

London N. Breed  
MAYOR



Miguel Bustos  
CHAIR

Mara Rosales  
VICE-CHAIR

Sally Oerth  
INTERIM EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Bivett Brackett  
Dr. Carolyn Ransom-Scott  
COMMISSIONERS

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE  
COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE  
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HELD ON THE  
19th DAY OF JANUARY 2021**

The members of the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure of the City and County of San Francisco met in a regular meeting via teleconference at 1:00 p.m. on the 19th day of January 2021. The public was invited to watch the meeting live on SFGOVTV: <https://sfgovtv.org/ccii>

**PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN:** 1-415-655-0001 **ACCESS CODE:** 146 131 0665

In accordance with Governor Gavin Newsom's statewide order for all residents to "Stay at Home" - and the numerous preceding local and state proclamations, orders and supplemental directions - aggressive directives were issued to slow down and reduce the spread of the COVID-19 virus. Individuals were encouraged to participate in the meetings remotely by calling in during the public comment section of the meeting.

**REGULAR MEETING AGENDA**

**1. Recognition of a Quorum**

Meeting was called to order at 1:13 p.m. by Chair Bustos. Chair Bustos apologized for the late start. Roll call was taken.

Commissioner Brackett - present  
Commissioner Scott - present  
Vice-Chair Rosales - present  
Chair Bustos - present

All Commissioners were present.

**2. Announcements**

- a) The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will be held remotely on Tuesday, February 2, 2021 at 1:00 pm.
- b) Announcement of Time Allotment for Public Comments from participants dialing in: Please be advised 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. Please note that during the public comment period, all dial-in participants from the public will be instructed to call a toll-free number and use their touch-tone phones to register any desire for public comment. Comments will be taken in the order that it was received. 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: 146 131 0665**

Secretary Cruz read 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 of regular meeting of December 1, 2020

**PUBLIC COMMENT - None**

Commissioner Scott motioned to move Item 5(a) and Commissioner Brackett seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Brackett – yes

Commissioner Scott - yes

Vice-Chair Rosales - yes

Chair Bustos – yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF DECEMBER 1, 2020, BE ADOPTED.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

b) Electing the Chair and Vice Chair under Section 27 of the Successor Agency Bylaws (Discussion and Action)

Chair Bustos requested nominations for the position of Chair.

Commissioner Scott nominated Miguel Bustos for the position of Chair.

Chair Bustos accepted that nomination.

**PUBLIC COMMENT – None**

Hearing no other nominations nor any oppositions or abstentions, Chair Bustos called for a voice vote.

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

Commissioner Brackett – yes

Commissioner Scott - yes

Vice-Chair Rosales - yes

Chair Bustos – yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT THE NOMINATION OF MIGUEL BUSTOS FOR THE POSITION OF CHAIR, BE ADOPTED.

Chair Bustos requested nominations for the position of Vice-Chair.

Commissioner Scott nominated Mara Rosales for the position of Vice-Chair and Vice-Chair Rosales accepted that nomination.

**PUBLIC COMMENT** – None

Hearing no other nominations nor any oppositions or abstentions, Chair Bustos called for a voice vote.

Secretary Cruz called for a voice vote on Item 5(b) for position of Vice-Chair.

Commissioner Brackett – yes  
Commissioner Scott - yes  
Vice-Chair Rosales - yes  
Chair Bustos – yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT THE NOMINATION OF MARA ROSALES FOR THE POSITION OF VICE-CHAIR, BE ADOPTED.

Chair Bustos congratulated Vice-Chair Rosales on her election.

- c) Conditionally approving the Basic Concept Design and Schematic Design Documents for Block 1 in Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 1, which propose 224 residential units (200 market-rate units and 24 inclusionary units) and an Amended Schedule of Performance for Block 1; and providing notice that this approval is within the scope of the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 1 Reuse Final Environmental Impact Report (“FEIR”), a program EIR, and is adequately described in the FEIR for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act; and, adopting environmental review findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 01-2021)

Presenters: Sally Oerth, Interim Executive Director; Kasheica McKinney, Assistant Project Manager, Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point Project Area; Dr. James McCray, Executive Director, Tabernacle Community Development Corporation (TCDC); Gerald Green, Project Manager, TCDC; Norberto Nardi, Architect, Nardi Associates LLP; Emil Khodorkovsky, CEO, Forbix Capital Corp.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Speakers: Linda F. Richardson, resident of Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP); Pastor Josiah Bell, Co-Chair, BVHP CAC; Jason Fried, President of the Condo Association, HOA for the Shipyard; Timothy Allen Simon, resident of BVHP, member of Bayview Hills Neighborhood Association and native of San Francisco; Stephanie, neighborhood resident; Eric Vanderpool, Shipyard homeowner; Theo Ellington, Hunters Point resident and former OCII Commissioner; [unintelligible], member of the Shipyard community; Dadria Smith, Bayview resident; Christine Lapan, homeowner at 451 Donahue

Ms. Richardson stated that she was in support of this project. She reported that she had appeared before this agency many times to support the community builder program which the community worked to establish decades ago. Ms. Richardson noted that this was the first equity provision ever written into any disposition development in the history of San Francisco and, in spite of the many challenges within the community builder program, the TCDC has prevailed. She asked Commissioners to support this item and thanked staff for their hard work and support of this item. Ms. Richardson commended Dr. Veronica Hunnicutt (Chair, BVHP CAC) for her tireless work with the community and the former head of Five Point, Kofi Bonner, who inherited this program and made sure that this program would remain in place for TCDC to continue forward.

Pastor Bell was in support of the Palmilia development project. He reminded everyone that this was the first and only time that the community has been able to benefit from the demolition and rebuilding of their community, unlike the case of redevelopment when entities other than the residents benefitted from the demolition and reconstruction of their own neighborhoods. Pastor Bell reiterated that the community had fought tirelessly to make sure that the BVHP community benefitted from this work. He commended the TCDC group for stepping forward and facing the challenges involved and making this happen. He urged Commissioners to support this project.

Mr. Fried stated that he was a resident of 451 Donahue Street, which was right across the street from Block 1 and that he wished he could be in support of this project. Counter to some other comments, Mr. Fried reported there had not been good public outreach by the developer. He explained that the developer had met with each community group once and only once, which he referred to as a “checkbox” meeting, because they needed to say they met with the community groups and they checked it off the list with no intention of doing anything more. Mr. Fried reported that the community groups had given the developer a list of questions that they wanted to discuss but the developer did not respond back until the day of the CAC meeting, so they did not have a chance to discuss any of their concerns with the developer and had not met with them since. He urged OCII to delay voting on this item to give the community more time to discuss some of the concerns and fix some of the issues raised. One issue was the discussion of views and he stated that during the presentation, only one view was demonstrated for one group of residents. However, in reality, this project would block all views for his building because of the height limit for this project. Mr. Fried stated that some, but not all residents would suffer from the proposed height limits, which was unfair for the residents living at his residence.

Mr. Simon stated that he was an attorney and a former Public Utilities Commissioner. He stated that he was in support of this item and encouraged OCII to approve this item. Mr. Simon commended the TCDC for their work and community engagement in this project and for the history that they were bringing in understanding the African American and the BVHP community and other cultures which desperately needed housing and rejuvenation of this area. Mr. Simon indicated that they had done everything necessary to achieve this approval.

Ms. Stephanie stated that she had been a resident in the neighborhood for over four years and that she supported the development of the block. However, she reported several issues: One: the developer had pitched to many of the surrounding residents that their view would not be obstructed; however, as per the design that was just presented, this could not be true according to the height limit discussed. Two: the start date of the project would conflict with another project which was just a block away and this multiple construction work would adversely impact the neighborhood with construction and traffic. She reported that most of these units would have 2-3 bedrooms, which meant that one parking spot would not be sufficient for these residents. As this avenue was a main road for the community, Ms. Stephanie explained that it would be impossible to handle all the traffic. Three: public amenities had always been an issue in this area with only one restaurant since 2019 and no grocery stores. She inquired about what plans were being made for grocery stores and restaurants to open within this development. Four: the design for the grey walls looked great on the outside; however, as you walked around the area there were many green walls inside.

Mr. Vanderpool had certain issues about the outreach of this project: 1) The community needed to be included in the design process much earlier than it was. He reported that by the time there was any community outreach in this development, the architectural design was already in place and schematic design drawn. By the time the community was allowed to give input, the attitude by OCII staff and the developer was that it was too late to change anything, when they never listened to any comments or concerns in the first place. Mr. Vanderpool stressed that there must be brainstorming and listening sessions at the beginning of these projects with the community. 2) Community outreach must be more than a check in a box. Even though the developer had the emails of many of the Shipyard residents, the developer claimed they had no way to contact residents to set up a meeting with them. This was not true. After the meeting was actually secured, 30 residents showed up and afterwards, there was no follow up or feedback with them. OCII, CAC and the developer needed to treat residents as a partner in the process. As a condition, the developer must be required to meet periodically with nearby homeowners to discuss many construction issues and other community concerns. 3) The CAC must listen to and value community input instead of treating those comments with condescension.

Mr. Ellington stated that he was excited about this project. However, he hoped OCII would be able to add two additional design workshops for residents at 451 Donahue. He reported that the previous comments by community members had been correct: community input had been very limited. He explained that numerous attempts had been made to meet with the developer which resulted in one information meeting and after that, they received a canned response from the developer. Mr. Ellington expressed concern about the height along Donahue Street. During the presentation, there had been inaccurate and misleading images regarding the views and the view from Donahue Street had been removed and only the image from Morgan Heights was presented. He reported that there was also concern regarding construction management in the neighborhood due to construction traffic and inability to use sidewalks. Mr. Ellington stated that there needed to be interim activation of the site because it was a mess and needed to be cleaned up and the developer had yet to address any of these items.

Mr. [unintelligible] was in favor of this project and stated that it was well-designed and would be good for Shipyard residents.

Ms. Smith stated that she was in support of this project and asked OCII Commissioners to vote for this project. She thanked TCDC for their work on this project. Ms. Smith reminded everyone that the CAC meetings had been held with the community for years on this project and other projects. She commended Dr. Hunnicutt and Ms. Richardson for their support on this project.

Commissioner Scott thanked Palmilia, OCII staff and TCDC for their hard work and for staying with this project for so long. She was in support of this project and stated that this had been going on for over 40 years and there had been many ongoing meetings regarding this project over the years. Ms. Scott stated that living in a city, residents have always had to deal with parking and views; however, they needed housing here right now. This project would bring much joy and peace to the BV neighborhood and there was no reason for delay or change, only moving forward.

Ms. Lapan stated that she was excited about the project. However, she requested that more meaningful consultations take place with the neighboring buildings because of the issue with height. She explained that the drawings were very misleading according to how the view would be for residents at 451 Donahue and would like the building to step back more and decrease the height. Ms. Lapan reported that the other big issue was with the traffic, which impacted movement on the road due to the construction.

Commissioner Brackett stated that while many of the residents who had recently moved into the area felt they had not been included in the design of this project, in reality, there had been community meetings regarding this project since the 1990's, so the community had been waiting for this almost

30 years. She mentioned other public amenities in the area as well. The newcomers now lived in residences whose construction back then blocked views of the surrounding residents before them. Ms. Brackett indicated that it was better to have a beautiful new project for a community waiting so long for this rather than continue to argue about heights and views. She was in support of this project and suggested that if the community wanted to be included in the selection of restaurants and other public amenities, the project management team would be open to community input for this issue. She inquired about the plan for units converted from rental to housing and whether they would be sold as rent to own. Ms. Brackett stated that very often people moved into rentals because they were not able to purchase. She inquired about what would happen to residents if their unit was slated to be converted to ownership and they could not purchase at that time. She inquired about whether that meant those residents would be out on the street or would the unit not be converted at that particular time.

Ms. McKinney responded that at lease-up, a portion of the units would be rental; however, when/if the developer elected to convert to home ownership, the residents living in those units would have an opportunity to have first right of refusal and first opportunity to buy. She explained that this would not be outright rent to own, but only if the developer decided to convert. Ms. McKinney responded that prior to converting the units, the developer would have to come to OCII to present a plan for conversion, in which OCII would play a significant role and would have to approve. She added that the Housing team would be working with the renters so there would be plenty of notice to the residents to prepare for the conversion.

Ms. Sims responded that the beauty of this project was that both the rental and ownership were at 80% AMI, so the reach to purchase would not be as high because it depended on when the conversion would happen. She added that because of the notice to renters, the renters would be able to save for a down-payment for purchase.

Vice-Chair Rosales thanked staff for the presentation. She requested a response from the developer regarding the public comments they had just heard and the opportunity for meaningful consultation.

Ms. McKinney responded that the developer had submitted a proposal regarding height for 55'. However, she explained that protecting private views would not be accommodated with this project.

Mr. Green responded that he understood the desire for a construction management plan with controls over the General Contractor and also reaching out with a briefing session from time to time regarding construction status. He explained that these kinds of issues came up on a regular basis with projects such as this one and that they were very reasonable requests. He reported that Ms. McKinney was preparing language that would be embedded as a condition to cover these issues. Mr. Green stated that they would be prepared to meet with the community and designate a contact person from the developer and the GC they could communicate with. He stated that having a dialogue with the community, the HOA and the CAC regarding tenancy and anticipated activities would be very beneficial and that his organization would be prepared to listen to their suggestions. He added that they intended to focus on local, small, minority and women-owned businesses.

Vice-Chair Rosales referred to the height issue and inquired about how long a delay there would be if they were to revise the design and whether it would be more than 60 days. She added that she thought the design was very beautiful.

Ms. McKinney stated that they had been working on this design for many years to make sure the design was compliant with the design guidelines of OCII and other agencies, such as the fire department. After a lengthy process to make sure that they were compliant with the D for D guidelines and DDI requirements, it had been decided that this was the most suitable design. Ms. McKinney added that revising the design would create a delay of considerably more than 60 days and then they would have to deal with reconfiguring safety requirements as well.

Mr. Khodorkovsky responded that the public comments indicating that the HOA suggestions were ignored by the developer or that nothing was changed were untrue. He stated that they had never made any promises about height or views not being impeded and if anyone had made such statements, it did not come from them. Mr. Khodorkovsky reported that they had had numerous meetings with the HOA and had made changes based on their suggestions, such as the access points for Hudson, and he felt the community input was very valuable. He stressed that the issue was not about reducing the height of the building, but how that would impact fire and safety and ADA issues. Mr. Khodorkovsky stressed that this was a very complex site and any further delay would impact the project even after the delays caused by the pandemic. However, he stated that at the same time all of the comments would be taken in and responded to.

Commissioner Brackett inquired about how the extended time of shelter in place due to COVID19 would impact the 2024 date and whether they should be considering pushing this out to 2025.

Ms. McKinney responded that on the construction side, there were City protocols for safety plans during the pandemic and they would have more information on how COVID19 was impacting construction. She added that other construction projects were continuing even during the pandemic while following certain safety protocols and she felt this project would be able to continue on time.

Mr. Khodorkovsky responded that they currently had several projects under construction throughout the country. He explained that there were special protocols in place for COVID19, which meant that construction was slower and inspections took a little longer, but the projects were proceeding. He hoped that by the time they broke ground, the pandemic would be over. However, in the meantime, they intended to follow the measures in place.

Chair Bustos stated that this was a project that needed to happen. He expressed concern about the new residents and the comments coming from one building. He stressed that this community had been waiting a long time for this project and for justice to happen as well. He wanted people to know that the community had been involved with this project for decades. Mr. Bustos stated that protecting views was not a priority while living in a city; however, creating housing for those in need was a priority. He was pleased that TCDC had stuck with this project for so long and put so much work into it and that it would allow people to move back into the City and live here once again.

Commissioner Brackett motioned to move Item 5(c) and Commissioner Scott seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Brackett – yes

Commissioner Scott - yes

Vice-Chair Rosales - yes

Chair Bustos – yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 01-2021, CONDITIONALLY APPROVING THE BASIC CONCEPT DESIGN AND SCHEMATIC DESIGN DOCUMENTS FOR BLOCK 1 IN HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD PHASE 1, WHICH PROPOSE 224 RESIDENTIAL UNITS (200 MARKET-RATE UNITS AND 24 INCLUSIONARY UNITS) AND AN AMENDED SCHEDULE OF PERFORMANCE FOR BLOCK 1; AND PROVIDING NOTICE THAT THIS APPROVAL IS WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD PHASE 1 REUSE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (“FEIR”), A PROGRAM EIR, AND IS ADEQUATELY DESCRIBED IN THE FEIR FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; AND, ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

- d) Conditionally approving a variation to the Transbay Redevelopment Plan's on-site affordable housing requirement as it applies to the mixed-use project at 542-550 Howard Street, subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco in its capacity as legislative body for the Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, and authorizing the payment of an affordable housing fee to fulfill the project's affordable housing obligation; providing notice that this approval is within the scope of the Transit Center District Plan project approved under the Transit Center District Plan Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR"), a program EIR, and is adequately described in the FEIR for the purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act; and adopting environmental review findings; Transbay Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 02-2021)

Presenters: Sally Oerth, Interim Executive Director; Jeff White, Housing Program Manager

**PUBLIC COMMENT – None**

Commissioner Scott thanked Mr. White and staff for their presentation and stated that she was in support of this project.

Commissioner Brackett referred to the amount of \$243K per unit as being mid-range but noted that other projects were about \$260K/unit and inquired about why the number for this project was \$243K instead of \$260K/unit.

Mr. White responded that the inclusionary affordable housing fee is established by the City and the fee is calculated based on the gross residential square feet in Parcel F; based on the 2020 rate the fee would be approximately \$31 million. However, he explained that OCII was able to negotiate to 150% of that fee. Based on an estimate of what the 2021 fee might be, the amount would be \$46.7 million. Applying the fee to subsidize 192 affordable units at TB Block 4 the per unit subsidy would be \$243/unit. Mr. White reported that the remaining gap would be covered by the developer, who may seek other public financing sources, probably from the state.

Commissioner Brackett stated that his answer referred to the rationale; however because they were dealing with a different issue and because of the size of this development and all the things that the developer wanted to build, this would negatively impact them being able to provide the market rate onsite and looking at the option of doing it off-site. If that was the case, Ms. Brackett explained, the developer would not be able to make it work. Even being at 150%, this would still leave OCII with having to raise more funds to make it possible to have that same affordable housing elsewhere.

Interim Executive Director Oerth responded that Block 4 was an inclusionary funded project, meaning that the developer had always intended to fund it. She explained that allowing units to be at Block 4 instead of Parcel F was the original vision and that the developer was implementing that original vision by paying a fee through OCII back to the Block 4 project. She reported that OCII was not anticipating putting any of their own funds into that project, so it would still be the developer's money and the per unit amount worked out based on the number of units. However, the sizing of the fee referred to Parcel F was based on using the City fee.

Chair Bustos thanked Mr. White for his work on this project.

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



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

Commissioner Brackett - abstained

Commissioner Scott - yes

Vice-Chair Rosales - yes

Chair Bustos – yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSTENTION THAT RESOLUTION NO. 02-2021, CONDITIONALLY APPROVING A VARIATION TO THE TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PLAN'S ON-SITE AFFORDABLE HOUSING REQUIREMENT AS IT APPLIES TO THE MIXED-USE PROJECT AT 542-550 HOWARD STREET, SUBJECT TO APPROVAL BY THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO IN ITS CAPACITY AS LEGISLATIVE BODY FOR THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE SAN FRANCISCO REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY, AND AUTHORIZING THE PAYMENT OF AN AFFORDABLE HOUSING FEE TO FULFILL THE PROJECT'S AFFORDABLE HOUSING OBLIGATION; PROVIDING NOTICE THAT THIS APPROVAL IS WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE TRANSIT CENTER DISTRICT PLAN PROJECT APPROVED UNDER THE TRANSIT CENTER DISTRICT PLAN FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ("FEIR"), A PROGRAM EIR, AND IS ADEQUATELY DESCRIBED IN THE FEIR FOR THE PURPOSES OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; AND ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FINDINGS; TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

- e) Workshop on the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule for July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022 (ROPS 21-22) (Discussion)

Presenters: Sally Oerth, Interim Executive Director; Mina Yu, Financial Reporting and Management Analyst; Annie H. Wong, Development Specialist, Housing; Marc Slutzkin, Project Manager, Mission Bay; Benjamin Brandin, Acting Project Manager, Transbay; Lila Hussain, Senior Project Manager, Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point; Aaron Foxworthy, Acting Real Estate and Development Services Manager/Deputy General Counsel

**PUBLIC COMMENT** - None

Vice-Chair Rosales thanked staff for the very comprehensive presentation.

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

Speakers: Oscar James, resident of BVHP

Mr. James stated that he was in support of Item c) but was unable to get through for comment at that time. He was pleased that OCII had passed that item because he knew that the community had been looking forward to it since 1974 and he was very excited for people to be able to come back and have rental and ownership units available to them.

## **7. Report of the Chair**

Chair Bustos stated that pursuant to the resolution passed by OCII during the December 15, 2020 meeting, he had appointed a committee to review and make changes to the Certificate of Preference (COP) program. He had asked Commissioner Brackett and Vice-Chair Rosales to head up this committee. From the community there would be Mr. Richard Hashimoto, Mr. Julian Davis, Mr. Ed Donaldson and Mr. Oscar James. Mr. Eric Shaw, Director of the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) and Sally Oerth, Interim Executive Director, OCII, would also serve on this committee with additional staff members for support. Mr. Bustos thanked Commissioner Brackett, Vice-Chair Rosales as well as Commissioner Scott for paving the way for doing the right

thing with this program so that future generations could benefit from it and be welcomed back to San Francisco.

## **8. Report of the Executive Director**

Interim Executive Director Oerth announced that as of January 12, 2021, OCII had acquired the Transbay temporary terminal site from the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA). This matter had come before OCII last year through a purchase/sale agreement. This effort had been led by Jim Morales, General Counsel and Deputy Director; Aaron Foxworthy, Deputy General Counsel/Acting Real Estate Development Services Manager, Hilde Myall, before she left OCII, and other staff members. Ms. Oerth explained that they were able to close on that acquisition on time and that OCII was now the owner on record and had put in place a Property Management contract to make sure that the property was properly maintained. Ms. Oerth also announced the issuance of a current RFP seeking interim use proposals before the temporary terminal site would be transformed into housing sites: the aforementioned Block 4; Block 2, an OCII 100% affordable housing development and Block 3, which would be a future City park.

Interim Executive Director Oerth announced that as of January 5, 2021, the Rincon Point South Beach redevelopment plan expired after 40 years. She explained that this plan was originally adopted on January 5, 1981, was composed of two geographic areas, Rincon Point and South Beach, and during much of that time, the area was characterized by dilapidated warehouses, storage yards and unutilized lots. Since then, much development has taken place funded by community development grants, taxes and revenue through the Redevelopment Agency and over 2,000 residential units were built with 24% of those units being set aside for low and moderate income households. Ms. Oerth reported that, OCII's land use jurisdiction had expired and they had successfully transitioned all their work over to the Planning Commission with the help of Jose Campos (Manager, Planning and Design Review, OCII) and his team and they anticipated this being a very smooth transition. She added that this was an important milestone in OCII's history.

Interim Executive Director Oerth also announced that in their packets, Commissioners had received the annual sole source report and public records request report. She explained that they had received 24 public records requests and had responded to all of them. On the sole sources report, they had five professional services contracts, three of which utilized competitive bidding and two were sole sourced due the qualifications of the particular contractors.

## **9. Commissioners' Questions and Matters**

Commissioner Scott stated that for the record, in light of the nation's division and current situation, she did not want San Francisco to mirror what was happening to the rest of the nation. Ms. Scott stressed that they all needed to listen to each other and care about each other to make this a better city. She stated that she was disappointed to hear residents complain about maintaining their views or needing more parking with no acknowledgement of the residents who had been waiting for 40 years for a better place to live.

## **10. Closed Session**

- f) Conference with Legal Counsel-Anticipated Litigation: Initiation of litigation pursuant to paragraph (4) of subdivision (d) of Section 54956.9 (one case) (Discussion)

**PUBLIC COMMENT** – None

Chair Bustos asked Commissioners and appropriate staff members to exit the meeting and log onto the separate link provided for this closed session.

The meeting was reconvened and Secretary Cruz announced that there was nothing to report.

## **11. Adjournment**

Vice-Chair Rosales motioned to adjourn this meeting and Commissioner Scott seconded that motion.

Chair Bustos adjourned the meeting at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Jaimie Cruz  
Commission Secretary