

London N. Breed
MAYOR



Bivett Brackett
CHAIR

Dr. Carolyn Ransom-Scott
VICE-CHAIR

Vanessa Aquino
Tamsen Drew
Kent Lim
COMMISSIONERS

Thor Kaslofsky
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
2ND DAY OF JULY 2024**

The members of the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure of the City and County of San Francisco met in a regular meeting in person at 1:00 p.m. on the 2nd day of June 2024.

REMOTE ACCESS:

WATCH LIVE ON SFGOVTV: <https://sfgovtv.org/ccii>

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Members of the public may provide public comment in-person at the noticed location or remotely via teleconference (detailed instructions available at: <https://sfocii.org/remote-meeting-information>).

Members of the public may also submit their comments by email to: commissionsecretary.ocii@sfgov.org; all comments received will be made a part of the official record.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:

DIAL: 1-415-655-0001 **ENTER ACCESS CODE:** 2663 275 4034 **PRESS # PRESS #**
again to enter the call. Press *3 to submit your request to speak.

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

1. Recognition of a Quorum

Meeting was called to order at 1:09 p.m. by Chair Brackett. Roll call was taken.

Commissioner Aquino – present
Commissioner Drew - present
Commissioner Lim - present
Vice-Chair Scott - present
Chair Brackett - present

All Commissioners were present.

2. Announcements

- a) The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will be held **in person** on Tuesday, July 16, 2024 at 1:00 pm at City Hall in Room 416.

- b) Announcement of Prohibition of Sound Producing Electronic Devices during the Meeting:
Please be advised that the ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers, and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing of or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic device.
- c) Announcement of Time Allotment for Public Comments from participants dialing in:
Please be advised that a member of the public has up to three minutes to make pertinent public comments on each agenda item unless the Commission adopts a shorter period on any item. We recommend that members of the public who are attending the meeting in person fill out a "Speaker Card" and submit the completed card to the Commission Secretary. All dial-in participants from the public will be instructed to call a toll-free number and use their touch-tone phones to provide any public comment. Audio prompts will signal to dial-in participants when their audio input has been enabled for commenting.

PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN: 1-415-655-0001 **ACCESS CODE:** 2663 275 4034

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

- 3. **Report on actions taken at previous Closed Session meeting** - None
- 4. **Matters of Unfinished Business** - None
- 5. **Matters of New Business:**

CONSENT AGENDA

- a) Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting of June 18, 2024

PUBLIC COMMENT- None

Vice-Chair Scott motioned to move Item 5(a) Commissioner Drew seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Aquino - yes
Commissioner Drew - yes
Commissioner Lim - yes
Vice-Chair Scott - yes
Chair Brackett - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FIVE COMMISSIONERS THAT APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF JUNE 18, 2024, BE ADOPTED.

REGULAR AGENDA

- b) Workshop on proposed amendments to the 1) Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan, 2) Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan, 3) Candlestick Point Design for Development, 4) Disposition and Development Agreement, and the 5) Tax Increment Allocation Pledge Agreement for Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard Project; Bayview Hunters Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Areas (Discussion)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; Lila Hussain, Senior Project Manager, Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point; Catarina Kidd, Director of Planning, FivePoint; Geeti Silwal, Principal, Perkins & Will; LaShon Walker, V.P. of Community Affairs, FivePoint; Suheil Totah, Senior V.P., FivePoint; Elizabeth Colomello, Housing Program Manager

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Bryan Robinson, member, Candlestick Heights Community Alliance; Shirley Moore, resident, Candlestick Point; Shawn McGill, McGill Security and Canine Patrol Services; Roberta Achtenberg; James Mabrey, Owner, All Day Everyday Janitorial Services and founder of the African American International Sports, Academics and Arts Academy; Oscar James, native resident Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP); Eve Vaccaro, Director Admissions, ICA Cristo Rey Academy; Oronde Sterling, Owner, Sterling Builders; Keri Bolding, Deputy Director, En2Action; Mitch Mankin, Community Policy and Impact Associate, San Francisco Housing Development Corporation; John Avalos, Council of Community Housing Organizations (CCHO); Corey Smith, Housing Action Coalition (HAC); Linda F. Richardson; Dr. Veronica Hunnicutt, Chair, Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) Hunters Point Shipyard; Richard Hobson, Access to City Employment (ACE); Brenda Ramirez, BVHP resident ; John Eller, Alliance for District 10

Mr. Robinson objected to this project because there had been insufficient outreach to the community. He stated that he had learned about this project by accident and then attended two meetings, where the presentations were different from each other. He stated that he was still unclear about the extent, scope, metes and bounds of the project and had no idea which parcels were included in the development or who the players were in the project. Mr. Robinson expressed concern that residents within 100 feet of the project had been given no notice and he felt had been systematically excluded from any information. Those were the people who would be affected first. He was not pleased that the community had not been given sufficient notice or information about the project and that information varied from presentation to presentation.

Ms. Moore stated that she had been a homeowner in Candlestick Point (CP) for 30 years and that her home was located about 100 feet from this project. Her street dead-ended into the Candlestick property and there were at least 25 families there. They had received no information regarding the development. Ms. Moore reported that she was a member of the CAC in 2005 and also signed the initial DDA to get the project started, so she was familiar with the project. In 2010 they signed off on the EIR; however, since then there had been numerous changes and addendums, which had not been shared with the community. For example, in 2015 they had to fight to reject an addendum to keep them from imploding the stadium and damaging their homes. At the recent June 3 meeting, when FivePoint asked for additional outreach requests, Ms. Moore reported that she asked them to come to meet with her community directly and that request was rejected. She asked OCII to make sure that the community homeowners and taxpayers be included in the outreach regarding this project.

Mr. McGill stated that as a member of the community, he was in support of this project. He explained that his company provided security services for Candlestick Park and had witnessed firsthand the positive changes that ongoing construction and maintenance work had had on the community. He reported that when progress was in motion, the area became safer, cleaner, aesthetically more attractive and conducive to a thriving community life. The increase in activity and foot traffic made a difference and issues such as homelessness, vandalism and arson had decreased due to the signs of improvement. When construction declined, all those issues re-

emerged including trespassing, illegal dumping and drug activity. Mr. McGill felt strongly that the presence of ongoing construction deterred crime and created a safe environment.

Ms. Achtenberg stated that she was a 52-year resident of San Francisco (SF), a former SF County Supervisor and had been a community development consultant to Lennar and then FivePoint on this project since 2006. She had also been an active BVHP community member for 14 years and helped administer the community benefits. Ms. Achtenberg reported that Lennar and FivePoint had invested over \$116 million in construction projects in the BVHP community and had helped meet the promise to the community. She advocated that this project plan was the best plan ever put forward and it was actionable and would commence momentarily once the Commission approved it.

Mr. Mabrey stated that, as a business owner, stakeholder and employer in BVHP, he was in support of this project. In the past 14 years that he had been a business owner and since FivePoint had been around, he had employed four Alice Griffith residents as well as other BVHP residents. He stated that FivePoint had helped them stay established and would help his business and other local businesses continue after the project was finished. He urged OCII to move forward with this development.

Mr. James supported the homeowners on Jamestown and requested that FivePoint talk with community members to make sure their concerns were heard and desires met. He wanted to make sure that contracts were available to black contractors. He commended Ms. Walker for her work as well as FivePoint. Mr. James stressed that the problems with the Shipyard were caused by the Navy, not FivePoint. He was very aware of the history of the Shipyard because he had lived through it.

Ms. Vaccaro was in support of the project because of the impact it had had on District 10 residents, and in particular, the students in her high school, who had received scholarships as a result. FivePoint had supported her school since 2014 with the scholarships, which had allowed 100% of her students to go on to college.

Mr. Sterling stated that he was a local community minority contractor and was requesting proper representation from the developers in all aspects, start to finish, of this project. He referred to AB 2873 passed in 2022, which set a new requirement for developers building affordable housing. He felt strongly that advocacy for local contractors should be imperative and would create an opportunity to address inequities in the building labor force. Mr. Sterling stated that he would like to see language in contracts addressing the micro-Local Business Enterprise (LBE) contractor community.

Ms. Bolding described En2Action as a black women-led non-profit organization located in the Bayview. To discuss the experience of the outreach by FivePoint and the OCII team. En2Action was involved in digital as well as physical outreach. She commented that based on some of the feedback heard at this meeting, she acknowledged that there was never enough outreach to make everyone happy, especially those residents located near the project site. Ms. Bolding explained that FivePoint's workshops were not traditional but that this was a collaborative effort and wanted everyone to know that even if an individual community member had not received the flyers or been invited to a certain meeting, FivePoint had heard the requests and would improve in this effort in the future.

Mr. Mankin was very pleased to see this project moving forward with 175 units of affordable housing as part of Phase 3 and he and his organization were looking forward to updates as they became available.

Mr. Avalos stated that CCHO was supportive of an effort to expedite housing development in the Candlestick Point area. He stated that they had community housing organizations, such as Mercy Housing and the Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Corporation (TNDC) as well as others, such as the SF Housing Development Corp, which were looking at later phases. He expressed concern that Lennar was requesting this extension as well as an increase in tax increment financing. Mr. Avalos inquired about what the benchmarks were to ensure the building of affordable housing more rapidly and whether FivePoint was meeting their mark. He referred to the homelessness and housing crisis in SF and stressed that the BVHP/Shipyard was one of the largest areas slated for affordable housing and housing development in general. However, there was no clear plan in place to get this done. Without the benchmarks and clear efforts to expedite these parcels and the building of roads and utilities, Mr. Avalos expressed concern that they would continue to see these delays go on and on. The CCHO had not been apprised of these changes or of how they would impact the community. He reminded that this project would come before the Board of Supervisors in September and he urged OCII to bring together all the players including the community before that meeting.

Mr. Smith expressed support for this project. He stated that it had been nine years now that they had been working on this project and the fact that it was still in the planning phase was both frustrating as well as exciting. He felt that given the current economic housing situation where most of their members were stalled out and sitting on the sidelines, the fact that they actually had a housing proposal, which although not perfect, underscored the need to move forward with this because of the promises that had been made and the commitment to the entire SE community. He reminded OCII and the Board of Supervisors that it was their responsibility to make sure this happened. Mr. Smith referred to a state bill that went into effect on July 1, 2024 and the fact that SF had lost its local land use authority because it had not met its housing targets. It would not impact this project but would affect other development projects in SF in the future. Mr. Smith warned against saddling a project with too many costs involved with the construction because the project could become economically infeasible. Mr. Smith feared that 10 years from now he would be at the same podium addressing OCII and having the exact same conversation as today. He agreed with the previous speaker regarding the need to set clear objective benchmarks for the project as well as community members to meet. He hoped they could put a shovel in the ground very soon.

Ms. Richardson stated that she was a long-term resident of BVHP and had been working at a grassroots level for over three decades in BV regarding this project. As the former Chair of Land use Planning and Transportation, she had worked with the Redevelopment Agency to ensure that BVHP was not left behind. Ms. Richardson felt that today's presentation was a milestone talking about a DDA amendment. She was pleased that 32% of the housing in the project would be affordable housing which was probably the highest in the Bay Area. She urged OCII to move this forward to be able to move it to the Board of Supervisors soon.

Dr. Hunnicutt stated that FivePoint had made a thorough and comprehensive presentation to the HP CAC and many community members were in attendance. She stated that the CAC unanimously approved the CP project for many reasons, including opportunities for community involvement at multiple levels, affordable housing, outstanding building and park designs, especially the promenade, the innovation district concept, and the community benefits opportunities. She highly commended the FivePoint team. However, they could not keep delaying opportunities that provided

housing for City residents and communities. Dr. Hunnicutt and the CAC urged OCII to move this project forward without delay.

Mr. Hobson stated that the developer was asking for more. However, he felt that it was incumbent on San Franciscans and in particular BV residents to push back and ask what more was the developer willing to give to the community. The community needed timelines and benchmarks and if the developer wanted more, then the developer needed to be willing to give more.

Ms. Ramirez stated that she lived at the end of the cul-de-sac located adjacent to the proposed research and development project. She was surprised and dismayed to learn about these changes at such a late date and wondered why no one had bothered to notify those closest to the project. She stated that she would be attending the meeting that evening. However, Ms. Ramirez felt that it would have been nice if the community could have worked with the developers at an earlier time with regard to heights, shadows, etc. so that the neighbors would not have been so negatively impacted.

Mr. Eller described Alliance for District 10 as a coalition of faith, labor and community organizations with many members from District 10 (D10), including SF ACE, Faith in Action and the SF Labor Council. He stated that a letter had been submitted before the meeting but he was not sure it had been shared with Commissioners. Mr. Eller explained that the Alliance worked on the community benefits with the then developer Lennar back in 2008 mostly around jobs and housing and what they thought was a clear timeline. He reported that, at the time, it was promised to be fast-tracked by the Mayor's Office and Governor Newsom because the developer was well-funded and would deliver on the jobs and housing with development by 2021. They had been trying to get this project moving for 7 years. However, they continued to see delays and lack of transparency by the current developer FivePoint. Mr. Eller felt strongly that there was no reason why the agreement and the DDA amendments could not be implemented to get the housing done at Candlestick. His organization had asked for details on project progress but they had not been provided, even though his organization had been involved since the beginning of Phase 2. Therefore, Mr. Eller stated that they could not support the developer's request to triple the funding unless the developer complied with the DDA. FivePoint had not paid over \$28 million in community benefits agreements and had not followed through with other items. He wanted to make sure the commercial space was vetted by the community and expedited affordable housing commitments with clear timelines.

Commissioner Aquino thanked staff and FivePoint for the presentation and thanked the community for attending the meeting. She applauded everyone for their commitment to the community. Ms. Aquino stated that she could hear the excitement from the speakers as well as the concern. She stated that she lived in D10 and had been following the projects for a long time. Ms. Aquino referred to Pier 70 and the power plant and the sea level rise. She inquired about whether they were communicating with those entities to see what they were doing and to build relationships there. Ms. Aquino referred to the opportunities that might become available from this project and inquired about what youth groups they had been in contact with, such as the YMCA and the Girls & Boys Club. Ms. Aquino stressed that they had to ensure that the entire community was receiving the information that they were entitled to.

Ms. Hussain responded to the sea level rise question. She explained that OCII participated in a sea level rise coordinating committee consisting of multiple City agencies including the Capital Planning Division. Ms. Hussain pointed out that it is to OCII's advantage to be building in not permanently built environment, so that the development could adjust their future plans to updated science. She

reported that OCII or the Project has mitigation measures in their Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that referred to sea level rise involving raising grades somewhere between 2-12' depending on location. They were updating their mitigation measures to the latest data from the California Ocean Protection Council. Ms. Hussain reported that much of the plan was in place to address sea level rise.

Ms. Hussain responded that it was too early to respond to the youth group's question. In addition to the community facility spaces, there are sites set aside for a fire station and for a potential school; however, it was too early to designate those permanently right now. The developer's obligation is to have a finished site with utility connections and the City and other partners would be responsible for other portions.

Ms. Walker stated that she had been involved with this project for 10 years but around the project for a longer period of time as a D10 resident. While there were community benefits requirements and a robust philanthropic program, those were going on before she was part of the project. Ms. Walker reported that the YMCA had already been involved in the current partnership. They were not doing much with the Boys & Girls Club today but reported that this might change in the future. She pointed out that different parts of the project had different owners.

Vice-Chair Scott applauded FivePoint for their work. She stated that it was not FivePoint that was holding things up, but commended them for hanging in there with this project for so long. Dr. Scott was grateful to them for ensuring that there would be growth and development to a mishandled, overlooked, and set-aside community that had done without for a long time. She hoped they would improve communications and provide clarification for the community but stressed that this project would bring in more jobs and raise up the community with hope. Dr. Scott stated that she had attended a recent meeting and everyone had been allowed to ask questions, even the children. She encouraged small business owners to get more involved. Dr. Scott referred to the unionized top qualified workers that had built the SE Community Center and noted that there had been no problems or complaints with that site.

Ms. Walker stated that they had a Project Labor Agreement (PLA) on the project and wanted workers to know that. In the workshop that Vice-Chair Scott attended, there were some comments from some youths asking them to create outreach specifically for them. Ms. Walker wanted everyone to know that they had not heard that request before but now that they had heard it, they had committed to engage with the youth groups in the community. Also, she informed that they did meet regularly with homeowners to share information.

Commissioner Lim referred to the 50% SBE participation for contracting. He stated that often in the large project, local business is forgotten. Mr. Lim asked that they set aside a percentage for the hyper local contractors and the micro LBE's certified in SF.

Ms. Walker responded that they had a relationship with the Renaissance Center in the BV. They were aware that the micro LBE's had a harder time. She explained that they had some limits on the owners of the project but they would do what they could to make sure that the micro LBE's participated in the contracts.

Commissioner Drew stated that she had worked on this project when she was an OCII staff member. She was very pleased that this project aimed to put community first and that goals were not just goals, but commitments. Ms. Drew expressed concern that they had not done outreach to

Alice Griffith (AG) residents but was pleased to hear that it was forthcoming. She expressed concern over the contemplated changes that might impact the neighborhoods. Ms. Drew asked Ms. Kidd to describe what the experience would be for AG residents regarding construction delays to 2032, which seemed very far away, since their street remained half built. She inquired about what the plans for that community would be.

Ms. Kidd responded that phasing was very challenging, because it could not all be done at once. She wanted to make sure they got the AG portion of the plan going, but also balancing that with other elements, such as connecting the Arelious Walker Drive section to AG in the next phase. Ms. Kidd stated that it was a challenge deciding what to do about the old AG. The demolition abatement of asbestos had occurred in those buildings before the building were demolished; however, getting some funding going would help propel more work in AG.

Commissioner Drew looked forward to hearing about what the feedback would be from AG residents at the next meeting with them as well as hearing about how FivePoint would be addressing that feedback. Ms. Drew suggested interim uses or interim activation to help build the community fabric so that AG would not be so geographically isolated for such an extended period of time.

Ms. Kidd was pleased to hear about the interim uses idea and stated that it would be on their list.

Commissioner Drew referred to the design and the base of the spine at Bayview Hill. She inquired about whether there was any physical connection between the end of the spine and the hill, like a pedestrian way, or whether it would dead-end into the street.

Ms. Kidd responded that it would connect to the sidewalk on Arelious Walker Drive and there would be complete streets that would connect to Jamestown, so people could get down the hill from Jamestown. There would not be anything up the hill because it was too steep.

Commissioner Drew suggested that they think through that area from an urban design perspective so it was not so dead-ended. She referred to parking and inquired about whether it would still be underground for CP Center or whether there would be vertical parking garages.

Ms. Kidd responded that this was a planning design standards issue and the CP Center had not been designed yet. From a planning perspective, they may have some underground parking, probably two levels as well as some shared vertical parking.

Commissioner Drew supported the higher parking ratio as the site was being established and transit improvements made. She encouraged the design standards to consider some future looking garages and have them be developed so to be able to repurpose them moving forward for residential or commercial uses in the event they did not have stand-alone parking garages forever. She encouraged them to build in that flexibility. Ms. Drew referred to height limits and requested that they consider increasing those limits on CP South and North in the more residential portions of the project. Ms. Drew advocated that this was a rare opportunity to build on a re-used site and stressed that they needed all the space possible for housing. The current height limits seemed unambitious and felt that they could do more to invest in this site. Ms. Drew referred to a note in the presentation that the provisions for adequate security were being updated and asked for more information about this.

Ms. Kidd deferred to Mr. Totah for more details on the security.

Mr. Totah responded that it was simply a clarification. At the time they had the major phase approval, they were to provide security to OCII to make sure the infrastructure would be built out in that phase. At the same time, when they secured a final map from the City, they would have to provide bonds to the City. In the current DDA, it stated that when they provided the bonds, the adequate security to OCII would be released. Mr. Totah described the clarification which was that if they provided the bonds at the beginning when they received the approval, there would be no need to provide security.

Mr. Totah responded to questions regarding AG and clarified that they were accelerating AG. He acknowledged that the phasing was confusing because AG was now part of major Phase 4. So from a timing perspective, it would be the same time. In addition, they had expanded what was the next phase of AG. It had previously been four parcels, three of which were affordable, one Market Rate (MR). Now it was seven parcels, four affordable and three MR. In addition two parcels, AG 6 & 7 on Arelious Walker Drive would be moved up to the next phase. Mr. Totah added that they were also building out neighborhood retail, which would benefit AG residents as well.

Chair Brackett thanked everyone involved and all the speakers who had come out to comment. She mentioned that one of her good friends who lived on Ingerson had passed away the previous night and it brought to light what this project meant to this community for the future. The people who were here now would be able to enjoy it, have jobs from it, purchase homes in it. Ms. Brackett acknowledged that OCII was proud about delivering housing and jobs, but they had not met that threshold yet to benefit the communities they needed to help. She wanted to make sure that people living in D10 had the options to take advantage of this new development and were hired by companies in this new retail space. She reminded everyone that OCII was not only extending the timeline but was also making a commitment as an agency to triple the tax increment dollars going into this project. Ms. Brackett commended FivePoint for their community work but would also like to see more being done in the future. Regarding AG, OCII knew as a fact that since 2020 the residents had had an unpleasant experience in the new development and to date the issues there had not been resolved. Ms. Brackett requested to hear from someone at FivePoint about how things would improve at AG, especially regarding the dirty streets.

Ms. Hussain responded that this was an ongoing issue with maintenance and that they were working with John Stewart (Company) on the maintenance of the streets. She explained that the streets had not been completed or accepted yet by the City. There were elements that FP was responsible for and elements that John Stewart. Co. was responsible for. Ms. Hussain reported that one of the reasons that the AG meetings had been delayed was because they wanted to make sure someone managing the site could address some of the issues that would be raised. She described some of the plans for AG early phases over the next five years. In terms of connectivity, they were considering extending (bus route) 29 going down further on Arelious Walker Drive. Also, Blocks 6 & 7 would be built to lessen the isolation at AG and also extending the residential community to across the street. Ms. Hussain stated that there would still be an effort to bring AG residents into the development jobs for AG. She deferred to Ms. Colomello for more details.

Ms. Colomello added that they had been working closely with property managers at AG related to ongoing maintenance issues as well as financial issues stemming from the pandemic. There was a plan to set aside some time at the next meeting to hear feedback from AG residents as well as the managers.

Chair Brackett pointed out that OCII had been meeting with AG residents for a long time and there had not been any progress. She referred to the original plan from 2019, which was slated for 498 units with 256 replacement housing units. Ultimately, they ended up with 337 units and she requested clarification on that.

Ms. Colomello clarified that the total number of units was 504 and there were 256 replacement units. She explained that OCII had built 226 of the replacement units, but there were vacancies. The replacement units for all existing AG residents were built. Ms. Colomello informed that the remaining phases included the remaining 30 affordable units and about 130 standalone new affordable units in AG. So those units were still planned and would be built in the next phase for AG.

Chair Brackett clarified that this had been pushed to Phase 4 in 2032.

Ms. Colomello agreed with that statement.

Chair Brackett asked for verification that the total number of new housing for Candlestick was 10,672.

Ms. Colomello corrected that this number was for Candlestick and the Shipyard together.

Ms. Hussain clarified that it was about 7,216 or 7,218 for Candlestick and the rest would be for the Shipyard.

Chair Brackett referred to one of the earlier diagrams showing there was some residential along Arelious Walker Drive section. However, the current presentation did not show this, rather it showed that this section was all commercial space. He inquired about where all those units would be moved to.

Ms. Hussain acknowledged that what Chair Brackett had noted was from the 2019 plan. She explained that originally 998 units of housing were planned for that section. However, commercial was now planned for that section. The units would still be built but in later phases.

Executive Director Kaslofsky explained that one of the reasons for the office R&D use was to allow it on top of the residential use.

Chair Brackett clarified that what they were seeing in the current presentation was that there was no indication of residential in that area anymore. She understood that the units in question would still be built, but at a later time. For a second time, she inquired about where on the site those units would be moved to.

Ms. Kidd responded that originally the innovation district showed both residential and commercial. The amount of units had not changed and there was no change to the commitment to build them. She stated that they would be able to finalize the next phase at the next meeting.

Chair Brackett noted that most of the OCII parcels and the affordable housing parcels had no waterfront adjacency. All the MR parcels had waterfront access. She concluded from this that the prime real estate would be going to MR housing and not slated as a mixed use affordable plus MR housing. Ms. Brackett pointed out that this would be creating a differential and class-based housing in that area. Since OCII was making a significant investment in this project, they were hoping that

FivePoint and the developers would try to maximize the housing, since they were also requesting an increase in height. Ms. Brackett requested that they bring the number of housing units to at least 8,000. She mentioned that the affordability bandwidth for the OCII properties and their developers was not meeting the needs of the current community, meaning that the community could not afford the affordable housing units. She wanted to hear from FivePoint about what their commitment was to making a deeper investment so that people within the 50% AMI and below would actually have housing opportunities when the units were finally delivered.

Ms. Kidd responded to the waterfront access comment. She stated that the next phase had an agency block right at the entrance of the development at the corner of Arelious Walker Drive and Harney Way. There would be significant views from that block and it would be 0-60% AMI. She added that they had strategically placed all the affordable blocks.

Executive Director Kaslofsky asked Ms. Kidd to speak about their inclusionary program and the AMI percentages that were part of that.

Ms. Kidd responded that their entire band of affordable went from 0-160%. For the 0-60% they had subsidized agency blocks and would continue to do this with the next phase. The second agency block would be across the street from AG and another was right by Gillman Playground and was another entrance. They tried to be sensitive to equity with the placement of all the agency blocks and having them being integrated with the fabric of their MR housing. Ms. Kidd added that they also had a band of inclusionary which was 80-120% as well as workforce, which was a very challenging category.

Chair Brackett asked them to pull up Slide 42 on the screen.

Ms. Hussain stated that she could speak to the history of some of the locations and explained that there were certain considerations that had gone into affordable housing site locations. She reported that 11A, which was part of the next phase, was one of the prime locations and was heavily negotiated in 2010 to make sure that it took advantage of prime views of the state parks and was located at the entrance. Ms. Hussain pointed out that two other agency blocks further north flanked Wedge Park and were close to the waterfront. She explained that 10A had a substantial number of units and the idea was to have an agency block on the main street or major retail street, along Ingerson Avenue. The other agency block was adjacent to a large park, which will be built in a later phase.

Executive Director Kaslofsky addressed Chair Brackett's intent on increasing the amount of housing units on the site. He explained that part of the redevelopment plan amendment and the DDA amendment was to permit with OCII approval the authorization to increase the housing. He explained that they still had to study the environmental impacts on that and do an evaluation because the redevelopment plan had a unit cap, which was part of the community development law requirements, so they might try to import units from the Shipyard to Candlestick. He mentioned that the SB 143 allowed OCII to use tax increment dollars on either side.

Chair Brackett inquired about the parking and the mention that parking might be decreased. She stated that any idea of decreasing parking in these residential areas while increasing parking for commercial space was a concern because this housing would be for families and families needed parking. They had found that many applicants gave up housing opportunities because parking would not be available. Ms. Brackett asked for an update on the parking situation.

Ms. Hussain responded that the change in parking ratio was tied to the commercial R&D parking and not to the housing parking ratios. She explained that this had come about after discussions with SFMTA. The Southeast (SE) was unique and all the transit was not there and would not be delivered until later phases. That was why they had 2 parking spaces/1000 sq ft for up to 1.7 million sq ft of R&D and a parking study would determine to see if that parking was being used to the maximum. Ms. Hussain explained that if the study showed that they had a lot of vacancy, they could reduce that to 1.3 spaces per 1000 ft of R&D. But the idea was to have a check-in because neighborhoods were all different and the phasing and location of this project was different from other large-scale developments in the City.

Chair Brackett reminded staff of an earlier issue in Mission Bay (MB), where parking had to be converted for other uses and then they ended up with not enough parking. She wanted to clarify the developer's commitment that if there was additional commercial space or commercial parking that it would be used for conversion to additional residential if that community grew.

Ms. Kidd responded that this issue had been very challenging because it was tied so closely to equity. She explained that there was a strong connection between the option of transit, the amount of it, and the frequency of it, and land values. Transit did not fit with all people, families, the elderly and sometimes was not convenient for certain types of jobs. Ms. Kidd indicated that they had sought out advice from urban planning professionals, architects and commercial real estate advisors on this issue. There was a lot of data that stated that parking ratios were largely copied from other agencies without looking at other factors. She reported that they approached this issue with a lot of thought and with the desire for sustainability and asked for 2 parking spaces/1000 sq ft to make them competitive. Then they decided on a phasing approach wherein once they had established half the square footage, they would do an assessment of how it was working including the residential and then propose a new parking ratio at that point.

Chair Brackett stated that she was appreciative of all the thoughtfulness that they had put into this issue. She commended everyone involved in this project and looked forward to the future progress.

6. Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items

Speakers: Triston Dion, Owner, Streamline Drywall Inc.; Oscar James, native resident, District 10; Francisco Da Costa, Director, Environmental Justice Advocacy

Mr. Dion stated that he was a SF resident and had been an advocate for fair contracting for many years. He described his company as a union, African-American Disadvantaged Business Enterprise (DBE), micro-LBE certified company in SF. He stated that he needed OCII's help with primes who were consistently avoiding using them. Mr. Dion stated that they often faced exclusionary practices. His company had a proven track record of delivering a high-quality product with multiple SF primes when they were able to secure backlog. However, he was concerned that there appeared to be a lack of enforcement and non-compliance despite the intent of the federal programs in place to bring a fair and equal playing field to the construction arena. He asked what technical assistance could be providing for those emerging DBE and SBE contractors who were capable, ready, willing and able. They needed support to navigate through the exclusionary practices that prevented them from being chosen on bids for projects in Transbay, Hunters View Blocks 14 & 17 and many other SF projects. Mr. Dion stressed that this was not just his story but that of many other SBE contractors as well. He requested a meeting with OCII and other contractors as well.

Mr. James referred to the parking issue discussed in Item 5b). He stated that underground parking would not be possible in that area because it was all landfill. He informed that where Gillman Park was located, it used to be all water. He commended OCII staff for doing a wonderful job.

Mr. Da Costa stated that he had advocated for the community for over 50 years. He suggested that OCII review the Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) and not change anything. He reminded everyone that in the past a rogue developer had promised affordable housing in the DDA and when everything was set and the community was ready to see what was happening, they amended it. Mr. Da Costa reported that right now Aaron Peskin (Board of Supervisors President) was working on a model that would give more affordable housing to the citizens of SF. Some people pretended to represent the community but they did not. Mr. Da Costa advocated that OCII pay attention to the DDA and work with Mr. Peskin on the new model for more housing for the poor. Regarding AG, he mentioned the rat situation, which proved that homes could be built, but if they were not maintained and the surroundings kept clean, then injustice was being done to the community. Mr. Da Costa stated that they needed action, not talk.

7. Report of the Chair

Chair Brackett announced that on Saturday, June 29, in collaboration with the California Candlestick Recreation Area Parks Department, OCII had partnered with Tony Hines, a local D10 resident for 30 years, and with Soul Skillet Street Kitchen to host a community health walk/hike at Candlestick Point, which included breath work. Ms. Brackett reported that many people of all ages attended. As a result, the Parks Department wanted to offer more maritime sports activities, such as fishing. Ms. Brackett reported that this area may end up being a ferry stop, among other things. She was pleased that the local Bayview Starbucks had donated coffee and snacks for the event.

8. Report of the Executive Director

Executive Director Kaslofsky thanked everyone for listening to the Candlestick proposal. He warned Commissioners that the binders for the July 16 meeting for the approval of this proposal would be thick, but this was preparation for that meeting. He announced that this evening there would be a meeting with the Candlestick neighbors and BV Hill residents. The team would meet later at One Ignacio Court to hear the concerns and feedback from the community.

Executive Director Kaslofsky announced that there would be a Planning Commission hearing on July 18 for approval of the Design for Development Amendment and the General Plan Referral and Consistency Findings for the proposal. He reported that OCII had been working with SFMTA, the Department of Public Works and the Public Utilities Commission on the infrastructure and transportation plan amendments, and that they had been great partners. They were agreeing to the increased parking for now and then looking to analyze the parking later on.

9. Commissioners Questions and Matters

Executive Director Kaslofsky stated that at the last Commission meeting, Chair Brackett had requested that a letter be drawn up and sent to the SF School District. Now that the minutes from that meeting had been approved today, the draft letter could be prepared for her approval to be sent.

Chair Brackett stated that they were supposed to respond within 30 days and inquired about whether the Communications Director had responded to any of the questions from the meeting.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that the letter had not yet been written because they were waiting for approval of minutes from the June 18 meeting but now that those minutes had been approved, they would draw up the letter and get it to her right away.

10. Closed Session - None

11. Adjournment

Chair Brackett asked that they adjourn this meeting in honor of her friend, Tania Thomas, who was born and raised in the BV and lived on Ingerson Street and who had passed away the previous day.

Vice-Chair Scott motioned to adjourn and Commissioner Drew seconded that motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Jaimie Cruz
Commission Secretary