

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
3RD DAY OF SEPTEMBER 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 3rd day of September 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:** 2662 008 7495 **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 1:19 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, September 17, 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: 2662 008 7495

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

NOTE: ITEMS 4(a) THROUGH 4(h) ARE CONTINUED FROM THE JULY 16, 2024 MEETING

Public Hearing per CRL Section 33451 to hear all persons interested in the proposed Redevelopment Plan Amendment for Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area

Public Hearing per CRL Section 33451 to hear all persons interested in the proposed Redevelopment Plan Amendment for Zone 1 of the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area

- a) Adopting findings, including amending adopted mitigation measures, pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act related to the approval of the 2024 Modified Project Variant for the Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard Development Project; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area and Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 22-2024)

- b) Adopting findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and approving the Report to the Board of Supervisors on the amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area; and authorizing transmittal of the Report to the Board of Supervisors; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 23-2024)
- c) Adopting findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and approving the Report to the Board of Supervisors on the amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area; and authorizing transmittal of the Report to the Board of Supervisors; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 24-2024)
- d) Adopting findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and approving amendments to the Redevelopment Plan for Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area, referring the plan amendments to the Planning Commission for its report on conformity with the General Plan, and recommending the plan amendments to the Board of Supervisors for adoption; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 25-2024)
- e) Adopting findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and approving amendments to the Redevelopment Plan for the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area, referring the plan amendments to the Planning Commission for its report on conformity with the General Plan, and recommending the plan amendments to the Board of Supervisors for adoption; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 26-2024)
- f) Adopting findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; authorizing a Fourth Amendment to the Disposition and Development Agreement (Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard) with CP Development Co., LLC, subject to the approval of the Oversight Board of the City and County of San Francisco and the California Department of Finance; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area and Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 27-2024)
- g) Approving the Candlestick Point Design for Development for Zone One of the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 28-2024)
- h) Authorizing the Executive Director to execute a First Amendment to the Tax Allocation Pledge Agreement between Agency and the City and County of San Francisco for the development of Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard; Bayview Hunters Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Areas (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 29-2024)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; Lila Hussain, Senior Project Manager; Lashon Walker, VP Communications, FivePoint; Elizabeth Colomello, Housing Program Manager; Suheil Totah, Senior VP, FivePoint; Jim Morales, General Counsel and Deputy Director

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Roberta Achtenberg, former San Francisco (SF) Supervisor and Consultant, FivePoint; Dr. Arelious Walker, CEO, True Hope Church and Founder, Tabernacle Community Development Corp.; Alex Lantsberg, Research & Advocacy Director, SF Electrical Construction Industry; Ishan Clemenco, Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS) Parcel B, Bldg. 116 artist; Margie Burke, HPS artist; Julian Billotte, Master Tenant, Bldg. 116, HPS; Jack Hain, South Bay attorney; Lorna Kollmeyer, HPS Bldg. 116 artist; Robin Denevan, HPS Bldg. 116 artist; Glenna Cole Allee, HPS Bldg. 116 artist; Patricia Diart, HPS Bldg. 116 artist; Alan Mazzetti, HPS Bldg. 116 artist; Claytis Norman, Owner, Integrity First Plumbing and VP, SF Hyperlocal Contractors Collective; Oronde Sterling, Owner, Oronde Builders and Framers; Joyce Armstrong, Co-Chair HPS CAC and President, SF Housing Authority Public Housing Tenant Association; Demetrius Williams, Owner, CIW & Sons Plumbing Company and President, SF Building Trades Contractors Collective; Greg Hardeman, International Union of Elevator Constructors, Local 8; Kimberley Hill-Brown, Secretary, Public Housing Tenants Association and Chair, Shipyard Candlestick Implementation Committee; Andrea Baker, CEO & Executive Director, En2Action Inc.; Tricia Gregory, District 10 (D10) resident and business owner; Guillermo Chacon, Local 22; Rudy Gonzalez, Secretary/Treasurer, SF Building and Construction Trades; Cameron Robbins, Operating Engineer, Local 3; Steven Monger, Carpenter, Local 22; Oscar Molena, SF carpenter; Andres Cortes, BV resident; Cathy Davis, Executive Director, Bayview Senior Services; Shawn McGill, McGill's Security; Aman Kaur, BV resident; Queen Vanessa Banks, native resident, BVHP; Maika Pinkston, BVHP resident; Joe Sanders, representing Painters & Drywall Finishers Local 913; Sharon Bealls, Shipyard artist; Mauricio Chavez, representing the NorCal Carpenters Union Local 22; Margaret Dematteo, Directing Attorney, California Movement Legal Services; Leila Mansur, HPS Bldg. 116 artist; Ashley Rhodes, on behalf of Aboriginal Black Man United (ABU); Nikki Vismara, D10 resident, HPS artist and Board member, Shipyard Trust through the Arts (STAR); Mike Lin, HPS homeowner; Elli Shahideh, HPS Bldg. 116 artist; Derek Tillman, Carpenter Local 22; James Mabrey, Owner, Your All Day Everyday Janitorial Services; [Name unintelligible], representing NorCal Carpenters; Tina Herringer, HPS artist; Linda F. Richardson, SF activist; Ace Washington, SF historian; Dr. Veronica Hunnicutt, Chair, HPS CAC and Chair, the Legacy Foundation; Mo McNeilly, Proprietor, Book Arts Gallery, BVHP and HPS artist; [Name unintelligible], Labor Council and Faith in Action; David Sobel, SF Housing Development Corp.; Corey Smith, Housing Action Coalition; Dennis Williams, Jr., DC Williams Development Company; Oscar James, native resident, BVHP

Ms. Achtenberg stated that she was a 50-year SF resident that for the last 18 years, had served as a community development consultant first for Lennar and then for FivePoint, working specifically on this project. She affirmed that the plans were equitable, sustainable and represented jobs, housing, 32% of which was Below Market Rate (BMR). She felt strongly that the time was now to build Candlestick Point (CP) and she urged Commissioners to pass these items.

Dr. Walker stated that SF was a world-class city and must have world-class leadership. This fell on OCII, the Board of Supervisors, and others. He stressed that people had not received the benefits of a world-class city, mostly home ownership, which lent authority to residents and that this development would make home ownership a reality for Bayview (BV) residents, not just a dream. Dr. Walker stated that he had been serving as a pastor for over 50 years and had been active in social action for 30 years and urged OCII to pass these items.

Mr. Lantsberg urged OCII to move this project forward. He argued that the pandemic had had dramatic effects on the construction industry and this project would be absolutely vital for continued post-COVID recovery, especially since the collapse of the office market. This project would put a lot of local people to work and was needed immediately.

Mr. Clemenco stated that he had been an artist with a studio for 10 years in Bldg. 116, a former naval building and stated that some of the artists had been there for 40 years. He was born in SF and his parents and his children were all San Franciscans. He described the building as having great bones, high ceilings and that the inside was very clean. However, it was time for their roof to be replaced and the ball kept getting tossed around and nothing ever happened Mr. Clemenco implored OCII to help them get a new roof on the building. His studio was his home and he has had over 40 visits in the past 10 years from artists, museum curators and directors from all over the world. He also mentioned other artists in Bldg. 116 to underscore the unique and valuable items that needed to be saved there.

Ms. Burke stated that she has had a studio in Bldg. 116 for 20 years and that the heavy leaking from the roof was a constant detriment to her materials there. She pointed out that the original contract required that the building be maintained and be watertight but those responsible had been passing that responsibility back and forth as the problem with the roof worsened. Ms. Burke stressed that the Shipyard was the largest artist community in the country and needed to be protected.

Mr. Billotte stated that there were promises made to the tenants there that needed to be upheld and addressed.

Mr. Hain stated that he had had a studio at HPS from 2005 to 2012. Recently one of the artists showed him the damage that had been done to their building and property from horrific flooding over the past few years, which had caused much loss of income. Now there was great fear for the coming winter. Mr. Hain explained that under a lease agreement between Lennar Corp. and the Redevelopment Agency in 2004, Lennar assumed a duty to maintain and make safe all aspects of the structures at HPS, including capital improvements and repairs. He stated that the City and OCII had the legal capacity to require Lennar to be compliant with this agreement. He stated that OCII had the right and ability to do the repairs under that agreement and the right to bill Lennar for the cost of the repairs and that this would be in compliance with the obligations stated in the agreement.

Ms. Kollmeyer stated that for 40 years she has owned and operated the last ornamental plaster shop, a legacy business which housed the only archives of SF historic, authentic, plaster details to ensure the integrity of the City's historic architecture. She claimed that OCII and Lennar have known about the deteriorating conditions of the roofs for 5 years but HPS has been ignored by the City, Lennar and the US Navy, who were involved in and responsible for the debacle at the Shipyard. Ms. Kollmeyer stressed that they needed to honor the commitments made to the artist community at HPS to keep the artist community intact and secure. She warned that SF is at risk of losing this healthy community of thriving artists, who could no longer remain silent in the face of another winter of rain. She implored OCII to exert the leadership to solve this problem and ensure that the artists could continue to stay at HPS.

Mr. Denevan stated that he had been an artist at Bldg. 116 for 25 years and an owner of a condo at HPS. He stated that he had watched as development stalled, lawsuits had ensued and property value declined. Mr. Denevan noted that he had been on the committee to develop the replacement studio for the artists that was promised a decade ago and they broke ground and then left it. Bldg. 116 was falling apart while millions of dollars were spent to upgrade and improve Bldg. 101. At Bldg. 116 they were only asking for a safe and dry place to work. In addition, as an employer with 20 employees, the state of the building was putting him in violation of state and local labor safety laws.

Ms. Cole Allee urged OCII and any of the other entities involved to follow through and maintain the studios at Bldg. 116 as soon as possible. She stated that she had been at her studio since 2006 and also worked as a remedial teacher at BVHP and cared about the entire area. She asserted that Lennar had broken the promises they had made to the artists at HPS. If there was binding language that could be upheld, Ms. Cole Allee asked that OCII require Lennar to fix the roof. She described the buckets set up to catch the water leaking from the roof and that as an insulation artist and photographer, there were aspects of her art that she could no longer perform due to the condition of the roof. This winter they expected the roof to come down. She implored OCII to help the artists to be able to stay at HPS.

Ms. Diart stated that she had been an artist in Bldg. 116 since 2002 among a group of 60 professional artists and that it was a thriving community. She stressed that so many artist communities have been lost due to development. She explained that they have had to deal with this leaking roof for 7 years and had to work under the continuous duress and stress of not knowing if their work would be damaged or destroyed due to water damage. Ms. Diart pointed out that repairing a roof would cost a small amount of money to save an entire community.

Mr. Mazzetti stated that he had been a self-employed artist for 48 years, has owned a home in Bernal Heights for 40 years and has had a studio in Bldg. 116 for 13 years where he worked 5 days/week. Mr. Mazzetti explained that his studio was originally the post exchange for the sailors at the Shipyard and therefore a connection to the history of the area. He stated that his studio had been crucial to his career for many reasons. He has spent much time patching ceiling leaks and moving pieces of work away from the leaks. Nonetheless, the roof leaking has destroyed some of his work as well as his supplies. He urged OCII to help get the Bldg. 116 roof fixed.

Mr. Norman was in support of the FivePoint Candlestick project being built. He thanked the community leaders for prioritizing the well-being of the community. He remarked that hiring local contractors meant hiring local workers, which lifted up the community by increasing income and decreasing poverty and then the community started to thrive. Mr. Norman felt strongly that the ultimate goal was to ensure that the economy grew to benefit everyone and not just a few and most importantly, it was to influence the children to believe that "what they see is what they'll be".

Mr. Sterling spoke about the impact the micro-Local Business Enterprise (LBE) contractors would have in the community and SF, if the FivePoint Candlestick project was approved. It would prove that there were local contractors who were ready to do real business and give back to the community. Mr. Sterling was in full support of the Candlestick project, which would also provide a big boost to SF economic development.

Ms. Armstrong stated that she was in support of the FivePoint Candlestick project. The City needed low-income and affordable housing as well as employment in the BV and the City. This project would keep residents in the City who might not be able to afford to live there due to the lack of low-income and affordable housing. Ms. Armstrong stated that she had been coming for a long time to comment on this project and she urged OCII to move this forward.

Mr. Williams stated that his organization was composed of a variety of contractors from BVHP who came together to form a collective to be involved in the community and make sure that the local contractors had an opportunity to develop their own neighborhoods. His family had lived in BVHP for generations and his children lived there now. Mr. Williams supported the FivePoint Candlestick project because it would bring back economic development to the community and they needed to build this now. Mr. Williams advocated that it be put in writing that the collective be included in the development phase of this project. He also asked OCII to give the artists a new roof because they deserved it.

Mr. Hardeman stated that he was a lifetime resident of SF. He wanted everyone to understand that the delays in Candlestick Point have been caused by the Navy and not by the developer. He urged OCII to keep this project moving forward because they could not afford to lose this opportunity. Mr. Hardeman stated that he very likely knew some folks that could help fix the roof as well.

Ms. Hill-Brown stated that her father was a WWII veteran and had worked at the Shipyard where she was born and grew up. Her family has lived in the Shipyard for over 60 years. She was in support of this project. She explained that her organization had been working tirelessly for BVHP, Sunnydale, Visitation Valley, Potrero Hill, Dogpatch and all the other communities that made up D10. They were vested in bringing services to these communities, which had not seen this magnitude of development and resources in over a century. She also supported the artists getting a new roof before winter arrived.

Ms. Baker stated that her company had been working with the FivePoint team to develop and facilitate the community engagement and outreach plan. She explained that this work had created workshops in which the community could learn more about the changes included in the development agreement and where residents could share their reaction and ask questions about how this project would impact them and future generations. Ms. Baker described their success so far: over 160 participants at four meetings at three different locations within six weeks. She added that they looked forward to working with FivePoint and with Vice-Chair Scott to continue the outreach to the community youth. She repeated some of the positive observations made by youth in BVHP.

Ms. Gregory thanked Dr. Hunnicutt (Veronica Hunnicutt, Chair, HPS Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC)) and the FivePoint team for their extensive outreach to the community and the local contractors in D10. She asked OCII to push this project forward not only for local contractors, but also to bring life back into the BV, so that BV residents could buy homes and stay in their community instead of leaving it.

Mr. Chacon stated that he was a lifelong SF resident and that as a carpenter, he was aware how essential construction jobs were to this City. This project would provide steady jobs for the skilled workforce and help the City get back on its feet. Mr. Chacon felt that supporting this project was crucial for SF economic recovery and represented an investment in the future of SF. He urged OCII to support this development.

Mr. Clemenco read a statement for H. Vee Mahoney, a HPS Bldg. 116 artist. She spoke about Julian and Anna Billotte, Master Tenants for the artists community and commended them for their help in the arts building. She stated that HPS had a thriving artist community; however, they needed to preserve this unique space for the artists. She urged OCII to help fix the roofs of Parcel B.

Mr. Gonzalez stated that his organization represented 27 construction unions and their related apprenticeship training facilities. He contended that when local contractors were put to work, local residents were also put to work. He advocated the movement to Candlestick Point and stated that it was in sync with the contractor as well as local workforce community. Mr. Gonzalez asserted that this project would give the local workforce a living wage, paid training, family health care and earned retirement. He stated that the Navy had deprived them of the opportunity to start and now they were behind schedule and the Navy should be held accountable. He commended Lennar for stepping in and not making excuses. Mr. Gonzalez felt that this was the right time for this project.

Mr. Robbins supported this project because it represented a commitment to the future of the community and would provide a lasting legacy of affordable housing, parks and community spaces. He asked OCII to move this forward and allow them to begin building today.

Mr. Monger stated that Candlestick would offer a wide range of construction jobs and apprenticeships, which would provide critical training for the next generation. Supporting this project meant supporting a diverse workforce and ensuring a workforce of carpenters in SF. He recalled that Mayor London Breed had spoken years ago about providing affordable housing for tradesmen who worked in the City in order to be able to live in the City. She promised that this would be one of her priorities. However, since that time, more tradesmen have left the City because they could not afford to live in SF. He encouraged OCII to move this project forward to be able to provide tradesmen the opportunity to work and live in SF.

Mr. Molena stated that he was a D9 resident and had been a carpenter for over a decade. He stated that they needed this project for the construction trades. He asserted that this was not just about building, but rather about rebuilding lives and making sure SF could thrive again.

Mr. Cortes stated that he lived very near to the development area. He fully supported this project and felt it should be done as quickly as possible. Mr. Cortes provided a different perspective to this issue and reported that the area surrounding the development had become a dumping site, where garbage and lawlessness were pervasive. He explained that the community needed the jobs that would be generated as well as the affordable housing and the new residents that would be arriving who would support the new businesses that would be created. Mr. Cortes felt that this project would be one step in the right direction to reverse the marginalization of an otherwise forgotten community. He urged Commissioners to pass these items.

Ms. Davis was in support of this project. She recalled going to meetings with Dr. Davis (George W. Davis) in 2010 about this project, so she felt it was definitely time to get it going. She advocated for structural progressive policies to make sure that the BV neighborhood could get into this housing. Ms. Davis stressed that many ideas had come and gone regarding the future of this project but she wanted to ensure that the locals were involved. Regarding senior housing Phase 4, Ms. Davis advised that if they truly wanted to go after legacy families and neighborhood seniors, then they should not put them last.

Mr. McGill stated that he was a 30-year SF resident and the security provider for FivePoint, handling the Candlestick, Alice Griffith and now the Shipyard areas. He was in support of this project because of the jobs it would provide as well as the help to clean up the illegal dumping and the homelessness issues that were currently there.

Ms. Kaur was in support of the Candlestick development. She stated that the site renderings were lovely; however, a visit to the site today would reveal trash, degrading infrastructure, and an unwelcome vista. She stated that the development was affecting the entire area surrounding it. Ms. Kaur pointed out that the fact that so many people from the community had shown up to this meeting, and she herself had taken a day off from work to be there, was proof of the importance of the matter.

Ms. Banks stated that she was there to stand in solidarity with the Candlestick project and to support FivePoint and wanted to echo what Ms. Davis had stated about not forgetting about the people that had been living in the area for a long time. She reminded OCII that many times construction was completed off the backs of the neighborhood but the residents did not reap the benefits. Ms. Banks urged OCII to move forward with the project.

Ms. Pinkston reminded OCII that the BV residents had been promised jobs and housing but cautioned that history showed that once the property managers and the store owners were brought in, they forgot about and dismissed the area residents. She was afraid that eventually no one that looked like her would be left there. Ms. Pinkston asked that OCII help the artists get a new roof and then go to the hill where the housing had had leaks and mildew for a long time.

Mr. Sanders stated that he was a commercial painter and a SF resident. He advocated that this project was more than about construction, but rather about creating good-paying jobs that would boost SF recovery. As a building trades worker, he knew firsthand how projects like this could make a real difference for working-class families. Mr. Sanders strongly supported this project moving forward now. He wanted to keep the momentum going for SF and also requested that the artists get their roof.

Ms. Bealls stated that she had been a photographer/artist at the Shipyard since 2008. She described how working at the Shipyard had changed her life and her career, with sales increasing and thus income increasing as well. She stated that she would like to stay and requested a new roof.

Mr. Chavez stated that he represented 37,000 workers across 46 counties of the state, and specifically, 4,000 workers of SF County. He was in full support of this once-in-a-generation opportunity to not just transform a neighborhood but the future of the City. This project would create approximately 4,000 construction jobs with a 50% local hiring preference, which meant that San Franciscans would get to build San Francisco. Mr. Chavez explained that this project would help the development of apprentices and journeymen and for them to be able to pass their knowledge and skills onward as well as to be able to retire with dignity. Over 7,000 new homes would be built, with 675 new units built by 2025, which demonstrated the commitment of FivePoint. This project was essential for the future of SF.

Ms. Dematteo stated that her office had been supporting Alliance for D10, who were stakeholders to a Community Benefits Agreement (CBA) that was negotiated over 16 years ago. Part of the community investment for this project was based on the promise of jobs, housing as well as housing for people who had been displaced due to redevelopment. Ms. Dematteo requested that OCII add language to the CBA to make this more enforceable and to serve as a benchmark for accountability going forward. She also urged that housing and workforce payments which were part of the CBA not be forgotten and to be part of this project. Ms. Dematteo declared that over \$30 million in payments had been lost so far and they would like to see these payments be resumed somehow. One way that the developer could show good faith would be to fix the roof at HPS, which was something that should have been done a long time ago. She urged OCII to move this forward.

Ms. Mansur was in favor of this project. She stated that she had enjoyed being a part of this community and asked OCII to please fix the roof at the studios so that generations ahead could enjoy the BV area and treat it with the dignity it deserved.

Mr. Rhodes described ABU as a strong community action group in BVHP, fighting for job for 40 years. He thanked FivePoint for the community meetings they had been hosting, which were very informative. He stated that they needed more of them so the entire community would be aware of what was going on. Mr. Rhodes referred to the discussion regarding all the jobs that would be created by this project, but he reminded OCII about the promises of jobs that had been made in the past and he was concerned about getting sold out again. Mr. Rhodes advocated creating a program whereby the people in the community people would be ensured that they would have a permanent job in the future. He advocated for people getting trained in advance for the future job opportunities, whether cleaning, landscaping, maintenance, etc. Mr. Rhodes announced a new organization in his community—the BVHP Hyper Local Workforce Development Committee, sponsored by ABU, and he promised they would be present to make sure jobs were made available in this community.

Ms. Vismara stated that she was a member of the Steering Committee for the Bay Area Air Quality Management District for BVHP. She mentioned that she had never owned a home and was in full support of the Candlestick project, which she felt represented a future investment in the community. Ms. Vismara thanked FivePoint for their commitment but repeated Dr. Walker's statement that the community had not received their benefits. She also requested the help of OCII to get a new roof. She appreciated all the outreach by Lennar and FivePoint to regain community trust and looked forward to actions matching words. Ms. Vismara read the part of the Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) of Phase 2 that spoke about OCII's obligation with the Navy to ensure the existence of the artist community and to make sure the development plan of Parcel B occurred.

Mr. Lin stated that he had owned a townhouse at HPS since 2016 and highly commended the Open Studios at the HPS. He commented that the City had lost so many artists due to the fact that housing was unaffordable in the City. Mr. Lin also spoke about the disarray and violence in the City and advocated pushing forward and getting things done.

Ms. Shahideh added her voice to the problem of roof repairs on Bldg. 116. She explained that the artists' studios were their homes and that the artists were not just artists, but also educators, offering workshops with student workers and youth employees during the Open Studios event. They had local, national and international visitors during this event. She asked OCII for their help with Bldg. 116.

Mr. Tillman stated that he was invested in seeing his Bayview community thrive. The Candlestick project would allow him to stay within his community and not have to leave to find work elsewhere. This project was critical for providing the jobs that the community needed.

Mr. Mabrey stated that he was a subcontractor to FivePoint at the Candlestick project doing landscape maintenance. He assured listeners that they were removing the debris and trash out of the site and that FivePoint was spending a lot of money on this matter. Mr. Mabrey stated that his company was working on graffiti removal, fence repairs, removing homeless encampments and that they had two trucks with four workers working on this every day. He added that he was also a 10-year journeyman carpenter with Local 22 and that his company could offer many services. Mr. Mabrey was in full support of this project, which would offer and provide many trades jobs. He was also owner of African American International Sports, Academics and Arts Academy, a non-profit organization, which took youth out of BVHP and the Bay Area and provided workforce development programs for youth.

Unidentified speaker asked OCII to move forward with this project so everyone could get to work now. He stated that SF was a safe haven for a working-class city and that this would be a great project for everyone in the trades.

Ms. Herring stated that most of the artists from HPS were not present at the meeting because they were working. She stated that she was not just an artist, but also taught at schools in BV and in Oakland and that she had taken the day off to come to the meeting. Ms. Herring stated that she wanted to bring the history of Candlestick Point and the Bay Area to children. She reported that HPS was the largest and the last artist community still standing, as artists and as teachers. Parcel B needed to be rescued and be given funds to fix the roof because of the value of the space. Artists needed large areas of space to work in and to store their work.

Ms. Richardson stated that she was a former SF Planning Commissioner. She was in support of this project. She knew that the Commissioners as well as many of the people present at the meeting were very familiar with all the City issues She stated that she had been part of many City projects, such as Mission Bay (MB), SOMA and downtown, which had all been activated. They were still waiting for activation of the Shipyard.

Mr. Washington stated that many things being said at this meeting had been said many times before and would be said again. The problems were still the same due to broken promises regarding jobs and housing. Mr. Washington pointed out that the community was there and most were African Americans. The City needed to make way for future generations and needed to fix things for them.

Dr. Hunnicutt commended Executive Director Kaslofsky for his outstanding work on behalf of the people of SF. She recalled that at their last meeting, she told OCII that the HPS CAC had unanimously approved the Candlestick project and they still did. It was time to move this project forward because this project had so many things that the City desperately needed, as outlined by Ms. Hussain and Ms. Walker during the presentation. Dr. Hunnicutt implored OCII to move this project forward.

Ms. McNeilly described her store as a hyper local Fine Arts Gallery in BVHP. She spoke about the continued population decline of the African American population in SF, the problems created by redevelopment and the destruction of the Fillmore. She recalled that in 2024 the SF Board of

Supervisors apologized for its role in this destruction. She wanted this project to serve the people displaced from redevelopment and lead toward the repopulation of those areas. Ms. McNeilly advocated using black contractors and workers for this project as a pathway for justice for the SF black community.

Unidentified person spoke about the seven years he and his organization had been trying to get Lennar to provide information, deliver on its promises and to hold the developer accountable and move forward with the 7,000 promised Candlestick housing units and the D10 community benefits. He reported that since that time Lennar had grown to a \$50 billion company and had built a total of 337 units at Candlestick and no permanent jobs. Within the past week, his organization had received 500 petitions and letters from BVHP local residents to create faster timelines, overdue housing, greater benchmarks and include greater penalties for not delivering on promises made to the community. He wanted to create an agreement which would guarantee the promised housing, jobs, schools and done within a timeline that the community could plan for. This was significant public land and public money and the developer stood to make a significant profit and he asked OCII to create benchmarks, timelines and real penalties for the developer as amendments to the documents.

Mr. Sobel described his organization as a 36-year-old community-based organization headquartered in the BV with programs that included affordable housing, development and preservation, financial empowerment and economic development. He applauded the leadership and staff of OCII, Dr. Hunnicutt and the CAC, FivePoint and others who had kept working on this project over the years. Mr. Sobel was eager to see the 7200-unit affordable housing program at Candlestick commence as well as their own 100% affordable housing project on Block 11A, which would be comprised of 175 affordable housing units for families. He was looking forward to see the community benefits, such as down payment assistance, be made available as well. Mr. Sobel wanted to highlight the importance of integrating the new economic development activity at Candlestick with the 3rd street commercial corridor, so BV residents could continue to benefit from this project.

Mr. Smith stated that everybody wanted this project to happen and to start now. He spoke about the economic challenges to building housing in SF and the investment of time and resources it took to complete this. He added that keeping this project moving forward was the light at the end of the tunnel and asked OCII to make sure the project moved forward.

Mr. Williams stated his company was in D10. He spoke about the 15 years of false promises and little progress made. He felt strongly that commitment to creating 7,000 housing units, living wages, jobs, community parks and schools was key in 2010. Since then many changes had been made. Mr. Williams stated that this was supposed to benefit BV small businesses and the community but there had been no progress with jobs and workforce development.

Mr. James fully supported this project. He requested that some of the 9,800 replacement housing units being built be reserved for COP holders from Western Addition (WA) and HP. He also requested that the businesses displaced out of WA and HP have first priority to open businesses in the African marketplace. Mr. James requested that black contractors be a part of this development and guarantee the hyper locals be a part of this development as well. He spoke about the investment Lennar had made in the BV for free. He described the history of the HPS and other areas. He advocated a new roof for the artists in Bldg. 116 so they could stay at the Shipyard and in the City.

Vice-Chair Scott stated that “out of a mountain of despair, a stone of hope”. She thanked Executive Director Kaslofsky and the OCII staff for their work on this project. She stated that OCII was really focused now on activating the stalled projects and initiatives. Dr. Scott reviewed the history of the accomplishments of Executive Director Kaslofsky—

1. The work on HPS and the Candlestick project had been brought forward. The Candlestick amendments with the developer, FivePoint, had been written to advance the project, which had been stalled since 2017.
2. HPS broke ground on 180 units of affordable housing.
3. SB 593 replacement housing passed state legislation authorizing over 5,800 new affordable housing units thanks to Mayor London Breed, Senator Scott Weiner, Dr. Veronica Hunnicutt, Mattie Scott and OCII.
4. Transbay (TB) Block 2 started construction of over 300 units of affordable housing.
5. Mission Bay (MB) Block 9 comprised of 140 units of affordable rental housing, all for formerly homeless adults, was full leased up.
6. MB 9A construction would be completed and the selling of 148 affordable units would begin.

Dr. Scott stated that so much more had been done and was being done. OCII had demonstrated good fiscal stewardship and conducted refinancing of a portion of OCII’s bonds. Dr. Scott thanked Dr. Veronica Hunnicutt and the HPS CAC for their work in the community with many projects.

Commissioner Drew thanked Vice-Chair Scott for outlining all the accomplishments of Executive Director Kaslofsky, staff, and others. She thanked Ms. Hussain for her presentation. She inquired about what could be done about the roof on Bldg. 116.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that the roofs on Parcel B, which consisted of three different buildings—115, 116, and 125, were under the management of three different landlords. He explained that the Navy, through a lease with OCII, signed in 2008, delegated the responsibility for maintaining the roofs to OCII. OCII transferred that responsibility to then Lennar, now FivePoint. FivePoint signed agreements with the three artists’ landlords that they would take care of the roofs. Mr. Kaslofsky stated that he had toured those buildings and the landlords had performed repairs over time. However, he explained that the rents for the artists were very low and ultimately were not enough to cover capital improvements. Mr. Kaslofsky reported that OCII had been working with the Navy on rent relief. OCII paid the Navy over \$200,000/year to lease out the buildings. They had considered rent relief to put that money toward roof repairs. He also reported that FivePoint had agreed to pay for an assessment to understand the actual conditions of the buildings. The Navy had ordered OCII to conduct an assessment of the buildings to make sure they were safe to occupy. He reported that all of that was underway and the first inspection was the following day. Mr. Kaslofsky reported that they would be working with FivePoint on a shared responsibility to do something about the roofs before the rainy season.

Commissioner Drew thanked Executive Director Kaslofsky for that update and requested an informational memorandum by the next meeting, outlining the timeline for these actions to keep Commissioners abreast of the progress on the roofs.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded in the affirmative and stated updates on this issue would be included in the upcoming Executive Director’s reports.

Commissioner Drew requested to hear from FivePoint and inquired about whether they could share information about their current capacity to take on this project, their progress on it, financing and staffing, how quickly they could move forward and what their plans were to do so.

Mr. Totah responded that as soon as they received approvals, they were prepared to commission all the infrastructure design work to submit the permits to the City. They would be reaching out to the task force immediately so that they could get prepared and would be ready to start construction on Phase 1 once they received the permits, which he hoped would be by the end of next year. Mr. Totah indicated that they were committed to fund the first phase of infrastructure. These approvals were critical because of the extensions which ensured a stream of revenues moving forward.

Commissioner Drew was very pleased to hear this news and thanked Mr. Totah for that update. She asked Ms. Hussain about whether there were any changes to the proposals as a result of community feedback.

Ms. Hussain responded in the negative. She added that because the project had been delayed, much of the meetings were about reminding people what the project was about and then the topic became the delay itself. Much of the discussion was also about traffic and parking in the Bayview neighborhoods as more commercial traffic entered. She added that much discussion was about creating paths for local contractors to be part of the early phases of the project as well as economic opportunities. She commended En2Action as a moderator in these formal and informal community meetings.

Executive Director Kaslofsky added that another idea that had been brought up at the meetings was the idea of interim uses for the former Alice Griffith site. He reported that he had met with Ms. Hussain and Ms. Colomello to review and assess what was there. He reported that there had been a couple of beautification efforts conducted and a temporary playground was planned as well as other ideas for interim uses. They had also heard from food entrepreneurs about the new commercial spaces being planned and the desire assistance with tenant improvements which would be required for restaurants. Mr. Kaslofsky said he heard desire to retain the senior project and underscored the overall need for senior housing at BVHP. He and staff had spoken with FivePoint about this and that was part of the proposal.

Commissioner Drew referred to the senior housing and inquired about where the exact site would be located. Given the importance of the aging population in the BVHP and given that this was something that was originally going to happen during the first major phase, Ms. Drew emphasized that this should happen as quickly as possible.

Ms. Hussain responded that the exact site had not been established and that this could happen within any of the phases but would definitely happen by Phase 4.

Commissioner Drew referred to Alice Griffith and inquired about any additional thoughts about what might happen at that site.

Ms. Hussain deferred to Ms. Colomello to answer this question.

Ms. Colomello stated that they had been working with the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) and HOPE SF on interim use for Alice Griffith. She explained that the temporary playground is planned where the Opportunity Center used to be and that there was funding for it through the Kaboom program. They hoped to have that done within the next year.

Commissioner Drew referred to the status of conditions of the new site as well as the half street which had been built and inquired about whether there were any conversations with the property manager to address some of the resident concerns.

Ms. Colomello responded that they continued to work with property managers regarding maintenance. She reported that they had recently reorganized their property management onsite which they hoped would improve ongoing maintenance. Ms. Colomello reported that they were working with the City to ensure there was rental assistance to make sure there was money flowing into the project for improvements.

Commissioner Drew inquired about how OCII was holding the property managers accountable for that improvement and how OCII could review that to make sure it was taking place.

Ms. Colomello responded that they provided annual monitoring reports and that the MOHCD asset management team was working with them as they were responsible for the ongoing maintenance.

Executive Director Kaslofsky stated that they could contact the MOHCD team who played more of an active role in the maintenance of Alice Griffith for an update and then report on it at the next meeting.

Commissioner Drew stated that this would be very helpful. She stressed that it was crucial to have the public housing be built on the site before any private and Market Rate (MR) development and wanted to make sure that they were getting that benefit. She added that this was a huge investment and they needed to make sure that the property was being well maintained and cared for. Ms. Drew indicated that OCII would be happy to help with this issue, if necessary.

Ms. Hussain responded to the inquiry about Arelious Walker Drive in front of Alice Griffith. She reported that the street was half built, according to the Infrastructure Plan, which had a wider cross-section, but that what was built is operational. She stated there is complicated ownership and maintenance obligation in this area, that includes the Port, the SF Department of Public Works (DPW), the SF Department of Parking & Transportation (DPT) and the MTA. Ms. Hussain explained that the Port had put up signage and is responsible for maintenance for a portion of Arelious Walker. She stressed that this continued to be an ongoing maintenance issue and that OCII remained in contact with all the agencies involved.

Commissioner Drew responded that to the extent that more permanent and better solution could be provided, given that the timeline for fully building out toward Alice Griffith was far off, this would be helpful because this was a concern and they wanted to make sure they were covering the residents there.

Commissioner Aquino was pleased to be a Commissioner during this time and be part of this important project work in D10. She thanked staff for the presentation and thanked the public for their attendance. She acknowledged that this project had evolved over the years and still promised

incredible benefits: workforce of 50% local hires, creation of over 10,600 new homes with 32% designated for affordable housing. Ms. Aquino mentioned that she still rode her bike around the area and that it had a special place in her heart. She looked forward to the ribbon-cutting ceremony.

Commissioner Lim recalled a story to his son regarding his worst problem be a leaky roof and also about the time his son told him he wanted to be an artist. He replied to his son that he would not be rich, but that he would be happy.

Chair Brackett commended Lashon Walker for her work with the community on this project as well as Dr. Hunnicutt and the CAC for their work in D10. She stated that she was disappointed with this proposal. She pointed out that they have had many documents come before the Commission with promises for residents to be able to live and work at the project place. However, the results here did not demonstrate that. She inquired about how many BV residents were able to buy homes in the HPS and how many BV residents were employed there. Ms. Brackett asserted that they could not afford to push a project forward without specific terms in place to protect the future of the residents.

At the last meeting Chair Brackett recalled that she had asked for an increase in the number of affordable housing units at this project. Sadly, this request was not represented in the presentation documents. Instead, she saw language that suggested that they were not able to increase the amount of affordable housing, which was very disappointing given how hard the COP Committee had fought for increased replacement housing. There was no mention of housing for the displaced in the documentation. Ms. Brackett referred to Appendix 7 and pointed out that in 2010 the performing arts space was 75,000 sq. ft. and now had been reduced to 5,000 sq. ft. She also pointed out that in 2010 the residential units totaled 7,850 units and now totaled 7,218 units. The commercial space was doubled; however, the community space remained at 65,000 sq. ft.

Chair Brackett explained that what she would like to see was a proposal that actually benefited both parties. Looking at the BMR plan, this was the most affordable housing that any development has had at 32%, but Ms. Brackett inquired about where those units were. The census average for the entire City had been used to construct the plan, thus purposely deflating the actual calculations that should have been done to demonstrate the amount of housing and jobs would be needed in the district. Statistics showed that average home size at BV was 3.4 persons/unit and they needed as much housing as possible. The document showed that the current population demand for housing in this project was 13,016; however, the document demonstrated they would only go up to 10,672 units. OCII's request for additional housing was completely ignored.

Chair Brackett pointed out that the actual statistics demonstrated that the level needed for those displaced to be able to move back into the neighborhood was 40-50% AMI and below. Inclusionary housing for this plan would go from 80-100% AMI, which would exclude the population described above. Inclusionary housing at 110-119% AMI would again exclude the same population, and again at the 120% level and at the 140% level, which was considered "workforce" housing. Ms. Brackett clarified that 140-160% AMI represented annual incomes of \$175,000 and above. The average income in the BV was \$35,000/year and it was evident that this development was not being built for the community. She explained that this was why SB 593 was passed to build that additional affordable housing, which should have been presented to FivePoint as an option, but which she now understood was not. The 50% AMI and below would also incorporate the homeless. She stressed that more work needed to be done here and they could not use trickle-down housing policies any longer. In the 1990's and the 2000's, it was thought that height increases and added live-work

spaces would help with the affordability crisis, but they still ended up with increased prices. She pointed out that 55% of the homeless population in SF were African-Americans who were impacted by redevelopment. OCII wanted to continue to partner and see this project move forward. However, the terms and conditions from this project would be set in stone for the next 40-50 years and she inquired about how they could honestly say they were trying to help the housing affordability crisis, if there was no equity built into this proposal.

Chair Brackett thanked Mr. Totah for working on and putting together this proposal over the past year. She referred to the conflicting language within the proposal. She inquired about whether FivePoint would extract the conflicting language indicating “up to 10,672 units” and requested it be changed to “at least a minimum of 10,672 units”. This would be helpful in the case that OCII chose in the future to purchase additional parcels or build more affordable units than currently indicated in the DDA.

Mr. Totah responded that he was familiar with the language that would allow OCII to add density to its blocks but pointed out that it provided a number of conditions. FivePoint was supportive of that. However, without knowing the exact number and what the impact would be, he could not acquiesce to allowing OCII to add whatever number they desired. They were anxious to add more housing in general and the language allowed for the transfer of units. But he could not commit at that time to amending the documents.

Chair Brackett responded that the language referring to the transfer to units would actually deplete the number of units at HPS in favor of Candlestick Point. She indicated that this might be helpful right now because they were unable to move forward with HPS for at least 15 years; however, when they were able to, they would have no agreement or language indicating that they could build more housing than what they were currently allotted to.

Executive Director Kaslofsky interjected that the idea of creating a minimum instead of a maximum amount of units, in other words, to have an open-ended unit count, which could be increased by some unknown amount, was not analyzed under Addendum #7. As Mr. Totah had pointed out, the Disposition and Development Agreement (DDA) allowed OCII to densify if they wanted to and the Mayor had advocated for this as well. However, this would require additional environmental review and analysis to see what the upper limit capacity would be. He pointed out that this addendum took many months and they had been working on this for two years and added that they could work further with FivePoint to meet her request. However, at this point they did not have the environmental coverage to do this.

Chair Brackett reminded Executive Director Kaslofsky that the request was made to do the environmental impact report before this item was brought back to OCII.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that they had spoken about amending the enforceable obligations to increase the unit count; however, to increase it would require additional environmental review. He explained that this could be done concurrently and would not require stopping the current progress in order to do that. It would be possible to come back in 8 months with an amount. So they could look at starting that process immediately but it could not be added right at this time.

Chair Brackett commented that basically they did not do their due diligence and now they were stuck with a proposal that they either had to approve or deny. So now they had something they might have to renegotiate in the future with the developer, at the whim of the developer.

Executive Director Kaslofsky stated that they considered community feedback as well as briefings from the Commission to consider what the appropriate development program would be. They had proposed the 2 million sq. ft. increase and other amendments. However, there was no clear direction from the Commission to go back and do an environmental review to increase it for X number of units or the upper limit, which would not have been possible without a fixed number.

Chair Brackett directed Secretary Cruz to pull up the minutes from a previous meeting so they could check and review Commissioner's comments regarding that statement. She read portions from the minutes of that meeting.

Chair Brackett stated that there were 259 units at the inclusionary limit of 80-100% AMI, 57 units at 101-119% inclusionary and 389 units at the 120% inclusionary, 446 units at the 140%, considered workforce and 446 units at 140-160%, also considered workforce. Thus, distributing the largest share of the affordable housing at the upper income limit. Ms. Brackett paused and stated that she was trying to discern where the misunderstanding had occurred and why this was not communicated and discussed before the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was completed, because the EIR was completed in July 2024 and there would have been time to add the additional requests to explore how many more affordable units they could have gotten in this project before it was brought back to OCII. She added that the binders were given out the Thursday prior to review.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that approximately 52% of the affordable units in Candlestick were at 0-60% AMI, including the Alice Griffith replacement housing which had already been built, except for 30 units and the 1400 units of OCII units and inclusionary senior were all at 0-60% AMI. He referred to the minutes of the previous meeting, where Chair Brackett mentioned increased the number of units to 8,000, which would have been an additional 800 units. He pointed out that those units were available at HPS and added that the Shipyard plan provided for a process and would authorize those units being moved to 8,000 units. In that respect, they were trying to meet the demands of the Commission at that time.

Chair Brackett responded that what they had been talking about were strictly the affordable units, not Market Rate (MR), so it was not a total of 8,000 within the realm of the 7,000 units. They were talking about maximizing as many units as possible because they were adding an additional 2.5 million sq. ft. of commercial space to the development. She pointed out that during that time, there were also discussions regarding unutilized parcels that had not yet been acquired by FivePoint, which could be potential sites for the City to possibly purchase or work with site developers to increase the affordable housing in that region as well. None of those things was represented in these documents and moreover, what was represented was that OCII would have to get permission from FivePoint to be able to do that. She asked for confirmation of that statement.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that through replacement housing, which had not been approved by OCII yet, acquisition of new sites would be possible. No additional authorization through this agreement would be necessary. Buying private parcels either from FivePoint or from other private owners would be the first step. He explained that if the parcel were to exceed in terms of unit count beyond what the environmental review required, then an additional environmental

review would be needed to see if there might be impact enough to require another EIR or addendum. The negotiations would have to happen with those owners to buy the property. He pointed out that nothing in this document prohibited that, but there was a process of negotiation that would require FivePoint participation, if it was their property. If it involved other private owners, they would have to have negotiations with FivePoint and OCII would have to have the same type of negotiation with FivePoint, which would be to avail OCII of the entitlement benefit and the infrastructure investment. This was all possible but they all required process.

Chair Brackett responded that this was why the recommendation to negotiate those terms prior to signing off on this document was recommended to both parties on the day that this proposal came to OCII. Having those negotiations in hindsight was not advantageous to the public, was not fiscally sound, and she pointed out that the EIR already indicated that there was the ability to build at least 16,000 units in Candlestick Point, which was double what was slated now. So even if it were true that they had to go through a whole new process, the current documents already supported the additional housing.

Chair Brackett stated that, in regards to the open arts space, there was some language that was changed from primary use to secondary use and asked why that was done.

Ms. Hussain responded that she understood the question about how performing arts moved from primary use to secondary use. She explained that the performing arts was a primary use in the Candlestick Point (CP) center area and while it was there, they had an idea of the impact it would have. However, the desire was to move some of those types of land uses to the surrounding areas. Since they were moving this to the outer areas, they did not know exactly where this would be and moving it to secondary use would allow OCII to analyze those impacts before approving its location and any impacts it might have.

Chair Brackett referred to counsel and pointed out that by adding that language to the DDA, there was another caveat there that stated that it did not have to be done at all. She inquired about what guarantee they would have that this art space would ever be done since it was being moved to secondary use and there was a caveat that stated “or for some other use”.

Mr. Morales responded that he did not have the language in front of him, but as she had been told by staff, this version of the DDA provided flexibility to the developer to provide development that was feasible in the market. He was not sure there was an absolute requirement but he thought FivePoint could clarify that point. The fact was that it remained an option, as many of the uses did, and if it were to be placed in a certain area that required additional conditions or review to mitigate impacts, this would come before OCII for review of those impacts. However, he could not speak about a guarantee.

Ms. Hussain followed up by saying that there was no guarantee, even if it was a primary use, that it would be constructed. Primary use meant that it was allowed by right and secondary use meant additional analysis was required. Even if it was listed as primary use, there was no guarantee that the use was going to happen.

Chair Brackett responded that there was language to strengthen commercial use, such as the use of the hotel and pointed out that they had changed the language to indicate that it would be primary use. She inquired about why that was done.

Ms. Hussain responded that there were many types of boutique hotels that could fit into residential areas, more so than a performing center. She explained that with a performing center, there could be noise, different entrances and other things that the community would want to have more input on. Hotels could be smaller and be boutique-type and could fit into a residential area and did not need the type of scrutiny that a performing center would need.

Chair Brackett clarified that in conclusion they had decreased the size of the performance area from 75,000 sq. ft. to 5,000 sq. ft. and had changed it to secondary use, so that it could be evaluated as to whether it could even be done in the future.

Ms. Hussain responded in the affirmative.

Chair Brackett stated that questions still remained regarding Alice Griffith (AG). She inquired about when the streets would become public streets, because if they were moving this to Phase 4, the same deplorable conditions of the property would remain. She inquired about when they might expect those streets to become public streets, so that SF Department of Public Works (DPW) could begin to pick up garbage in the area.

Ms. Hussain responded that they had the same interest on this issue, because OCII was an underlying owner of those streets and the sooner they were accepted as public streets, the sooner they could begin to receive regular City services. Given that phasing had changed, one of the things that the City had mentioned was that they wanted to resolve the AG streets issue. It was part of the infrastructure work, if approvals moved forward, it was a priority for the Public Utilities Commission (PUC), DPW and OCII to resolve this issue to see how these streets could get accepted. It would involve negotiation with the PUC and reconfiguration of utility requirements or do some improvements, so that they were acceptable.

Chair Brackett responded that this had been the same situation for the past four years. She inquired about whether it would be appropriate for this issue to be prioritized since people were already living there.

Ms. Hussain responded in the affirmative and stated that she completely agreed.

Chair Brackett stated that this plan did not do that.

Ms. Hussain responded that the acceptance issue was not tied to the DDA, but more to the public improvement agreement and mapping conditions which were tied to the City infrastructure permits. She stated that this would be a priority for the PUC, DPW and OCII in resolving the AG streets before starting the next phase streets.

Chair Brackett referred to counsel and stated that, the fact that many of these documents had been dumped on Commissioners at the last minute and that there were many details that were not explored or worked out before coming to the Commission, she inquired about what a delay would mean and whether they could allow an additional month or more, so that some of the negotiations could take place and some environmental reviews that should have taken place could actually take place later.

Mr. Morales responded that this was a policy call rather than a legal question. He explained that any delay would mean that the project would not proceed through the Planning Commission, the Board of Supervisors, and the Department of Finance (DOF). He pointed out that OCII had the prerogative to delay, but stressed that this was a policy call for OCII to make.

Chair Brackett inquired about what the policy was when it came to maximizing housing and whether that be the priority or whether the priority was the acceleration of the process vs the sustainability of the community and fulfilling the goal of OCII to develop whole communities that do not further gentrification or displacement.

Mr. Morales responded that this was a policy call. OCII's policy has always been to maximize affordable housing and it has always been the opinion of previous commissions and staff that what this project provided was the maximum amount of housing that could be provided. He explained that it was the right of the Commission to increase the housing, but as was pointed out, this would result in significant delay to consider environmental review and the impact on the enforceable obligation. He reminded Commissioners that OCII was operating as a dissolved redevelopment agency under the contracts that were approved before dissolution in 2012 and this DDA was a contract that was approved in 2010 by the DOF which stated that OCII could continue to implement that contract. Any increase would require that the DOF and the Oversight Board review that increase to determine whether there would be any benefit to the taxing entities, how much it would cost OCII to add affordable housing or anything else. These were aspects of the proposed amendment which would delay the consideration and require additional analysis.

Chair Brackett inquired of counsel as to whether he thought they should just follow the EIR in Addendum 7.

Mr. Morales responded that his opinion was that to the extent that they approved these amendments, they should follow and abide by what the addendum indicated, which was that the existing EIR covered any changes to the project which basically kept the fundamental project intact, albeit transferring where some of the development would occur and some of the land uses.

Chair Brackett referred to Addendum 7 on page 51 where it stated that the project site total for the 2024 modified project variant total housing demand was 13,016 units. She stated that she was hoping that they could amend all of the documents so that would be listed as the maximum number of units that they could do in CP and that they amend that from the 10,672 units to what the EIR indicated, which was the 13,016 units. She pointed out that in this document as well it did mention that the potential number of units in CP could go up to 16,818. She was asking for some minor changes in the document before they approved it.

Mr. Morales interjected that the 13,016 was the number related to the broader project area because the HPS had both Phase 1 and Phase 2.

Chair Brackett corrected Mr. Morales' statement and stated that it was meant specifically for CP. She stated that she was happy to support this as long as they could maximize the number of affordable housing units they could build. She explained to Commissioner Lim as what she wanted to amend.

Commissioner Lim inquired about whether this would cause additional delay.

Chair Brackett responded in the affirmative.

Mr. Morales clarified that adding units would require additional analysis and could not be done on the spot. In particular, changing the enforceable obligation by adding those units alone would cause a delay, but they would also have to look at what that reference in the addendum meant and whether or not the analysis of the original number would still be valid.

Chair Brackett inquired about whether they were accepting the EIR, which was Addendum 7, or rejecting it. She stated that she was confused about this.

Mr. Morales clarified that the addendum indicated the same amount of units as had been proposed in 2010, which was 10,672 units.

Chair Brackett pointed out that this addendum stated that they could add more units, meaning more than the 10,000 units.

Executive Director Kaslofsky interjected that the way the Addendum 7 worked was that it was analyzing a specific proposal. If the addendum identified additional housing capacity and that was not in the proposal, that would continue to be the proposal. He indicated that the 16,000 was a jobs number but that they could look into the 13,000-housing demand number further. He stressed that this was not in the proposal that had been put forward so far, and so had not been analyzed.

Commissioner Lim inquired about whether they could add additional units at a later date.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that the process of adding units could continue parallel to this work and the Commission could consider that, if they wanted to. But they did not need to stop this work to do that instead.

Commissioner Lim proposed to go parallel with this plan.

Chair Brackett stated that there would still be barriers to doing that.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that there was a process to all these ideas. The existing DDA would allow OCII to densify their affordable housing subject to make sure there was no impact to the overall project and require potential overall environmental review, if needed. They intended to densify their units, which was something they did in all their project areas, but he concurred that there would be a process to doing it.

Chair Brackett responded that it would only densify to the number already in the DDA, which was the 10,000 units and would not go above that and asked for confirmation of that.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that they had not reviewed that environmentally, but could be considered if they wanted to do that.

Chair Brackett stated that she wanted to focus on what they would be allowed to do at this moment with this DDA, and not what they might consider doing in the future.

Mr. Morales reminded Commissioners that they were dealing with a contract here between two parties, which were OCII and FivePoint. He explained that the Commission could not unilaterally change the contract without some consultation and negotiation with FivePoint and that just adding a number would not change the enforceable obligation, if the parties did not agree. Part of the process for coming to an agreement would require additional analysis and review regarding where the units would go and what the impacts would be. Mr. Morales reminded OCII that this was going to be a 30 to 40 or 50-year process with future amendments, so there would be plenty of opportunities to add the housing units in the future. The goal now was just to get the project started with the 10,000 units to be built. Mr. Morales stressed that there would be plenty of time to add and seek additional amendments to add more units in the future.

Chair Brackett inquired about whether Mr. Morales was present at the July meeting.

Mr. Morales responded in the affirmative.

Chair Brackett inquired about why there was no advocacy on his part to increase the number of units and start the discussions and negotiations with FivePoint to get this done or to even offer them that opportunity.

Mr. Morales responded that only the Commission could direct by majority vote that the terms of the contract be reconsidered or added to and he pointed out that her comment at that time was not a binding directive from the Commission to staff to increase the number of units.

Chair Brackett insisted that she was not the only Commissioner to ask that the number of units be increased and in fact, after Public Comment, Executive Director Kaslofsky stated that he would take all comments by Commissioners and make sure that those items would happen with FivePoint in discussions with FivePoint before the next meeting. She clarified that there were no unilateral activities happening on the Commission by herself or any other member.

Mr. Morales responded that the Commission operated under its bylaws which incorporated Robert's Rules of Order, which clearly stated that in order for the body to direct staff or to direct policy, it needed to take a vote on the matter and pass by majority vote.

Chair Brackett inquired about whether it would be better if the meeting notes were brought up and read.

Executive Director Kaslofsky referred to the 8,000 units and repeated what he had said earlier, that amendments to the HPS plan were already allowed through the agreement. Since then Chair Brackett had raised the idea of increasing the amount of units beyond 10,000 units. He repeated that there was a process for that and they were open to that, because they all wanted more housing but this would also have to be approved by the DOF. He was not denying that they could do this, but there was a process that could go on concurrently with this plan.

Commissioner Lim stated that he was in favor of working concurrently with this plan.

Vice-Chair Scott stated that she was in favor of working concurrently with this plan and would like to make a motion to move this item.

Vice-Chair Scott motioned to move Item 4(a) and Commissioner Drew seconded that motion.

Secretary Cruz called for a voice vote on Item 4(a).

Commissioner Aquino - yes
Commissioner Drew - yes
Commissioner Lim - yes
Vice-Chair Scott - yes
Chair Brackett - no

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE NAY THAT RESOLUTION NO. 22-2024, ADOPTING FINDINGS, INCLUDING AMENDING ADOPTED MITIGATION MEASURES, PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT RELATED TO THE APPROVAL OF THE 2024 MODIFIED PROJECT VARIANT FOR THE CANDLESTICK POINT AND PHASE 2 OF THE HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD DEVELOPMENT PROJECT; HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA AND BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Vice-Chair Scott motioned to move Item 4(b) and Commissioner Aquino seconded that motion.

Secretary Cruz called for a voice vote on Item 4(b).

Commissioner Aquino - yes
Commissioner Drew - yes
Commissioner Lim - yes
Vice-Chair Scott - yes
Chair Brackett – no

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE NAY THAT RESOLUTION NO. 23-2024, ADOPTING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND APPROVING THE REPORT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA; AND AUTHORIZING TRANSMITTAL OF THE REPORT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS; BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Vice-Chair Scott motioned to move Item 4(c) and Commissioner Lim seconded that motion.

Secretary Cruz called for a voice vote on Item 4(c).

Commissioner Aquino - yes
Commissioner Drew - yes
Commissioner Lim - yes
Vice-Chair Scott - yes
Chair Brackett – no

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE NAY THAT RESOLUTION NO. 24-2024, ADOPTING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND APPROVING THE REPORT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA; AND AUTHORIZING TRANSMITTAL OF THE REPORT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS; HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Vice-Chair Scott motioned to move Item 4(d) and Commissioner Aquino seconded that motion.

Secretary Cruz called for a voice vote on Item 4(d).

Commissioner Aquino - yes

Commissioner Drew - yes

Commissioner Lim - yes

Vice-Chair Scott - yes

Chair Brackett – no

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE NAY THAT RESOLUTION NO. 25-2024, ADOPTING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND APPROVING AMENDMENTS TO THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, REFERRING THE PLAN AMENDMENTS TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR ITS REPORT ON CONFORMITY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, AND RECOMMENDING THE PLAN AMENDMENTS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR ADOPTION; BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Vice-Chair Scott motioned to move Item 4(e) and Commissioner Drew seconded that motion.

Secretary Cruz called for a voice vote on Item 4(e).

Commissioner Aquino - yes

Commissioner Drew - yes

Commissioner Lim - yes

Vice-Chair Scott - yes

Chair Brackett – no

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE NAY THAT RESOLUTION NO. 26-2024, ADOPTING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND APPROVING AMENDMENTS TO THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, REFERRING THE PLAN AMENDMENTS TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR ITS REPORT ON CONFORMITY WITH THE GENERAL PLAN, AND RECOMMENDING THE PLAN AMENDMENTS TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR ADOPTION; HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Vice-Chair Scott motioned to move Item 4(f) and Commissioner Lim seconded that motion.

Secretary Cruz called for a voice vote on Item 4(f).

Commissioner Aquino - yes
Commissioner Drew - yes
Commissioner Lim - yes
Vice-Chair Scott - yes
Chair Brackett – no

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE NAY THAT RESOLUTION NO. 27-2024, ADOPTING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; AUTHORIZING A FOURTH AMENDMENT TO THE DISPOSITION AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT (CANDLESTICK POINT AND PHASE 2 OF THE HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD) WITH CP DEVELOPMENT CO., LLC, SUBJECT TO THE APPROVAL OF THE OVERSIGHT BOARD OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE; HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA AND BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Vice-Chair Scott motioned to move Item 4(g) and Commissioner Lim seconded that motion.

Secretary Cruz called for a voice vote on Item 4(g).

Commissioner Aquino - yes
Commissioner Drew - yes
Commissioner Lim - yes
Vice-Chair Scott - yes
Chair Brackett – no

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE NAY THAT RESOLUTION NO. 28-2024, APPROVING THE CANDLESTICK POINT DESIGN FOR DEVELOPMENT FOR ZONE ONE OF THE BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT; BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Vice-Chair Scott motioned to move Item 4(h) and Commissioner Aquino seconded that motion.

Secretary Cruz called for a voice vote on Item 4(h).

Commissioner Aquino - yes
Commissioner Drew - yes
Commissioner Lim - yes
Vice-Chair Scott - yes
Chair Brackett – no

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE NAY THAT RESOLUTION NO. 29-2024, AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXECUTE A FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE TAX ALLOCATION PLEDGE AGREEMENT BETWEEN AGENCY AND THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF CANDLESTICK POINT AND PHASE 2 OF THE HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD; BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT AND HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREAS, BE ADOPTED.

5. Matters of New Business:

CONSENT AGENDA

a) Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting of August 20, 2024

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Vice-Chair Scott motioned to move Item 5(a) and Commissioner Lim 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 AUGUST 20, 2024, BE ADOPTED.

REGULAR AGENDA

b) Authorizing an Exclusive Negotiations Agreement and a Predevelopment Loan Agreement in an amount not to exceed \$5,111,731, with Mission Bay 4 East Associates, L.P., a California limited partnership, for the development of approximately 165 affordable rental housing units and for the initial predevelopment activities for additional units in a separate building at Mission Bay South Block 4 East; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 30-2024)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; Phillip Wong, Development Specialist, OCII; Cathy Davis, Executive Director, Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP) Multipurpose Senior Services

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Linda F. Richardson, member, Board of BVHP Multipurpose Senior Center; Demetrius Williams, Owner, CIW & Sons Plumbing Company and President, SF Building Trades Contractors Collective; Lashon Walker, Chair, BVHP YMCA Board of Advisors; Oscar James, native resident, BVHP; Alex Lantsberg, Research & Advocacy Director, SF Electrical Construction Industry; Dennis Williams, Jr., DC Williams Development Company

Ms. Richardson stated that the vision for this Center was started decades ago by Dr. George W. Davis. She stated that the Center was the most successful when it came to the COP program. This was an example of progress that could be done to provide more housing in BVHP. Ms. Richardson stressed that that seniors also needed housing and asked that OCII keep that in mind.

Mr. Williams stated that this had been a long day. He explained that his organization was a group of contractors who tried to get ahead of projects to ensure work for the community contractors. He wanted to make sure that they were heard and that the developers knew that there were community contractors who were interested in participating in building these projects. Mr. Williams stressed that it was imperative that the City ensure that community contractors had the opportunity to work on these projects. He stated that they were not being given the information about bidding on this job or welcomed to be involved in these projects. Mr. Williams stated that there was a lot of talk about goals and percentages including community contractors, but inquired about how those goals were being met or checked. He stated that members of his organization were not working and were not being included in the information about these projects.

Ms. Walker stated that she was a 29-year resident of BVHP. She explained that the BVHP YMCA would be providing the programming for the Crane Cove YMCA extension, which would bring more of BVHP into Crane Cove. She stated that the Senior Center would be providing the social services for this project, which would bring more of BVHP into Mission Bay (MB). Ms. Walker argued that anything that could break down barriers between communities was very important. She announced that the John Stewart Company would be the property manager for this new MB project. She requested assistance from OCII to make sure that the services team did not end up doing property management work.

Mr. James described the history of BVHP and MB. He supported this project because Michael Johnson was a developer dedicated to the community. He wanted to make sure that the hyper local black contractors who built Southeast SF and who were licensed union contractors to be participating in this project. He stated that he was a member of the Board of the Dr. Davis project and would make sure that COP holders get into this project.

Executive Director Kaslofsky corrected Mr. James and stated that Michael Johnson was not the developer on this project, but rather that Curtis Development would be the developer.

Mr. Lantsberg was pleased that this project was moving forward. He referred to the OCII MB Block 9A project, which was being worked on by non-union contractors from San Diego for at least 15% of the electrical work there. He wanted to ensure that local black contractors were working on this project rather than allow non-union San Diego-based contractors that nobody was familiar with be brought in. He advocated one way to address this would be to cover all projects with a city-wide project labor agreement. This would ensure that all affordable housing development built by the City and with public funds was covered by the project labor agreement to make sure that the work was done by local laborers. Mr. Lantsberg stated that workforce monitoring was incredibly important in order to put the money back into the community to help recovery from the pandemic. He felt it was very important that OCII take a stand on this as well.

Mr. Williams extended gratitude for OCII's understanding and knowledge of the complexities and challenges faced by local contractors. He stated that support and advocacy for local black developers and contractors was not just important but imperative to bring about constructive change to benefit everyone. He pointed out that everybody talked about inclusion but stopped short of including micro developers and workers, while outside developers were brought into the City all the time taking financial gains back to other cities and states. Mr. Williams felt strongly that they should not have to work this hard to bring in micro developers who had experience on projects such as this.

Mr. Williams offered a quick prayer for 49er's rookie player, Ricky Pearsall, who was shot in Union Square on August 31.

Vice-Chair Scott thanked Mr. Wong for his presentation and inquired about whether John Stewart or representative was present and when told no, she inquired about why not. Dr. Scott reported that there had been a downpour of complaints regarding this company's management, or lack thereof, and inquired about whether this was the only company that was available. She inquired about how this company would be monitored. Dr. Scott did not have any good things to say about the John Stewart Company and inquired about whether there was any other property management company they could use.

Mr. Wong responded that Mr. John Stewart was deceased and that his company was a long-term property management company in SF. He deferred to the team to respond to her questions regarding annual monitoring of this company. Mr. Wong stated that they intended to ensure that monitoring was done and that the property management plan was closely watched to address concerns. He deferred to Ms. Davis to answer Dr. Scott's questions.

Ms. Davis responded that she was very aware of Vice-Chair Scott's concerns. She stated that first, there were not many companies to choose from and second, that BV Senior Services would be an appropriate watchdog, because that was what they did. Ms. Davis added that whoever the property management was, her Center would be the service provider. She acknowledged that it would be nice if there were more choices available, but there weren't. They were taking this measure to be able to move forward and assured OCII that they would oversee their work. She stated that it was all about personnel and she had seen good work from this company as well as not.

Vice-Chair Scott commended Ms. Davis and her Center for their work in the Bay Area. She inquired about whether they would be getting more staff to help with all their work.

Ms. Davis responded that they would be expanding their housing services staff because they were getting Blocks 52 and 54 as well and would be able to start leasing that up by spring 2025. She announced that they would be getting 967 Mission as well.

Chair Brackett thanked Executive Director Kaslofsky as well as staff for their work on this project. She referred to the 20% of units set aside for formerly homeless as well as the mix of housing units regarding number of bedrooms and ensuring that there would be onsite parking.

Commissioner Drew motioned to move Item 5(b) and Commissioner Aquino seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Aquino - yes

Commissioner Drew - yes

Commissioner Lim - yes

Vice-Chair Scott - yes

Chair Brackett - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FIVE COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 30-2024, AUTHORIZING AN EXCLUSIVE NEGOTIATIONS AGREEMENT AND A PREDEVELOPMENT LOAN AGREEMENT IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$5,111,731, WITH MISSION BAY 4 EAST ASSOCIATES, L.P., A CALIFORNIA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF APPROXIMATELY 165 AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING UNITS AND FOR THE INITIAL PREDEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES FOR ADDITIONAL UNITS IN A SEPARATE BUILDING AT MISSION BAY SOUTH BLOCK 4 EAST; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

6. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

Speakers: Ace Washington, Fillmore Corridor Ambassador; Oscar James, native resident, BVHP; Dennis Williams, Jr., DC Williams Development Company

Mr. Washington recalled that the agency used to go very long and very late speaking just about the Western Addition, but no longer. He wanted to speak about the Fillmore. He acknowledged that OCII owned the land that Yoshi's was on and that they leased it out to the MOHCD but now there was no clarity or leadership to turn to. He referred to the fact that Safeway was leaving without meeting with the community first but stated that he was trying to get Safeway and the developer to meet with him and the community. Mr. Washington stated that he was trying to put some funds together to work on the Western Addition and on Fillmore community reform. He asked OCII for their support in the Western Addition. He commended Chair Brackett for taking on everyone else and for standing up for her principles.

Mr. James stated that had worked with white contractors since 1972 when he had a trucking company. He was familiar from working with white contractors that they pulled their people together and held meetings to talk about contracts coming up even before the project was started. He suggested that the black contractors do the same thing.

Mr. Williams wanted to comment on the John Stewart Company, which was the property management company for the Plaza East Apartments. He stated that the John Stewart Company had the lowest ratings on record and was known for disparaging the black community, especially in District 5. Mr. Williams stressed that this was supposed to be about inclusion but they were basically begging for jobs as local black developers and contractors. He felt that they should be way beyond this by now. He pointed out and thanked a few strong black women leaders who supported them.

7. Report of the Chair

Chair Brackett announced that in the past week she had been invited to speak on a panel at the BV Opera House regarding voter registration and community issues. She indicated that multiple labor unions and local leaders were present as well as non-profit organizations, such as the Faith-Based Coalition and APRI (A. Philip Randolph Institute). Vice Chair Scott was one of the moderators on the panel. During the presentation Ms. Brackett stated that she had met with people from the Governor's office and announced that there was an opportunity coming forward from OBED (Office of Business and Economic Development) with \$168 million workforce dollars. They were currently meeting to decide how to deliver those funds to the communities of 94107, 94124 and 94134, specifically, which were adjacent to Candlestick Point and HPS. Ms. Brackett described the business and education opportunities that they would be offering. She wanted to make sure that these

communities could take advantage of these funds and offerings and be job ready for the workforce hiring that may be forthcoming with the Innovation District area.

8. Report of the Executive Director

Executive Director Kaslofsky stated that he had no report.

9. Commissioners Questions and Matters

Vice-Chair Scott stated that she was sorry to hear that Mr. Dennis Williams had not heard OCII speak over and over again about jobs and the inclusion that was needed in the workforce and the steps that were being taken regarding jobs and economic development because that was one of the items that OCII was very supportive of and always tried to make sure it was happening in their projects. She hoped that he would join more meetings and was grateful for his presence and for the voice of all the hyper locals and SBE's.

Chair Brackett held up a HP and India Basin Industrial Park calendar given to her by Mr. James. It reminded her about building a community by the community and self-determination. The same cooperative housing built by black community members and developers throughout the state 60-70 years ago was still standing today. Ms. Brackett wanted Mr. Dennis Williams to be aware that there was a Black Developers Forum in the State of California that held events in the Bay Area and throughout the state. She would like to see OCII partner with them to have discussions about how to bring back the Developers Certificate of Preference (COP) program, which still existed under the Redevelopment Agency. She hoped they could offer new developers the mentorship and training that was needed as well as to the hyper local developers, so they could start working on not just OCII projects, which had workforce percentage requirements, but be able to work on other projects outside the OCII purview as well.

10. Closed Session - None

11. Adjournment

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

The meeting was adjourned at 7:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Jaimie Cruz
Commission Secretary