

Edwin M. Lee  
MAYOR



Mara Rosales  
CHAIR

Marily Mondejar  
VICE-CHAIR

Miguel Bustos  
Leah Pimentel  
Darshan Singh  
COMMISSIONERS

Tiffany Bohee  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE  
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HELD ON THE  
20th DAY OF DECEMBER 2016**

The members of the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure of the City and County of San Francisco met in a regular meeting at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 416, in the City of San Francisco, California, at 1:00 p.m. on the 20th day of December 2016, at the place and date duly established for holding of such a meeting.

**REGULAR MEETING AGENDA**

**1. Recognition of a Quorum**

Meeting was called to order at 1:08 p.m. Roll call was taken.

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

Commissioner Pimentel was absent. All other Commission members were present.

**2. Announcements**

A. The next scheduled Commission meeting will be a regular meeting held on Tuesday, January 3, 2017 at 1:00 p.m. (City Hall, Room 416).

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

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

C. Announcement of Time Allotment for Public Comments

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

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

**5. Matters of New Business:**

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

a) Approval of Minutes: October 18, 2016

### **Public Comment – None**

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

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

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

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE MEETING OF OCTOBER 18, 2016, BE ADOPTED.

## **REGULAR AGENDA**

b) Reviewing the design of UCSF's Mission Bay East Campus Phase 1 Building on Block 33 for substantial conformance with Required Design Standards as described in the Memorandum of Understanding between OCII and UCSF for Blocks 33-34; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 56-2016)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director, OCII; Mark Slutzkin, Project Manager, Mission Bay; Don Rudy, Deputy Campus Architect, UCSF; Mark Roddy, Design Principal, Smith Group JJR; Kevin Beauchamp, Campus Planning, UCSF; Damon Loo, Community Relations Office, UCSF; Todd Lansing, Landscape Architect, Creo; Nikki Henry, Associate Project Manager, Mission Bay

### **Public Comment - None**

Commissioner Bustos referred to Phase I, which was Block 33 and Phase II, which would include the parking lot sometime in the future. He inquired about whether there were any renditions of what the final block would look like in comparison to what they were looking at today because he felt that they needed to look ahead and see the whole thing. Mr. Bustos understood there were concerns about the garage and indicated that they might approve this piece but not the garage. He inquired about why they would want to approve anything today when the overall design was not included and asked that they share the entire vision with OCII. Mr. Bustos indicated that this was his first concern.

Mr. Slutzkin responded that Blocks 33 and 34 together would total up to 500,000 sq. ft. plus a 500 car garage. He responded that there was no final rendition of the entire project because they were many years away from working on Block 34. He added that they would come back before the Commission to make sure the garage and additional building conformed to Block 33.

Commissioner Bustos stated that he preferred the smaller building because it provided shading. He commented that the academic building looked like a block of glass and as OCII had been looking at some very unique building designs, they were looking for the "wow" factor. Mr. Bustos indicated that they had in the past asked had asked developers, including Lennar, to go back and redesign projects to offer something to the community rather than a bunch of boxes.

Mr. Roddy responded that they had to keep in mind what the Warriors were building in their center as well. He reported that during discussions, the university had indicated that they did not want the building to look like a corporate office building but stay more in keeping with an academic administrative office that would work with the overall campus. They also wanted to allow in appropriate daylight from all facades with a banding motif that connected all the buildings together.

Commissioner Bustos repeated that this building looked like an office building and that it needed something to make it stand out more because this was an important building and right now it looked plain.

Mr. Roddy added that the materials might add some texture and dimension and visual interest and responded that they would continue to work on this.

Commissioner Bustos referred to the fact that they had made it a priority to use local and long-term San Francisco (SF) businesses in new OCII projects. He stated that he had not seen any bios of businesses listed in the documents and indicated that they would be looking for businesses and professional services that would be included in the project.

Mr. Rudy responded that he agreed with the premise of using local businesses and that his organization took that very seriously. He pointed out that the General Contractor (GC), the architects, engineers and the entire design team was all local and that they had brought with them a person from UCSF to specifically talk about their participation in local hire. Mr. Rudy stressed that because of their construction logistics, they would need to depend heavily on local resources. He deferred to Mr. Lew for more details.

Mr. Lew explained that he managed the UCSF workforce program pertaining to recruitment and retention of SF residents. He reported that five years ago the UCSF community construction outreach program had decided to align itself with the City local hiring mandate. As a state agency, they could not mandate the same hiring goal so they did this on a voluntary basis and applied it to the Mission Bay (MB) Hospital for a 20% construction goal performed by SF residents. In partnership with Mission Hiring Hall they have had two main projects in MB in which the local hire program applied--the MB Hospital and the Mission Hall Global Health Sciences research building. For those two completed projects SF resident trade workers accounted for approximately 700,000 construction hours and \$26 million in wages were paid to SF residents. The target goal for the Hospital was 20% and they came in at 19.6%; for the Mission Hall project, the goal was 30% and they came in at 18%. Their goal for this project was 30% construction hours in line with City goals. Mr. Lew reported they were also looking to bolster local hire efforts and partner more closely with CityBuild's CAPSA (Construction Administration Professional Services Program) and City College's Construction Management Program to identify more internships opportunities with contractors and subcontractors as well as within UCSF to look at trade positions and others.

Commissioner Bustos reminded them that they would be asking for business bios to identify how long those businesses had been working in the City.

Commissioner Singh inquired about the palm trees on the project; inquired about the building color scheme; inquired about the completion date.

Mr. Lansing responded that there were palm trees planned for the Third Street streetscape which would be performed by Mission Bay.

Mr. Roddy responded that the academic office building would be limestone in an off-white color and the clinical building would be in a variety of earth tones, light bronze coloration so there would

be multiple variations of both colors. He responded that the project would be completed in June 2019.

Vice-Chair Mondejar wanted clarification that they were asking for approval for Blocks 33 & 34; she inquired about how large the garage would be; inquired about whether there were any other plans for Block 34. Ms. Mondejar stated that they needed to see a larger overview to see the finished product.

Mr. Slutzkin clarified that Block 33 was included in the current presentation and that Block 34 was a parking lot and they would be coming back later for a second approval on Block 34. He responded that the garage would hold 500 cars and be about 90' tall. He responded that Block 34 would include a 160,000 sq. ft. building and would have to have a garage to accommodate all the parking needs. The parking would be in a separate structure on what was currently an open space.

Mr. Beauchamp responded that Blocks 33 & 34 were entitled for 500,000 sq. ft. of building space with a 500-space parking structure. He explained that Phase One displayed the building with surface parking lot. In the future the surface parking lot would be replaced with a parking structure. They had not completed the programming at this time and had no designs for Phase II but would come back later for approval of the second building and the parking structure.

Vice-Chair Mondejar indicated that CAC had expressed concern that the parking structure might block the view; inquired about how large the two conference centers and the auditorium would be.

Mr. Beauchamp responded that they were aware of those concerns and one consideration that they put into design of Phase II was how that would affect views from the hospital across the street and whatever other development existed in the area at that time.

Mr. Roddy responded that the 100-seat auditorium was destined for the ophthalmology clinicians and the two conference centers would service the office building. The centers were comprised of two large conference rooms with a divisible wall and other medium-sized conference rooms available for staff. He did not have the seating capacity of the conference rooms.

Vice-Chair Mondejar inquired about whether they would be renting out the rooms to the public or whether they would just be for internal use; inquired about how these would impact parking; inquired about whether the café would be open to the public and what hours it would be open; inquired about how many bike spaces there would be.

Mr. Roddy responded that the conference rooms would be for internal use by staff in the building and staff and academics across the street. He responded that the café would be open to the public and was programmed for 2000 sq. ft. designed as a coffee shop. They did not have a tenant yet so they did not know the hours of service. Mr. Roddy explained that they had placed the café on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street for access by patients, family members and staff. He responded that he did not have the number of bike spaces but the bike storage would be next to the café and would be for staff and workers in the building only. He added that showers would be provided at the bike storage location as well and would be available to employees only.

Chair Rosales referred to the amenities map and inquired about the transportation lines that would be servicing the area; inquired about the overlap of this project with the Warriors arena construction.

Mr. Slutzkin deferred to Nikki Henry for details.

Mr. Henry responded that the 55 was the interim bus until the 22 Fillmore was completed and would extend down to 16<sup>th</sup>. He added that the T-lines would expand once the central subway opened.

Mr. Slutzkin responded that Andy Vanderwater with the City was spearheading coordination of all the construction, including this project, Block 36, the Warriors arena and the T-line platform change for the Warriors center, all of which would be happening at the same time.

Chair Rosales inquired about whether there would be weekly meetings regarding the traffic and neighborhood impacts from these projects; inquired about whether the Warriors had a parking component for their project; inquired about the parking capacity for the Parnassus structure.

Mr. Slutzkin responded that there were no scheduled meetings yet but assumed they would be scheduled soon. He reported that they were also opening up Owen and Channel Streets to relieve the congestion around Third Street into MB and were hoping to have them opened by May 2017. He responded that the Warriors had a subterranean 1,000-space parking structure and had also acquired parking in a parking garage north as well.

Mr. Beauchamp responded that the Parnassus structure held about 500-600 spaces.

Commissioner Bustos inquired about whether they had considered subterranean parking for Phase II; again asked if they had considered going underground because they were facing opposition in going up.

Mr. Beauchamp responded that they knew they would have to provide a parking resource once they displaced the surface parking lot with the parking garage and the second building. They had some flexibility because they had parking resources on the UCSF campus across 3<sup>rd</sup> Street. The parking demand generated by Phase I was determined to be 470 spaces, so 200 of those spaces would be accommodated by the service parking lot. The remainder would be accommodated by lots across the street and other parking UCSF resources. Mr. Beauchamp reported that as they projected the parking needs for Phase II, the idea was to provide priority parking for patients and health care providers as close to the building as possible. He responded that having a subterranean parking area was a possibility when they moved forward. However, he added that the buildings in Phase II would not be very tall because the area was located in a 90' height zone. Those buildings were planned to be lower to not obstruct the sunlight along the bayshore.

Vice-Chair Mondejar inquired about whether the 55 would be discontinued once the 22 line was activated.

Mr. Henry responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Singh inquired about whether there was any housing in the area for the workers; inquired about how many units there would be.

Mr. Beauchamp responded that there was a plan underway to develop student housing for graduate students and trainees south of the MB redevelopment plan area, which would come online about 2020 and would be comprised of 610 units.

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

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

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

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION No. 56-2016, REVIEWING THE DESIGN OF UCSF'S MISSION BAY EAST CAMPUS PHASE 1 BUILDING ON BLOCK 33 FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE WITH REQUIRED DESIGN STANDARDS AS DESCRIBED IN THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN OCII AND UCSF FOR BLOCKS 33-34; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

c) Workshop on the Annual Affordable Housing Production Report for OCII's FY 2015-16  
(Discussion)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director, OCII; Jeff White, Housing Program Manager

### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Speakers: Oscar James, native resident, Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP); Peter Cohen, Council of Community Housing Organizations

Mr. James spoke about the possibility of Certificate of Preference (CoP) holders being able to get information on the TV news channels. He reported that there were many people in Sacramento and Stockton who were CoP holders but were not getting the information. Mr. James acknowledged that OCII did a lot of work trying to find people. However, he reported that some of his friends from Sacramento had called him for information regarding the CoP program because some of these people do want to return to the City. Mr. James requested that information be made available to the people in those areas as well. He was wondering if there were people in other areas of SF and the Bay Area who also were not getting significant information regarding the program. Mr. James expressed concern that people who wanted to become contractors be able to get information about becoming contractors. He referred to the 1970 Model Cities Memorandum of Understanding, which dealt with creating jobs in the Mission and BVHP and which was extended from Geneva to 280 by the ball park. So the people living within those areas were grandfathered in and were able to participate and Mr. James asked OCII to enforce that.

Mr. Cohen stated that he and Fernando Marti were co-directors of the organization and were totally involved in housing policy Citywide. He explained that they worked with OCII staff, specifically with Jeff White, and that historically they had been involved actively with the previous San Francisco Redevelopment Agency. Mr. Cohen complimented Commission staff on putting this report together. He referred to a colored graph on page 24 that they referred to as dashboards, which he described as snapshots of how those three big plan areas were developing in the context of the affordability goals set for them. Mr. Cohen stated that if you stepped back and looked at what these areas were supposed to accomplish and the progress along the way, this little table and the narrative was very helpful, especially with regard to balance. He explained that what made SF continue to be a place for all was having a balance of housing that was affordable for different people. He pointed out that it was a disaster outside of OCII plan areas, but inside the plan areas, significant goals had been set and were being achieved through the link between market rate and affordable housing. Mr. Cohen stated that this success story was very impressive and was about balance and that more people should know about it. He suggested that the little chart be enlarged

to a whole page, called out and let the public know about it. (OCII staff subsequently enlarged the chart for the final report per this suggestion).

Commissioner Bustos thanked staff for the report.

Commissioner Singh inquired about the amount of very low income rental; inquired about how much it would cost seniors.

Mr. White responded that 25% AMI would be \$19,000 for a single person/senior and their rent would be approx. \$500/month. He explained that a four person household would be at 50% AMI or about \$53,000/year. He added that they also served people below that at 40% AMI and 30% AMI and the homeless. He responded that seniors pay the same affordable rent, but explained that Dr. Davis Residence has Section 8, so those seniors pay only 30% of their income.

Chair Rosales referred to slide 6 which indicated that 265 affordable units were delivered. She inquired about whether these were all family units or not. Ms. Rosales stated that she it would be very helpful to know how many actual individuals including children were being positively affected and benefitted by their policies. She inquired about reference in the report to costs being capped; inquired about what cost containment meant and the amount.

Mr. White responded that 120 units would be senior and the 145 units remaining would be for families. He figured out in his head that if the household size was 2.3, then the total would be 450 to 500 people being affected by these units. He responded that the current CDLAC cost allocation cap is approximately \$825,000 per unit, and the Candlestick Point projects have to fall below that amount. The Candlestick Point project costs are skewing high due required larger unit sizes. He explained that because of the DDA they had to build slightly larger units at that site, not below 2.5 bedrooms/unit, which results in units that are more expensive to build. Mr. White responded that cost containment meant being mindful of things like square footage, unit sizes, how much common area there would be, the building footprint, community services spaces, offices, supportive service spaces, finishes, stacking, among other things.

Executive Director Bohee added that there were two significant highlights regarding the CoP program. One was concerning welcoming African Americans back to SF from places like Sacramento, Hayward, Fresno, Oakland and Richmond, which had resulted in an in-migration. On the local hiring side, there was additional information as well and she deferred back to Mr. White for more detail.

Mr. White referred to page 7 which contained a chart highlighting construction work opportunities and summarized that 6,534 jobs had been created during fiscal year 2015/16, there was a total of 1.55 million construction hours and over \$92 million in wages had been paid. Also, 27% was SF resident workforce so 1,222 SF residents were employed on OCII housing projects.

Chair Rosales referred to the breakdown by zip code of where the SF residents were from: 94110 was the Mission, 94112 was Bernal & Outer Mission & 94124 was the Bayview and that this showed the impact on the SF neighborhoods that needed it. Ms. Rosales commended all the good work.

d) Workshop on the Certificate of Preference Marketing and Outreach Report, FY 2015-16 from the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (Discussion)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director, OCII; Pamela Sims, Senior Development Specialist, Housing Division; Maria Benjamin, Director, Home Ownership & Below Market Rate Programs, MOHCD

## **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Speaker: Oscar James, native resident, BVHP

Mr. James indicated that he was a CoP holder as well his children and he hoped that they would apply for a place to live under the program and get out of his house. Mr. James commended OCII for getting CoP holders the necessary information. He commended the Dahlia system and thought it should be included on the certificate when they sent them out. He was very happy to hear about the neighborhood resident housing preference program so residents living in an area would be able to apply and get housing as well. Mr. James reported that one of the concerns of those living in BVHP and other project areas was that they no longer had a SF address because they had moved out of their parents' home and were told they could not get on the priority list even though they had lived in those project areas for many years. This has always been a concern in the project areas. Mr. James commended staff working on the housing programs.

Commissioner Bustos recalled a saying that at the end of life people would remember not what you said but how you made people feel. He stated that this was the essence of this project; that the CoP program was about giving people a home again in their home. He recalled that originally people had not been displaced because of their income or credit scores and they should be allowed back in SF not based on their income or credit scores. Mr. Bustos referred to creative ways of disseminating the CoP program information. He stated that KPOO did lots of community announcements and that many of the TV channels had public segments and perhaps OCII could reach out to them to announce CoP information.

Commissioner Singh thanked the staff for all their hard work and especially Executive Director Bohee and Jim Morales. He extended best wishes for happy holidays to everyone.

Chair Rosales stated that this had been a long road and really appreciated all the challenges and all the outreach accomplished. She stated that it was like giving people a second chance and even additional chances by encouraging them to not give up when they were rejected, but to get back on track and keep trying. She was pleased to hear about the in-migration of African Americans. Ms. Rosales referred to Slide 19 and the Dr. Davis complex map. She pointed out that there was a cluster in District 10 and inquired about what happened to the housing that people were leaving to go into new housing.

Ms. Sims responded that the majority of people from District 10 had been living with relatives and paying a modest rent. She reported that sometimes relatives were upset that they were leaving. But for those living at Dr. Davis, it was like a new lease on life. Ms. Sims described the holiday party at the Dr. Davis Center, which was "rocking" and suggested Commissioners attend the party next year.

## **6. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items**

Speaker: Oscar James, native resident, BVHP

Mr. James wanted to wish everyone a happy holiday and hoped they would be able to move forward with all the programs in 2017 to benefit the people of SF even with the challenge of a new president. He thanked everyone for all their hard work all year.



**7. Report of the Chair**

Chair Rosales wished everyone a happy holiday and a happy new year.

**8. Report of the Executive Director**

Executive Director Bohee announced that it was good to look back at the accomplishments and successes from all their hard work over the past year. She reported that the next meeting would be in the Bayview on January 17, 2017.

**9. Commissioners' Questions and Matters – None**

**10. Closed Session**

**11. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Rosales at 3:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Lucinda Nguyen". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Interim Commission Secretary