

**MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
OVERSIGHT BOARD OF THE CITY AND
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HELD ON THE
24th DAY OF MAY 2018**

The members of the Oversight Board of the City and County of San Francisco met in a special meeting at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 408, in the City of San Francisco, California, at 10:30 a.m. on the 24th day of May 2018, at the place and date duly established for holding of such a meeting.

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Meeting was called to order by Chair Bukowski at 10:33 a.m.

Roll call was taken.

Chair Kenneth Bukowski – present
David Goldin - present
Bevan Dufty - present
Vice-Chair Lisa Motoyama – present
Bob Muscat – absent
John Rahaim – absent

Board member Muscat was absent; Board member Rahaim arrived late. All other Board members were present. The seat for the Community College District is currently vacant.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Regular Meeting of January 22, 2018

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Board member Dufty motioned to move Item 2) and it was seconded by Vice-Chair Motoyama.

Voice vote was taken for Item 2).

Chair Bukowski – yes
Board member Goldin - yes
Board member Dufty – yes
Vice-Chair Motoyama – yes
Board member Muscat – absent
Board member Rahaim – absent

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR BOARD MEMBERS WITH TWO ABSENCES THAT APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF JANUARY 22, 2018, BE ADOPTED.

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- A. The next scheduled Board meeting will be a regular meeting held on Monday, September 10, 2018 at 11:00 am (City Hall, Room 408).
- 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

Please be advised a member of the public has up to three minutes to make pertinent public comments on each agenda item unless the Oversight Board adopts a shorter period on any item. It is strongly recommended that members of the public who wish to address the Oversight Board should fill out a "Speaker Card" provided by the Board Secretary, and submit the completed card to the Board Secretary.

4. CONSENT AGENDA – None

5. REGULAR AGENDA

- A. Approving the Sixth Amendment to the Mission Bay South Owner Participation Agreement to remove a 0.3-acre portion of Seawall Lot 337 known as "P20"; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 2 - 2018)

Presenters: Nadia Sesay, Executive Director; Marc Slutzkin, Project Manager, Mission Bay

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Board member Dufty motioned to move Item 5A) and it was seconded by Board member Rahaim.

Voice vote was taken for Item 5A).

Chair Bukowski – yes
Board member Goldin - yes
Board member Dufty – yes
Vice-Chair Motoyama – yes
Board member Muscat – absent
Board member Rahaim – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FIVE BOARD MEMBERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 2 – 2018, APPROVING THE SIXTH AMENDMENT TO THE MISSION BAY SOUTH OWNER PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT TO REMOVE A 0.3-ACRE PORTION OF SEAWALL LOT 337 KNOWN AS “P20”; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Agenda Items 5(B) and 5(C) related to the Redevelopment Plan for the Hunters Point Shipyard and Candlestick Point Project Area were presented together but acted on separately

- B. Adopting findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Authorizing a Seventh Amendment to the Disposition and Development Agreement (Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 1) with HP Development Co., LP, and finding such action is in the best interests of the taxing entities; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 3 - 2018)

- C. Adopting findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Authorizing a Third Amendment to the Disposition and Development Agreement (Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard) with CP Development Co., LLC to effectuate an updated program of development for the project, and confirming such action is in the best interests of the taxing entities; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area and Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 4 - 2018)

Presenters: Nadia Sesay, Executive Director; Sally Oerth, Deputy Director; Dr. Veronica Hunnicutt, Chair, Shipyard Citizens Advisory Council (CAC); Jose Campos, Manager, Planning and Design Review, OCII

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Linda Richardson, Board of Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP) Public Senior Center & Bayview resident; Brian Butler, Green Action Community Organizer & Policy Advocate; Sheridan Noelani Enomoto, Green Action for Health & Environmental Justice; Michael Theriault, San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council; Dr. Raymond Tompkins

Ms. Richardson stated that she was in support of the DDA amendment and had always been involved with environmental issues at BVHP. She stated that Five Point had gone beyond the call of duty and had been very gracious to the BVHP seniors and that the community benefits were clearly defined. Ms. Richardson reported that the Shipyard was the only project that employed HP and San Francisco residents and Five Point had exceeded goals in job creation. She commended the access to business incubators at the Shipyard as well as schools and light industrial spaces integrated as mixed-use, which was unique for the City. She thanked Board member Rahaim for coming to BVHP the previous day.

Mr. Butler inquired about how many Board members had been present at the Board of Supervisors hearing two weeks prior regarding the Shipyard environmental issues and the Tetrtech revelations. He felt it was critical that Oversight Board members be involved in this issue. Mr. Butler expressed his concern about the discussion of moving forward with development of the Shipyard in light of recent discoveries and inquired about what the plan would be if the area was found to be unsuitable for residential and commercial activity. He also expressed caution in working too closely with the Shipyard CAC because in his close contact with the community, he had found that many residents claimed that the CAC was too narrow and not representative of the entire community, especially the poor, and requested that the Oversight Board as well as OCII broaden the stakeholder engagement and work with more independent community organizations, beyond the CAC. Mr. Butler explained that many residents felt that the CAC was tied too tightly to the City's agenda, which was to expedite the creation of more low income housing to solve the City's housing crisis, but was not meeting the needs of the low income residents in that area.

Ms. Enomoto stated that she had spoken at the April 17 OCII meeting. She was pleased that there had been discussion of the environmental impact report because it had been based on 2010 findings and in the meantime much had been revealed, especially regarding the fraudulent activity. She expressed her concern regarding the impact of water level rise on shoreline communities such as Candlestick and HP Shipyard. Ms. Enomoto referred to an underground fire that broke out at the Shipyard in 2000 which burned for 105 days and for which to this day there was still no explanation from the City. She reminded everyone that the Shipyard was a Superfund site and any development there needed to be taken seriously, especially accountability for Shipyard residents and what it would really mean to build on an impacted Superfund site. Ms. Enomoto agreed that the City needed housing but remarked that not all land needed to be developed. There were other areas in the City that could be developed instead of the Shipyard that were sitting empty.

Mr. Theriault commended Dr. Hunnicutt and expressed his great admiration for articulateness, her clear dedication to the community, her intelligence and her insight. He stated that they would eventually have a clean site at the Shipyard and he welcomed the increased scrutiny of the clean-up which was so critical for site workers as well as the ultimate residents. Mr. Theriault asserted that they would need to have a plan to do something with that site once it was cleaned up. He referred to the history of Mission Bay, which was a site that had required considerable clean-up and which went through several permutations in the course of its history, where they did not foresee that UCSF would become a key component nor that the Warriors Arena would be there nor that there would be any other forms of technology other than biotech. Mr. Theriault stated that, like Mission Bay, this project needed some adaptability to changes in economic conditions. On the positive side, it would create increased employment opportunities in the construction trades as well as for the community and City residents. In terms of housing and the financial opportunities for housing, Mr. Theriault reported that they had taken HP and BV community members into the building trades for a generation now and then watched them flow out of town because there was no low income housing or BMR housing available for them. This housing would allow them to stay in the community and the design was very impressive as well.

Dr. Tompkins stated that he had served on the Navy's remediation advisory board for 12 years, had chaired the technical committee for 6 years and also governed and operated the

EPA Federal Tag Grant for Community Assistance. He stated that he had hired many university experts and scientists over the years to assist him in cleaning up hazardous waste sites. Dr. Tompkins clarified that this project was not technically a clean-up, but rather a containment operation and warned that there would be severe restrictions on the Shipyard property. He wanted to clarify that he was for development; however, the Shipyard community had been impacted by the environmental hazards at that site. Dr. Tompkins explained that the surface scans being done at this site were not adequate for this kind of containment because they only go 6-12 inches and were not effective. The only appropriate method for measuring radiation was core sampling going nine feet deep into the soil and the water table and measuring water for radiation contamination. Dr. Tompkins reported that there was radiation spilled all over the Shipyard naval base and that radiation from plutonium had a half life span of 1,600 years and would not go away. He asked Board members to consider moving forward with Candlestick but to wait on the Shipyard.

Board member Dufty motioned to move Item 5B) and it was seconded by Board member Rahaim.

Voice vote was taken for Item 5B).

Chair Bukowski – yes
Board member Goldin - yes
Board member Dufty – yes
Vice-Chair Motoyama – yes
Board member Muscat – absent
Board member Rahaim – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FIVE BOARD MEMBERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 3-2018, ADOPTING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; AUTHORIZING A SEVENTH AMENDMENT TO THE DISPOSITION AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT (HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD PHASE 1) WITH HP DEVELOPMENT CO., LP, AND FINDING SUCH ACTION IS IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE TAXING ENTITIES; HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Board member Dufty motioned to move Item 5C) and it was seconded by Board member Rahaim.

Voice vote was taken for Item 5C).

Chair Bukowski – yes
Board member Goldin - yes
Board member Dufty – yes
Vice-Chair Motoyama – yes
Board member Muscat – absent
Board member Rahaim – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FIVE BOARD MEMBERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 4-2018, ADOPTING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; AUTHORIZING A THIRD AMENDMENT TO THE DISPOSITION AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT (CANDLESTICK POINT AND PHASE 2 OF THE HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD) WITH CP DEVELOPMENT CO., LLC TO EFFECTUATE AN UPDATED PROGRAM OF DEVELOPMENT FOR THE PROJECT, AND CONFIRMING SUCH ACTION IS IN THE BEST INTERESTS OF THE TAXING ENTITIES; HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA AND BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

6. NEW MATTERS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION - None

7. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS - None

8. ADJOURNMENT

Board member Dufty motioned to move Item 8 and it was seconded by Board member Rahaim.

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Bukowski at 11:45 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Jaimie Cruz
Board Secretary

ADOPTED: