MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HELD ON THE 21st DAY OF JULY 2026

The members of the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure of the City and County of San Francisco met in a regular meeting in person at 1:00 p.m. on the 21st day of July 2026.

REMOTE ACCESS:
WATCH LIVE ON SFGOVTV: https://sfgovtv.org/ccii

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

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:
DIAL: 1-415-655-0001 **ENTER ACCESS CODE**: 2663 528 7582 **PRESS #, PRESS # again to enter the call. Press *3 to submit your request to speak.**

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

1. Recognition of a Quorum

Meeting was called to order at 1:01 p.m. by Chair Scott.

Roll call was taken.

Commissioner Hakimi - present
Commissioner Lim - present
Commissioner Shaddix - present
Vice-Chair Miller - present
Chair Scott - present

All Commissioners were present.

2. Announcements

a) The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will be held **in person** on Tuesday, August 4, 2026 at 1:00 pm at City Hall in Room 416.

b) Announcement of Prohibition of Sound Producing Electronic Devices during the Meeting: Please be advised that the ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers, and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing of or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic device.

c) Announcement of Time Allotment for Public Comments from Participants dialing in: Please be advised that a member of the public has up to three minutes to make pertinent public comments on each agenda item unless the Commission adopts a shorter period on any item. It is recommended that members of the public who are attending the meeting in person fill out a “Speaker Card” and submit the completed card to the Commission Secretary. All dial-in participants from the public will be instructed to call a toll-free number and use their touch-tone phones to provide any public comment. Audio prompts will signal to dial-in participants when their audio input has been enabled for commenting.

PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN: 1-415-655-0001 **ACCESS CODE**: 2663 528 7582

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

3. **Report on actions taken at previous Closed Session meeting** - None

4. **Matters of Unfinished Business** - None

5. **Matters of New Business:**

CONSENT AGENDA

a) Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting of May 19, 2026

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Commissioner Hakimi motioned to move Item 5(a) and Commissioner Shaddix seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Hakimi - yes
Commissioner Lim - yes
Commissioner Shaddix - yes
Vice-Chair Miller - yes
Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FIVE COMMISSIONERS THAT APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF MAY 19, 2026, BE ADOPTED.

REGULAR AGENDA

Agenda Item Nos. 5 (b) through 5(d) related to the Mission Bay North Refunding Bonds Contracts were presented together but acted on separately

b) Authorizing a Personal Services Contract with Fieldman, Rolapp & Associates, Inc., in an amount not to exceed $176,000, for financial advisory services in connection with the proposed issuance of Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds related to the prior funding of Mission Bay North Infrastructure (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 15-2026)

c) Authorizing a Legal Services Contract with Jones Hall LLP, in an amount not to exceed $182,000, for Bond Counsel and Disclosure Counsel services in connection with the proposed issuance of Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds related to the prior funding of Mission Bay North Infrastructure (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 16-2026)

d) Authorizing a Personal Services Contract with Keyser Marston Associates, Inc., in an amount not to exceed $62,000, for Fiscal Consultant services in connection with the proposed issuance of Tax Allocation Refunding Bonds related to the prior funding of Mission Bay North Infrastructure (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 17-2026)

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

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Vice-Chair Miller thanked Mr. Jones for tracking this because the bonds were linked to a specific date. He requested confirmation that this was money that could be used to develop more housing.

Mr. Jones responded in the affirmative. He explained that they tracked the bond portfolio for opportunities for refinancing and as the eligible refinancing date was coming up in August 2026, they decided to move forward with this. He confirmed that any amounts saved on these bonds could be used towards the replacement housing bonds

Chair Scott thanked Mr. Jones for the presentation and stated that she was grateful for any help the City could get to save funds and then do the right thing with what they had.

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

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

Commissioner Hakimi - yes
Commissioner Lim - yes
Commissioner Shaddix - yes
Vice-Chair Miller - yes
Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FIVE COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 15-2026, AUTHORIZING A PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH FIELDMAN, ROLAPP & ASSOCIATES, INC., IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $176,000, FOR FINANCIAL ADVISORY SERVICES IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF TAX ALLOCATION REFUNDING BONDS RELATED TO THE PRIOR FUNDING OF MISSION BAY NORTH INFRASTRUCTURE, BE ADOPTED.

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

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

Commissioner Hakimi - yes
Commissioner Lim - yes

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FIVE COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 16-2026, AUTHORIZING A LEGAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH JONES HALL LLP, IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $182,000, FOR BOND COUNSEL AND DISCLOSURE COUNSEL SERVICES IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF TAX ALLOCATION REFUNDING BONDS RELATED TO THE PRIOR FUNDING OF MISSION BAY NORTH INFRASTRUCTURE, BE ADOPTED.

Commissioner Hakimi motioned to move Item 5(d) and Commissioner Lim seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Hakimi - yes
Commissioner Lim - yes
Commissioner Shaddix - yes
Vice-Chair Miller - yes
Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FIVE COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 17-2026, AUTHORIZING A PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH KEYSER MARSTON ASSOCIATES, INC., IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $62,000, FOR FISCAL CONSULTANT SERVICES IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF TAX ALLOCATION REFUNDING BONDS RELATED TO THE PRIOR FUNDING OF MISSION BAY NORTH INFRASTRUCTURE, BE ADOPTED.

e) Confirming authorization of the issuance of new money and refunding Tax Allocation Bonds for infrastructure in the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area in aggregate principal amounts not to exceed $48,000,000 and $170,000,000, respectively, and approving preliminary and final Official Statements, a Continuing Disclosure Certificate and other related documents and actions; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 18-2026)

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

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Vice-Chair Miller noted the over $9 million estimated in savings and was very pleased to see this happen. He was in support of this item.

Chair Scott echoed the words of Vice-Chair Miller and stated that it made her smile.

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

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

Commissioner Hakimi - yes
Commissioner Lim - yes

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

<u>ADOPTION:</u> IT WAS VOTED BY FIVE COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 18-2026, CONFIRMING AUTHORIZATION OF THE ISSUANCE OF NEW MONEY AND REFUNDING TAX ALLOCATION BONDS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE MISSION SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA IN AGGREGATE PRINCIPAL AMOUNTS NOT TO EXCEED $48,000,000 AND $170,000,000, RESPECTIVELY, AND APPROVING PRELIMINARY AND FINAL OFFICIAL STATEMENTS, A CONTINUING DISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE AND OTHER RELATED DOCUMENTS AND ACTIONS; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

f) Approving a Variation for the Transbay Block 2 West project of the Rooftop Mechanical Screening Development Control required by the Transbay Development Controls and Design Guidelines; Transbay Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 19-2026)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; Alok Vyas, Senior Planner-Design Division; Victor Pappalardo, Interim General Counsel

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Commissioner Shaddix referred to a statement within the presentation that read “the developer was not aware that the final design would be visually unacceptable” and inquired about who they were talking about and exactly who the design would be unacceptable to.

Mr. Vyas responded that it would be unacceptable to the conditions of the Transbay Development Controls and Design Guidelines (DCDG) as well as unacceptable to the conditions of approval when looked at from the public realm.

Executive Director Kaslofsky added that the design standard is a subjective standard, which comes into play if the equipment is visible to the public, either from the adjacent park or the neighboring building. So attempts were made to ameliorate the visual appearance of the rooftop mechanical to the public observer and to OCII staff. The developer, Chinatown Community Development Center (CCDC), produced the project with their contractors and they submitted for an inspection by OCII staff for feedback and comments.

Commissioner Shaddix stated that in his building on the fifth floor, they were starting to see more and more high-rises with rooftops. He was surprised but agreed that if the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) of the area approved this, then he would support it because it’s their neighborhood.

Commissioner Hakimi referred to Slide #3 and inquired about whether that was the original design which was approved.

Mr. Vyas responded in the affirmative

Commissioner Hakimi pointed out that in front of the area which was gray on top, there was a water tank and a mechanical unit and requested confirmation that those items were not accounted for at the time the design was submitted for approval.

Mr. Vyas responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Hakimi requested confirmation that slide #5 would be the resulting view.

Mr. Vyas responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Hakimi requested confirmation that the metal screening observed in the middle of the slide would not exist for the water tank and the mechanical unit.

Mr. Vyas explained that during the design phase, most items were screened. However, these additional items popped up in the construction documents as part of the design build and they were now the only two items not screened.

Commissioner Hakimi stated that the picture did not really show it, but asked for clarification that it was actually far out and not that much of an issue.

Mr. Vyas responded that it was not as imposing, but mostly the front look which was the townhome block, which was more visible.

Commissioner Lim stated that he had been in the mechanical business for 50 years and was not pleased with the look of the design and found it embarrassing. He asserted that it was widely known that all equipment must be screened and stated that was he was looking at was not acceptable, that maybe 50 years ago it would be okay, but not today. Mr. Lim contended that this was the fault of the design build contractors. He stressed that anyone who was aware of screening ordinances would know that this was not acceptable.

Executive Director Kaslofsky thanked Commissioner Lim for his comments and added that they did not disagree with his statement and that OCII was aware that this was due to an error on the part of the developer and the contractor. However, he reasoned that it was already built and the post-construction options would be to penetrate the roof once more with more screening and other add-ons which would amount to more expenditure. He concluded that OCII did not think it was in the public's best interest to have additional expenditures on the project for this minor impediment into the zone of view. He added that they had made attempts to improve the aesthetics with paint to blend them in better, but that was all.

Commissioner Lim expressed his opinion that he was not pleased with the results and stated that this should not have happened. He stated if it was his job, he would have been asked to cut it (pipes) down or do something. He understood that the intent was to save money but found it embarrassing. He stated that he is one of the five votes.

Commissioner Hakimi stated that she agreed with Commissioner Lim. She had indicated that this was a problem when she asked about how they could have missed this at the time the design was submitted for approval. She stated that she would go on record as saying that whoever designed this was responsible to fix it at their cost. She wondered what the legal remedy was and was not sure why they had to live with this error.

Commissioner Lim stated that it was the fault of the designer and the contractor, not the developer, and they should be responsible for the cost of fixing this. He stated that the contractor had the 3d model of design to check and that someone dropped the ball. People who know design and construction should not have allowed it to happen.

Mr. Vyas claimed that moving forward and building more high-rise projects, they were taking steps to be more cautious. One was to include the conditions of approval on the plan sets and permit sets and that during construction drawings phase they would be more careful to look for these things.

Commissioner Lim stated that he could not accept what Mr. Vyas was saying.

Chair Scott inquired about whether there was anything they could do to rectify this.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded in the affirmative and stated that they had already done things to rectify this. He explained that this came up during construction and they painted the objectionable items to blend in with the architecture of the building. Mr. Kaslofsky pointed out that the screening itself was not invisible either and the aim was not to have the mechanical equipment disappear, but rather have something that related architecturally to the building. As a result, they had painted the items which improved the aesthetics. OCII did not disagree with any of the fault and responsibility being put on the developer and the contractor. However, in the future they would be looking for better coordination among the design professionals to avoid this happening in the future. Mr. Kaslofsky indicated that, to his knowledge, this had not happened in any recent OCII construction and in this case, they decided not to invest any additional public funds in what was a nominal visual appearance problem on the top of this building.

Chair Scott inquired about whether there was anything that could be done to the designer or contractor, so they were aware that this should not have happened.

Commissioner Lim stated that the architect and the contractors were responsible for this and pointed out that there was errors and omissions insurance coverage that covered this type of mistake.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that they had considered many of these options. He argued that the construction loan was closing, the building was complete and being occupied and OCII needed to close out the construction so they were no longer paying construction interest. If they opened up the roof to put in two metal screens, it would delay things. He stressed that they did not think it was in the public's interest to further invest public money into it.

Commissioner Lim argued that this was not public money. He felt strongly that OCII should be going after the errors and omissions insurance of the design build contractor. Whatever cost was incurred with this fix, it would be covered by their insurance. He wondered if they could start construction even after everybody moved in.

Vice-Chair Miller inquired about whether at this point OCII had the Certificate of Occupancy (COO).

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that they had a temporary COO and that they were pursuing the final COO.

Commissioner Lim stated that the timing was okay then to pursue this further.

Vice-Chair Miller agreed with Commissioner Lim that they should have caught this error at the beginning. He stated that it looked like an industrial rooftop. However, he was not sure that it was worth it to pursue litigation against the actors involved and tie up staff time with it. He was pleased that there were steps in place to prevent this from being repeated in the future.

Chair Scott requested confirmation that the fix would not cost OCII anything, but would put the cost back on the designer architect and contractor which would be covered by their insurance. She deferred to Mr. Pappalardo for comment.

Mr. Pappalardo stated that without reviewing the contract and the insurance certificate, he could not make a definitive statement. He pointed out that insurance companies do not just hand out money based on a complaint. Mr. Pappalardo stated that OCII might have a case based on the existing contracts, the loan agreement, etc., but legal would have to look at existing contracts first in order to determine who had the legal obligation to make up the costs.

Commissioner Lim interjected that this constituted an omission by the architect and the design build contractor. The insurance company could easily come up with $300,000 to make the necessary changes. If there was a problem with fixing the error, OCII could hold their retention payment until they settled the dispute.

Commissioner Shaddix stated that he definitely agreed with Commissioner Lim and Commissioner Hakimi because this was a gross oversight. However, he also agreed with Vice-Chair Miller to move forward with the project. He pointed out that the CAC had already reviewed and approved this, which was the only reason that he was supporting this. Mr. Shaddix commented that unfortunately the new reality was looking at the rooftops of new buildings from one's own residence.

Commissioner Hakimi stated that, as a lawyer, she agreed with Commissioner Lim. However, she understood the dilemma that OCII was in, wanting to move the project forward, being a 100% affordable housing project. She was not sure about delaying the project any further but did feel that there should be reprimand against the architect and contractor such as by not using them again or at least be on high alert if OCII did use them again. Ms. Hakimi also referred to the legal documents and noted that this had never happened to OCII before. However, there should be provisions within the legal documents that state that if this sort of thing happened, it was their responsibility to pay to fix it.

Chair Scott agreed with Commissioner Hakami's statement that those responsible should pay a fine or fee. She felt that if they let it slide this time, the next time it would be difficult to hold anyone responsible because in the first instance they got away with it.

Commissioner Lim stressed strongly that this was Design 101, which stated that mechanical screens must be used to cover all equipment and everyone in the business knew it. He was appalled that this careless oversight could happen to an OCII Commission project in the first place.

Executive Director Kaslofsky concluded that to close this item, they would look into what an appropriate response would be to this situation and Commissioners would be updated on the results in the future.

Commissioner Hakimi motioned to move Item 5(f) and Commissioner Shaddix seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Hakimi - yes
Commissioner Lim - no
Commissioner Shaddix - yes
Vice-Chair Miller - yes
Chair Scott – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE DISSENT THAT RESOLUTION NO. 19-2026, APPROVING A VARIATION FOR THE TRANSBAY BLOCK 2 WEST PROJECT OF THE ROOFTOP MECHANICAL SCREENING DEVELOPMENT CONTROL REQUIRED BY THE TRANSBAY DEVELOPMENT CONTROLS AND DESIGN GUIDELINES; TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

6. **Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items** - None

7. **Report of the Chair**

Chair Scott announced that members of the OCII staff had provided a presentation on the Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP) Shipyard at a Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) meeting, which was informative and clear. She was proud that even though Pam Sims (OCII retiree) was gone, the work was still going on.

Chair Scott announced that she also attended another CAC meeting, where members of the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) were present for the first time. Dr. Scott was very pleased that the City was there. She demonstrated and handed out copies of a pamphlet for first time homebuyers that was distributed to the attendees.

Chair Scott announced that she attended the SF Juneteenth celebration with over 7,000 attendees, where information about the Certificate of Preference (COP) program was provided with overwhelming reception. She felt that attendees, including community and church leaders, were very excited about OCII's presence at that event. Dr. Scott reported that several of the COP program members were present to explain how the program worked and to answer many questions. Dr. Scott reported that a special opportunity for homeowners to get their roofs repaired was announced there, which was a special program, with a forgivable loan after five years. Dr. Scott was pleased that information regarding first-time homebuyer down-payment information was also released.

Commissioner Hakimi commented that she was very pleased to see the pamphlet. She stated that she had been on the Planning Department and they had never been able to get the audience to understand the COP program and the homeowner process.

8. **Report of the Executive Director**

Executive Director Kaslofsky announced that in the Commissioner binders were the previous outreach communications and flyers from the COP outreach program, which LYNX Insights & Investigations, Inc. (a private investigation and research firm working with OCII) and the New Community Leadership Foundation (NCLF) had been using to promote their workshops.

Executive Director Kaslofsky also announced that a new community-led pharmacy would open in BVHP and its build-out would start on August 1, 2026. He explained that since two pharmacies had closed in that community, there was currently no pharmacy in that area. Mr. Kaslofsky recognized that this was not an OCII-funded project, but that OCII had been involved in the area for many years. He also acknowledged the contribution of Commissioner Shaddix, whose organization had started the restoration of the vacant site many years ago in order to stabilize the block, which was adjacent to two of OCII's senior housing projects.

Mr. Kaslofsky welcomed a member of the SF Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) to speak about this.

Presenter: Larry McClendon, Senior Project Manager, OEWD

Chair Scott inquired about whether the new pharmacy would provide Over-the-Counter (OTC) medications as well as prescriptions.

Mr. McClendon responded that the pharmacy would be providing both. He stated that they would use a database of auto-prescriptions from throughout the neighborhood and within the City and County of San Francisco. Mr. McClendon added that they would carry all the medications prescribed on a regular basis, as well as provide health education, shots, and a food pharmacy. He informed that the intent of this pharmacy would be to cater and center around meeting the needs of all the community residents.

Commissioner Shaddix recalled his time spent with Mr. McClendon going through the site together 10 years ago. He highly commended Mr. McClendon's work on this project.

Chair Scott commented that this was so needed as she was well aware because she lived in that community and recalled that there were always long lines for service, which was difficult when one was sick. Dr. Scott hoped they could open another one soon. She thanked Mr. McClendon for his work on this project.

a) Transbay Essex Hillside Maintenance Request for Proposals (Discussion)

Executive Director Kaslofsky announced that this item was in regards to advertising a contracting opportunity for maintenance of a small OCII-owned open space parcel at the Essex Street hillside near Folsom and near one of OCII's affordable housing sites. The long-term plan for this property was for it to be transferred to the City for long-term usage as part of their bike improvements. He welcomed Mr. Brandin to provide more details.

Presenter: Benjamin Brandin, Project Manager, Transbay

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Commissioner Shaddix inquired about whether the maintenance agreement included the garden.

Mr. Brandin responded in the negative. He explained that the garden was managed by the East Cut Community Benefits District, and that OCII had entered into a property control agreement with them, whereby they controlled use of that property at no charge, but they were responsible for 100% of the maintenance of the garden and its operation. That was ongoing, funded independently on their own and the agreement was renewed every three years. Mr. Brandin reported that the Essex hillside at one point before the garden was there was part of the maintenance agreement with Forster & Kroeger. However, once the community garden was established, that area was extracted from their area of responsibility.
Vice-Chair Miller recalled the tour of that site and stated that he was looking forward to taking his bike across the Bay.

Mr. Brandin demonstrated two slides of the renderings of the public crossing over the Bay, quoting that the price to build this was estimated at over $1 billion. He explained that they would build a cantilevered section that would hang off the northern section of the Bridge which would traverse the entire span. Mr. Brandin remarked that currently one could ride a bike from Oakland to Yerba Buena but there was no way to get to the City. It was proposed that the track would come off the Bay Bridge and wind down the hillside terminating on Essex and would directly connect to the City bike paths on Folsom street. He explained that at one time OCII was going to develop this area as part of the Under Ramp Park project. However, the City and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission had earmarked this site for the bike landing and OCII was asked to hold the property and maintain it until it could be developed. Mr. Brandin added that it was a possibility that they would transfer this property to the City before the project was completed. Once transferred to the City, it would become the City's responsibility to maintain it.

Commissioner Lim inquired about the amount of the RFP.

Mr. Brandin explained the process of the RFP, whereby all of the respondents would come back with a proposed budget. He reported that the current budget for Forster & Kroeger Landscape Maintenance was $2,600/month for their services with a $43,000 contingency budget on top of that over the life of their three-year contract. So they would compare their budget in the RFP with the other proposals from other firms.

Chair Scott inquired about whether they had thought about a double-decker bike path.

Mr. Brandin responded that OCII had no involvement with the bike project.

Executive Director Kaslofsky stated that he did not think the design was very advanced. He added that if there was to be an open house regarding this project, he would make sure Chair Scott could participate with her design input.

Mr. Brandin acknowledged that this was a concept design and had not advanced very far.

b) Issuance of a Request for Proposals to develop, own, and operate affordable rental housing on Candlestick Point North Block 7; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion)

Executive Director Kaslofsky announced that this was an advertisement for development opportunity at Candlestick, the first 100% affordable project since the restart at a site near Gilman Park. He deferred to Ms. Jackson for details on this project.

Presenter: Channing Jackson, Assistant Development Specialist

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Vice-Chair Miller was very pleased with this presentation and thanked staff for their efforts in getting this project moving.

Commissioner Shaddix inquired about the income and restrictions and requested the dollar amounts.

Ms. Jackson responded that the AMI could go as low as 30%. She explained that once a developer was selected, OCII would encourage them to go out for subsidies, so the AMI could go below 30%. However, currently they had set the price from 30-60% AMI.

Executive Director Kaslofsky referred to the construction schedule and clarified that the incomes would be reflected for that time in the future. He pointed out that the MOHCD AMI table were incomes set for today's AMI levels. So the exact amounts were not shown because they were for the future.

She added that once a developer was recommended or selected, they would be encouraged to go for subsidy-based vouchers, if available, for deeper affordability.

Commissioner Shaddix referred to the parking ratio of .6-.8 spaces per unit and was not pleased with it.

Ms. Jackson responded that OCII had notified developers that they wanted to set the parking ratio at .6 to .8 spaces per unit.

Chair Scott was very pleased with the presentation. She was grateful for the information because she was getting many calls and questions from families looking for affordable housing with 4-5 bedrooms. She inquired about how many units might have that many bedrooms.

Ms. Jackson responded that once the developer had been selected, they would be able to walk through the design and discover what the need was. But they did plan to have a number of 4-5 bedroom units in the project.

Chair Scott commented on the parking restrictions and the challenges residents were facing within the City. She hoped they could come up with better parking solutions with at least one space per unit for cars. She felt that parking was just as important as housing. Dr. Scott felt they needed to reconsider the need for more parking. She thanked Ms. Jackson for her presentation.

Commissioner Hakimi thanked Ms. Jackson for her presentation and commented that it really helped her learn about the City issues.

9. Commissioners' Questions and Matters - None

10. Closed Session - None

11. Adjournment

Chair Scott asked for a motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Lim motioned to adjourn and Commissioner Shaddix seconded that motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jaimie Cruz
Commission Secretary