'm the president of San Francisco Chinese Club. I support the project. This is the biggest development ever happened the San Francisco. 10,000 homes, 32-percent affordable housing. We need housing. We need homes. Our living environment is very bad. I

live in Chinatown. The development is good for the Bayview. It's good for San Francisco. I don't own a home, but I hope my children and my grandchildren will have the opportunity of owning a home in San Francisco. That's why I support the project. And please support the project. Thank you.

RICHARD LAU: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Richard Lau. For the last few years from time to time, we heard that San Francisco is losing our population. People, families are moving out of our city. And tonight both commissions passed environmental report. This is the first step to turn this trend around. Once this is also passed by the Board of Supervisors, you will start building houses. You will hire people. And as I say, I see all this dynamic new conception of a community. You have recreation, you have open space, you have trees, you have flowers, and you have many houses. There will be children. And it will revitalize the whole section of Hunters Point. And people are moving in, especially our policemen, firemen, teachers; and we're going to have a happy family. Thank you again for passing the EIR tonight. Thank you.

FLORENCE KONG: Evening, Commissioners. My name is Florence Kong. I am a small business owner in Bayview for about 20 years. The Bayview Hunters Point community and the City have been working together for nearly a decade to plan to revising and development of Hunters Point shipyard. Finally, a project that will deliver much-needed affordable housing and open space, economic development, opportunities, workforce training for more than 10,000 permanent jobs and thousands of ongoing construction jobs, transportation. Improvements to the Bayview Hunters Point community is close to realize. I strongly support the project and asking you to please support our efforts to improve the southeast sector. Currently, the community lacks access to basic necessities, such as full-service grocery store. And this project will provide retail space for grocery store in the neighborhood. It creates new transportation infrastructures. It provides thousands of opportunities. It brings the City more revenue. I have a lot of friends tonight and coworkers. They are attending the hearing, though they finish a long day at work and they have to wake up early in the morning at 4:00 a.m. tomorrow. But they still insist to stay here to support the project, because they know this is a very important project, that they say community that is important to their livelihood also. I'd like to have all them that support this project to stand up. So we really urge the Commission to support the project and thank you very much.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you.

MS. SOLIS: Next speaker is Chan Si Ching. Chi Kin Chan. Grace Martinez. Giselle Casada. Michael Shugawa. Ollie Burgess. Michael Theriault. Tony Rodriguez. Tim Paulson. Richard Lau.

OLLIE BURGESS: Good evening, Commissioner. I am Ollie Burgess. And I am a member of the Bayview Hunters Point project area committee. As a matter of fact, I serve as the vice chair. I am also a member of the Southeast Health Center board and I am a resident for Bayview Hunters Point for approximately 50 years. I am most appreciative and thank each of you for this evening and this day that we've been talking about Bayview Hunters Point and what we can improve to make the quality of life for us who are residing out there better. I want to also say thanks to each of your staff, because they put up with us and we put up with them. But we are

here tonight and we hope that the results will prove it was worth all of our time and all of the meetings that we went to get to this point. Today I started out at a memorial service at 11:00 o'clock. And the text was -- the title of the sermon was "Upward, Onward, and Forward." And here tonight I am saying that we have heard those words tonight. And I strongly hope and request that you approve the amendment to the redevelopment plans, which include the Candlestick Point and the Alice Griffith and all of that. And I want to also -- and the project area. And I want to emphasize that we do want an expansion of the Southeast Health Center, which will include services -- our vision is to include services for the babies up to the oldest within our community. That means including our seniors, our youth, our young adults, our babies, and our children and our teens as well. So, again, I want to thank you for giving us such cooperative staff that put up with us as we put up with them. And I think we'll be happy in the end. Thank you. I request that you pass a vote for these two amendments or three.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you very much.

GISELLE CASADA: Hi. I'm Giselle Casada And I'm a member of ACCE, which is the Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment; and we support the project. This project means a great deal, not just in the sense of the housing but in the jobs that it will create. That is one of the things that will help definitely the community -- jobs and also learning skills for a lot of the young men and women. But, also, I do have an ask. And the ask is that you -- that there be \$20 million for the health center. Currently, the health center, which is at 2401 Keith, is very small and very limited. When it was first -- the concept of that clinic, it was also supposed to allow members from my community -- and I'm from Oceanview in San Francisco - - and yet it is so crowded. Not enough facilities. So this is something that we need. And then, you know, about the housing that's going up, the number of people that will -- this is something that we need in the southeast. When you look at the amount of hospitals that have been closed and when you look at St. Luke's and its limited ability, when you think about what's going to be happening soon with San Francisco General, it leaves us with very little place for us to be able to get medical attention. So I ask that you consider -- \$20 million is what we need for a state-of-the-art medical facility that will service that community of Oceanview and also to be able to make sure that everyone is entitled to be healthy. And, also, there's one more person that is involved in this. When you think about somebody is injured or has a heart attack, it puts two people at risk. One is the person that is basically taken to that hospital and the other is the person who is driving all the way across town to ensure that that person's life gets saved. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you.

GRACE MARTINEZ: Hello. My name is Grace Martinez. I am with ACCE. I've been working with a lot of residents in the Bayview Hunters Point for over six years and a lot of our residents that we have worked with in different capacities are very supportive of this plan. The Bayview Hunters Point has a 40-percent unemployment rate. A lot of the residents in Alice Griffith are living in sub -- just substandard living conditions and they have been for a very long time. And this development opens up those opportunities to live in better housing and for a lot of families who have been out of work for a long time opportunities to work and also buy their own home at some point. However, there are a lot of or residents that we work with also are concerned about just this plan also having a big portion of health and addressing some of

the health needs. For example, the expansion of the Southeast Health Center. As it stands, a lot of residents in the Bayview Hunters Point utilize this center. And with this development, which is -- which our members completely and wholeheartedly support, it will be doubling the population. And if there was -- what we're urging the Planning Commission and Redevelopment Agency Commission to also consider is -- consider an amendment to also address some of the health needs in the community and to figure out a real opportunity for the City and the developer to figure out how they're going to invest in health as well. And they've done so much already and it's wonderful plan. We just need a little bit more. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you.

MICHAEL THERIAULT: Commissioners, Michael Theriault, San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council. No comments this time. There was a few folks from the trades who stuck this out too. And I'd like them to stand up and thank them for persisting. They also have to be up at 4:00, 4:30 in the morning. So this is way late for them. Thank you. After all the ardour and arduousness of the discussion in the prior part of the meeting, I would hope that the relatively technical exchanges that you're looking at in the documents before you here are a straightforward matter. And I'll leave my comments at that. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you very much.

TONY RODRIGUEZ: I guess it's good evening instead of good afternoon, like it was earlier. But anyway my name is Tony Rodriguez. And, sitting here, I was thinking of something that I'd like to share with you. About 20 years ago -- I live in Bernal Heights and belong to the Bernal Heights Community Foundation. And part of the thing that they try is to build affordable housing or affordable rental properties. And there was a piece of property behind the farmers market. It was an empty piece of property. It was usually garbage strewn. And they were trying to build rental affordable housing there. And I remember being a part of the process from the very beginning. We had meetings in the neighborhood. We'd have displays at the farmers market because people started saying, of course, that the farmers market was going to get destroyed or it was going to disrupt the farmers market. And anyway so we went through this long process with all these meetings. And fruition came about. And I think it was a bigger project, but it turned out to be 90 units. But 20 years later, you go by there and you'd never know. You see 94 units. You see people that are living there; and it brought homes to people that really needed it. I'm not comparing Hunters Point to an empty piece of property or dirt or whatever, but the comparison is there. You look at the shipyard and you see what's there. You can see what this project can bring to Hunters Point and to the community there. And it's long overdue. And I think that is just another step of careful planning, careful design for the community. I just pray that you pass this so we can go to the next one. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you very much.

TIM PAULSON: Commissioners, Tim Paulson again with the San Francisco Labor Council. And, again, we represent over 150 unions in San Francisco, hundred thousand men and women and many thousands of them who do live in this district. I want to thank you on behalf of not just the Labor Council, but also our community partners for moving on the EIR. I think that the amount of work that's done -- and I'm looking at the amendments that you're going to

be considering right now to fulfill the DDA, which we hope that you will move today. We see that there's finally -- we are on the edge of having a whole tremendous amount of hope to really move in this district, to do the things that have been so long overdue. Again, I want to reiterate the 35 percent -- if you put all the packages together -- 35-percent affordable and workforce housing. That is the largest set-aside for affordable housing in the history of the United States, when it comes to private development. And I think you guys should be commended for moving forward on that. The jobs that's going to be creating. And I want to be clear on behalf of the Labor Council. We know that there have been difficulties in making sure that local jobs get into some of the projects that are moving there. We are going to be diligent. We know that we have negotiated some millions of dollars from the developer to make sure that there will be workforce development. And we've been told that the City is going to be matching a lot of that money. This is extremely important to us that we get this right. But, anyway, we urge you to move forward with the DDA. We think this is a great project. The amount of hours, the amount of time -- I can't believe you, as Commissioners, how much time it must take you to work on this job, as a side job, to be reading all this stuff. But it's really exciting to see that this is going to be moving forward. And, again, we urge you to pass the DDA today with the amendments so we can move forward. Thank you.

SIMON BARBER: Hi. My name is Simon Barber. I'm here on behalf of the Jamestown Area Neighborhood Association. And, again, I want to raise the issue of building heights. Given the large area that we have, a height limit of 420 or 370 feet -- that's a lot of very tall buildings. And those height buildings could even be constructed right on top of a hill behind Jamestown, where they would already be pretty high up. And that, in my opinion, would put more of a blight on the neighborhood by being right at the top of a hill there. So to have some kind of restriction that doesn't allow such tall buildings, given the amount of space that's available, which I think would be a good thing to have and to maintain the views for people who already have properties to look out over the waterfront.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you.

MS. SOLIS: Florence Kong, Eric Brooks. Karen Winger. Marsha Dale-LaWinter. Jerod Browne.

ERIC BROOKS: Good late evening, Commissioners. Eric Brooks once again, representing the San Francisco Green Party and our city. So just a couple of comments. First of all, since all of these action items are now moving forward if they do, under an EIR that was just approved, that every single environmental and social justice and racial justice group that is not receiving some kind of money from this project is opposed to and says it's completely dangerous and inadequate and bad for the environment, I would strongly urge -- at least all of you that voted against the EIR -- also vote against all of these action items. I'd also appreciate it if -- they probably would not comply -- but if staff could stop dragging up the Prop G issue. Prop G passed because Lennar spent \$5 million in a very PG&E-like maneuver to get people to see glossy mailers that would convince them to vote for it. Deceptive mailers. So let's stop using that spin. Another piece of spin: On the state park land swap, it wasn't an agreement with Sierra Club. I work closely with Sierra Club people. Sierra Club just went along making it less bad. It was not an agreement. And I'd appreciate it if staff wouldn't lay that spin on this either. Now, Commissioners, if you can really hear me out on this next point, because this is

important equally to all of you. One of the proposed items in these plans as they go forward has been repeatedly hyped by the mayor and others. It's called the, quote, United Nations, unquote, global compact. That global compact is a private organization created by 5,000 international global corporations. It is not part of the United Nations. It is a greenwashing mechanism. Some of the members of global compact are Nike, Nestle, and Coca-Cola. This is just a thing -- an imprimatur -- that they used to just cover up their bad practices with a supposed United Nations seal of approval. At Copenhagen, just before the Copenhagen conference, the global compact was part of a business group that pushed on that decision-making process things like nuclear power, clean-coal, carbon trading, and biofuels, all of which are bad for climate change, not good. And if you allow this to become a cornerstone of this project, it will send the worst possible message from San Francisco to the rest of the world about what real climate change action is. So I urge you to set this aside for a separate hearing so that you can get a true vetting of what the global compact is about. And if you go to courtwatch.org and look up global compact, you'll see the truth about this thing. Thanks.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you.

JARON BROWNE: Good evening, Commissioners. I'm Jaron Browne with POWER. And I just want to -- because it's been talked about so much, the 32-percent affordable housing. I think it is important to just bring forward the actual income levels in Bayview. So this is from the core community benefits agreement. If you look, you see that over half of -- I'm sorry -- it's about 13.75 percent of the affordable housing is at levels of 120 percent of AMI to actually 160 percent of AMI. Now, the projections that I got from the San Francisco Office of Housing doesn't go as high as 160 percent of annual median income, but if you're able to look here at the bottom levels, you can see that 120 percent of AMI is an individual making \$80,000 a year. 140 percent of AMI is \$94,000 a year. 150 percent of AMI is \$101,000 a year. And 160 percent of AMI is obviously higher than that. And when we compare the drill-down analysis and the actual income levels, in Bayview -- in Bayview in the 2000 census, the median income is \$43,000 a year. This is significantly below \$80,000, which is the bottom of what they're calling below-market rate, but it's nearly double the income. Now, there is a projection to say projecting forward the drill-down analysis was -- potentially that income has gone up to \$60,000 a year. In the economic crisis, I'm not sure we've actually hit that projected mark and we'll see in the 2010 census, but that's still significantly below. And I think if we actually look at where market-rate housing is, 160 percent of AMI is barely below market rate. But this isn't some massive deeply affordable level of housing. So I just want to put that forward. And the other thing is I do remember during Prop G one of the major messages that came forward is we're not going to use public money, right? We're going to do all this, we're going to build a stadium, we're not going to use public money. But tax increment is, in fact, public money. The problem is the development isn't on a regular audit schedule with the controller's office. And when, in 2006, the Bayview Hunters Point project area was developed, one of the agreements we got in there was regular audits to look at to not have an opaque situation where we don't know where our public money going. And so I think it is important that there's something in here about that money being reported, but we need to look. Are we taking public money to subsidize the stadium when it's desperately needed in other areas of our city right now? Thank you.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you.

ANGELO KING: Angelo King, PAC member, community member. I coach football. I'm in Bayview every day. I go to Super Save. You see me with my kids every day. And I just want to say that I'm chair of the PAC. And this is what happens when people are not here for the full discussion. Things are out of context. The reason why you have a 120 percent of AMI levels like that is because the population that we seem to be losing the quickest is middle-income black folks. I also sit on the Out Migration Committee for African-Americans. And they cannot afford homes at market rate and pay the market rate in subsidized homes. It's absolutely ridiculous. We're competing for their choice to live here with the rest of the Bay Area. And so as a compromise we have put this kind of housing. And if you work at Muni and your wife or significant other is a nurse, you will easily get your butt into 90 to 100 thousand dollars and still will not be able to afford a market-rate home in this community. And those are the people who coach your football teams. Those are the people that teach your kids. And we are losing them because they don't have a place to stay in Bayview. So unless you were here to hear the whole context of the conversation, you miss why we have that in there. I want to say that I want to respect the work what these advisory committees are doing. This list here is about 44 meetings that we've had to go over different elements of DDA, the plan amendments. So when people say, Well, how could you read all of those documents, I said, It was easy. When I started opening up the documents I realized I'd seen all of them, I'm having déjà vu every single time I come here. And it's not only the PAC meetings that I go to; it's all the meetings. I go to the meetings when they're at the environment commission. I go to the meetings when they're at the Redevelopment Commission. I go to the meetings when they're at the Planning Commission. And so do most of my colleagues. So when we get here tonight and people say they're from the PAC or the CAC, trust me, when they say that they want this thing to move forward and they've taken a look at it, it's spot on the money. Last but not least, it's been a long night. There are many things I could say about the plan. We approved the plan amendment, the DDA, and the D for D, and all the other documents that's in the DDA, 14 to 2. And we hope that both the Planning Commission as well as the Redevelopment Commission -- I love you all for your hard work. And I want to thank Michael and his staff, because they have taken the time to answer any question that we've had. I could call any of them at any point in time when I'm reading those documents. I want to thank everybody. Please pass this.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you, Mr. King.

MARCIA DALE-LEWINTER: Commissioners, I'm, again, Marcia Dale-LeWinter. I'm a member of the CAC and chair of the planning development subcommittee. And we have been very much a part of developing this project over the many years and we are in support of it this evening. We urge you. You have a whole basket of items to approve this evening that will move this project forward. And we urge you to take the time. And we thank you for taking the time and effort to move these necessary items forward. I would just like to comment on one of those items, which is the DDA for the shipyard. This is DDA 2, because DDA 1 was the DDA for the first phase; and that was the learning curve. And we made -- as good as it was and as good a job as it was doing of guiding the first phase of development, there were a couple of mistakes made. One of them was that we started out with a discretionary fund that we thought was going to be \$30 million, and it dwindled to zero. That has been changed for the current DDA for the joint project. There will be a discretionary fund and it will not drop to zero. The other thing, of course, we learned from it was that the DDA is a contract. And

contracts by their very nature, particularly over time, get to be changed. So change will be a part of this project for many years to come. That's not a bad thing. That's a good thing. When many of the smaller items that people think have not met their criteria or what they believe should be included today, can and will be addressed again and again. Believe me, everything that is a part of this project today has been addressed again and again many times. So we urge you to simply accept this as a good point in time for the process to move it forward. And we thank you for your time.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you very much.

AL NORMAN: Al Norman, Bayview Merchants Association. I want to thank all of you this evening for passing this EIR so we can go ahead and go forward, especially this Redevelopment Agency. And I want to pay homage to a couple of fellows who are not with us in this life right now -- Mr. Will Bass and Mr. Alex Pitcher. And Mr. Will Bass and Mr. Alex Pitcher and Aurelius Walker was the reason they came to the Redevelopment Agency and asked, Could you come to Bayview? We don't have nothing in Bayview Hunters Point that's an economic vehicle for us to try to put these kids to work and stop them from running around here and killing each other because they don't have any hope. I talked to you about the hope before. I talked to you about the hope that these kids that we were able to go around and persuade to slow things down and to put those guns down and to stop thinking, because redevelopment and Lennar and all the things that this project gives forward gives them that hope. We can't let them lose that hope. We can't let them go back to what they were doing. The drugs tried to kill all of us out there and it didn't work. We battled that. We still suffer from some of that whole little drug episode. That was an epidemic throughout San Francisco, not just Bayview Hunters Point. But we, as older adults, got with our young people and talked to them. It wasn't the police. It's that we're still talking to them. We still have random violence throughout Bayview Hunters Point, but it's not like it was, because we were able to go out and talk to these young people -- some young people that you never see that do all of those type of bad things that you never want to see. But we were able to talk to them and talk about this project and talk about the redevelopment, why we got redevelopment here, why we got Lennar project here. So we can provide them some training. Go to school. Get some training. Get a job. It might not be what you think you should make, but at least you'll be able to feed your family. And a whole bunch of them bought into it because we had other people like Dwayne Jones from the Mayor's Office and other people throughout the neighborhood work with all these folks. So don't -- let's keep this project moving, like at the pace you're having tonight, to keep these people with the hope that they need to be forward. That \$17 million between the city and Lennar won't help anything if you people did not keep moving things along like you are. So we're depending on y'all to be able to provide everything necessary for us to make the southeast section of San Francisco a better place to live, not just for black people and not just for white people, not just for Asian, but for everybody, you know. That's all a part of our whole program -- we not only want to make it perfect and provide jobs -- and she talking about the IMA and all that. Well, we know a whole bunch of folks in Bayview can't afford that housing, but --

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you, Mr. Norman.

AL NORMAN: Thank you.

PASTOR JOSIAH BELL: Good evening, Commissioners. Pastor Josiah Bell again. I'm a member of the CAC and the chair of the housing subcommittee. And one of the things that just positively amazed me that when I come to these meetings, all of these people that get up and they voice their opinion; and all of these community meetings that we hold, there's no one there. And I had a particular incident I'd like to share with you. There was a comment about the housing, the way it looked. It looked so spare and, you know, we didn't get a chance. So I'm the chair of the housing subcommittee; and I said, You're lying. We advertise every day for you to come to these meetings. I've got on the radio and told you where the meetings were. And so, since no one showed up, we on the committee had to make a decision. And we made the decision. I want to say that I am very proud of being up here this afternoon and working with these people -- Fred Blackwell from Redevelopment. They know I'm not a patsy or pushover. I've jumped him and Michael Cohen, Kofi Bonner. They all know me. I don't take just a simple answer. I have a degree and I know how to ask intelligent questions. So I resent people coming up here just out of nowhere. I never see them at a meeting and implying that we have ignorant people that are just sitting there drinking Kool-Aid and eating popcorn. We're not doing that. We are very, very studious. We're very aware of what has transpired in the past with the Redevelopment Agency. And at some point in time we reached the decision that, look, we got to go on. We got to move on. The past is the past. Okay, they made mistakes in the past. Let's not let those things happen. Let's be vigilant. And that has been the cry of our committee, the CAC. We have been vigilant. We've had extensive study, people come in and talk to us about all of these documents. Yes, it's a lot of material to read. But I guarantee you this: I'm not going to sit there ignorantly and not read it, because I don't want the same thing that happened in the Fillmore to happen all over again. So I want thank you in advance for pushing this project forward. We need it. San Francisco needs it. Bayview Hunters Point needs it. And you need it, as our elected officials. And I want to say this one last thing. Prop G is the American way of politics. I heard somebody get up and rag on Prop G. Well, if you wanted it stopped, you had the same opportunity to fight against it as the people had to promote it. So thank you very much.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Thank you, Commissioners. It's almost about 11:30. And thank you again for honoring the CAC and the PAC. We also want to extend our gratitude to your staff -- I'm looking at the director of the Planning Commission -- the Planning Staff; Mr. Blackwell, your staff; Mr. Michael Cohen, your staff. But I need to put a word in for Mr. Kofi Bonner. We know what this man -- intelligent -- has done for the city of Emeryville. He developed an area that is even larger than the shipyard. He's brought those expertise to San Francisco. We thank you and we thank your staff for your due diligence for the expertise. Someone mentioned about Bayview Hunters Point and what are we going to do. But I want to support Commissioner Covington. If there's anything we need to derive from tonight's hearing, please no eminent domain. Some people were knocking on the doors of people in Hunters Point and actually giving them misinformation that the whole committee was going to be eminent domain. I'm glad, Commissioner, you stressed that tonight. There is no eminent domain. Commissioner London Breed mentioned about the community benefits. One of the things that we have done in Bayview Hunters Point and it took us 13 years to produce a concept or plan. Stan Muraoka is here. And most of his staff from Redevelopment Agency. 13 years to produce a concept plan. We have created a node for the aging campus. We want to make sure that the benefits that come to the development that we can make decision to help to

rebuild it of the aging campus so that our seniors -- they were here tonight. They've been at every meeting. Some of them are not going to live to see what is going on. But at least a majority of the seniors in Bayview Hunters Point Bayview will have a place to go to. One of the other projects that we also are looking at is the rebuilding of the Southeast Health Center. Any community benefits. And we are pledging -- the PAC is -- on our priority. We are going to make sure that the money we get is earmarked to that. And so we are committed to that. That's why it's taking us about 13 years to get even up to this point. And I also need to stress that Area C is separate from the shipyard. Your staff, redevelopment agency, the Planning staff, the Mayor's Office of Economic Development are also the players that are also going to make sure that Area C, the feasibility studies, the community benefits, the infrastructure are going to be in place. So, in closing, please, thank you very much for you being with us. The people of Bayview Hunters Point needs to be a San Francisco family. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you.

DR. VERONICA HUNNICUTT: My name is Dr. Veronica Hunnicutt. And I'm the chair of the CAC for the shipyard. Good evening, Commissioners. You know, what's nice about the work that we're doing out at the -- in terms of the CAC is that we enjoy what we do. We are dedicated to this project and you can see that as manifested by the other CAC members who came up here. We're not only passionate about this project, but we're also compassionate and truly trying to represent the members of our community. We firmly believe in this project, so much so that we approved both the DDA and the amendments at our May meeting without -- you know -- almost unanimous. So, therefore, we urge you to continue moving all of this forward. Pass this DDA. Pass the other amendments without delay. And I, too, would be remiss if I did not thank Fred Blackwell, Kofi Bonner, and Michael Cohen, because these gentlemen have more than earned their paychecks three or four times over, because we have called them on numerous occasions to make this information plain to us. So thank you very much and just move this forward.

PRESIDENT SWIG: I'm going to take one more speaker and then I'll call for a recess.

KATHY DAVIS: Hi. Kathy Davis. I'm with Bayview Hunters Point Multipurpose Senior Services. And two points I just want to bring in this whole process of what we've been talking about. And the first one is the community outreach. It's going to be really important with everything that gets built that we do the level of community outreach that it really takes. Armstrong Senior Housing is built and ready to go. And many, many people drive past it and still don't know it's available. So when these things get created, we got to make sure that the community's involved in it. The second thing I want to bring out is aging in place. In all of this huge expanse of ten thousand pieces of homes, we want to make sure that when you're 40 you can buy your home; and you can live there when you're 70 and 80. And if you need to go into another level of care and you need a little more support, you can still stay in your community. And I was very pleased, actually, to see how even in the initial stages of the planning process how this housing is set up so that people can age in place, walk around their neighborhood, be able to get on a ground-level floor. That kind of housing is going to be very, very important as San Francisco ages in place. So I just want to bring up that point. I want to bring up the point that that's being taken into consideration and that they really have -- the whole -- the Redevelopment Agency, Lennar -- everybody has been listening to the

community. We've had our say and we keep having our say. And this is just the beginning. I mean this is a milestone. And if you pass this tonight, we can celebrate for a hot minute. But then we got a lot of work to do to make sure this happens. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you. I'm sorry for the inconvenience, but it's 11:30 and, as promised, I'm going to call for a recess so.

MARIE J. FRANKLIN: Are you calling a recess in my face?

PRESIDENT SWIG: Yes, ma'am, I am, as noticed. I'm very sorry. I'll ask you to wait about 15 minutes.

MARIE J. FRANKLIN: I know. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you.

[Break from 11:29 to 11:50 p.m.]

PRESIDENT SWIG: All right. Thank you for your consideration of that break -- parking, bio, et cetera. I've been advised that street cleaning starts at 2:00 a.m. So our next break is at 2:00 a.m. unless anybody wants to not be around at 2:00 a.m. to have that break. So can we continue public comment? And once again, I appreciate your patience, because I know you were already to go, but we're ready to go now. Thank you.

MARIE J. FRANKLIN: Thank you to the Commissioners. My name is Marie J. Franklin. And I'm a long-time resident of the Bayview Hunters Point. I actually was involved with the first PAC, which is the joint housing committee. So that's why. And, also, we were involved in organizing the current PAC along with Martha Simmons, et cetera. The CDC, who did the study for the shipyard -- Carl Strickland who's supposed to do a musical instructional college out there, Mr. Bonner. So I also -- I am the chair person for the shared environmental justice, CEO, organized five organizations. We were active in the area -- the project area, the one before here. But I want to say is that the City has invested money in respect to the environment of the Bayview Hunters Point, in that our organizations were responsible for finding methods by which we would provide clean indoor air. During that research, we learned that there are methods by which we may be able to utilize this time by if we are going to build on land that has been highly polluted and toxic, as it is, then I stand for the residents who are yet to come. And I would like to propose that -- add this amendment to the list that you already mentioned: That each home, each building that is constructed there on the shipyard will be absolutely indoor, safe, clean air. There needs to be not only air conditioning, but we need air purification. There are other methods by which I have learned through the research funded by both the federal and the city environmental groups. I will be happy to share them with you. But I will just say to you right now that I do plan on pursuing this method, that every house, every structure that's built on the hill will need to be ensured against improper air toxics, et cetera. So there is something that we need to look forward to. I'll be happy to talk with you about that, but I intend to take the message to my community. We can't afford to end up like Louisiana with the oil rig. So why don't we just prepare ourselves?

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you very much.

NYESE JOSHUA: Thank you. Nyese Joshua, for the record. I do want to say I've only been involved for the last four years, when I got knee deep in Proposition F, where we spent less than probably a couple of thousand dollars and ended up with something like 44,000 signatures and we got like 11,000 signatures in maybe eight days and in the rain, so to me that's a faith walk. And that's when I got solidified in this fight on this side of the fight. And what I've been seeing over the years is -- and what I'm wondering, what I'm learning is -- when did Redevelopment become Jesus? Because Redevelopment seems to become the ultimate savior for Bayview Hunters Point; and I am in complete disagreement with that. I've also seen principles represented in this ballot. You have Judas, the betrayer; you have Noah and Ezekiel, the warners; and you have Jesus, who came before his time. And he said -- he used the term money-changers in his time. So today political whores, money-changers, you know -- just depends on what time you're living in. Another thing, the irony of the shipyard is that if it weren't toxic, there would be no black people in Bayview right now anyway. It would have been gentrified a long time ago, just like the Fillmore. And that's a fact and we know that. So what we have here today is just a global trend to just go ahead and build on toxic land and hope for the best. But just as the Gulf has spoken up for herself, so will the shipyard. And our lying eyes will finally tell their truth. But it just takes time for these things to reveal themselves, even though the legacy fund has revealed itself, as it has completely disappeared. Now, I know that it's not a Lennar project, but if you go up to West Point and Middle Point you will see a desolate hill forming there as well; and those people had a lot of promises made. Another thing: I really don't understand why there aren't jobs currently in the Bayview, because there's a ton of construction. You've got Lowe's coming up in a minute. So to me the problems -- and then I also remember, being in Bayview since '78, I remember a peaceful Bayview. I remember a safe Bayview. So what happened? When people are stripped of resources, that's when you begin to deal with blight. So when you're talking about increasing tax increment limits, what is that going to do? That's going to take more tax dollars away from other places that those tax dollars should be going to. I would love for this committee to send out just a postcard to every Bayview homeowner and say to them, we are voting -- or we have voted on raising your tax increment limits and really explaining to people that that comes from their property taxes and then see how many more people would show up to these meetings if they really understood. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you.

TONY KELLY: Hello, Commissioners. Tony Kelly, Potrero Hill Democratic Club. I'm going to speak about one specific thing. And I know it's late. This is the statement of overriding considerations. It's Item 2 that you're considering, because once again after decades of broken promises that document once again trades, cut admitted health impacts for the promises of jobs. In the EIR you just accepted the City admits four dozen or so environmental impact report impacts that they can't mitigate. This isn't even debatable. These are in the EIR you just certified. But then with the statement of overriding considerations, you claim that the condos and jobs make it all okay. I would suggest that that's a bad policy decision on its own, but especially given the City's history on these kinds of promises. It's really arguable that we're not going to see these benefits. So just take a look briefly at the list of presumed overriding considerations. The housing programs -- all the specific contributions. I mentioned

this before in my last public comment. Those are all funded by the City through property tax increment money and the tools of redevelopment. That's our money. And those benefits are not unique to this project. You can build condos anywhere else in Bayview. You can do other projects and you wouldn't have the environmental impacts admitted in the EIR. And that's specifically on the jobs. I think we all know that these hallways in this building are littered with the wreckage of previous promises of jobs used to justify development contracts. Not even discussing Lennar and their history of promises or Redevelopment and their history of promises, let's just look at the Office of Economic and Workforce Development. I think we're all familiar with the Third Street rail and the promises of jobs. I think we're all familiar with Solar City and their promised workforce training program. That's just two examples. I know, because I've worked with them, the Mayor's Office has worked steadily for the last year on backtracking and rolling back promised developer contributions in the eastern neighborhoods and other plan areas, including the reduction of affordable housing units. Now, why won't -- why do you think that won't happen here? I would suggest it is happening here already, because that's what's behind SB 792, the addition of state park land to this project. I would say that's what's behind early transfer and the capping not cleaning. Or, for that matter, the DDA, where they don't have to come back to you every single time as much as before. If you think we're done cutting corners to make development easier for this project, you do not know how this Mayor's office does business. So on the one hand you've got definite, admitted environmental and community health impacts that you've already admitted in the EIR and rather vaporous promises of jobs and community benefits that are almost certain to be rolled back in future years. If you really look at that honestly, it would lead you to reject this statement of overriding considerations in Item 2. Thank you.

CHRISTINE ANIA: I think I'm the last comment of the evening before we switch to tomorrow. My name is Christine Ania. I have served on the Bayview Project Area Committee for several years; also on the shipyard restoration advisory board for several years. I chaired the Indian Basin Neighborhood Association. I'm here to endorse this project, despite some of the very negative consequences for my neighborhood. I believe that on balance it's good for the community. I thank you for the break, because four of my six comments were addressed. So I will say just briefly to repeat what I did earlier that you make a condition of your approval of these documents that we find funding to build out Hudson Avenue to address the transportation problems caused by the development in the shipyard. Please remember that in addition to the 10,000 units that you're approving now, there are up to 1,600 units in Phase 1 of development and potentially another 1,400 if the non-stadium argumentative is chosen but includes housing. So that's 13,000 homes. To reach those homes from the north side of the shipyard you will have to take Innes Avenue. I believe there's funding identified to build out Hudson. It doesn't even necessarily have to come from this project, but please make that commitment to build out Hudson Avenue to solve some of these transit problems. And the second is a question that I wasn't able to confirm during break. And that is to ensure that there is some protection that tax increment from the larger project area of the shipyard Candlestick project is not used to fund the stadium. I believe there are some protections in place and that staff can address this, but I just needed to get confirmation. That's something I haven't been able to confirm yet. Thank you.

HEARING OFFICER: Thank you.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you.

SAUL BLOOM: Commissioners, my name is Saul Bloom. 14 years I served on the Hunters Point CAC. In fact, Mayor Agnos and deputy mayor at that time Claude Everhardt and I helped conceptualize that committee. And you've heard Michael Cohen speak to Sophie Maxwell's committee of environmental justice groups that helped shape the conveyance agreement. I chaired that committee. Jesse Mason, who you've referred to earlier is an employee of my organization, Arc Ecology. And I want to thank Michael for the kind words about Jesse, just to acknowledge him right now in his time -- in his fateful time, as it were. Angelo King mentioned that when he comes to these meetings he's in a state of déjà vu, because all of the meetings he's attended. Well, imagine the view of somebody who started coming to these meetings when Angelo was 10 years old. No one wants this issue to move forward more than I do. I just want it done right. And I want to talk about two issues that I have some concerns about. The first is the reversionary rights. This is, from our perspective, the nuclear option with regard to enforcement of the disposition and development agreement, the agreement with Lennar. And while it looks good on paper, we don't think it's useable in practice. We think that what will happen is that, as this project changes and develops over time, modifications will be made. And what we are more in favor of is a strategy of a moderated approach, one that focuses on measurable enforcements through liquidated damages. Finally, I must correct the misstatement that was made earlier by one of the Commissioners with regard to the route around Yosemite Slough involving eminent domain. My staff designed that route around. There is no eminent domain, no taking of personal or public property in that design. It was designed specifically in reference to our coordination with members of the CAC and PAC about that issue to provide an affirmative way to address the concerns arising from the desire to have a bridge and the desire of the environmental community not to impact the habitats and biology of that area. It was a compromise strategy that was developed by us to attempt to accommodate and move this project forward. So thank you for your time and I appreciate the opportunity tonight.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you, Mr. Bloom.

JASON FREMYOU: I had to scratch my first words, which was good evening. Now it's good morning. Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Jason Fremyou. My wife and I are residents of Bayview Hunters Point and I'm a member of the Bayview Hunters Point project area committee. However, tonight my remarks are my own. As you already heard my voice and the voice of ten of my PAC colleagues who voted last week to endorse the DDA and the Bayview Hunters Point plan amendments. I just want to make two brief statements. The first is to pass the motion tonight to give our community the opportunity and the tools to bring about the changes that inspired me two years ago to join the PAC. When I saw the commitment of those who have -- many of whom you have heard from tonight who had brought this project to this point -- and I remember telling my wife at that point I'm joining the PAC. I want to commit whatever skills and abilities I have to this work because we're at a pivotal moment in this project. That was two years ago. I admit my naivete. I thought we were closer. So two years later here we are. And it's a very proud night in that respect. So I encourage you to pass this tonight to give us the tools. The second comment is this -- exercise the same vigilance that you have exercised tonight hearing these matters before you at every phase along the way. As many speakers before me have said, this is just the beginning. And so I would just encourage

you as this project moves forward to exercise the vigilance, to ask the tough questions, as we try to do at the PAC, to make sure that all -- again the aspirations of our community that are embedded in this project are realized. Thank you very much.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you.

TIM COLON: Good morning, Commissioners. Tim Colon on behalf of the San Francisco Housing Action Coalition. And the first thing I'd like to say is to express my deep and abiding gratitude to the Commissions for adopting the EIR tonight. It was a long time coming. And at the same the appreciation for the stamina, the dedication, the professionalism of the departments that brought it to this point. We've seen them many, many times. And after 35 years since the base closed and -- what -- going on a dozen years of planning, here we are. The planning was necessary to -- it was useful and it made the project better. It was better for San Francisco that this 12-year planning process went on. But we would do well to remember that the objective is not the planning. The objective is to build something in this part of town. And I think that, as you've heard before, this is the starting point. This will before you again and it success will stand or fall on the degree to which the agencies cooperate. It's brought before public bodies; the tough questions are asked. You're close to making history tonight. Please adopt the action items before you. Finish the job. You're getting close. Don't let up now. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you.

SUE HESTOR: Sue Hestor. I have comments in basically two areas. One is the first issue, which is the CEQA findings and all of the overriding considerations. I ask those of you who are used to doing this -- this is Planning Commission -- to really look at these findings. There are no impacts except transportation and noise impacts in the EIR, according to these findings. There's no impacts on open space. There's no impacts on Candlestick Point Park. There's no impacts on Yosemite Slough. There's no impacts, even though it comes through in the letter from BCDC, of resources that deal with the Bay. So you have overriding creditors that have lots of things talking about transit impacts -- pardon me -- transportation impacts, traffic impacts. It's really scary to think that people are that myopic about natural areas along the waterfront. The second thing is I think one of the things you should clarify -- Planning Commissioners -- again, Redevelopment is in a different shoe -- is what are the entry points in the future? Is this a 20 years and you don't see it anymore issue? If it is, this better be perfect. You better have a totally -- totally clear understanding of energy standards. You better have a totally clear understanding of sea level rise, because you won't see it in 20 years. The people won't see it. It'll be at the Redevelopments hands. So you need to find out from your staff when do you have any view -- any view at all -- of this project again. Is it basically after your grandchildren have graduated from high school or college? How long? Because this is not -- and this is directed to Commissioner Borden. This is not the eastern neighborhoods. This is 20 years of abandonment. You did not abandon the eastern neighborhood from project review. You did not abandon -- you've done eastern neighborhoods projects two weeks in a row -- big ones. You were looking at the eastern neighborhoods in Market Octavia when you did 555 Fulton and you did 900 Folsom. It helps you think again about whether they're good, because you have cases before you. This is no more. You don't see it. So you have to pay close attention to is this really the best it can be in terms of analysis. But I'd also like to second

Saul's comment about the nuclear option. A nuclear option is no option. The only option for enforcement is liquidated damages with cash on the line, because no one sets off a nuclear bomb, including the Redevelopment Agency, the Mayor's Office, the City. It doesn't happen. Politics don't allow it. The way to get people's attention is money on the table. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you very much.

MANNY FLOREZ: Thank you, President -- boy, I'm tired. Commissioners, I want to applaud you all for a job well done, for your time and energy. Staff, Mr. Blackwell, Mr. Snyder, Mr. Evans, Kofi, everybody here, job well done tonight. You guys are great, seriously. And with that, I move for approval and I call for the question and thank you very much.

PRESIDENT SWIG: We'll try to go there. Is there -- we have no more cards. Is there anybody else in the audiences who wishes to address either commission at this point. Please step to the mike. Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: Good morning, President Swig and President Miguel and Commissioners on both sides of the Chair. I'd like to just say thank you for passing the EIR. And I'll tell you why I think this project has to go through. I don't know of any other project where the community can come together, you can change the lives of people, of families, where someone can actually go to work in their community and afford to purchase a home in their community. That just does not happen. It doesn't happen anywhere else in San Francisco. And I just want to be brief and say please let's get this thing passed. Let's get to work. And let's help families out. Help the residents of San Francisco out. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else in the audience wishing to address the commissions at this point? Hearing no one and seeing no one -- yes, I do see one.

MARTINEZ PELOSA: Martinez Pelosa, piledriver. Local 34. I'm working with the carpenters' union over here, Local 22. And I was for two weeks outside this beautiful City Hall. You probably got my handbills. I work for the workers and I represent better living for the community. And I'm going to give you something that nobody give you before probably -- my cellphone number. And if you guys got kids that needs work, you know, we've been promising jobs. Well, there is no jobs. And these projects will create jobs. And if your kids wants to become good union members, I'm open to give you my telephone number. Thank you.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you very much. Once again, is there anybody in the audience wishing to address either commission on this item? I'm seeing nobody or hearing nobody. And with that, I'll close public comment and turn to both sets of Commissioners for their comments. Remember this is a joint comment period, so press your buttons at will, regardless of commission, if you wish to speak. And I'll start with Commissioner Antonini, please.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Thank you. I just had a couple of questions. I know the hour is late. Perhaps Mr. Cohen can address these. And the first is -- a question was raised buy a commenter and it has to do with the oversight of the Planning Commission in the future. And my understanding that it is no less than what we have in situations like Mission Bay. Of

course, we have design review, we have office allocation. We might also have approval powers over some of the vertical developments. Perhaps you can elaborate a little bit on that.

MR. COHEN: Yeah. I think it is accurate to say that what's being proposed here is consistent with not only with what's been done recently -- not so recently maybe with Mission Bay -- but Schlage Lock, Transbay Zone 1, what is being contemplated for Treasure Island for comparable examples. What it really involves is fundamentally the implementation of the project under the redevelopment plan as a jurisdiction of the Redevelopment Agency. Primary function for the Planning Commission is approving the design guidelines, the redevelopment plan, obviously any amendments to the design guidelines. Redevelopment plans come back. But that cooperation agreement, which was described earlier, requires that the planning director and the planning staff have a very active role, including at major phase approvals. And past practice and what we would expect future practice to be that the planning director would exercise his expression and bring those items to the Commission for comment.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Thank you. And I guess my other question, while you're here, is just on the tax increment. I think there was a little bit of misunderstanding, because that doesn't affect places except the new construction. The tax from what is new it goes to tax increment. It doesn't go to existing. And my understanding is that absolutely none of that goes to the stadium. It would go to the infrastructure. The stadium is funded by a hundred million from the developer at least and not from the tax increment.

MR. COHEN: Well, thank you for giving me the opportunity to clarify that, because you're entirely right. No one's taxes anywhere in San Francisco are going to go up to pay for this project. The way tax increment financing works is right now, because this property has been abandoned for so long, it actually doesn't generate any taxes. And so the new development and homeowners will pay regular taxes, but those -- a portion, it's actually about 60 percent of the net new taxes -- go back into the project, because without the investment, as Tiffany presented earlier, you'd have no project at all. And for that reason, the fiscal watchdogs in San Francisco and the Controller's office and the budget office have never had a problem with this type of tax increment financing, because it is the classic but-for financing. But for the project, there's no property taxes to talk about. And so it's the reinvestment of the taxes that the tax increment itself creates. That is what makes the tax increment work. That's why it's the most powerful tool under California redevelopment law. And no one's taxes go up as a result.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Yes. And I think the only other thing on this was that I did hear that there would be provisions which only make sense that some of the tax increment funding could be used for related infrastructure outside some of the areas, such as Harney Way or perhaps it was brought up, even though it's a different zone, the Hudson situation. But that would come later in India Basin.

MR. COHEN: Yeah. It's one of on the long list of public benefits that we talk about that reach outside of the boundaries of the project. There's about \$67 million in transportation improvements which are offsite to improve streets, to improve streetscapes, to improve signalization, transit, et cetera.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Thank you very much, Mr. Cohen. And thank you also for your very clear statement at the very beginning that talked about the four concerns, because

that was one of the best encapsulations of what we have been hearing for a long time. And I thought it really answered a lot of the concerns that people had. Thank you. I just had a couple of other comments. And that's I really appreciate the remarks of Angelo King in regards to the opportunity that this presents for middle-class housing. I've been on the Commission eight years and it's been a constant problem; and that is we're not providing affordable middle-class housing. And that is a situation I've seen on a personal level, because I've been in dental practice 38 years and many of my patients who used to live in San Francisco don't anymore. And -- and many are African-American and of all ethnic persuasions, but they would love to live here, but they're in other places because they want to buy homes. They've bought homes. They can't buy homes here. And this is exactly the type of situation that will allow this to happen in the future. And the other part of it is that we have the to realize that there will be a certain amount of market-rate housing also, because last time I looked dollar bills weren't falling from the sky. And for one of these things to work, there have to be people who will buy homes; and the money from this and from other developments will help us to fund the entire project. And that only makes sense and it sounds like a wonderful concept and one that's been used successfully in many places. So I'm very proud to be a San Franciscan tonight. I think this is historical in these beautiful chambers. People still here after 11 hours. Maybe I've added an hour, but it's around that amount -- 10 to 11, anyway. And that's wonderful. And I won't go over all the parts of the plan that have been talked about many times. And I have -- hard to believe that somebody would actually be in opposition to this plan, because it is too well structured and so well done.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you, Commissioner. 11 hours and 19 minutes -- 20 minutes, to be exact.
Commissioner Bustos.

COMMISSIONER BUSTOS: Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to first of all thank everybody who has been up here, not only today but over the last several years of trying to make this work. It's a tribute to the City staff when members of the public get up and say, hey, we worked really with you, even if at times where people didn't get along. But we can agree to disagree, and as a civil society come together on items that are really, really important to all of us. And so they say a journey of a thousand miles begins with one step. And I think today -- and I'm hoping today that we do two steps towards that journey of finally making this area a place that people could be proud of. In looking at the notes of all the speakers, I think everybody is grateful that there has been a lot of discussion, a lot of debate, and a lot of compromise to get to a point where we can now finally begin to move. So, Mr. President, it's my great honor as a San Franciscan to move that we approve the findings, directives, and amendments that are before us. PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you very much. Commissioner Breed.

COMMISSIONER BREED: Thank you. Just a couple of quick questions and I don't think that I'm looking for the answer this evening. But I'd like to hear more about the health center that was mentioned, the interest in providing a health center. And I also -- which I stressed in the past in terms of community outreach in the future, would like that to be a focal point of discussion, as well as the plans for the hospital -- the children's hospital and the cancer hospital that's planned for Mission Bay. So I want there to be a thorough discussion around -- around opportunities in the Bayview for this health center. And I apologize. I'm mumbling my

words. Late in the evening. But so I'd like to see further discussion on that issue. One other thing that I also want to mention is I'm really excited about the opportunity to move this forward. I want us to continue the dialogue. I want us to continue the conversations with the residents who were impacted by this the most. And, specifically, one of the conversations that I also had was with the director of the housing authority, who assured me that he would be very proactive in working with the residents of Alice Griffith to make sure that they are all ready for this transition. And I think not only has he stepped up to the plate, but the fact that we have Redevelopment, Planning, Mayor's Office of Workforce and Economics Development, and all of these different City departments coming together to not only go above and beyond around outreach, around meeting with members of the community on a consistent base. I mean all these things makes for a design of a great project. And I'm really happy to be a part of this project. And I want us to continue to go above and beyond as it relates to communicating everything that we're doing and constantly receiving community input. I've listen to the community input today, both the positive and the negative, and really have taken that into consideration. But it is so different when you are in the community when you have family -- I'm a native too and I have family members who live in these areas. I have friends who live in these areas. I have friends who are raising children. I just went to my niece's graduation today earlier in this neighborhood. And I want the best for the people who currently live there. I want the best for the people who are going to live there. And there is no way in heck that as a Commissioner would dare put somebody's health in jeopardy above -- put something else above somebody's health. The jobs will come and go, but a person's life is invaluable. And we all understand that. We don't serve the city just because we want to be on a commission and we want to read all these materials and sit in all these long meetings. We believe in what we doing as commissioner and we believe in people, more importantly. And so as far as I'm concerned, I think this is a step in the right direction. And it's an investment in the future of this community. And I want to make sure that we don't forget the people of the Bayview Hunters Point, who have been there their entire lives. I don't want them to get shut out of the job opportunities. I don't want them to get shut out of housing opportunities. And we will do everything that we can to ensure that this cleanup is done. And, finally, let me say that I want to also thank labor for their willingness to basically roll up their sleeves and work with members of community and understand that there's a level of frustration in the community of people who are not necessarily involved in the trades but are watching others work in their communities; and wanting to be involved in labor has opened the door for that opportunity. And we're all working together. And the big key word in moving this project forward is collaboration. We all have to work together to make this better for San Francisco and for our future generations. So I'll second this and I'm really excited about this. And thank you all for coming. Thank you all for hanging in there and I want the thank the Commissioners of Planning and Redevelopment. And, more importantly, I want to thank the staff who has gone above and beyond and worked on this project for so many years. And, especially, Michael Cohen, who has been not only involved in this project, but the work he's done on Treasure Island. He's been so committed to this city. So I just wanted to say that and thank you and I second it. Thanks.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you, Commissioner Breed. Commissioner Moore.

MS. AVERY: Commissioners, President Swig, before Planning Commissioners start their deliberations, let me just make an announcement. Your commission has already made a

motion and seconded. And it's my understanding that the Planning Commission has to take their actions prior to your commission taking theirs. And I just want to put that on the table.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Yep. Understood and duly noted. Commissioner Moore.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Sure.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Oh. Sorry. Shared mike.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Like I said before. I have a procedural question for the Planning Commission. Are we going to make one motion on all items on the list or are we going to take them separately?

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: I have to entertain whatever motion is made.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Well, here's my issue. I'm going to vote against two of the items on here and I'm going to vote for the rest of them. If we take them all at once, I'm going to be forced to vote against the entire motion.

MS. AVERY: Then, Commissioners, I would actually recommend that you take your items independently -- I mean separately.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Let me explain why. Because of my opposition on the environmental report, I don't think that I can vote on the CEQA findings, which I think are still flawed. The way the CEQA -- the way the language is set forth, it says we found that the FEIR was adequate, accurate, and objective. Because of my position, I don't think I can make that finding. It's also bolstered by the fact that in the materials we received in our packet with respect to this item, there's a projection of \$400 million that was made by CB Richard Ellis with respect to the rehabilitation costs associated with the preservation alternative. I don't doubt that number. I'm not an economist and not a real estate person. So if we use that number, my problem is that later on it says, At best federal tax credits, et cetera, would total about \$28 million. That's less than 10 percent of the 400 million. The historic preservation tax credit alone is worth 20 percent of rehabilitation costs, which puts the figure at 80 million, not 28. So that analysis, I believe, is flawed. It's a little thing, but it's an indication to me that some of the numbers being used in here are not correct. Secondly, on a motion to find the Planning Code Section 101 findings, there's a statement that, Thus the project would not adversely affect the preservation of landmarks and historic buildings. I don't believe that finding is true. So on the motion for Section 101 and for the findings on CEQA are the ones that I'm objecting to.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Any other comments, sir?

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: If you want to take all the rest of them, that's fine with me. If you want to separate it out, those two -- whatever you want to do. But that's my position at the moment. PRESIDENT MIGUEL: You can make a motion on the other.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: I'm not going to make a motion to deny it. That happened to me the last time and I was burned terribly, so I remember my Roberts rules here.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Okay. Thank you very much. Commissioner Borden.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Okay. So we've had many hearings over the last month, month and a half on this plan. And I think, just as in those hearings, we found that there aren't major issues with the plan. They're obviously things to be quibbled with and there are opportunities to fix and refine the plan; and I know that that will happen, just as we've seen with Mission Bay and with other projects. And I do ask the planning director that he, when there are changes, bring those projects back to us for review. And I know that we'll be interested because of the larger developments as they're coming forward to look at those. So I just want to put that out there for the planning director since you're going to be working with Redevelopment on the plan issues. I'm so glad to hear the clarification on the tax increment financing. I think that's important. The issue of the health center. Obviously, this plan is going to further refined, but I would state my support for rebuilding the Southeast Health Center as well. I think that a lot of the transportation things will be coming to fruition through the transportation plan, so I know that there will be input from the Redevelopment Commission as well as from the MTA, I would imagine, on the transportation plan. I imagine we'll get some clarity around Hudson and some other issues there. In terms of the issues of what they require of the developer, I think there's lots of penalties here in the project and this is what's customarily done in DDAs because this goes with the land. I think that we have assurances if the developer can't meet the obligation that there will be future developers along the way that will meet the obligations, as we've seen with Mission Bay, which was initially put forth by Catellus; and, as you all know, Catellus no longer exists and projects continue to come forward to approve there. I think it's time for this community to have its plan: I am originally from Baltimore, Maryland, but people might know about Baltimore. Baltimore experienced African American flight to the suburbs. Detroit experienced the same thing. That's what's destroyed those cities. And the reason that African Americans -- the middle class -- left those cities and kind of left them in the condition that they were was because there weren't new housing and job opportunities in the cities anymore. And I think that's a real issue that we have to look at. The reason that so many people moved to Antioch is they wanted new homes in a nice community. When people think about moving up -- my mother grew up in West Philly. When she thought about moving up, she didn't think of staying in West Philly. I love urban cities. I love that. But I understand the thinking and people -- the middle class will want to come back if this project is the project of the opportunities that this community has settled upon, which the CAC and the PAC, which is made up of a lot of the African American middle class, has arrived at as the best opportunity there. I think it can be underscored that we've seen this in other cities across the country; and what's caused the gentrification is there weren't the new opportunities in those communities. Places like Baltimore are now becoming gentrified, because new development -- because so many of the African American middle class has left and they're not coming back. And the only people that are coming back, unfortunately, are a more affluent class of individuals; and it's because the new opportunities took so long to come and people became settled in the new communities that they became part of. So I think we have an opportunity. We've had the commitment from the CAD and the PAC here, saying that this is what they want and the community needs. We've gone through numerous hearings on transportation, on affordable housing, on the jobs. I think there's obviously work to be done

on the new PLA and the new jobs agreement. And I trust and I'd love to get updates on where Redevelopment gets through in that process. But I, too, believe that it's time to move forward and approve this plan, like every other neighborhood in the city's plan is being approved. I know lots of people are supportive of the Treasure Island plan. I might remind people that the same developer is developing Treasure Island. So it seems to me if we can support a plan put forth by a similar developer in another part of the city, it should be something that we can support in this part of the city as well. So, with that, I want to move Items -- let me look at the agenda here.

MS. AVERY: And, Commissioner, as you're looking at the agenda, let me just remind you that you do have to adopt CEQA findings before you adopt anything else.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Right. So why don't we move to adopt CEQA findings and then the -- I guess the No. 6, which is related to the General Plan findings consistency, because it's related to the CEQA document.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Okay.

MS. AVERY: I'm sorry. Is there any other Commission comment?

PRESIDENT SWIG: Yeah. Commissioner Lee.

COMMISSIONER LEE: I think about 20 years ago -- and I think -- I wanted to mention Sue Bierman. She served on the restoration advisory board. And I remember the early '90s, before she became -- she was a planning commissioner at that time and became supervisor and then port commission before she passed away. Actually, I had coffee with her at McDonald's at the Haight. She used to hang out there. And so we talked about Hunters Point shipyard. And she always wanted to make sure that this project -- that she could be part of before she passed away. And she passed away, I guess, about four or five years ago, unfortunately. But, however, I think today she would be proud we finally did it, after 20 years.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you, Commissioner Lee. Commissioner Olague.

COMMISSIONER OLEAGUE: Yeah, I just was going to comment. I have notes. I'm really sleepy, so I'm going to try sound somewhat articulate here. The UN Global Compact -- let me see where my notes are -- I don't know. I'll see if I can remember some of this stuff. But I just think I would hope that if we ever get to the point where that is going to be considered for this project, that there is at least a public hearing so that we do truly understand the nature of this. And I know there were some concerns that were raised by a member of the public today; and I just hope that we do follow through and inform ourselves as to some of the entities that are involved in that -- in that. I wanted to -- I'm not feeling completely satisfied with where we are currently with this, so I'm disinclined to support it. But I did want to thank the staff -- Planning staff has been very accommodating, answering questions. And, also, Mayor's Office of Economic and Workforce Development has been very open and friendly to me; and I've sat with Michael Cohen and Tiffany and Sonya, who talked to me at length about some of her ideas around workforce development. So I'm hoping that eventually the language -- and we discussed this a little bit at the hearing and I followed up with members of the community. It was

Brightline Institute I believe that raised a lot of concerns around some of the language that -- mandatory versus good faith in local hiring discussion. So I know that Sonya said that there's still a lot of work -- I think her name is Sonya. I hope I'm getting her name right -- that there's still work to be done around local hiring and workforce development and putting teeth to it. So we're getting close, but doesn't sound like we're quite there. So I'm hoping that still there is moves in that direction. Also, as it pertain to Alice Griffith, I know, is one of the projects that's going to be redeveloped here; and that's long overdue. I know that in other parts of the city, we saw Valencia Gardens and also the project in North Beach that were also renovated through, I believe, tax increment funding -- redevelopment tools. So here I think it's going to be a little bit different setup. I believe that there isn't going to be any direct City funding for this project, but I do hope that we still ensure that all local laws regarding right of return and relocation are applied. I believe that, again, we talked a lot about flight of African Americans out of the city. I believe that the population is currently as low as six percent. I know this community has been languishing for a long time. I'm not sure that this plan necessarily directly addresses that concern. It seems -- I was a lecture recently where someone pointed out that the issue that a lot of planners dealt with before was white flight out of the city and into the suburbs and now it seems to be that we're looking at a lot of return of non-ethnic populations back into the urban environment and in many ways the issue of how that impacts communities and communities of color is one that still needs to be examined. And I think that's probably an issue that we're going to all be looking at over the next few years. I think that this plan does address the needs of those populations, but I'm not convinced entirely that it addresses the needs of people who currently live in that neighborhood. I wanted to -- I have heard that there might be some legislation that's currently worked on regarding Hope VI projects, so I do hope that we can be sure that residents of Alice Griffith get the same rights, protections, and services that residents of other Hope SF public housing units will have. Therefore, if there are any further local protections guaranteed by the City, I hope that even though the City isn't financing this project, I hope that these residents of Alice Griffith will be subject to the same protections related to relocation and right of return and those sorts of things. Again, I'm just a little sleepy. I have notes, but I'm not going to continue on. I think it's a work in progress. I know that some people did mention the community health facilities. There was a -- Commissioner Breed, I believe, and a member of the public. And it does seem that there still are questions around infrastructure, around schools. If we're talking about bringing 10,000-plus new residents into the city and market-rate developments, then I think the only hospital I'm aware of in the south side of the city is, obviously, General Hospital and St. Luke's. And St. Luke's has only really given a 20-year commitment to the City. Of course, those conversations are still in flux as we view the CPMC project. But \$2 million is all that I see allocated currently for community health facilities. And that doesn't seem enough to accommodate those additional residents that we see there. Again, education. In Mission Bay, I believe we had to add a school and this sort of thing. I question whether the 49ers -- we've been hearing about the 49ers returning to the city for I don't know how many years. Still hasn't happened. Maybe it will some day. In the event that it doesn't, though, we -- the research on the alternative to that, I'm not sure if it's an alternative that necessarily leads to the economic diversity of the city. So I still think that there's a lot of work to be done here. I'm just not ready to support it.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you, Commissioner. Now, Commissioner Moore.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: I want to briefly speak about the plan as a physical plan, which I believe has many strong points and has been thoughtfully developed. Given my position on the EIR and my concerns about a number of areas, I will not be able to support adopting environmental findings and the statement of overriding considerations under CEQA. I also feel that Commissioner Sugaya's concerns about the incomplete considerations for historic preservation on the project warrant attention. And I cannot support our motion under Item 6 either. I would strongly encourage Lennar to keep the option of a road circumnavigating Yosemite Slough as a consideration, because I do believe that Mr. Bloom's concerns are something we need to keep on the table. And I do think, as you seem to indicate to be open to consider the maturing of the plan as something which will be revisited, that that move is not in front of us today or tomorrow. But as you're moving forward with whatever the votes on June 8th will bring forward, there will be opportunities to revisit that particular aspect of the project. I also personally would be interested -- and I'm not quite sure if that is solved tonight -- to find at the minimum five-year increments in which both parties together and singularly would revisit updates on the physical implementation of the plan and come together to discuss critical crossroads at which major considerations need to be considered and evaluate together in light of the responsibilities we're taking on today for approving a project which has a time frame of 20 years of implementation. That, for me, personally is too large a leap of faith. As I said, I strongly believe that what you have presented and what you have worked in the physical plan as it stands, you have convinced many people who are here tonight. But in the end, as change is inevitable and that's the only thing which is certain, I think the community at large, which is primarily Hunters Point and Bayview, they should have the right to re-voice concerns and be part of a change in direction if it's necessary. And I think there is no plan ever made which can be fully implemented in the way that we're seeing it today. Change is inevitable and you can only try to stay with change and responsibly make decision which take it forward to the next level as you describe your own processes as reiterative. So, in light of that, you have the -- you have my support for the physical portion of the plan. In some other areas, I have to reserve judgment to not support you.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner Olague, you had your -

COMMISSIONER OLEAGUE: If I want to say something, I might.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Commissioner Covington, please.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: Thank you, Mr. President. Due to the lateness of the hour, I was going to forego my comments, but after hearing some of my fellow Commissioners, I do want to point out a couple of thing. One is that I want to make sure that everyone assembled here and everyone listening on KPOO and watching on our government channel understands that the reason the Redevelopment Commissioners may appear quiet is not due to the lateness of the hour, but we have been over this territory many, many, many times. We feel secure in our votes. We know our CAC members. We know our PAC members. We know them to be people of integrity and great intelligence. We have had many discussions with them, both formal and informal. The City family/staff members have worked way beyond due diligence. They have really brought their best efforts to this larger effort from which we will all benefit for many, many, many years to come. There will, of course, be numerous meetings, monthly, regarding each and every aspect that has been presented to you. All that the staffs of the various agencies

and the departments understand that -- they understand that we bring to our tasks great scrutiny of what it is that they do. We are committed to this -- I will speak for myself -- I am committed to this because I am familiar with what's going on. Maybe I didn't read all 7,700 pages. I think I left out 700 pages. When I got to 7,000, you know, the eye strain was too much and I just had to -- I had to call it quits for a while. But I am familiar with these documents. I have questioned Michael Cohen about -- just this morning continuing the conversation about Ohlone burial sites as well as our issues. Anytime I have had a question I have presented it; and I presented follow-up questions if I did not understand. So I feel very, very confident that, while this plan may not be perfect -- only God is perfect -- it is what we have before us now after many, many years and an incredible amount of effort on the part of at this point hundreds of people. People are eager for this change. Again, the community vetting of this whole process has been extremely thorough. And I listened to my fellow citizens when they speak about their house, their block, their immediate community; and I respect their feedback. Concerning hospitals, the health center has in these documents an appropriation of \$2 million. That is just the beginning. We also have the Health Department. We have granting foundation sources that can also be tapped. This is the threshold. This is not the top of the doorway in terms of moneys for the health center. The hospitals in Mission Bay, pediatric hospital as well as the women's hospital there, have a number of hospital beds and doctors that are going to be going online as soon as those properties are built out. And in addition to that, in Mission Bay we have required as an agency - - I put forth the motion myself -- that with all of this build-out of Mission Bay that there be workforce housing. Many of the people who live in the Bayview are going to work in those hospitals. They're going to want to work in the daycare, work in the laundry room, you know, after they have graduated from Harvard Medical School. And I do want to point out that many of our young people don't get enough -- enough screen time, enough ink in the newspapers -- about their good deeds. We do have college graduates in the Bayview. We do have people with advanced degrees in the Bayview. And they also will be looking for positions in these hospitals. So the hospitals -- again, this is just the beginning. The health center -- this is just the beginning. And to stay at the beginning means that there will be no progress. We have got to start somewhere. This is our starting point. I had just a couple of very quick questions for Mr. Cohen. Mr. Cohen, is building No. 205 slated for demolition or is it slated to be kept? I was a little confused in the documents.

MR. COHEN: I'm also a little confused, so I have to get the answer.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: Okay. That's the one with the lovely archways. It's a brick building close to the --

MR. COHEN: All the pump houses are definitely being retained.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: Okay. Great, because that wasn't -- that wasn't clear to me.

MR. COHEN: So, yes. The answer is it's being retained.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: I'm happy to know that. And could you please circulate a photo of Building No. 224? I wasn't able to, in all of these volumes, find a photo of No. 224.

MR. COHEN: We'd be happy to do that.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: Okay. Thank you. And I'm trying very hard to be brief here. Oh, Alice Griffith. There have been meetings over the past few years -- the Hope SF Task Force, the San Francisco Public Housing Task Force -- which I really feel need to be reconvened so that we continue the work that we had begun -- has made sure that there are guarantees in place so that the current residents of Alice Griffith do have a right of return. In addition to that, they have been very, very active in pushing us to get this done. The president of their residents association, the vice-president, the entire executive board of Alice Griffith is very eager to see this happen. So I don't know if my comments can allay the fears of some people who seem to be reticent to say aye to a number of items, but it's the best I could do at this hour.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you, Commissioner Covington. The Commissioner Moore button is pushed again.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Yes. I have a couple of questions. I don't know who to direct it to -- Mr. Cohen, maybe. I understand the tax increment is a tremendous financial tool. The understanding of the way it works is you have a base and development starts and whatever above that begins to be generated is then available for use within the project area or, in this case, perhaps beyond a little bit. The issue for me with tax increment has always been then that portion of the increased increment does not flow back into the city as a whole. You said that the use of the tax increment generates additional benefits to the city through business taxes and other forms of revenue that may be generated. Do you know of any studies that have been conducted to show that perhaps that kind of revenue flowback to the city offsets the tax loss?

MR. COHEN: Yes. In fact, there is a fiscal impact study which we have filed with the Board of Supervisors and the Controller of the City of San Francisco as this moves through the Board process. So there are two things. One, while a portion of the tax increment is recaptured, again, recognizing without the investment of tax increment, there is no new taxes. There's a portion that continues to flow through to schools and other important elements of the local service network that are not necessarily general fund funded. But for every project -- we do it for Treasure Island, for Mission Bay, this one, Transbay, we did it for Rincon Hill -- we conduct a fiscal impact study. The purpose of the fiscal impact study is so, notwithstanding the fact that the property tax that would normally flow into the general fund, we look at what are the costs over roughly 30 years, the increased costs to the City for police, fire, DPW, public health, et cetera. Then we look at the revenues that come -- that are separate from the property tax which go to future tax increment financing. In this case in the early years the revenues match the cost. And over time the net benefits to the general fund become enormous. One of the things that we have discussed in many of these project areas is that every year we have these budget fights over a shrinking pie, that there are opportunities to actually grow the pie. And these economic analyses show on projects like this -- Treasure Island and other ones -- that over time the net benefits to the general fund is enormous.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: All right. And second question: Again, I don't know though who to direct it to. The approximately 30 percent of affordable housing, apart from Alice

Griffith -- I understand for that particular housing development that the residents are guaranteed that they will have units and that they won't be displaced, because it will be a phased process. For the other units that will be affordable at whatever level, there's been lot of talk and presentation and arguments made by people -- residents of Bayview or advocates of housing in the Bayview -- that this project is essential to that community. However, in past situations I've been led to understand that there's no guarantee that that housing is solely available for Bayview residents; is that correct?

MR. COHEN: Yeah. That's true. As a matter of fair housing law, for Alice Griffith units, as you noted, those residents not only have the right of fair return. But there's actually something much more profound here -- and you alluded to it -- which is in the past for public housing residents we have given them a certificate and said come back in three years when your units are rebuilt. And because of the needs of these individuals, they often don't come back. The unique opportunity at Alice Griffith is we are building the replacement units first while people stay in their current homes. That addresses that. The remaining of the affordable housing units, which are subject to a variety of state and federal fair housing laws -- and I'm looking at Agency Counsel Morales, who literally wrote the book on a lot of this stuff. What we can do, and what we do, is aggressively market these opportunities in the Bayview community. We have been having first-time home buyer workshops and affordable housing workshops in the Bayview for years around this project to try to create a disproportionate opportunity for Bayview residents. The other thing I would add is the Redevelopment Commission took a fairly important step, I think, maybe half a year ago, where they expanded the preference program, which is an opportunity, notwithstanding fair housing laws, for future certificate holders to sort of jump to the front of the that line and expanding that program to multiple generations of former San Franciscans who now may live in the East Bay or even out of the area, creating a much larger pool of both current Bayview residents and former residents to come back. And so we have basically done everything we can within the limits of fair housing law to create that result.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Okay. Thank you. I don't know whether this is the time to introduce my three little additions to the plan -- or should I wait until there's a motion?

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: If I may, I'm going to move Items 2 and 6.

PRESIDENT SWIG: There is a motion on the floor.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: I'm sorry. I was going to call the question for Items 2 and 6.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner, before you call the question, the City Attorney has informed me that, because of the sequence of the items, that she recommends that the Commission take the items separately. So she's basically asking that you separate Items 2 and 6 and take them -- take each item separately.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Okay. I would then call the question --

MS. AVERY: There is a motion on the floor for -- that motion has to be rescinded and the motion needs to come through for one item, for Item 2 only.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: I think I was a seconder.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Yeah, so the remaker of the motion moves to adopt CEQA findings along with the mitigation and monitoring reporting program. MS. AVERY: And the second?

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Second.

MS. AVERY: Oh, that was Commissioner Lee.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Okay. Are we clear on this is Item 2 that we're voting --

MS. AVERY: This is Item 2 only, on the CEQA findings and the consideration of overriding conditions. Mr. President, would you like to call the question?

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Call the question on Item 2.

MS. AVERY: On Item 2, for adoption of CEQA findings and considerations of overriding considerations. Commissioner Antonini.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Borden.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Lee.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Moore.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: No.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Sugaya.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: No.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Olague.

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: No.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Miguel.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Aye.

MS. AVERY: That motion passes 4 to 3, with Commissioners Moore, Sugaya, and Olague voting against. Thank you, Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: I would like to now move Item 6, if that is okay with the City

--

MS. AVERY: No. She'd like you to go in order. Actually in order.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Every single one of them?

MS. AVERY: Every single one of them.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Individually.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Okay. I'm going to move Item No. 3, amendments to -- request for amendments to Bayview Hunters Point area and various elements. Move.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Second.

MS. AVERY: Mr. President, we have a motion and a second for approval of Item No. 3, which is a resolution to approve amendments to the Bayview Hunters Point area plan, the transportation element, recreation and open space element, the commerce and industry element, the land use index, establishing the Candlestick Point subarea plan, the Hunters Point area plan, along with other minor General Plan map amendments. That motion --

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: This is the time -- is this the part that I'm going to amend? I just want to add a couple of things. One that I already mentioned. I'd like to have some inclusion for a concept that includes a history walk.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Would that be here or where would it be?

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: As I was told, I couldn't stick it in mitigation.

MR. SNYDER: Mat Snyder for Planning Department staff. Perhaps the more appropriate action would be to add it in the D for D -- in the design for development document. As a General Plan, we do have some general language about wanting to celebrate the history of both areas, but they're not specific. If you wanted to provide --

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: And, also, I'd like to have Building 813 continued to be evaluated for historic significance. And then, lastly, the condition that reflects the request of the Historic Preservation Commission that there be continued consultation with them on Alternative 4-A and their concern about other historic resources that may be in the shipyard.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Would that all be included in Item No. 9, D for D?

MR. EVANS: Just to clarify -- Tom Evans from the Redevelopment Agency staff. The redevelopment plan does currently call for preservation of Building 813, but we could separately --

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: I realize --

MR. EVANS: -- that the Agency do an evaluation on top of that, but we're not planning --

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: I think I'm just continuing -- I understand that and I think there may be some advantages to going forward with a further historic significance evaluation, because there may be possibilities of a 20-percent rehabilitation tax credit.

MS. AVERY: Excuse me, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: I don't care where it goes.

MS. AVERY: But the last recommendation you had for the recommendation of the HPC, I'm sorry. I didn't catch that one.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Oh, it's in the letter requesting that there -- just about further consultation with them on Alternative -- the historic preservation alternative, which is 4-A. I think mainly because they only got the document on the day they were having a meeting and would like some additional -- and I think it's just a matter of the staff and whoever would be involved, just talking to the HBC and working with them on that and hearing them out, I think.

MR. EVANS: Just to clarify, after discussing, we think that all those adds would be best addressed in the Hunters Point shipyard design for development motion.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Okay.

MS. AVERY: So all of those amendments would go to Item No. 9? Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Okay. So now we're on 3. I believe I am going to move -- I did move 3 --

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: And we have a second. And we'd like to call the question.

MS. AVERY: Okay. Thank you, Mr. President. We'll call the question on Item No. 3 for Approval. Commissioner Antonini.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Borden.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Lee.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Moore. Commissioner Moore. [inaudible]

MS. AVERY: Thank you. Commissioner Sugaya.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Olague.

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: No.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Miguel.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Thank you, Commissioners. That resolution passes 6 to 1, with

Commissioner Olague voting against.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: If I may, I would move Item 4, which is the request for amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code by establishing Candlestick Point activity node special use district.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Second.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Call the question.

MS. AVERY: Commissioners, on the motion to approve Item 4, which is consideration of formulating a resolution to approve amendments to the San Francisco Planning Code by establishing the Candlestick Point activity node special use district, the Hunters Point shipyard Phase 2 special use district, and to establish special height provisions for Candlestick Point activity node special use district, and the CP height and bulk district and special height provisions for Hunters Point shipyard Phase 2 special use district, and the HP height and bulk district. On that motion, for approval, Commissioner Antonini.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Borden.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Lee.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Moore.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Sugaya.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Olague.

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: No.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Miguel.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Thank you, Commissioners. That resolution passes 6 to 1, with Commissioner Olague voting against.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Thank you. You know the drill now. Okay, so to speak? Item 2. I'd like to move for approval of Candlestick Point, Hunters Point shipyard Phase 2 request for amendments to San Francisco zoning maps amending sections SU 9 and SU 10 to establish the Candlestick Point activity node special use district and Hunters Point. We can go on and on. Okay.

MS. AVERY: Because there's so many, I will repeat them totally.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Second.

MS. AVERY: Thank you. Commissioners, on the motion for approval of Item 5, consideration of formulating a resolution to approve amendments to the San Francisco zoning maps by amending sectional maps SU 09 and SU 010 to establish the Candlestick Point activity node special use district and the Hunters Point shipyard Phase 2 special use district, amending sectional maps HT 09 and H5 010 to establish the CP and HP height and bulk districts. On that motion, Commissioner Antonini.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Borden.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Lee. COMMISSIONER LEE: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Moore.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Sugaya.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Olague.

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: No.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Miguel.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Thank you, Commissioners. That resolution passes 6 to 1.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: I would like to now move Item 6, Candlestick Point Hunters Point shipyard Phase 2, establish findings for consistency with the General Plan of the City and County of San Francisco and Section 101.1 of City Planning Code for Candlestick Point Hunters Point shipyard Phase 2.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Second.

MS. AVERY: Thank you. Commissioners, on the motion for approval of Resolution 6; that is establishing findings of consistency with the General Plan of the City and County of San Francisco with Section 101.1 of the City Planning Code for Candlestick Point Hunters Point shipyard Phase 2 development project, including an amendment to the Bayview Hunters Point redevelopment plan, the Hunters Point shipyard redevelopment plan, and for various actions necessary for the implementation of the project. On that motion, Commissioner Antonini.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Borden.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Lee.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Moore.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: No.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Sugaya.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: No.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Olague.

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: No.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Miguel.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Aye.

MS. AVERY: That motions passes 4 to 3, with Commissioners Moore, Sugaya, and Olague voting against.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: I'd like to move Item 7, Candlestick Point and Hunters Point shipyard to establish findings of consistency with General Plan proposed amendments to Bayview Hunters Point redevelopment plan and Hunters Point shipyard redevelopment plan.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Second.

MS. AVERY: Commissioners, on the motion for approval of Item No.7, resolution establishing findings of consistency with the General Plan of the City and County of San Francisco for proposed amendments to the Bayview Hunters Point redevelopment plan and the Hunters Point shipyard redevelopment plan as part of Candlestick Point Hunters Point shipyard Phase 2 project recommending the approval of the amendments to such redevelopment plans and making office allocation findings pursuant to Planning Code Sections 320 to 325. On that motion, Commissioner Antonini.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Borden.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Lee.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Moore.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Sugaya.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Olague.

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: No.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Miguel.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Thank you. That motion passes 6 to 1, with Commissioner Olague voting against.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Thank you. Item 8, Candlestick Point Hunters Point shipyard Phase 2 for approval of the planning cooperation agreement between the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and San Francisco Planning Department, Zone 1 of the Bayview Hunters Point redevelopment area and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point shipyard redevelopment project area.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Second.

MS. AVERY: Thank you.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: This is the one item that will have the continuing 20- or 20-year-plus agreement that will ensure both commissions being involved in everything that happens and is one of the more important considerations before us.

MS. AVERY: That provision is included, so it's not an amendment. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Yes. Thank you.

MS. AVERY: On motion for approval of Item No. 8, a resolution to approve a planning cooperation agreement between San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and the San Francisco Planning Department for Zone 1 of the Bayview Hunters Point redevelopment project area and Phase 2 of Hunters Point shipyard redevelopment project area. On that motion, Commissioner Antonini.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Borden.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Lee.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Moore.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Sugaya.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Olague.

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: No.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Miguel.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Thank you, Commissioners. The motion passes 6 to 1, with Commissioner Olague voting against.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: I'd like to move Item 9, which is the Candlestick Point Phase 2. And I believe -- correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Sugaya, with amendments that would have commemorative plaques -- maybe you can elaborate a little bit on that.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: That would be to have the concept of a history walk and a shipyard area, sort of similar to what the Port of San Francisco has; that Building 813 be continued to be investigated for its historic significance; and that there be continued work with the HPC on its review of the Alternative 4-A; and also their concerns about other historic resources that may be part of the project area.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: All right. That's fine as my motion, although of course that is already -- 4-A is already an option, but this is the understanding that there will be consultation with the HPC regarding it. Okay. That's fine. Commissioner Moore.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: I would like to add that the idea of the slough to remain as an option as a road circumnavigating it remains open and on the table, particularly in light of the fact that BCDC has not weighed in. I want this to remain an idea and be examined on its own merit as you move through the development of the project.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: That really does not need to be part of motion, because that already is an option -- a variant. And so, of course, the previous option is the bridge. Of course, as we all understand, but you know this is an option and it's already in there. So my motion continues, but does, of course, involve what all of these variants and options are in the language. Am I correct in this, staff?

MR. EVANS: Tom Evans, Redevelopment Agency staff. So regarding the first three historic items, we've found appropriate places for those in the Hunters Point shipyard Phase 2 design for development for the 813 site and the historic walk and the consultation on the historic option. However, it's unclear if the D for D document or motion is the appropriate place to deal with elements of the transportation analysis. So I would look to staff to figure out where that would be appropriately addressed.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Well, except this is the last one we have. And so my motion will probably not include that. I think that's already understood that that is something that will

always be an option as this process moves forward and it's procedurally unnecessary to put it in there. So my motion does not include that language.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Second.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Does she have something she wanted to add?

COMMISSIONER MOORE: I tried to stick it under transportation plan. There was no ability to -- my name was lit up. And as there was general considerations being put into the D for D, I considered it to be a good-faith gesture to have it mentioned here.

MR. COHEN: I just want to -- if I may -- I apologize. Just clarify one thing. You were asking a couple of questions, since we're all tired. The no-bridge alternative -- because it is part of the CEQA documents -- it was certified. We'll continue forward. And that was Commissioner Antonini's point earlier, that that is by definition part of the CEQA action that was taken previously. As we move through the major phase and the subphase process on this project, we're constantly going to be looking at these issues. I think it is correct to characterize that the bridge alternative is currently the preferred alternative, but that there is nothing in these documents, because we do have the no-bridge alternative, that wouldn't allow us to revisit that issue at a later point in time.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: There's a subtle point between what Mr. Bloom Arc Ecology presented relative to a concept, which seemed to be in line with larger design ideas than just simply creating right-angle turns on an existing street network. And I think I was intrigued by the idea that there was a real alternative to a bridge. And that is where my comment comes from. So what I'd like to leave on the table is, indeed, the considerations expressed by Arc Ecology in support of larger concerns for environmental and BCDC considerations, if that needs to be pursued.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: I don't really know that this is necessary to have in there. And I'm not convinced, in fact, that you don't have to do anything, that plan would even be feasible, but we can call the question.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Is there a comment from the City Attorney?

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: City Attorney, can we get a clarification on this, so we can --

MS. WARREN: Elaine Warren, City Attorney. I'm sorry. I was being asked a question, so you'll have to repeat what you're seeking clarification on.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: I guess the clarification is this: Commissioner Moore wants to add the motion something -- first of all, it's about a transportation issue, which may or may not be appropriate in this particular motion or this item anyway. And, you know, I guess what she's saying is to consider something that is already under consideration. So it's a little bit redundant. And so I just think it's no use mucking it up. I'm happy to do it if it makes her happy, but I don't think it really accomplishes anything.

MS. WARREN: Just for clarification, in the CEQA findings that you adopted, you are required at that point to decide among the alternatives that were presented in the EIR, those that you were selecting. And what the CEQA findings provide is that the bridge is accepted as part of the project. So the alternative without the bridge is rejected as an alternative at this point. Mr. Cohen is correct that in the future you could consider -- without redoing the CEQA analysis, you could decide if the bridge doesn't work out, that you want to change the project, but it would be a change in the project that you're approving right now.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: I'm sorry. I'd like to clear that up a little further. The prime option is the bridge. What we're saying is that we're allowing this to be an alternate option; is that what we're saying?

MS. WARREN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Which I thought it was anyway.

MS. WARREN: It is not something that at this point -- I mean you could change your mind -- but at this point the project and the elements of the project that are being brought forward include the bridge.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Okay. Well, I guess I'm clear on this, that the preferred option is the bridge; and you could bring forth this other one as an alternate option without -- but making it very clear that this is a secondary option. Is that what we're saying?

MS. WARREN: That would be a change in the project and I'd need to talk to staff about how -- the way to change the project is not through the D for D, because the design for development does not address the transportation plan. The transportation plan is addressed in other documents.

PRESIDENT SWIG: I have a question from Commissioner Covington.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: No. For when it comes over to us.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Can't we reconsider Item 3 or 4 or whatever had to deal with the transportation?

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: We have a motion on the floor. Right now I'll entertain that one.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: As the maker of the motion, what I would say is this: We'll put in the things that Commissioner Sugaya, which we've already agreed could be done; and we will, if it's -- we'll add this thing in. If it's not appropriate, that's something that has to be decided later on. But we can -- City Attorney, does that sound reasonable there? I mean I have no control whether it's appropriate or not in this. So basically we're saying the bridge is the prime option and we will also ask for exploration of the efficacy of this other route.

MS. WARREN: The item before you is the design for development. It deals with design of the buildings. So the items that were previously raised regarding the review of Building 813,

the historic walk -- those are items that, as Mr. Evans explained, can be appropriately added into the design for development. So if you were to amend your motion to just include those things, those are appropriate items to include in the design for development.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: So what you're saying, if I can interpret it, this probably is not an appropriate addition to this motion -- the last part of it. So we will amend it to include the things that we've talked from Commissioner Sugaya. And that will be my motion. And we will not deal with that other item. It's something that probably can be taken up at a future time, I'm sure, but not tonight.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: I think there's a second.

MS. AVERY: Commissioners, the motion on the floor is for approval with modifications to include a history walk along the shoreline in the shipyard, to have an evaluation of Building 813 for historic significance, and to allow further consultation of Alternative 4-A by the HPC, or the Historic Preservation Commission, and other historic resources. On that motion, Commissioner Antonini.

COMMISSIONER ANTONINI: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Borden.

COMMISSIONER BORDEN: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Lee.

COMMISSIONER LEE: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Moore.

COMMISSIONER MOORE: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Sugaya.

COMMISSIONER SUGAYA: Aye.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Olague.

COMMISSIONER OLAGUE: No.

MS. AVERY: Commissioner Miguel.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Aye.

MS. AVERY: That motion passes 6 to 1, with Commissioner Olague voting against. Thank you, Commissioners. All of your motions and resolutions have been acted on.

PRESIDENT MIGUEL: Is there going to be an attempt at a motion in reconsideration? In that case, the Planning Commission has finished its work. I thank you. The Planning Commission is adjourned.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Thank you, Commissioner Miguel. It's been a pleasure chairing the session with you and thank you to our fellow Commissioners on the Planning Commission. And now we will move on the items for the Redevelopment Agency. I had a motion to -- I want to clarify, so we can go back. Commissioner Bustos, is that a motion to approve all items, B through P?

COMMISSIONER BUSTOS: That is correct. Findings, correctives, and amendments.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Right. And I had a second from Commissioner Breed; is that correct? For Items B through P? So I have a motion, I have a second, and I have a comment from Mr. Morales. Can you turn your mike on, please.

MR. MORALES: Mr. President, I believe you -- the Agency Commission needs to consider the D for D as amended by the Planning Commission.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Okay.

MR. MORALES: Just so that's clear for the record.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Why don't I take Items B through -- what's before P -- is O. It's late, you know. It's 1:30 in the morning. And I have a motion and a second on both of those; and then we can deal with P separately. I have a motion, I have a second. May I have a roll call vote, please, Madam Secretary.

MS. SOLIS: Commissioner Breed.

COMMISSIONER BREED: Aye.

MS. SOLIS: Commissioner Covington.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: Aye.

MS. SOLIS: Commissioner King.

COMMISSIONER KING: Yes.

MS. SOLIS: Commissioner Bustos.

COMMISSIONER BUSTOS: Aye.

MS. SOLIS: Vice-president Singh.

COMMISSIONER SINGH: Aye.

MS. SOLIS: President Swig.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Aye. May I have the same call, with your permission, on Item C. All in favor, aye. Yes. The same call on Item D. Approved. Same call on Item E. Same call on Item F. Same call on Item G. Same call on Item H. Same call on Item I. Same call on Item J. Same call on Item K. Same call on Item L. Same call on Item M. Same call on Item N. And same call on Item O. And we have no opposition or abstentions to any of those items. Those items are passed unanimously. Now I will deal with Item -- we have one more, sir. We have Item P. Mr. Bustos, you have the -- you have the motion; and it was suggested by Mr. Morales that we consider the amendments which were presented by the Planning Department. Could you repeat those? Could I have the help of the -- sorry, Item P.

MS. AVERY: The amendments for the Planning Commission were to allow a history walk along the shoreline in the shipyard, that Building 813 would be evaluated for historic significance, and that there would be further consultation with the Historic Preservation Commission for Alternative 4-A and other historic resources.

COMMISSIONER KING: I second that.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Hold on. I made a mistake. Excuse me. I should have skipped Item E. I'm sorry. And call it for -- that isn't coincidental. So I'm going to ask that we remove the vote on Item E and the same call on Item P. Okay?

COMMISSIONER BREED: Move.

COMMISSIONER BUSTOS: Second.

PRESIDENT SWIG: So moved and unanimous. We'll go back to Item E and ask for those changes on Item E that Madam Secretary just verbalized to link up with the same D for D motion by the Planning Commission. So, Commissioner Bustos. I'm sorry for the confusion. So we're on Item E, which is the issue of the D for D.

COMMISSIONER BUSTOS: Yes.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Your thoughts, please, or you moved?

COMMISSIONER KING: Second.

PRESIDENT SWIG: So on Item E on our list is the D for D. The D for D was amended by the Planning Commission; and so I asked Commissioner Bustos whether he would also accept the amendments or would like to place as amendments the items -- and Commissioner Covington would like to make a comment.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: Thank you. Just for clarification, I just want to make sure that the amendments are as follows -- and then I'm clear on that -- that there be a history walk similar to what the Port has.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Yes.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: That there be further consideration for Building No. 813.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Yes.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: That there be continued consultation with the Historic Preservation Commission regarding the alternative.

PRESIDENT SWIG: No.

COMMISSIONER BREED: On Alternative 4-A.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: Yeah. Alternative 4-A.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Okay.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: Okay. Alternative 4-A. And that was it, because there was also some talk about the -- okay. All right. So I'm clear. Okay. I like to know what I'm voting on, even early in the morning.

PRESIDENT SWIG: 1:34 in the morning, to be exact. Commissioner Breed, you had the second?

COMMISSIONER BREED: Yes.

PRESIDENT SWIG: And continue that second?

COMMISSIONER BREED: Second.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Would you -- on this one would you call roll call, just to make it easy?

MS. SOLIS: Commissioner Breed.

COMMISSIONER BREED: Aye.

MS. SOLIS: Commissioner Covington.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: Aye.

MS. SOLIS: Commissioner King.

COMMISSIONER KING: Aye.

MS. SOLIS: Commissioner Bustos.

COMMISSIONER BUSTOS: Aye.

MS. SOLIS: Vice-president Singh.

COMMISSIONER SINGH: Aye.

MS. SOLIS: President Swig.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Aye. Okay. No opposition or abstentions. The motion is passed unanimously. We've gone through all the actions.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: We have to vote on P, I believe.

PRESIDENT SWIG: No, P -- I had already done with P. I'll do it again, if you request.

COMMISSIONER COVINGTON: Yes, once more with feeling.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Item P, same call, please.

COMMISSIONER BUSTOS: Aye.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Okay. That's unanimous.

COMMISSIONER BREED: Motion to adjourn.

PRESIDENT SWIG: Motion to adjourn accepted. We're adjourned.

[Hearing adjourned at 1:36 a.m.]

STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO CERTIFICATE OF
REPORTER I, FREDDIE REPPOND, a duly authorized Shorthand Reporter and licensed
Notary Public, do hereby certify that on the date indicated herein that the above proceedings
were taken down by me in stenotype and thereafter transcribed into typewriting and that this
transcript is a true record of the said proceedings. IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have hereunto
set my hand on this 9th day of June, 2010. _____
FREDDIE REPPOND