

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE
COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HELD ON THE
4TH DAY OF MARCH 2014**

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 4th day of March 2014, 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 1:11 p.m. Roll call was taken.

Commissioner Ellington – present
Commissioner Mondejar – arrived late
Vice-Chair Rosales – present
Commissioner Singh – present
Chair Johnson – present

Commissioner Mondejar arrived at 1:30; all other Commission members were present.

2. Announcements

A. The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 18, 2014 at 1:00 pm (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 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

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 February 4, 2014

Commissioner Ellington abstained from voting due to his absence at the February 4 meeting.

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

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

Commissioner Ellington – abstained
Commissioner Mondejar – absent
Vice-Chair Rosales – yes
Commissioner Singh – yes
Chair Johnson – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY 3 COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE AND ONE ABSTENTION THAT THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 4, 2014, BE ADOPTED.

- b) Authorizing a First Amendment to the Personal Services Contract with Public Financial Management, Inc., a Pennsylvania Corporation, to increase the contract amount by \$13,038 for a total contract amount not to exceed \$62,788; former Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Project Area. (Action) (Resolution No. 9-2014)

PUBLIC COMMENT – None.

Chair Johnson commented that this item was discussed at a previous meeting and that this simply demonstrated actual costs to conclude the item.

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

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

Commissioner Ellington – yes
Commissioner Mondejar – absent
Vice-Chair Rosales – yes
Commissioner Singh – yes
Chair Johnson – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY 4 COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 9-2014, AUTHORIZING A FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH PUBLIC FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, INC., A PENNSYLVANIA CORPORATION, TO INCREASE THE CONTRACT AMOUNT BY \$13,038 FOR A TOTAL CONTRACT AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$62,788; FORMER YERBA BUENA CENTER REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

REGULAR AGENDA

- c) Adopting environmental review findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and conditionally approving a Combined Basic Concept and Schematic Design for an institutional building to be built by Family House, Inc. on Block 7 East in Mission Bay South to provide temporary housing for families receiving medical treatment in San Francisco, pursuant to the Owner

Participation Agreement with FOCIL-MB, LLC; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No.10-2014)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Catherine Reilly, Project Manager, Mission Bay; Richard Stacy, FAIA, Leddy Maytum Stacy Architects; Lorcan Kearney, Representative, Cambridge CM; Alexandra Morgan, Executive Director, Family House

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speaker: Corinne Woods, Chair, Mission Bay, CAC

Ms. Woods stated that she was very excited at the prospect of having Family House be part of their neighborhood and community and encouraged the Commission to support this item.

Commissioner Singh inquired about what other projects the architectural firm had done for the City and inquired about the value of the project.

Ms. Reilly responded that they had another ongoing project with the City, which consisted of two buildings - one across from the Parnassus Hospital and another one in the inner Sunset. Ms. Reilly deferred to Mr. Kearney to respond to the second question.

Mr. Kearney responded that the overall value of the project was \$40.5 million.

Commissioner Ellington inquired about the overall construction timeline and next steps.

To the question regarding next steps, Ms. Reilly responded that once Commissioners approved the design at that meeting, they would work with Family House on design development and construction drawings. Then, assuming there would be no changes to the designs approved at the meeting, construction would begin. Ms. Reilly added that there were also other administrative actions, such as payment of the affordable housing fee by Family House, which was coming due. From a design standpoint, Ms. Reilly concluded that this would be the only time that the OCII would see the design drawings.

To the timeline question Mr. Kearney responded that they anticipated mobilization onsite in July and construction starting in August with occupation in December 2015.

Commissioner Singh inquired about the unit layout and parking spaces and inquired about where people would park if all the parking spots were full.

Mr. Kearney responded there were 80 units, with three different bedroom types-single bedrooms, suites and single rooms that could open up into double rooms with 42 parking spaces onsite.

Ms. Morgan also responded to the parking question by stating that there would be parking available in two parking garages owned by UCSF. She explained that Family House had an agreement with UCSF and the families visiting Family House would be able to park in the garages for free.

Commissioner Ellington inquired about the main entrance at China Basin and whether there would be any entrance on Third Street.

Mr. Stacy responded that the entrance was on Mission Bay North Blvd and not on Third Street because they felt it was not an appropriate place for an entrance because there was no street parking or any place to drop someone off.

Chair Johnson referred to several caveats regarding their approval in the memorandum and asked for more detail about how they were going to resolve those issues, especially regarding ground floor activation. Ms. Johnson pointed out that because parking was on the ground floor and the private courtyard was above people's heads, the muse did not appear to be activated, especially considering that there were ground floor units in the affordable housing development right across from there. Rather than just leaving that to the future, Ms. Johnson requested more feedback on how that would be resolved.

Mr. Stacy responded that this condition was related to Third Street. He explained that one of the challenges they had in designing the building was that they had a limited amount of space to work with on the ground floor and they felt it was better to stress Third Street as the primary street and therefore not have the parking garage along Third Street. He stated that this left the pedestrian walkway side of the building and because it would be difficult to activate a parking garage, they decided to incorporate vertical landscaping with green screens as much as possible and create a planted wall all along that side of the building up to the podium.

Chair Johnson stated that designing street furniture was part of the streetscape plan and this might be another way to activate that area as well as landscaping. She inquired if street furniture was part of the building design or the streetscape design for Mission Bay overall.

Mr. Stacy responded that the pedestrian walkway was shared with a related project and the open space was on the other property, which had more area to work with, but added that his group would be working jointly with the other project to develop that area. He added that there would be no blank or exposed concrete walls.

Chair Johnson stated to the other Commissioners that this was something they should keep under advisement because she believed Related would have ground floor units in their affordable housing development so that might end up having front doors face the garage of the adjacent building which could affect the character of the muse.

Mr. Stacy added that they would be open to the possibility of incorporating street furniture on the pedestrian walkway because it would be appropriate to do so and that they would work with Related on that matter.

Chair Johnson returned to the activation question on Third Street. She stated that the ground floor layout seemed to have a few resident utility rooms along Third Street and inquired how they would add transparency along that street.

Mr. Stacy responded that utility-like spaces, such as electrical, mechanical, laundry and storage would be interior to the building. He explained that the north end of Third Street would be comprised of administrative offices and a staff lounge and the southern end would be comprised of more communal spaces, with a meeting room, waiting area, and counselling rooms. Mr. Stacy stated that they were able to internalize all the less active spaces.

Chair Johnson inquired about an entrance along Third Street.

Mr. Stacy responded that this was a fire exit. He explained that even though this fire exit was placed in an awkward position, in working with the Building Department, it was decided that this was the only solution. He added that they would work hard to try to make it not look like the front door of the building.

Chair Johnson inquired about what was on the opposite side across from Third Street.

Ms. Reilly responded that there was an existing condominium, the BOSA project, with bottom floor retail and added that a Chase Bank site was already there and that they were working on putting in a small market.

Commissioner Mondejar referred to the conditions of approval and inquired whether this item would be coming back to Commissioners after all the conditions were met or would staff be recommending all of these together.

Ms. Reilly responded that these represented more tweaks rather than major changes and added that if there were any major changes to the design, they would come back to the OCII for further approval. She stated that their intention was to refine the design details of what was approved during the meeting and gave as an example, what kind of glass they would be using for the windows. Ms. Reilly stated that they would continue working on the best form of activation for the building on all sides.

Commissioner Singh inquired about the rent on the units.

Ms. Morgan responded that there was no rent and added that everybody staying at Family House stayed there for free and that it had been that way for the past 33 years. She explained that they have been successful in obtaining private funding from foundations, corporations and private donors so that families would be able to stay there for free.

Commissioner Singh motioned to move Item 5(c) and Commissioner Ellington seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Ellington – yes
Commissioner Mondejar – yes
Vice-Chair Rosales – yes
Commissioner Singh – yes
Chair Johnson – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY 5 COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO.10-2014, ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND CONDITIONALLY APPROVING A COMBINED BASIC CONCEPT AND SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR AN INSTITUTIONAL BUILDING TO BE BUILT BY FAMILY HOUSE, INC. ON BLOCK 7 EAST IN MISSION BAY SOUTH TO PROVIDE TEMPORARY HOUSING FOR FAMILIES RECEIVING MEDICAL TREATMENT IN SAN FRANCISCO, PURSUANT TO THE OWNER PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT WITH FOCIL-MB, LLC; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

- d) Approving a Memorandum of Understanding with the San Francisco Office of Economic and Workforce Development to provide workforce compliance services to the Office of Community

Investment and Infrastructure in Fiscal Years 2013-14 and 2014-15 for a total aggregate amount not to exceed \$278,792.00. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No.11-2014)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Jim Morales, Interim General Counsel and Deputy Director; Patrick Mulligan, Director, CityBuild, Office of Economic Workforce Development

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speaker: Oscar James, native resident, Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP)

Mr. James stated that he was part of the group that wrote the original Memorandum of Understanding in 1973 for BVHP and for the Mission under the Model Cities guidelines, which were 50% community and 100% citywide. He stated that this was the MOU that they would be standing by for BVHP and that anyone coming into BVHP would be doing 50% community, 100% citywide, and 35% subcontractors or minority contractors. Mr. James pointed out that there were many people who have been through the training programs offered by OEWD or the unions as carpenters, plumbers, iron workers, etc. and then became union members; however, because there was no work, many of those people were not able to keep up with their union dues. Mr. James asked the OCII to consider having those people reinstated into the unions and be given jobs so they could have the opportunity to start working again.

Chair Johnson inquired about the FTE employee, how that person would work with George Bridges and what responsibilities that person would have.

Mr. Mulligan responded that they had had a long-standing relationship with Mr. Bridges who was familiar with the employment liaisons in the OEWD, who were already actively working on OCII projects. He explained that Mr. Bridges' role would be specific to LBE's and compliance and added that the compliance position they were currently funding would be specific to workforce goals, the 50% goal overall. Mr. Mulligan added that there would be overlap with LBE participation and local hiring goals but that their compliance goals were separate and they would be working with the employment liaisons who worked with the public and other CBO partners in fulfilling those goals.

Chair Johnson inquired whether the new FTE would be responsible to the OCII in providing informational reports to Commissioners.

Mr. Mulligan responded in the affirmative and added that they already had personnel attending local CAC meetings to be able to respond to community input and that this would continue and that they would be available to respond to questions or concerns from the OCII.

Chair Johnson stated that more specifically she wanted it to be added to the FTE job description that they would be responsible for providing written reports or charts to the OCII when needed.

Mr. Mulligan responded that he personally would always be available to respond to any questions or concerns of the OCII.

Chair Johnson responded to Mr. James' public comment by stating that his concern would be addressed by the employment liaison staff working with the CBO's, especially YCD, which had strong connections with CityBuild to help people coming out of those workforce programs.

Mr. Mulligan also added that they had just come off a deep recession, and added that YCD had been charged with the outreach role to reconnect with displaced former construction workers and added that there were resources set aside for barrier removal.

Vice-Chair Rosales noted that it was stated that the MOU would support one FTE and inquired as to whether one would be enough to handle the load.

Mr. Mulligan responded that there were two additional positions open for employment liaisons, which would be funded through the ongoing obligations for the Mission Bay Development Group and that they had received additional resources from that group for those types of positions. He added that they provided workforce compliance for construction projects citywide and there was an economy of scale and they were staffing those positions without additional resources. He pointed out that they were challenged and appreciated the commitment from OCII to see this through.

Vice-Chair Rosales stated that this was a very important issue and with so much construction going on in the City, they certainly wanted to make sure they had enough resources. She stated that she needed a better understanding of how an individual San Francisco resident interested in a position and who wanted to get into the CityBuild training program would go about accomplishing that. Ms. Rosales inquired as to what happened when someone got to CityBuild and how were they channeled out to work on the projects; she inquired as to how many people remained within the workforce of the construction companies.

Mr. Mulligan responded that this issue was about a career pathway and sustainable employment. He explained that their goal was to get people into apprenticeship programs and completion and then into a career path. He stated that entry level as well as continuing employment services would go through CityBuild. He explained that an experienced resident construction worker who was actively seeking employment could go to their office at 3120 Mission Street where they have a weekly check-in and where they can inform the office that they wanted to be included on the list for any of the jobs that were open with local hire provisions. Mr. Mulligan explained that compliance officers identified shortages on various projects or where contractors might be out of compliance with good faith goals or mandatory workforce goals and then they passed that information on to the employment liaison officers, who then utilized their access to the public and database of San Francisco resident workers to meet those goals on the job site. He stated that, in addition to the CityBuild Academy services, their office also provided ongoing training in cooperation with City College to provide skills upgrades and continuing education services. Mr. Mulligan stated that they saw themselves as a partner to the industry and provided a service to the contractor base as well.

Commissioner Ellington referred to the employment liaisons or the FTE's and inquired about whether they worked under the OEWD or whether they were new folks that the office would be hiring.

Mr. Mulligan responded that they would be able to hire a new additional compliance officer and then two additional employment liaison officers who would be working primarily on OCII projects.

Commissioner Ellington stated that he assumed that these new hires would be up to date with the OCII workforce policies.

Mr. Mulligan responded in the affirmative. He added that all the other workforce provisions came out of the original Redevelopment Agency construction workforce policies and that the intent was the same. He stated that they were looking for the right kind of candidates to interface with both the San Francisco resident construction workforce and the needs of the different communities.

Vice-Chair Rosales inquired as to whether his office kept workforce demographic statistics.

Mr. Mulligan responded that they kept statistics on everything, including by job site and neighborhood, type of construction, by trade etc. He added that they have a lot of data and that he could provide it at a later time.

Chair Johnson stated that she would like to schedule another workshop to review the differences between federal, state, local, OCII and city workforce policies.

Commissioner Ellington motioned to move Item 5(d) and VC Rosales seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Ellington – yes
Commissioner Mondejar – yes
Vice-Chair Rosales – yes
Commissioner Singh – yes
Chair Johnson – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY 5 COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO.11-2014, APPROVING A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING WITH THE SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE OF ECONOMIC AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT TO PROVIDE WORKFORCE COMPLIANCE SERVICES TO THE OFFICE OF COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE IN FISCAL YEARS 2013-14 AND 2014-15 FOR A TOTAL AGGREGATE AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$278,792.00, BE ADOPTED.

- d) Authorizing a Second Amendment to the Personal Services Contract with Twin III Building Maintenance Company, a sole proprietorship, that extends the term by 15 months to June 30, 2015 and increases the amount by \$19,698.75 for an aggregate contract amount not to exceed \$352,768.75 to fulfill property management obligations for Shoreview Park; former Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No.12-2014)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Tracie Reynolds, Manager, Real Estate & Development Services; Rita Harvey-Tyler, President, Twin III Building Maintenance Co.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speaker: Oscar James, Bayview Hunters Point Resident

Mr. James talked about what poor condition Shoreview Park was in and how dangerous it was for children to play there. He reminded Commissioners that when he was working on the project there were worms in the sand pits which were gated off as well as water leaking under the concrete. Mr. James stated that the entire park needed to be redone and advised Commissioners to go up there and take a look at it. Mr. James had recently visited the park again and stated that the worms were still there, that there were old, unrepaired, fences, that it was still unlit and that syringes could be observed on the ground. Mr. James felt that the City should take over the Park and maintain it.

Chair Johnson followed up on Mr. James' comments because it stated in the memorandum that the Park would remain in limbo until the Property Management Plan (PMP) was accepted or denied and whether the Park would be transferred to the City, in which case, it would be the responsibility of the

Recreation and Parks Department to upgrade or rebuild. Ms. Johnson asked Ms. Reynolds or Ms. Bohee to elaborate on the strategy for this park.

Ms. Reynolds responded that all the details had not all been worked out but that they had requested the \$1.5 million and the CDBG funds on the ROPS, which the Oversight Board had approved. She explained that the second step would be to get use of the funds approved through the City's CDBG Action Plan and that they would include this on their action plan, which would have to go through the Board of Supervisors. Ms. Reynolds continued that supposing the Department of Finance (DOF) as well as the Board of Supervisors approved the money for that use, one option would be to give the City the money at the time they transferred Shoreview to the City, and the Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH), which is the CDBG administrator, could then enter into a grant agreement. The OCII would grant it to the MOH with the stipulation that the funds be used for Shoreview Park and then they would grant it to the Department of Public Works (DPW) for that purpose. Ms. Reynolds indicated that the exact mechanism had not been worked out but she felt this might be the easiest way to accomplish this.

Chair Johnson asked for clarification on getting an agreement attached to the ROPS funds, so in the event that they were to get the CDBG funds on the ROPS, the funds would be in reserve until the Park was transferred to the City and then the money could be granted to MOHCD.

Ms. Reynolds replied that the CDBG funds were rent payments coming to the OCII. She explained that the way this usually worked was that MOH would get the CDBG money and then grant it, but this time the OCII was getting the money and asking MOH to use the money for that purpose, which she assumed they would approve. Ms. Reynolds stated that, therefore, there were two options available: 1) the OCII could transfer the money to MOH, who in turn could grant it back to the OCII so that OCII could do a public procurement process to get an entity to do the improvements before it was transferred to the City; 2) OCII could give the funds to the City with an agreement and/or restriction on the funds and the City could then grant the funds to DPW to perform the improvements once the City owns the property. Ms. Reynolds explained that the difference this time was because OCII was collecting the ground lease payments and somehow they would have to enter into a CDBG grant agreement with the City and an agreement with MOH to be able to use the funds for Shoreview Park. Therefore, MOH would have to enter into an agreement with either the OCII or the DPW to be able to confirm that the funds had been used for the intended purpose.

Chair Johnson stated that 15 months was a long time and inquired as to whether that was because it was easier to have a continuation of the same management set-up that was currently in place until the PMP was secured.

Ms. Reynolds responded that now that there was only one property on the contract instead of five, it would be difficult to do an RFP for one sole property. She explained that this would also jive with the ROPS with the 6-month fiscal year which ends in March and lastly, that they just did not know when the transfer was going to happen but that it could happen sooner, so this was the outside date.

Commissioner Ellington inquired as to whether the park would be fixed before the transfer or not; as to what the timeline was; whether there was a representative from Twin III Building Maintenance present at the meeting.

Ms. Reynolds repeated that this issue of fixing the park was still being worked on and that it had not yet been determined whether the OCII would perform the improvements or whether the OCII would transfer the funds to the City and the City would perform the improvements. She replied that first the DOF would have to approve the use of the funds on the ROPS and then the Board of Supervisors

would have to approve the use of the funds through the MOH Action Plan. After that, Ms. Reynolds explained that there would be a discussion about which entity would actually perform the improvements. She stated further that it could be possible for the OCII to enter into an agreement with DPW. Ms. Reynolds explained that it must be a DPW project so that it complied with City standards and must be maintained by the City. She stated that if they heard from DOF on the PMP by this summer, they could get it done later this year.

Ms. Bohee added that there were many levels of review and approval that must come first, but the overall intent was to fix the park and transfer it to the City.

Commissioner Singh asked whether the representatives from the Twin III Company knew that this item would be on the agenda. He stated that he thought they should wait to hear from the representative before any vote of approval was taken. Mr. Singh inquired about the size of Shoreview Park and how much was needed to maintain it for a year.

Ms. Reynolds responded that Shoreview Park was about an acre in size. She replied that the Park cost \$1,300/month to maintain and confirmed that this contract was for 15 months.

Chair Johnson stated that they would wait to vote on this item until after the Twin III representative had arrived and had spoken.

Rita Harvey-Tyler, President, Twin III Building Maintenance Co. arrived and was invited to speak to Commissioners.

Ms. Harvey-Tyler reported that they monitored all activities in the park, made sure it was clean and reported anything abnormal or unusual back to the OCII. She added that currently overall everything was going well.

Commissioner Singh inquired about what her company was actually monitoring; inquired as to whether they had cameras on site; asked about the amount of trash in the park; asked how many hours her company worked at the park per week.

Ms. Harvey-Tyler responded that her company emptied the garbage cans and mowed the lawns; they also removed trash that people dumped on the site, for instance, the Christmas trees left at the Park after Christmas. She replied that no cameras were installed at the Park, but that they took pictures every month and sent them with the bill to the OCII. She stated that they would take pictures of anything abnormal or unusual. Ms. Harvey-Tyler replied that there was the normal amount of trash in the receptacles from people picnicking and spending time in the park but added that often people dump trash in other places other than the garbage receptacles. To the question regarding hours, she responded that it varied depending on what work there was to do at the park, but normally they spent 5 hours or more per week working there.

Commissioner Ellington motioned to move Item 5(e) and Commissioner Mondejar seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Ellington – yes

Commissioner Mondejar – yes
Vice-Chair Rosales – yes
Commissioner Singh – yes
Chair Johnson – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY 5 COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO.12-2014, AUTHORIZING A SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH TWIN III BUILDING MAINTENANCE COMPANY, A SOLE PROPRIETORSHIP, THAT EXTENDS THE TERM BY 15 MONTHS TO JUNE 30, 2015 AND INCREASES THE AMOUNT BY \$19,698.75 FOR AN AGGREGATE CONTRACT AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$352,768.75 TO FULFILL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT OBLIGATIONS FOR SHOREVIEW PARK; FORMER HUNTERS POINT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

6. Public Comment on Non-agenda Items

Speaker: Oscar James, BVHP resident

Mr. James spoke about the groundbreaking ceremony at the Dr. Davis Senior Housing, which he had attended the previous Saturday. He said they were able to raise a great amount of money at the event and commented that his wife's key lime cake was a great success. He offered to bring one to the Commissioners at a later meeting.

7. Report of the Chair

Chair Johnson stated that she would not be present at the next meeting on March 18 and that Vice-Chair Rosales would chair that meeting.

8. Report of the Executive Director

Executive Director Bohee reported on urgency legislation, AB 471, approved by the Governor on February 18, which related to how successor agencies operated and signed one week before the ROPS were due. Ms. Bohee stated that this bill was intended to provide some relief. She pointed out that there was a summary of the legislation prepared by Mr. Bryan and the actual text of the bill was located in Tab G of the Commissioners' binders. Ms. Bohee discussed several changes resulting from AB 471:

1) Expenditures would now be allowed beyond the ROPS period. Ms. Bohee explained that all the affordable housing projects that the OCII approved were subject to a contractual enforceable obligation, but in order to secure tax credit from the State, the tax credit investors and lenders required that all the money be in hand and this money would be spent over the life of the contract, not over a six-month period. She stated that this was a common sense change that was enacted to allow streamlining of operations and to give comfort to all entities involved.

2) Use of reasonable estimates would be allowed to create a bill or invoice, even though an invoice might not have been available at the beginning of the ROPS period or budget period. Based on

historical or practical data, they had worked with DOF to accept this change and it was now codified into law.

3) Proposed expenditures for bonds would be allowed on the ROPS. Ms. Bohee explained that DOF had denied the very first Mission Bay South bonds on the ROPS because OCII had not yet received bond approval, even though they had planned to get it during the review process.

4) Ms. Bohee explained that existing law stated that Infrastructure financing districts (IFD) could not be put in place in former or even existing redevelopment project areas, so this change would provide immediate relief to cities, counties and successor agencies across the state that had not adopted provisions like San Francisco, whether it was a housing trust fund or other economic development backfill. For the OCII, this change would help Visitation Valley that did not have an executed contract in place at the time of dissolution. Ms. Bohee added that the City had been working with the private development partner and if the City deemed appropriate, it could form an IFD for Vis Valley. IFDs are now permitted in existing OCII project areas. However, Ms. Bohee added that the first step would be to pay existing debt and that there was also a mandate to keep all schools whole in the area. Only after existing enforceable obligations have been met, would it be available for an IFD. Ms. Bohee stated that perhaps after 10 or 15 years of wind-down, the City could expand the district and contribute to any infrastructure improvements needed.

5) Increase in the administrative cost allowance for public housing entities as differentiated from the City's Housing Successor, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development. Ms. Bohee explained that the way the law was written, there was a 3% administrative fee, which could be used for administrative costs. This had been increased to 4%, broken down as 3% for successor agencies and 1% now for housing authorities. Previous versions of the bill had specifically excluded cities and counties and was only meant for federal agencies. In San Francisco's case, because the City had elected to be the Housing Successor and the San Francisco Housing Authority did not end up as the Housing Successor, there was no distribution. Ms. Bohee added that the 1% increase would provide some relief to other regions, like Marin County, which had a federal housing authority, but had no dollars to pay for transferred assets, but would not apply to San Francisco operations.

6) Clarification of Property Management Plans in terms of the transfer. Successor agencies would now be allowed to designate cities as public entities pursuant to a redevelopment plan and also clarified pursuant to a community plan or five-year implementation plan. Ms. Bohee indicated that this would not be helpful for the OCII, but for other entities around the state.

7) The creation of a formula for loan repayments to the City or county that created the former redevelopment agencies. Ms. Bohee explained that this would not apply to OCII, since the OCII did not have any outstanding loans with the City. However, it would apply to other successor agencies and sponsoring cities and counties within the state.

Chair Johnson inquired about AB 440 which allowed local entities to take the place of former redevelopment agencies to assign and to clean up sites and procure environmental reports on sites for clean-up requirements. She stated that she could understand where this would apply across the state in

different areas because redevelopment agencies were the only bodies who were allowed to designate a clean-up site and assign responsibility and require clean up, and so now AB 440 would allow the local taxing entity to take over that responsibility. Ms. Johnson inquired if that would apply to the Shipyard as well.

Executive Director Bohee responded that she was not familiar with the particulars of that bill as there were a number of bills dealing with redevelopment clean-up, IFD's and other issues and that she would have to do more due diligence on that matter and report back. She stated that they were tracking and following all the bills dealing with those issues.

8) Commissioners' Questions and Matters

Commissioner Mondejar announced that March was Women's History Month and that all Commissioners had been invited to a reception by the Mayor that day at 5pm in the Mayor's Office with the Board of Supervisors and the District Attorney.

Chair Johnson announced that there were a number of groundbreaking and other public events coming up and that more information would be forthcoming as the dates came up.

Closed Session – None.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Johnson at 2:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Natasha Jones

Natasha Jones, Interim Commission Secretary