ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, AND CONDITIONALLY APPROVING SCHEMATIC DESIGNS FOR THE ALICE GRIFFITH HOUSING DEVELOPMENT BLOCKS 2 AND 4 PURSUANT TO THE CANDLESTICK POINT AND HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD PHASE 2 DISPOSITION AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH CP DEVELOPMENT CO., LP; BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA

WHEREAS, Under Chapter 5, Statutes of 2011, Assembly Bill No. 1X26 (Chapter 5, Statutes of 2011-12, First Extraordinary Session), and Assembly Bill No. 1484 (Chapter 26, Statutes of 2011-12, Regular Session) (collectively, the “Dissolution Law”), the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (“SFRA”) was dissolved and the non-housing assets and obligations of SFRA were transferred to the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco (“Successor Agency”), now known as the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure or “OCII,” by operation of law; and,

WHEREAS, As required by the Dissolution Law, the oversight board for OCII was established (the “Oversight Board”) to oversee certain fiscal matters of OCII. The Oversight Board has been meeting since March 2012 to perform its duties under the Dissolution Law; and,

WHEREAS, On October 2, 2012, the Board of Supervisors in its capacity as the legislative body of the Successor Agency adopted Ordinance No. 215-12, acknowledging that OCII is a separate legal entity as a result of AB 1484, creating the Community Investment and Infrastructure Commission (the “Commission”) as the policy body of OCII, and delegating to the Commission the authority to act in place of the SFRA to among other matters, implement, modify, enforce and complete the SFRA’s enforceable obligations, approve all contracts and actions related to the assets transferred to or retained by the Commission, including, without limitation, the authority to exercise land use, development, and design approval, consistent with the applicable enforceable obligations, and take any action that the Dissolution Law requires or authorizes on behalf of the Successor Agency, and,

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors’ delegation to the Commission, includes the authority to grant approvals under specified land use controls for the Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard Project (the “Project”); and,

WHEREAS, In connection with the Project, the Board of Supervisors on August 3, 2010, approved amendments to the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan and the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan by ordinances 210-10 and 211-10, respectively (the “Redevelopment Plans”), the SFRA approved the Candlestick Point Design for Development and the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Design for Development (the “Design for Development Documents”) by Resolution 62-2010 and the SFRA and CP Development Co., LP (“Master Developer”) entered into a Disposition and Development Agreement (Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2), dated June 3, 2010 (the “DDA”) by Resolution 69-2010. The DDA was amended on December 18, 2012, a First Amendment to the DDA, by OCII Resolution No. 3-2012; and,
WHEREAS, The DDA establishes the Master Developer’s rights to develop within the parameters of the Redevelopment Plans and Design for Development Documents and incorporates through exhibits and attachments various Project documents including the Design Review and Document Approval Procedure (“DRDAP”), Below Market-Rate (“BMR”) Housing Plan, Transportation Plan, Infrastructure Plan, Community Benefits Plan, Design for Development Documents, Open Space Plan and Sustainability Plan and other documents (together, “Project Documents”); and,

WHEREAS, The BMR Housing Plan stipulates that 31.36% or 3,345 units of 10,500 units be below-market rate units, including a one-for-one replacement of the existing Alice Griffith public housing units (“Alice Griffith Replacement Units”), OCII affordable units, inclusionary units and workforce units. Three primary groups of providers will develop the BMR units: (1) the OCII and qualified housing developers selected by OCII will develop the 1,140 OCII Affordable Units on the OCII Lots; (2) the developer of the Alice Griffith Replacement Units (“Alice Griffith Developer”) will develop 256 Alice Griffith Replacement Units and 248 OCII Affordable Units on the Alice Griffith lots; and (3) vertical developers, including Master Developer and its affiliates, will develop 809 Inclusionary Units and 892 Workforce Units in accordance with the BMR Housing Plan; and,

WHEREAS, McCormack Baron Salazar (“MBS”) has been selected by the Master Developer to act as the developer for the Alice Griffith Replacement Units; and,

WHEREAS, All of the 256 Alice Griffith Replacement Units will be replaced and integrated into newly constructed buildings developed by MBS and will include 248 new affordable units. The first phases of new homes will be built on vacant land adjacent to the Project site currently owned by OCII and the California Department of Parks and Recreation “State Parks,” meaning that existing residents will have the opportunity to move directly from their existing homes into new homes without leaving their community or risking displacement; and,

WHEREAS, It is anticipated that State Parks will convey the approximately 2.8 acres of the site owned by State Parks to OCII, which will then convey the property to the San Francisco Housing Authority in 2014 for housing development; and,

WHEREAS, The DDA is an enforceable obligation under the Dissolution Law and shown on line HPSY 30 of the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule for January to June 2014, which was approved by the Oversight Board and the California Department of Finance (“DOF”). On December 14, 2012, DOF issued a final and conclusive determination under California Health and Safety Code § 34177.5 (i), that the Phase 1 DDA and the Phase 2 DDA are enforceable obligations that survived the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency; and,

WHEREAS, Alice Griffith Developer has submitted Alice Griffith Block 2 and 4 Schematic Designs (“Alice Griffith Designs”); and,

WHEREAS, In accordance with the DRDAP, OCII staff has determined that the Alice Griffith Designs submission is consistent with the DDA, the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan (the “Plan”) and the Design for Development Documents and,

WHEREAS, The Alice Griffith Design application generally follows DRDAP with the exception that the AG Schematic Designs will be reviewed and considered before the approval of the Sub-phase for the surrounding property. Because of the tight schedule, which is driven by a federal grant, the Executive Director of OCII will approve Sub-phase
CP-01 after Commission consideration of AG Schematic Designs. Because there is no material change in the street grid layout or the location of the parcels, as set forth in the CP 1 Major Phase Approval, the approval of the AG Schematic Designs before approval of the Sub-phase will still be consistent with the infrastructure improvements provided for in the CP-01 Sub-Phase.

WHEREAS, OCI staff informed the Mayor’s Hunters Point Shipyard Citizens Advisory Committee (“CAC”) of the details of the Alice Griffith Designs during its meetings in October, November and December 2013. At the CAC’s December meeting, the CAC recommended approval of the Alice Griffith Designs moving forward; and

WHEREAS, On June 3, 2010, the SFRA Commission by Resolution No. 58-2010 and the San Francisco Planning Commission by Motion No. 18096, certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (“FEIR”) for the Project as adequate, accurate, and objective and in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) (“CEQA”) and the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq.); the Board of Supervisors affirmed the Planning Commission’s certification of the FEIR by Motion No. 10-110 on July 14, 2010; and,

WHEREAS, As part of its approval of the Project on June 3, 2010, in addition to certifying the FEIR, the SFRA Commission, by Resolution No. 59-2010 adopted findings pursuant to CEQA, regarding the alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant environmental effects analyzed in the FEIR, including a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Project, which findings are incorporated into this Resolution by this reference; and,

WHEREAS, Subsequent to the certification of the FEIR, the Planning Department, at the request of OCI and in response to changes proposed in the Project as part of the first major phase and sub-phase applications, issued an addendum to the FEIR (Addendum No. 1); and,

WHEREAS, Addendum No. 1 addresses changes to the phasing schedule for the Project and corresponding changes to the schedules for implementation of related transportation system improvements in the Transportation Plan, including the Transit Operating Plan, Infrastructure Plan and other public benefits; and minor proposed revisions in two adopted mitigations measures, TR-16 Widen Harney Way and UT-2 Auxiliary Water Supply System; and,

WHEREAS, Mitigation Measure TR-16 Widen Harney Way was amended to provide for implementation prior to issuance of the occupancy permit for the Candlestick Point Sub-Phase CP-02 instead of the first grading permit for Major Phase 1 of the Project, and to provide for a two-way cycle track on Harney Way rather than the previously proposed bicycle lane; and,

WHEREAS, Mitigation Measure UT-2 Auxiliary Water Supply System (“AWSS”) was amended to no longer specify a loop system for the AWSS; and,

WHEREAS, Based on the analysis in Addendum No. 1, the Planning Department concludes that the analyses conducted and the conclusions reached in the FEIR on June 3, 2010, remain valid and the proposed revisions to the Project and the two adopted mitigation measures will not cause new significant impacts not identified in the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures will be necessary to reduce significant impacts; further, other than as described in the Addendum No. 1 no Project changes have occurred, and no changes have occurred with respect to circumstances
surrounding the proposed Project that will cause significant environmental impacts to which the Project will contribute considerably, and no new information has become available that shows that the Project will cause significant environmental impacts and, therefore, no supplemental environmental review is required under CEQA beyond the Addendum No. 1 to approve the first major phase and sub-phase applications; and,

WHEREAS, OCII staff has reviewed and considered the FEIR, the Addendum No. 1, and supporting documentation, in preparing necessary findings for the Commission’s consideration, and has made the FEIR, Addendum No. 1, and supporting documentation available for review by the Commission and the public and these files are part of the record before the Commission; and,

WHEREAS, Copies of the FEIR and Addendum No. 1 and supporting documentation are on file with the Commission Secretary and are incorporated in this Resolution by this reference; and,

WHEREAS, The approval of the Alice Griffith Designs is an undertaking pursuant to and in furtherance of the Project in conformance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15180; and

WHEREAS, The FEIR and the CEQA Findings adopted by the SFRA Commission by Resolution No. 59-2010 on June 3, 2010, reflected the independent judgment and analysis of the SFRA Commission, were and, except for the minor amendments to mitigation measures TR-16 and UT-2, remain adequate, accurate and objective, and were prepared and adopted following the procedures required by CEQA, and the findings in such resolution are incorporated by this reference as applicable to the approval of the Alice Griffith Designs; and

WHEREAS, OCII staff has reviewed the Alice Griffith Designs, and finds it acceptable and recommends approval of the Alice Griffith Designs; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, The Commission has considered the FEIR, the CEQA Findings that were previously adopted by the SFRA Commission, including the statement of overriding considerations and mitigation monitoring and reporting program and the Addendum No. 1, and the Commission adopts the CEQA Findings and Addendum No. 1 as its own, with the following modifications to those findings as set forth in Commission Resolution No. 1-2014, which is hereby incorporated into this Resolution by this reference.

RESOLVED, The Commission finds and determines that the Alice Griffith Designs, as recommended for approval, are consistent with the Project as analyzed in the FEIR and requires no additional environmental review beyond the FEIR and Addendum No. 1 pursuant to CEQA Section 21166 and the CEQA Guidelines Sections 15180, 15162, 15163, and 15164; for the following reasons:

(1) Implementation of the Alice Griffith Designs does not require major revisions to the FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts; and,

(2) No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project analyzed in the FEIR will be undertaken that would required major revisions to the FEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects, or a substantial increase in the severity of effects identified in the FEIR; and,
(3) No new information of substantial importance to the project analysis in the FEIR has become available, which would indicate that (i) the Alice Griffith Designs will have significant effects not discussed in the FEIR; (ii) significant environmental effects will be substantially more severe; (iii) mitigation measures or alternatives found not feasible, which would reduce one or more significant effects, have become feasible; or (iv) mitigation measures or alternatives, which are considerably different from those in the FEIR, will substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment that would change the conclusions set forth in the FEIR; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Commission finds that the Alice Griffith Designs submission is complete pursuant to the DRDAP subject to satisfaction of the conditions below, is consistent with the DDA including the schedule of performance, the Plan, and the D for D; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Commission conditionally approves the Alice Griffith Designs submission, a copy of which is on file with the Secretary of the Commission, subject to the remaining design issues being resolved to the satisfaction of the Executive Director and any changes included in subsequent design stages, beginning with the Design Development phase as follows:

1. Illustrate in further detail wall sections that clearly show the combinations of materials referenced in the Schematic Designs as well as the proposed volumes of each material in relation to one another.
2. Eliminate exterior materials that are sparsely used in order to simplify the material palette.
3. Provide materials, colors, finishes, and architectural detailing samples for review and approval by staff during the design development and construction phase in order to ensure that the quality and diversity shown in the Schematic Design is achieved and prepare constructed mock-ups of the exterior during an early phase of construction.
4. Propose alternatives to vinyl windows that allow for a recessed installation.
5. Relocate or modify the configuration of the transformer rooms in order to create secondary access from Donner or Fitzgerald Avenues to the podium courtyards, or provide justification for not creating this access.
6. Increase size of stoops that lead up to ground floor units, or provide justification for not making the change.
7. Use different techniques including but not limited to strategically-placed planters, scoring, and variations in finishing colors and textures, to visually expand the residential units and maximize the usable open space within the courtyards without creating physical barriers or separation.

RESOLVED, That the Commission authorizes the Executive Director to approve subsequent design documents related to this Alice Griffith Designs submission, beginning with the Design Development phase, that the Executive Director reasonably determines are in OCII’s best interest or are necessary or convenient to implement the development of Phase 2 under the DDA, and the Major Phase as applicable, and further the goals of the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan and the DDA, and, be it further
RESOLVED, That the Commission authorizes the Executive Director to take such other actions as may be necessary or appropriate, in consultation with the City Attorney’s Office, to effectuate the purpose of the intent of this resolution.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting of January 7, 2014.

Natasha Jones
Commission Secretary
MEMORANDUM

TO: Community Investment and Infrastructure Commissioners

FROM: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director

SUBJECT: Adopting environmental review findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, and conditionally approving Schematic Designs for the Alice Griffith Housing Development Blocks 2 and 4 pursuant to the Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Disposition and Development Agreement with CP Development Co., LP; Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Project Area

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Alice Griffith ("AG" or the "Project") is a public housing asset owned by the San Francisco Housing Authority ("SFHA" or "Housing Authority") located within the Candlestick portion of the Hunters Point Shipyard ("Shipyard") Phase 2 / Candlestick Point Project ("Phase 2") within the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Area. AG’s rebuild is an important community benefit that has been included in the Shipyard Phase 2 Development and Disposition Agreement’s ("DDA") Below-Market Rate ("BMR") Housing Plan and is part of the Project’s first Major Phase. The overall plan for the rebuilding of the Project is to provide new buildings that will include 1-for-1 rebuilding of all 256 AG units in an integrated development that will also include an additional 248 new affordable units for families earning up to 50 percent area median income ("AMI") (part of the OCII Affordable Units required under the BMR Housing Plan), for a total of 504 units, in order to both retain affordability and establish a mix of incomes.

The developer of the Project, McCormack Baron Salazar ("MBS"), is now seeking schematic design approval of AG Phases 1 and 2, which are comprised of Blocks 4 and 2 respectively. The AG Schematic Designs application generally follows the Phase 2 Design Review and Document Approval Process ("DRDAP") with the exception that AG Schematic Designs approval will precede approval of the Sub-phase of the surrounding property. Because of the tight schedule, which is driven by a $30.5 million grant awarded by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"), the Executive Director of the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure ("OCII") will approve Sub-phase CP-01 after Commission consideration of AG Schematic Designs.

Staff recommends adopting environmental review findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, and conditionally approving Schematic Designs for Alice Griffith Blocks 2 and 4.
DISCUSSION

Hunters Point Shipyard and Candlestick Point Overview and Summary

The Hunters Point Shipyard and Candlestick Point areas (together the “Shipyard Project”) are comprised of approximately 780 acres along the long-neglected waterfront lands of southeastern San Francisco. The Shipyard Project will be developed in two phases and transform the land into productive areas for jobs, parks, and housing, including affordable housing.

The Shipyard Project will deliver over 12,000 new homes, approximately 32 percent of which will be below market rate and will include the rebuilding of the AG public housing development consistent with the City’s HOPE SF public housing revitalization program, up to 3 million square feet of research and development space, and more than 350 acres of new parks in the southeast portion of San Francisco. In total, the Shipyard Project will generate over $6 billion of new economic activity to the City, more than 12,000 permanent jobs, hundreds of new construction jobs each year, new community facilities, new transit infrastructure, and provide approximately $90 million in community benefits. The Shipyard Project’s full build out will occur over 20 to 30 years, but nearly 1,500 units of housing and 26 acres of parks will be completed over the next five years in the first phases on the Hilltop and Candlestick Point sites.

Phase 2 Major Phases

The Phase 2 DDA reflects a “horizontal” land development model, wherein the OCII assembles and conveys land to a competitively selected developer, in this case CP Development Co., LP, a partnership formed for the specific purpose of developing the Candlestick Point and Shipyard Phase 2 project and led by Lennar Corporation (“Lennar” or “the Developer”), together with other land acquired by the Developer, who in turn must build horizontal infrastructure improvements, together with the provision of various community amenities and other public benefits. In return, the Developer receives the right to sell land for vertical development. For vertical construction of new housing and commercial space, the DDA contemplates that the Developer may choose to build vertical projects itself or with affiliates, or alternatively to convey finished lots to other developers for construction.

The DDA’s DRDAP outlines the process by which horizontal and vertical designs are reviewed and permitted and prescribes a process for the Developer to receive development approvals for each Major Phase through a “Major Phase Application” that require Commission approval and subsequent Sub-Phases which are approved by OCII’s Executive Director. Following a Sub-Phase Approval, vertical developers may seek approval of vertical improvements within that Sub-Phase.

The AG Schematic Design application generally follows the Phase 2 DRDAP with the exception that AG Schematic Designs will be reviewed and considered before the approval of the Sub-phase of the surrounding property. Because of the tight schedule, which is driven by a federal grant, the Executive Director of the OCII will approve Sub-phase CP-01 after Commission consideration of AG Schematic Designs. Because there is no material change in the street grid layout or the location of the parcels, as set forth in the CP 1 Major Phase Approval, the approval of the AG Schematic Designs before approval of the Sub-phase will still be consistent with the infrastructure improvements provided for in the CP-01 Sub-phase.
Phase 2 Affordable Housing Program

The BMR Housing Plan stipulates that 31.36 percent or 3,345 units of 10,500 units be below-market rate units, including a one-for-one replacement of the existing public housing units ("Alice Griffith Replacement Units"), OCII Affordable Units, Inclusionary Units and Workforce Units. Three primary groups of providers will develop the BMR units: (1) qualified housing developers selected by OCII will develop the 1,140 OCII Affordable Units on the OCII Lots; (2) MBS will develop 256 AG replacement units and 248 OCII Affordable Units on the AG lots; and (3) Vertical Developers, including Lennar and its affiliates, will develop 809 Inclusionary Units and 892 Workforce Units in accordance with the BMR Housing Plan.

AG Overview

AG currently consists of 256 units of multi-family public housing and community services including the Alice Griffith Opportunity Center\(^1\), Hunters Point Family\(^2\) and a community garden as well as play space for an adjacent child care facility. The Project is located on Candlestick Point along Aurelius Walker Drive between Carroll Avenue and Gilman Avenue. The housing itself is in severe disrepair and must be replaced to preserve the health and safety of AG residents. Through the City’s HOPE SF program, the project site will be reconfigured to provide existing residents with completely new, high-quality housing that is both environmentally sound and equipped with modern amenities and will include new affordable housing units available to other low-income households.

Lennar selected, and OCII approved MBS to act as the developer for the Alice Griffith Replacement Units. MBS has extensive experience in affordable/mixed-income housing and public housing revitalization throughout the United States and has partnered with Urban Strategies, a non-profit organization coordinating community support services for AG residents to ensure that residents are engaged in both the physical and social aspects of the revitalization.

All of the 256 units will be replaced and integrated into newly constructed buildings developed by MBS and will include 248 new affordable units. The first phases of new homes will be built on vacant land adjacent to the Project site, meaning that existing residents will have the opportunity to move directly from their existing homes into new homes without leaving their community or risking displacement.

---

\(^{1}\) The Alice Griffith Opportunity Center, the current services and community hub for AG residents, is operated by Urban Strategies ("US"). US is a non-profit partner of MBS, and has worked successfully with MBS on multiple public housing revitalization projects across the country. US brings expertise in the areas of case management, family support, education, economic development, and job training. US employs a team of service connectors and outreach workers who execute health, education, employment and public safety strategies. The consistent emphasis on community building and resident engagement supports the successful implementation of services.

\(^{2}\) Hunters Point Family ("HPF") operates the community garden at AG and has supportive services space on site at AG where they provide services to AG residents and the greater community. HPF specifically targets youth who are at "high-risk" for participating in violence, illegal acts, unsafe sex, drug abuse, school truancy, and other destructive activities. HPF’s Peacekeepers program is a crisis and violence prevention, intervention, and response program that provides services to youth (10-22) and their families.
Choice Neighborhoods Grant

In 2011, the AG public housing site was one of five projects selected nationwide for $30.5 million grants from HUD through its Choice Neighborhoods Initiative ("CNI"). The CNI program supports locally driven strategies to address struggling neighborhoods with distressed public or HUD-assisted housing through a comprehensive approach to neighborhood transformation. The CNI funding comes with a variety of deadlines and deliverables, the most important of which is a statutory obligation that grant funds must be expended by September 20, 2016 and units utilizing these funds must obtain temporary certificates of occupancy by September 20, 2016. In order to maintain the CNI schedule, MBS submitted Schematic Designs for the first two blocks of the new Alice Griffith development for OCII and City departmental review in October 2013 and to the Commission for its consideration on January 7, 2014.

After the 256 AG and 248 OCII Affordable units have been completed by MBS, Lennar and third party builders will develop on the remaining AG site market-rate and additional affordable units, as follows: approximately 382 market-rate units; 43 inclusionary units for households earning up to 120 percent AMI, and; 281 workforce units for households earning between 120 percent and 160 percent AMI, to be priced below-market. The 1,210 total units will serve households at all income levels. The table below provides further detail about the schedule and amounts of different types of units being constructed on the AG site:

### Alice Griffith Site: 1,210 Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Block(s)</th>
<th>Construction Start (Est.)</th>
<th>Public Housing Replacement Units</th>
<th>OCII Affordable Units</th>
<th>Workforce Housing Units</th>
<th>Inclusionary Affordable Units</th>
<th>Market Rate Units</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Jan 2015</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aug 2015</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5/8/9/14</td>
<td>Dec 2016</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Dec 2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>1,210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AG Development**

The DDA originally contemplated that the Alice Griffith Replacement Units would be distributed throughout the AG site. The DDA provides for flexibility in determining the final AG lot placement. A panel reconfiguration, developed with community input, allows for the initial replacement units to be built on existing vacant land, reducing the potential for AG tenants required to move temporarily to an on-site unit before moving to a permanent unit, or "interim moves". The total number of units and the total number of blocks assigned with each affordable housing category remains the same. These changes, which accelerate the AG revitalization and maximize leverage of the CNI grant funds, are included in Major Phase 1 CP that was presented to the Commission in a workshop on November 5, 2013. The new lot configuration strategically
locates the replacement affordable housing on seven blocks, the majority of which front a new central park (See Attachment 1, Site Map at Page 3).

The current plan is to rebuild AG in five construction phases. Estimated vertical construction commencement dates for each of AG’s five construction phases are provided below. Phases 1 and 2 are being developed concurrently and consists of blocks 2 and 4 respectively and are the subject of this Schematic Design approval request. Together, Phases 1 and 2 include 114 public housing replacement units and 70 OCII Affordable Units for a total of 184 units, and are scheduled to start construction in January 2015. Phase 3 of the Project will be on Block 1 and is scheduled to begin construction in August 2015. The last two phases of AG development are scheduled to begin construction in December 2016 and be complete by May 2018 in concert with Lennar’s infrastructure schedule.

The first three building phases will be located on vacant portions of land currently owned by the San Francisco Housing Authority, OCII, and the State of California through its State Park Commission ("State Parks") (See Attachment 1, Site Map). The approximately 2.8 acre State Parks portion will be conveyed to OCII in June 2014. In accordance with the DDA, these completed blocks will subsequently be transferred to the San Francisco Housing Authority, which will hold the land with a long-term lease back to MBS who will manage the property. As each of the new buildings is completed, AG tenants will move into the new units, leaving vacated buildings that can then be demolished for additional new structures. MBS is in the process of retaining a relocation consultant to develop the relocation plan required by HUD and a replacement housing plan as required by California Community Redevelopment Law ("CRL"). The replacement housing plan will be considered by the Commission in association with the predevelopment funding request later in January of this year.

The remaining market-rate and workforce lots will be developed by third party developers, including Lennar affiliates, as provided in the DDA. Lennar has completed the schematic designs for infrastructure related to AG, and is on schedule to begin that work in spring of 2014. MBS has completed a site planning process for the entire development (with extensive community involvement) and will now design and develop the AG buildings in phases.

**AG Design Summary (see attached Schematic Design Submittal)**

**Architectural Overview**

Located at the eastern perimeter of AG, Blocks 2 and 4 serve as the gateway to the new neighborhood, connecting the higher density affordable housing with the proposed mixed-income, mixed use community within the existing fabric of single family homes.

The densities on Block 2 and Block 4 are 76 and 73 units/acre, respectively, and include a mix of housing types - flats and townhomes - reflecting the need to accommodate both large and small families. The 184 total units included in the two blocks are allocated between one-, two-, three-, and four-bedroom units further described in the below table; five-bedroom units will be built in subsequent phases:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Types</th>
<th>Avg. square feet.</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th>Block 4</th>
<th>Sub Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1BR Flat</td>
<td>625 sf</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2BR Flat</td>
<td>900 sf</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3BR Flat</td>
<td>1209 sf</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhome</td>
<td>1312 sf</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4BR Flat</td>
<td>1433 sf</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhome</td>
<td>1595 sf</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both blocks have a near-identical configuration: a single structure sitting atop a podium and wrapped around a podium-level central courtyard. The massing is articulated to create the appearance of two separate buildings: one larger building with double loaded corridors, rising five stories at its highest and wrapping three sides of the block with a lobby along Aurelius Walker Drive, administrative uses along the street level on Egbert Ave, and street accessible residential units along the outside frontage – Donner Ave for Block 2 and Fitzgerald Ave for Block 4; and one low-rise building rising three stories along G Street with walk-up units accessible from the street allowing for three- and four-bedroom units for large families with direct access to the outside without passing through common areas, corridors or elevators.

A private, secured parking garage with 51 car spaces and 36 bicycle spaces on Block 2 and 35 bicycle spaces on Block 4 is located on the ground level with access situated on Donner Ave and Fitzgerald Ave on Blocks 2 and 4, respectively. A podium-level central courtyard is accessible from a stairway along Egbert Avenue and the outer, parallel street; it is these courtyard entrances, situated directly opposite from each other, that create the appearance of two buildings per block. The courtyards are intended as community gathering space for residents, extending the community space from indoor to outdoor.

The units are designed for comfort and efficiency, with a separation of private and public uses, well-defined dining areas and spacious living rooms for family activity. All ground floor units are elevated between two feet and four feet above the street for privacy. Unit sizes are consistently larger and more efficient than the existing public housing units that they replace.

**Accessibility and Sustainability**

Unless otherwise indicated by the pending tenant survey, the Project will conform to the OCII standard practice regarding accessibility: 10 percent accessible units and a maximum number of adaptable units. MBS and the Project architect have met with representatives from the Mayor’s Office of Disability twice regarding feedback on the master plan and initial designs for phases 1 and 2, and current designs are consistent with ADA standards and guidelines.

The buildings will be highly energy and resource efficient in order to meet or exceed LEED for Homes Mid-Rise Silver Certification. The Project is designed to exceed Title 24 Energy requirements by 15 percent.
Building Form and Materials

Blocks 2 and 4 are located at the intersection of Arelious Walker Drive and Egbert Avenue, which is the most visibly prominent intersection of the Project. Therefore the building massing is broken into a corner signature element that reinforces the statement of a gateway and two 5-story volumes with 3-story bay windows to create a strong sense of identity. The landscaped courtyard at the podium level and the central park along Egbert is connected visually and physically by a grand staircase in both Block 2 and Block 4. Along Egbert, Donner and Fitzgerald, building massing scales down from 5-story to 4-story and 3-story to respond appropriately to the street hierarchy. The west side facade along G Street creates a 3-story row-house expression. Unique identity amongst units is created using differentiations in projections and material color. The ground floor features residential stoops, landscaped front yards, and tall windows, engaging the pedestrian-level walk. The exterior building material palette includes stucco, fiber cement board panels and siding, board formed concrete, and concrete masonry units as a base with a small portion of corrugated and perforated metal panel which punctuates the design and adds to the distinct, pedestrian-oriented character of the residential neighborhood.

Landscaping

The landscape design is consistent throughout both blocks, with a second level courtyard as the primary exterior living space for residents in each block. The courtyard is divided into a series of outdoor rooms that support a variety of activities which include: outdoor kitchens, contemplative zones, view terraces, and children’s play areas.

The courtyard design theme is inspired by nature with curvilinear forms crating wave patterns or fallen leaf patterns and is consistent with the landscaping elements for the surrounding Major Phase. Each courtyard connects to Egbert Avenue through a grand staircase.

Design Review and Approval Process

The Candlestick Point Design for Development ("D for D") provides land use controls and design guidelines necessary to implement the Project, which includes the construction of infrastructure, parks, and housing. The D for D acts as the zoning for the site, including controls for height, bulk, setbacks and lot sizes, but also establishes more detailed standards and guidelines to ensure that the ongoing physical planning and design of the development results in a highly desirable urban environment.

The Phase 2 DRDAP outlines the necessary documents, schedule, and procedures for the review and approval of design submittals. Under the DRDAP, a series of increasingly detailed design documents are required in the design process. They are, 1) Schematic Design, 2) Design Development, and 3) Construction Documents. The DRDAP requires the first design submittal to be presented to the Commission for review and approval.

Approval of vertical improvements follows a Major Phase and Sub-Phase approval under the DRDAP. The AG development is part of Major Phase 1-CP which will be considered by the Commission on January 7, 2014. The AG Schematic Design submittal is deviating from the standard DRDAP as Schematic Designs are being considered ahead of a CP-01 Sub-phase approval, but as noted above, staff does not view this deviation as material in this instance because the street layout and parcelization of the applicable lots has not changed. The CP-01 Sub-phase application was submitted to OCII on September 19, 2013 and is currently under
review. No major design concerns have been raised in this process and OCII Executive Director approval is anticipated in late January 2014. Approving the AG Schematic Designs for Blocks 2 and 4 before the Sub-phase approval is necessary in order to meet the CNI Grant schedule.

For the AG Schematic Designs application, OCII staff has also agreed to eliminate or postpone certain elements that would otherwise be required as provided in the DRDAP, for a Schematic Design submittal in order to maximize scheduling efficiencies, but which are inconsequential to the thoroughness or quality of the design review. OCII staff has determined that: (a) no model is required, but the design team instead will focus on perspective renderings and street views, and (b) no axonometric drawings are required because the high quality of perspective renderings eliminates the need for this type of three-dimensional technical drawings.

Schematic Design Conditions of Approval

As is typical, there are a few remaining design issues to be resolved in subsequent design stages, including the Design Development phase. OCII staff recommends approval of the AG Blocks 2 and 4 Schematic Designs subject to the following conditions:

1. Illustrate in further detail wall sections that clearly show the combinations of materials referenced in the Schematic Designs as well as the proposed volumes of each material in relation to one another.
2. Eliminate exterior materials that are sparsely used in order to simplify the material palette.
3. Provide materials, colors, finishes, and architectural detailing samples for review and approval by staff during the design development and construction phase in order to ensure that the quality and diversity shown in the Schematic Design is achieved and prepare constructed mock-ups of the exterior during an early phase of construction.
4. Propose alternatives to vinyl windows that allow for a recessed installation.
5. Relocate or modify the configuration of the transformer rooms in order to create secondary access from Donner or Fitzgerald Avenues to the podium courtyards, or provide justification for not creating this access.
6. Increase size of stoops that lead up to ground floor units, or provide justification for not making the change.
7. Use different techniques including but not limited to strategically-placed planters, scoring, and variations in finishing colors and textures, to visually expand the residential units and maximize the usable open space within the courtyards without creating physical barriers or separation.

Small Businesses and Local Workforce

The Phase 2 DDA requires MBS to follow an equal opportunity program, which consists of: 1) the Bayview Hunters Point Employment and Contracting Policy (“BVHP ECP”), 2) the Small Business Enterprise Policy (“SBE”), 3) the Nondiscrimination in Contracts and Equal Benefits Policy, 4) the Minimum Compensation Policy, 5) the Health Care Accountability Policy, 6) the Prevailing Wage Policy, and 7) the Card Check Neutrality Policy.
Under the BVHP ECP, developers must make good faith efforts to award 50 percent of the contracting opportunities to SBE consultants and contractors with first consideration for businesses with addresses in the BVHP Area (defined as zip codes 94124, 94134, and 94107). The BVHP ECP also requires developers to make good faith efforts to achieve 50 percent local workforce participation, with First Consideration to BVHP Area residents, in construction workforce hiring, permanent/temporary workforce hiring, and trainee program.

In addition, the HUD-funded project is subject to Section 3 of the HUD Act of 1968, which requires that “recipients of certain HUD financial assistance, to the greatest extent feasible, provide job training, employment, and contracting opportunities for low- or very-low income residents in connection with projects and activities in their neighborhoods.” Following federal guidelines 20 percent of contracts must go to qualified Minority and Women Business Enterprises that provide opportunities for qualified neighborhood residents and grant recipients are further encouraged to have Section 3 residents make up at least 30 percent of their permanent, full-time staff.

To date, the developer has achieved 54 percent SBE participation for professional consultant services. 50.4 percent of consultants are San Francisco-based SBEs, 32.3 percent are from minority-owned firms and over 12.1 percent are from women-owned firms.

Attached are MBS’s projections for construction hiring for Blocks 2 and 4 and the SBE professional services summary (see Workforce Jobs Projection and Professional Services Consultant Summary, Attachments 4 and 5).

**Design Team Selection**

Torti Gallas and Partners served as the architect for the master plan as well as for the buildings on AG Blocks 2 and 4. They were selected through a competitive, public procurement process in accordance with OCII requirements. Shortlisted firms were interviewed by a panel that included members of the development team, Lennar and OCII before a final selection was made.

**Community Outreach**

The proposed AG Schematic Designs underwent an extensive community process that included a week-long design charrette and additional public meetings with AG tenants and at the Hunters Point Shipyard Citizens Advisory Committee (“CAC”). The community process is summarized in the attached Design Charrette Summary. The inclusion of community design feedback is further described in the Charrette Results section on page 2 of the Design Charrette Summary (Attachment 3). OCII staff conducted a review of the proposed development and facilitated discussion on the designs at various CAC meetings in September, October, and November of 2013. At their December 9, 2013 meeting the CAC recommended approval of the AG Blocks 2 and 4 Schematic Designs.

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT**

On June 3, 2010, the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (“FEIR”) for the Project as adequate, accurate, and objective and in compliance with CEQA Guidelines. As part of its actions on June 3, 2010, the Commission adopted findings pursuant to CEQA, including a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Project, which findings are incorporated into the Resolution being considered alongside this memo.

OCII staff has determined that the AG Schematic Designs as submitted are consistent with the Project as analyzed in the Phase 2 EIR, and recommends that the Commission require no additional environmental review beyond the FEIR and Addendum No. 1 pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15180, 15162, 15163, and 15164.

(Originated by Amabel Akwa-Asare, Assistant Project Manager, Hunters Point Shipyard)

Tiffany Bohée
Executive Director

Attachment 1: AG site plan
Attachment 2: Schematic Design Application
Attachment 3: Summary of Community Design Charette
Attachment 4: Consultant List
Attachment 5: Workforce projections
Site Map: Existing Parcel Ownership
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ARCHITECTURE

Project Background

Located in southeast San Francisco in the Candlestick Point area, the Alice Griffith Neighborhood is home to 256 public housing units on approximately 22.5 acres of land. Constructed in 1962, the current housing stock is in dire need of rehabilitation. Located near the decommissioned shipyard, an aging football stadium for the 49ers, and many acres of a coastline landfill, Alice Griffith is quite isolated from the rest of the city, lacking access to social services, jobs, and other amenities typically found in San Francisco neighborhoods.

The Candlestick Point Design for Development (D4D) plan (2010) acts as a zoning code for the redevelopment of the Alice Griffith neighborhood. New streets and open spaces are laid out for the site, as well as the location and density of new housing.

As part of the Choice Neighborhood Implementation Grant, Lennar is tasked with helping to revitalize Alice Griffith as part of the larger implementation strategy for the Candlestick Point Plan. Lennar partnered with McCormack Baron Salazar and Torti Gallas and Partners to develop seven blocks of affordable housing within the Alice Griffith Neighborhood. Based on stakeholder feedback and the design standards and guidelines in the D4D plan, the Design Team developed a revised site plan that strategically phases the development of affordable housing on seven blocks. The site plan (see page 10) illustrates the clustering of the new affordable housing along Arelious Walker Drive. Blocks 2 and 4 will be constructed during the first phase of redevelopment with inviting frontages and facades oriented to the central park.

Design Approach

Block 2 and Block 4 site is central to the overall site plan in Alice Griffith Neighborhood. Two blocks creates the gateway to the neighborhood, the design challenge here is to integrate higher density affordable housing into a proposed mixed-income, mixed use community and an existing context single family homes. The design incorporated a variety of unit and building configurations to support a mix family types and household sizes. By applying urban design and architectural strategies based on the principles of good urbanism that are inherent in traditional San Francisco, those building and unit types are intricately interwoven with and tied to a public realm that is seamlessly connected to the larger community.

The densities on Block 2 and Block 4 range from 72 to 75 units/acre, we have designed a blending of housing types and densities reflecting the varying needs of large and small families, as well as the differences of densities resulting from the hierarchy of adjacent streets. While double loaded corridor buildings deployed with universal design features occupy part of each block, the block arrangement includes some sort of hybrid courtyard building, allowing for walk-up units within or at the edge of the block. Those walkups allow for three- or four-bedroom, multi-story units to sit above flats, assuring that large families have direct access to the outside without passing through common areas, corridors or elevators. Privately secured parking garage is located inside the block wrapped by residential uses. Landscaped and programed courtyard at podium level creates community gathering space for residents, and extending the community space from indoor to outdoor. The grand stairs with landscaped front yard, and tall windows, engaging pedestrian level walk and creating a vibrant pedestrian oriented residential neighborhood.

The recognition that Arelious Walker is an important connector adjacent to the site, and the Egbert is the frontage of the central park. The intersection at Arelious Walker/ Egbert has the highest visibility, and thus these facades have the most catalytic effect on the site, at corner, large storefront windows with side composite wood panel accent at ground level serve as the residential lobby and the common spaces, provide inviting views for pedestrian. The signature corner signature elements reinforce the statement of the gateway. At Arelious Walker, 5 story façade is articulated with 3 story bay windows and balconies vertically and horizontally to create a strong sense of identity. Along the Egbert, Donner and Fitzgerald, building massing scale down from 5 story to 4 story and 3 story to respond appropriately to the street hierarchy. The westside façade along G street creates 3 story row-house expression which includes 4 bedroom families units, here, different scales of projections and colors of materials are used to create identity for each unit. The ground floor features residential stoops, landscaped front yard, and tall windows, engaging pedestrian level walk and creating a vibrant pedestrian oriented residential neighborhood.

Compliance with the Design for Development (D for D)

Refer to Page 27

Density: Site Area for Block 2 is 1.244 Acres, and Site Area for Block 4 is 1.238 Acres, the density for Block 2 is 76 units/Acre, and Block 4 is 73 units/Acre

Bulk: the maximum allowable block coverage for Low-rise 0'-40’ is 100%, Block 2 and Block 4 all have a footprint total coverage of 97%, and the maximum allowable block coverage for Low-rise 40’-65’ is 75%, Block 2 has a footprint total coverage of 50%, Block 4 has a footprint total coverage of 49%.

Building Height: the building height on each block is within 65’ height limitation. The height is measured from the average grade.

Massing: the maximum allowable apparent face at base and above base will be 30’, the proposed apparent face at base and above for Block 2 and Block 4 are ranging from 3’ to 30’. (Refer to page 07 for details)

Setback: The minimum setback for residential street (G street, Donner, Fitzgerald and Arelious walkers) is 10’, the proposed setback ranges from 10’ to 17”-11” for both Block 2 and Block 4.

Build-To-Line: The Minimum required build-to-line is 70%, Proposed build-to-line for Block 2 ranges from 89% to 98%, and Proposed build-to-line for Block 4 ranges from 90% to 97%.

Projections: the allowable maximum habitable space projection is 3’ from the setback line, we have proposed 1’ projection for both Block 2 and 4. And the minimum height clearance to the sidewalk is 9’, and the proposed height clearance to the sidewalk is 10’ for both blocks.

Vehicle and Bicycle Parking: privately secured parking is provided for residents within an enclosed garage. Required maximum parking ratio in D4D is 1 space per unit, 51 spaces has provided for each block (.54 space/unit for block 2, .6 space/unit for block 4), and 2 accessible parking stalls and 2 compact parking stalls in each block.

Bicycle parking is required at 1 per every 4 units, secured bicycle storage rooms are provided in each block within the garage.

Open Space: the D for D requires that 60% minimum open spaces be provided per unit. Each block has a centrally located landscaped courtyard at podium level as the common space provided for the residents.
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LANDSCAPE

Block 2

The Courtyard. Framed by 2 to 4 story family residential buildings the second level courtyard is the primary exterior living space for residents. The courtyard has been divided into a series of outdoor rooms of differing sizes that will support a variety of activities for residents. The courtyards design theme is inspired by nature with curvilinear forms creating a pattern of fallen leaves on the floor of the courtyard.

West courtyard. We start with a curving grand stair providing access to Egbert Avenue and the central park. The western edge has a planted screen that provides privacy for the townhomes and a planted backdrop for the courtyard. At the north edge, a terrace over looks Donner Avenue. A specimen canopy tree provides a sense of enclosure to the terrace. This is the contemplative portion of the garden. Informal seating is provided that can be moved by residences as they wish. Moving east – a children’s play area is provided with a variety of play structures that will appeal to both 2-5 year olds as well as 5-12’s. It includes a safe resilient lawn like play surface. A variety of tables and chairs are provided for supervising adults.

Central Courtyard. In the central courtyard an outdoor eating/gathering space has been placed near the community room. A major specimen tree is provided here acting as a canopy over the space. This area also has a vine trellis to help subdivide the space along with gas fire pit for an evening conversation area. This portion of the courtyard also includes planters along the south edge of the courtyard with screen planting for privacy.

East Courtyard. The east courtyard has an additional outdoor eating/gathering space off of the community room so that multiple groups can use the space if desired. A specimen tree is provided here for screening the upper floor units. Flexible table and chair seating is available in this area as well.

Ground floor Streetscape. The context for the ground floor sidewalks and building entries are the streetscape designs illustrated in the Candlestick Point Sub Phase CP-01 Improvement Plans. The scope of these plans cover the +/- 12 foot Right of Way (ROW) zone from new curb and gutter to the building property line. One half of this zone (6’) is reserved as a street furnishings zone. Starting at the back of curb this zone is paved with precast concrete unit pavers. The street furnishings zone is reserved for street amenities including street trees, precast concrete detention planters, benches, bike racks and pole mounted light fixtures. The remainder of the ROW is reserved for the pedestrian sidewalk. The sidewalk is simple natural colored concrete with saw cut joints.

Within the building setbacks the sidewalk paving extends to provide access to residential, public and commercial entries. The natural colored concrete used in the ROW is used in these areas as well. At the townhouse entries along G Street raised planters are used to take up the grade change, provide a green edge to the sidewalk and buffer the unit entries. Similarly on the Fitzgerald Avenue, Arelious Walker Drive and Egbert Avenue frontage, raised planters are used as well. Fewer entries and smaller grade changes allow for longer more continuous planters to buffer residences from the sidewalk. Curving planter wall faces are used along the sidewalk to remain consistent with the project landscape theme using forms inspired by nature.

Block 4

The Courtyard. Framed by 2 to 4 story family residential buildings the second level courtyard is the primary exterior living space for residents. The courtyard has been divided into a series of outdoor rooms of differing sizes that will support a variety of activities for residents. The courtyards design theme is inspired by nature with curvilinear lines creating wave form patterns on the floor and with raised planters flowing through the courtyard. Alternating colors of paving help accentuate the theme.

West courtyard. Starting in the northwest corner - a grand stair provides access from the courtyard to Egbert Avenue and the central park beyond. The western edge of the courtyard has a continually planted edge that provides privacy for the townhomes and acts as a planted backdrop for activities in the courtyard. A semicircular alcove with overhead vine supporting trellis has been created at the west end of the courtyard. Furnished flexible seating this area will function as an outdoor eating/gathering space. Just to the south of the gathering space is a more intimate protected space. Informal seating is provided that can be moved by residences as they wish. Moving east – just off of the community room - a children’s play area is provided with a variety of play structures that will appeal to both 2-5 year olds as well as 5-12’s. It includes a safe resilient play surface that continues the wave form paving theme. Seat walls surround the play area providing seating for supervising adults.

East Courtyard. Springing from the east entry of the community room is a large exterior circular community space. The space is defined by a fifty (50) foot ring of raised planter walls and a vine covered garden trellis overhead. This is a flexible space that includes the main outdoor eating/gathering space that creates a comfortable evening conversation area. A variety of tables and chairs are provided. Planter walls extend out from the central space creating walkways through planting to access other parts of the garden as well as pleasant conversation areas. The raised planters also create opportunities for informally planted trees that will create a green canopy over the space. Primarily planted with bright green deciduous canopy trees for dappled shade in the summer and maximize the sunlight in the winter. The tree canopy serves as a canopy over the space. Primarily planted with bright green deciduous canopy trees for dappled shade in the summer and maximize the sunlight in the winter. The tree canopy also includes planters along the south edge of the courtyard with screen planting for privacy.

Ground floor Streetscape. The context for the ground floor sidewalks and building entries are the streetscape designs illustrated in the Candlestick Point Sub Phase CP-01 Improvement Plans. The scope of these plans cover the +/- 12 foot Right of Way (ROW) zone from new curb and gutter to the building property line. One half of this zone (6’) is reserved as a street furnishings zone. Starting at the back of curb this zone is paved with precast concrete unit pavers. The street furnishings zone is reserved for street amenities including street trees, precast concrete detention planters, benches, bike racks and pole mounted light fixtures. The remainder of the ROW is reserved for the pedestrian sidewalk. The sidewalk is simple natural colored concrete with saw cut joints.

Within the building setbacks the sidewalk paving extends to provide access to residential, public and commercial entries. The natural colored concrete used in the ROW is used in these areas as well. At the townhouse entries along G Street raised planters are used to take up the grade change, provide a green edge to the sidewalk and buffer the unit entries. Similarly on the Fitzgerald Avenue, Arelious Walker Drive and Egbert Avenue frontage, raised planters are used as well. Fewer entries and smaller grade changes allow for longer more continuous planters to buffer residences from the sidewalk. Curving planter wall faces are used along the sidewalk to remain consistent with the project landscape theme using forms inspired by nature.
Project Design Statement

**STRUCTURE**

**PROJECT:** Alice Griffith - Blocks 2 & 4

**DATE:** December 20, 2013

**REFERENCE DRAWINGS:** September 23, 2013 by Torti-Gallas & Partners, Inc.

**GEOTECHNICAL REPORT:** Not Available, Preliminary Information from ENGEO.

**LOCATION:** San Francisco, CA

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:** 3-, and 4-stories of Type V Residential Wood Frame construction over a Type 1, post-tensioned concrete podium over 1 level of parking. Townhouse units on one side of the podium will be three stories on grade, adjacent to the parking/podium structure.

**BUILDING CODE:** 2013 San Francisco Building Code

**LIVE LOAD DESIGN:**
- Roof, flat: 20 psf, reducible
- Roof, sloping: 16 psf, reducible
- Residential floors: 40 psf, reducible
- Residential Balconies: 100 psf, reducible
- Residential Corridors: 100 psf, reducible
- Podium Courtyards: 100 psf, reducible

**WATER TABLE DEPTH:** 14" square precast, pre-stressed piles.

**PILE CAPACITIES:**
- 75-100 kips (net of downdrag) per pile
- Water Table Depth: 14" square precast, pre-stressed piles
- 75-100 kips (net of downdrag) per pile
- (Dead + Live Loads)

**PILE CAPACITIES:**
- 75-100 kips (net of downdrag) per pile
- Water Table Depth: 14" square precast, pre-stressed piles
- 75-100 kips (net of downdrag) per pile
- (Dead + Live Loads)

**LEVEL 1 FLOOR**
- Podium Slab: 13" minimum post-tensioned concrete slab
- Tie beams at 14" x 24" precast, pre-stressed piles
- Ceiling: 1-1/2" gypcrete over 3/4" T&G plywood
- Shear walls in garage.

**LEVEL 2-3 FLOORS**
- Structural slab on grade and pile caps shall be f’c=4,000 psi at 56 days, low shrinkage mix with 30% Slag and 20% flyash.
- Column free space with glu-lam beams under bearing walls above.

**SUSTAINABLE DESIGN**

**LEED FOR HOMES MID-RISE SYSTEM**
- This project is designed to exceed Title 24 Energy requirements by 15%.
- LEED for Homes Rating System Multifamily Mid-Rise California Oct. 2010

**RESIDENTIAL WOOD FRAMING**

**ELEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENT</th>
<th>MATERIAL ESTIMATE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Framing - Floors in Type V construction</td>
<td>1-1/2&quot; plywood sheathing, glued and screwed to 1x12 TJI at 16&quot; on center.</td>
<td>Max span 15 ft (+/–). May be able to space joists at 24&quot; on center depending on span lengths and rated assemblies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Framing - Roof</td>
<td>Built-up roofing over 5/8&quot; plywood sheathing on rippings at 24&quot; on center over 5/8&quot; plywood sheathing over 9-1/2&quot; TJI at 24&quot; on center.</td>
<td>Max span 15 ft (+/–).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Framing - Bearing Walls in Type V construction</td>
<td>Lower floor: Exterior walls shall be 2x6 at 16&quot; on center. Party walls shall be double 2x4 at 16&quot; on center. Corridor walls shall be 2x6 at 16&quot; on center. Provide furred walls where plumbing walls occur in front of shear walls. Upper 3 floors: Exterior walls shall be 2x6 at 16&quot; on center. Party walls shall be double 2x4 at 16&quot; on center. Corridor walls shall be 2x6 at 16&quot; on center. Provide furred walls where plumbing walls occur in front of shear walls.</td>
<td>Provide 3x studs at all panel edges on plywood shear walls, including sole plates. All sole plates and top plates shall be Kote Dural (5% max moisture content).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BLOCK 2 & BLOCK 4**

**ELEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENT</th>
<th>MATERIAL ESTIMATE</th>
<th>REMARKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Framing - Shear Walls</td>
<td>3/4&quot; plywood sheathing (or OSB) on all corridor walls and all party walls. Lower floor will require sheathing on both sides of walls in corridors and lower 1 or 2 floors of party walls will require sheathing on both sides. Sheath all exterior walls with plywood.</td>
<td>Tie-down system will be selected from either Simpson ATS, Earthboard, or Zone 4.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LEED STANDARDS:**
- Project target: LEED for Homes Mid-Rise Silver Certification
- Project is designed to exceed Title 24 Energy requirements by 15%.
- LEED for Homes Rating System Multifamily Mid-Rise California Oct. 2010
MEP
The apartment units will be provided with forced air electric wall heaters for space heating. Domestic hot water system is a recirculating system. High efficiency, gas-fired water heaters will be provided and supplemented with a solar thermal hot water system. This provides an economical balance between first costs of water heating and long term operating costs for the domestic hot water system. The Amenity spaces throughout the building will be provided with a dedicated central multi-heat recovery system to heat, cool, and ventilate the spaces, and is an energy-saving system. A central control system will be provided to control, monitor, schedule equipment start-stop and to control the building interior and outdoor lighting. Through the use of high-efficiency lighting, solar equipment, envelope insulation, and lighting, the project will be designed to earn LEED for Multi-Home Family Midrise – Gold, and comply with California Green Code requirements.

I. Mechanical System Description

A. Heating and Ventilation System for Residential Units
   1. Alternative 1: Heating provided by forced air electric wall heaters for each living space, with separate wall thermostat
   2. Alternative 2: Heating provided by a central heating water plant to be located in the Boiler Room and supplied with (2) high efficiency gas boilers, (2) circulation pumps (1 for standby), (4) 450 HP pumps (2 for standby), (6) 20’ x 20’ x 12’ high efficiency air handlers, (2) 20’ x 20’ x 12’ high efficiency air filters, (1) 450 HP return fan, (1) 450 HP supply fan, (2) 20’ x 20’ x 12’ high efficiency exhaust fan, (2) 20’ x 20’ x 12’ high efficiency ventilation fan, (1) 450 HP air handler, (1) 450 HP return fan, (1) 450 HP supply fan, (2) 20’ x 20’ x 12’ high efficiency exhaust fan, (2) 20’ x 20’ x 12’ high efficiency ventilation fan

B. Air Conditioning, Heating & Ventilation System for the Residential Lobby, Offices & Common Areas:
   1. Air Conditioning: 4’ x 16’ x 16’ air conditioned space to be located in the main point of entry room. The air conditioned space shall be located indoors.
   2. Air conditioning unit shall be provided with integral exhaust fan. Exits to discharge to the corridor shall be provided with integral exhaust fans. Exits to discharge to the corridor shall be provided with integral exhaust fans.
   3. Exit signs shall be LED types with green color letters on white faceplate, universal mount and supervised non-coded annunciated low voltage complete with fire alarm manual stations, panel via programmed telephone numbers of the residents in the building. The entry door shall be released by the residents via their telephones.

C. Electrical System
   1. The electric service shall be obtained from PG&E and shall be transformer located in a three hour rated transformer vault. The vault size shall be a minimum dimensions of 23’ -0” x 16’-0” x 12’-0”.
   2. The main service entrance shall be 200A, 208Y/120V, 3 phase, 4 wire, located in the main electrical room in First Floor Living Room. All electrical services shall be approximated 24’-0” x 12’-0” x 9’-0” in dimensions.
   3. A separate disconnect shall be provided at the main entrance vault with a conduct wire-up to the lighting electrical service.
   4. A separate switch shall be provided to the main house loads. Two main banks shall be set up in the main electrical room for the entire building. The two main banks shall be fed off the main service disconnect feeder. The two main banks shall be fed off the main service disconnect feeder.
   5. Exterior lighting shall be provided for security, safety, and landscaping purposes.

D. Door Entry and Security System
   1. Telephone entry system – Citizens shall contact resident using telephone entry system control panel via programmed telephone numbers of the residence in the building. The entry door shall be released by the resident via their telephone.
   2. The building fire detection and alarm system shall be provided by Fire Alarm System Consultant.
   3. Fire alarm system shall be released by the residents via their telephones.

E. Fire Detection and Alarm System
   1. The building fire detection and alarm system shall be microprocessor based, addressable supervised non-wired monitored two voltages complete with fire alarm manual station, evacuation panel, detectors, horns and strobes and automatic circuits.

II. Electrical System Description

The following outlines the minimum scope of work required for the project:

A. Applicable Codes and Standards
   1. CBC – California Building Code – 2010
   3. WSE – San Francisco Heating Code – 2010
   5. CFC – California Fire Code – 2009

B. Electrical Service and Distribution:
   1. The electric service shall be obtained from PG&E and shall be transformer located indoors in a three hour rated transformer vault. The vault size shall be a minimum dimensions of 23’-0” x 16’-0” x 12’-0”.
   2. The main service entrance shall be 200A, 208Y/120V, 3 phase, 4 wire, located in the main electrical room in First Floor Living Room. All electrical services shall be approximated 24’-0” x 12’-0” x 9’-0” in dimensions.
   3. A separate disconnect shall be provided at the main entrance vault with a conduct wire-up to the lighting electrical service.
   4. A separate switch shall be provided to the main house loads. Two main banks shall be set up in the main electrical room for the entire building. The two main banks shall be fed off the main service disconnect feeder. The two main banks shall be fed off the main service disconnect feeder.

C. Telephone/Direct Cable TV Systems
   1. Incoring telephone and cable TV service shall be underplumbed and provided by AKT and Comcast respectively.
   2. Main telephone and cable TV shall be located in the main entrance vault. The main entrance vault shall be located indoors in a three hour rated transformer vault. The vault size shall be a minimum dimensions of 23’-0” x 16’-0” x 12’-0”.
   3. The building telephone and cable TV service shall include wiring, wiring and exited circuit in each residential unit and its associated space.

D. Door Entry and Security System
   1. Telephone entry system – Citizens shall contact resident using telephone entry system control panel via programmed telephone numbers of the residence in the building. The entry door shall be released by the resident via their telephone.
   2. The building fire detection and alarm system shall be provided by Fire Alarm System Consultant.
   3. Fire alarm system shall be released by the residents via their telephones.

E. Fire Detection and Alarm System
   1. The building fire detection and alarm system shall be microprocessor based, addressable supervised non-wired monitored two voltages complete with fire alarm manual station, evacuation panel, detectors, horns and strobes and automatic circuits.

F. Emergency/Steady Engine Generator System – Not required for this project.

G. Exit and Emergency System Lighting
   1. Exit signs shall be provided at all exits and exit paths.
   2. Exit signs shall be LED types with green color letters on white faceplate, universal mount and supervised non-coded annunciated low voltage complete with fire alarm manual stations, panel via programmed telephone numbers of the residents in the building. The entry door shall be released by the residents via their telephones.
   3. Emergency escape lighting shall be provided with exit light fixtures to be provided with integral emergency battery for 90 minutes minimum operation. Lighting along all exit paths including at roof decks and courtyards shall achieve fire exit candela minimum floor level in accordance with code.
   4. Outdoor LED light fixtures for emergency escape shall be backed up by a central inverter lighting system with 90,000 hour life expectancy.

III. Residential Unit Electrical Requirements:

A. WIRING REQUIREMENTS
   1. The building electric service shall be provided to the residence via an underground and shall be provided to each two-story residential unit.

   A. CIRCUIT REQUIREMENTS
   1. The building electric service shall be provided to the residence via an underground and shall be provided to each two-story residential unit.

   B. ELECTRICAL OUTLET REQUIREMENTS
   1. Interior outlets shall be provided in accordance with the National Electrical Code.
   2. Exterior outlets shall be provided in accordance with the National Electrical Code.

   C. LIGHTING REQUIREMENTS
   1. Lighting shall be a combination of 2’x2’ fluorescent fixtures and LED recessed downlight.
   2. Duplex receptacles shall be provided in offices, community and fitness rooms. One receptacle to be provided in the main telephone room.
   3. Duplex receptacle outlets in the offices, community and fitness rooms.

   D. OVERHEAD LIGHTING REQUIREMENTS
   1. Overhead lighting shall be provided in the main telephone room.

   E. TELEPHONE OUTLET REQUIREMENTS
   1. Telephone outlets shall be provided in the main telephone room.

   F. GARAGE REQUIREMENTS
   1. Lighting shall be 4’-0” long linear fluorescent fixtures.
   2. Emergency lighting shall be provided in the main telephone room.

   G. WIRING REQUIREMENTS
   1. Wiring shall be provided in accordance with the National Electrical Code.

   H. ELECTRICAL OUTLET REQUIREMENTS
   1. Interior outlets shall be provided in accordance with the National Electrical Code.
   2. Exterior outlets shall be provided in accordance with the National Electrical Code.

   I. LIGHTING REQUIREMENTS
   1. Lighting shall be provided in accordance with the National Electrical Code.

   J. TELEPHONE OUTLET REQUIREMENTS
   1. Telephone outlets shall be provided in accordance with the National Electrical Code.

   K. WIRING REQUIREMENTS
   1. Wiring shall be provided in accordance with the National Electrical Code.

   L. ELECTRICAL OUTLET REQUIREMENTS
   1. Interior outlets shall be provided in accordance with the National Electrical Code.
   2. Exterior outlets shall be provided in accordance with the National Electrical Code.
## Project Data

### BLOCK 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT AREA</th>
<th>54195 SF (1.244 Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNITS</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY (DU/ACRE)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION TYPE</td>
<td>Type V A; Type I A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING TYPE</td>
<td>Multi-family Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BLOCK 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT AREA</th>
<th>53924 SF (1.238 Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNITS</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY (DU/ACRE)</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION TYPE</td>
<td>Type V A; Type I A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING TYPE</td>
<td>Multi-family Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UNIT TABULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Types</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th>Block 4</th>
<th>Sub Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1BR Flat</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2BR Flat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3BR Flat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhome</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4BR Flat</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhome</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUILDING AND UNIT AREA

#### BLOCK 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Types</th>
<th>Net Sq Ft</th>
<th>Ave Net Sq Ft</th>
<th>Total Sq Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1BR Flat</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>661</td>
<td>1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2BR Flat</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>4754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3BR Flat (Corridor Bld)</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>3618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>1441</td>
<td>5764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4BR Flat</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>4936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>3386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Residential</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Circulation | - | - | - | 10234 |
| Community/Lobby | - | - | - | 676 |
| Trash Room/Utility/Storage | - | - | - | 3972 |

**Grand Total (Gross Residential):** 140151

#### BLOCK 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Types</th>
<th>Net Sq Ft</th>
<th>Ave Net Sq Ft</th>
<th>Total Sq Ft</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1BR Flat</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>1348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2BR Flat</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>924</td>
<td>4620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3BR Flat (Corridor Bld)</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>1214</td>
<td>3642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>1411</td>
<td>1411</td>
<td>4233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4BR Flat</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>1410</td>
<td>4230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TH</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>1701</td>
<td>3402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Net Residential</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Circulation | - | - | - | 1583 |
| Community/Lobby/Office | - | - | - | 10234 |
| Trash Room/Utility/Storage | - | - | - | 3982 |
| Storage | - | - | - | 2056 |

**Grand Total (Gross Residential):** 138833

---

**SCHEMATIC DESIGN**

©2013 Torti Gallas and Partners, Inc. | 523 West 6th Street, Suite 212, Los Angeles, California 90014 | 213.607.0070

ALICE GRIFFITH

December 20, 2013
## Design Standards

### BUILDING HEIGHT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>60'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>55'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Per Design for Development (DAD):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>65'</td>
<td>65'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>55'</td>
<td>55'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERMABLOC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>100% Max.</td>
<td>100% Max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Development Block Coverage - Low-Rise 0'-40':

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>75% Max.</td>
<td>75% Max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MAX Apparent Face - Base:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>30' Max.</td>
<td>30' Max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>3'8&quot; to 30'-0&quot;</td>
<td>3'-0&quot; to 30'-0&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Min. Change in Apparent Face-Base:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>2' depth min. offset in the horizontal plane and; 3' length min.</td>
<td>2' depth min. offset in the horizontal plane and; 3' length min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>2'-0&quot; to 5'-0&quot; in depth</td>
<td>2'-0&quot; to 8'-1&quot; in depth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PERSPECTIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>1' depth min. offset in the horizontal plane and; 1' length min.</td>
<td>1' depth min. offset in the horizontal plane and; 1' length min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>1'-0&quot; to 5'-0&quot;</td>
<td>1'-0&quot; to 8'-1&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### UPPER FLOOR STEPBACK RELATIVE TO FLOOR IMMEDIATELY BELOW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>10' Min.</td>
<td>10' Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>10'-15'-10'</td>
<td>10'-17'-11'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STREET FACING PARK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>6' Min.</td>
<td>6' Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>6'-10'-2&quot;</td>
<td>6'-10'-2&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BUILD TO LINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>70% Min.</td>
<td>70% Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Donner: 89%; Arelious Walker: 100%</td>
<td>Egbert: 90%; Arelous Walker: 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>3' Max.</td>
<td>3' Max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
<td>1&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Min. Height Clearance to Sidewalk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>9' Min.</td>
<td>9' Min.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>10'</td>
<td>10'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cumulative Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>67% Max.</td>
<td>67% Max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>Donner: 15 %; Arelous Walker: 16 %</td>
<td>Egbert: 8 %; Arelous Walker: 2 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRADE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>2' to 4' Above the Street</td>
<td>2' to 4' Above the Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>2' to 4' Above the Street</td>
<td>2' to 4' Above the Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PARKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>94 Max.</td>
<td>90 Max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>51 Total (2 Disabled; 2 Compact)</td>
<td>51 Total (2 Disabled; 2 Compact)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CAR SHARE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BICYCLE PARKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPEN SPACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>BLOCK 2</th>
<th>BLOCK 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Required</td>
<td>5640 sf</td>
<td>5400 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
<td>15,000 sf (Podium Courtyard)</td>
<td>15,000 sf (Podium Courtyard)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEED for Homes Mid-rise Project Checklist for California

Project Description

Building Type: Multi-Family
Home Address: 300 West 6th Street, Suite 212, Los Angeles, California 90014

Certification Level: Base

Project Team

Builder Name: Alice Griffith

Certification

Preliminary Rating: Not Certified

Max: 25 Y:9 M:0 Final: 0

Notes: 

Project Goals

3.2 Site Selection

a) Within 1/4 mile of 7 basic community resources

b) Within 1/4 mile of 4 basic community resources

c) Site meets criteria as "contaminated" by ASTM E1903-97 Phase II

d) Not built within 100 ft of water, including wetlands

3.4 Durability Management

a) Durability evaluation completed

b) East-west axis is within 15 degrees of due east-west

c) Stockpile and protect disturbed topsoil from erosion.

d) Use tiers, erosion blankets, compost blankets, etc. on sloped areas.

e) Use tiers, erosion blankets, compost blankets, etc. on sloped areas.

3.6 Sustainable Sites (SS)

a) Site meets criteria as "contaminated" by ASTM E1903-97 Phase II

b) Within 1/2 mile of transit services providing 60 rides per weekday

c) Within 1/2 mile of 11 basic community resources

d) Within 1/2 mile of 14 basic community resource

4.2 Energy and Atmosphere

a) Any turf must be drought-tolerant.

b) Limit conventional turf for MID-RISE

3.3 Innovation or Regional Design

b) Install light-colored, high-albedo materials for 50% of sidewalks, patios, and driveways

4.3 Water Efficiency

a) Preserve existing vegetation

b) Reduce roof heat island effects for MID-RISE

5.3 Materials and Resources

a) Use of recycled building materials

b) Use of recycled building materials

c) Use of recycled building materials

d) Use of recycled building materials

6.3 Access to Open Space

a) Within 1/4 mile of 7 basic community resources

b) Within 1/4 mile of 4 basic community resources

c) Site meets criteria as "contaminated" by ASTM E1903-97 Phase II

d) Not built within 100 ft of water, including wetlands

Date Most Recently Updated: Updated by:

Indicates that an Accountability Form is required. Available Y / Pts Maybe No Points

Preliminary: Final:

LEED Checklist
LEED Checklist (Continued)

Water Efficiency (MEP) (Minimum 3.5 LEED Points Possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mac</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Water Fixtures</td>
<td>A. Panelized construction</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Precut framing packages</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Third-party inspection of irrigation system</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Size parking to not exceed min zoning req'ts, AND</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Irrigation system designed by EPA Water Sense certified professional</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Municipal recycled water</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Graywater reuse</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Other: driveway type:</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. Roof, floor, wall: sheathing type:</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Roof, floor, wall: cavity insulation type:</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K. Roof: framing type:</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Exterior wall: framing type:</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Floor: framing type:</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. Floor: flooring (45%)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O. Exterior wall: flooring (55%)</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P. Exterior wall: finish type:</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q. Exterior wall: window type:</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. Landscape: decking and patio type:</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Landscape: landscape plants</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T. Other: counter type:</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>U. Other: door type:</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V. Other: interior trim type:</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W. Other: window type:</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schematic Design
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LEED Checklist (Continued)

b) One-hour walkthrough with occupant(s)

b) One-hour walkthrough with building manager

By affixing my signature below, the undersigned does hereby declare and affirm to the USGBC that the required inspections and performance testing for the LEED for Homes requirements, as specified in the LEED for Homes Rating System, have been completed. I have evaluated this project's documentation package and conducted the necessary QA/QC procedures with the LEED Green Rater, and I hereby declare and affirm to USGBC that the homes included in this submittal are ready to earn LEED for Homes certification, as per the attached requirements, as specified in the LEED for Homes Rating System.

By affixing my signature below, the undersigned does hereby declare and affirm to the USGBC that the required inspections and performance testing for the LEED for Homes requirements, as specified in the LEED for Homes Rating System, have been completed for the indicated credits and will, if audited, provide the necessary supporting documents.

By affixing my signature below, the undersigned does hereby declare and affirm to the USGBC that the LEED for Homes requirements, as specified in the LEED for Homes Rating System, have been met for the indicated credits and will, if audited, provide the necessary supporting documents.

By affixing my signature below, the undersigned does hereby declare and affirm to the USGBC that the LEED for Homes requirements, as specified in the LEED for Homes Rating System, have been completed.

By affixing my signature below, the undersigned does hereby declare and affirm to the USGBC that the LEED for Homes requirements, as specified in the LEED for Homes Rating System, have been completed. I have evaluated this project's documentation package and conducted the necessary QA/QC procedures with the LEED Green Rater, and I hereby declare and affirm to USGBC that the homes included in this submittal are ready to earn LEED for Homes certification, as per the attached requirements.

By affixing my signature below, the undersigned does hereby declare and affirm to the USGBC that the required inspections and performance testing for the LEED for Homes requirements, as specified in the LEED for Homes Rating System, have been completed.

By affixing my signature below, the undersigned does hereby declare and affirm to the USGBC that the LEED for Homes requirements, as specified in the LEED for Homes Rating System, have been completed. I have evaluated this project's documentation package and conducted the necessary QA/QC procedures with the LEED Green Rater, and I hereby declare and affirm to USGBC that the homes included in this submittal are ready to earn LEED for Homes certification, as per the attached requirements.
Site Analysis

BLOCK 2 & BLOCK 4

Public Transportation

Open Space

Pedestrian Path

Bike Path
Overall Conceptual Site Plan

Site Plan Key
- Residential Units
- Lobby/Community/Management
- Utility & Service Space
- Block Number
- Spot Elevation
- Community Space on 2nd Floor
- Senior Housing
- Street Access (Elevator) to Courtyard
- Street Access (Stairs) to Courtyard

Typical Level Plan

Ground Level Plan
Project Site Plan: Block 2 & Block 4
BUILDING PERSPECTIVE 4

BLOCK 2

ALICE GRIFFITH
December 20, 2013
Block 2 Courtyard Elevation Diagram

NORTH COURTYARD
ANGLED FACADE AND PLAN

SOUTH COURTYARD
ANGLED FACADE AND PLAN
SCHEMATIC DESIGN

BUILDING SECTION A-A

KEY MAP

BLOCK 2

ALICE GRIFFITH
**SHRUBS-Podium and Ground Level Planters Along Building**

- Meyers Asparagus
- Bush Anemone
- Ramanas Rose
- New Zealand Flax
- Screening Bamboo

**Shrubs - Interior Courtyard Planters**

- Daylily
- Spanish Lavender

**Vines on Courtyard Trellis**

- Jasmine
- Lilac Vine

**Groundcover-Podium Level**

- Winter Blooming Bergenia
- Coral Bells

**Bioretention Planters**

- Cape Rush
- Berkeley Sedge

**LandScape Plant PaLeTte - Shrubs**

**Block 2**
4TH FLOOR PLAN

BLOCK 4
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McCormack Baron Salazar
Torti Gallas and Partners
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LANDSCAPE PLANT PALETTE - TREES

BLOCK 4

CORAL BARK MAPLE

WESTERN REDBUD

HORNBERRY

GINKGO

RED SUNSET MAPLE

JAPANESE MAPLE

LITTLELEAF LINDEN

ZELKOVA
Note: Plans are the base option; some of the unit types will be modified with the addition of bay windows or other articulation.
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TYPICAL UNIT PLAN

BLOCK 2 & BLOCK 4

ALICE GRIFFITH

December 20, 2013
Note: Plans are the base option; some of the unit types will be modified with the addition of bay windows or other articulation.
UNIT TYPE: 4 BEDROOM FLAT
UNIT SIZE: 1458 SF

UNIT TYPE: 4 BEDROOM FLAT
UNIT SIZE: 1408 SF

UNIT TYPE: 4 BEDROOM TOWNHOME
UNIT SIZE: 1595 SF

Note: Plans are the base option; some of the unit types will be modified with the addition of bay windows or other articulation.

SCHEMATIC DESIGN

TYPICAL UNIT PLAN
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Alice Griffith Design Charrette Summary

Date: May 14-18, 2012

Location: Bret Harte Elementary School and the Alice Griffith Opportunity Center

Project Leadership

McCormack Baron Salazar; Lennar Community Development; Torti Gallas and Partners, Inc.; Urban Strategies

Participating Stakeholders

Alice Griffith Residents; Bayview Merchants’ Association; Best4Job Training; Bret Harte Elementary School; FranDelJA Enrichment Center; Hunter’s Point Family; Infrastructure Development and Acquisition Task Force; Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development; Mayor’s Office of Disability; Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure; Reverend Walker and Tabernacle Church; San Francisco Housing Development Corp; San Francisco Housing Authority; San Francisco Police Department; San Francisco County Department of Public Works; San Francisco County Sheriff’s Department; San Francisco County District Attorney’s Office; San Francisco County Department of Children and their Families

Design Charrette Activities

The development and architecture team gathered in San Francisco in May 2012 for a week-long community workshop with stakeholders, residents, community members, and city agencies. During this workshop, the Design Team –

- Educated residents on how the increased density and mix of income levels will impact the neighborhood,
- Took residents on a tour of recent affordable housing developments in San Francisco with similar housing densities to that proposed,
- Discussed the amenities and design features that residents would like to see included in their neighborhood and homes, and
- Presented and received input on design concepts for the new buildings and open spaces.

Stakeholder Feedback

During these meetings, stakeholders expressed both their concerns and hopes for neighborhood redevelopment, emphasizing the need for -

- Safety and security
- Access to transit, social services, and jobs
- Community open spaces for all ages with play areas for children, sport courts for youth, etc.
- Childhood daycare center
Community garden
Jobs/training center
Good handicap access to units
Large units and large bedrooms
Phasing that minimizes disruption to residents and coordinates expanded transit service with redevelopment.

Charrette Results

Based on stakeholder feedback and the design standards and guidelines in the D4D plan, the Design Team developed a revised site plan that strategically locates the replacement affordable housing on seven blocks, the majority of which front a new central park. The site plan illustrates the building configuration for the seven blocks of affordable housing. Blocks 2 and 4 will be constructed during the first phase of redevelopment with inviting frontages and facades oriented toward the central park. The Design Team developed a variety of unit types and sizes to suit a diversity of resident preferences, ranging from one bedroom flats to five-bedroom townhomes.

The units offer the following key design features:
- Full size in unit washer and dryer for accessible 2 bedroom and all 3, 4, and 5 bedroom units
- Dishwasher
- Fill size refrigerator
- Spacious fully accessible bathrooms for all flat units
- Private bathrooms for all three and four bedrooms
- Spacious fully accessible kitchen for all the units
- Large windows
- Coat closet for two, three, and four-bedroom units
- Microwaves

Participation

The opening public meeting included 23 participants with 15 of them residents of Alice Griffith. The closing public meeting included 71 participants with 52 of them residents of Alice Griffith. Over 100 residents and other stakeholders participated throughout the week with 35 joining the tour of other affordable developments in the City.

Additional public meetings were held between the charrette and the November 2013 Schematic Design submittal:
- 5/6/2013 – 50 Participants (33 Alice Griffith Residents)
- 6/3/2013 – 61 Participants (40 Alice Griffith Residents)
- 7/1/2013 – 53 Participants (42 Alice Griffith Residents)
- 8/5/2013 – 70 Participants (61 Alice Griffith Residents)
- 9/9/2013 – 36 Participants (27 Alice Griffith Residents)
- 10/24/2013 – CAC Housing Subcommittee
- 11/14/2013 – CAC Planning & Development Subcommittee
- 11/18/2013 – Full CAC meeting
Images from community meetings and tours with AG residents
### Fees & Participation Goal Percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultant Names</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th>Block 4</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>SBE</th>
<th>MBE</th>
<th>WBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Torti Gallas and Partners</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>523 West 6th St, Suite 212, Los Angeles, CA 90014</td>
<td>$478,800</td>
<td>$478,800</td>
<td>$957,600</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDE Architecture (est. value)</td>
<td>Associate Architect</td>
<td>465 California St., Suite 1200, San Francisco, CA 94101</td>
<td>$119,700</td>
<td>$119,700</td>
<td>$239,400</td>
<td>$239,400</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torti Gallas and Partners</td>
<td>Renderings / Redraw</td>
<td>523 West 6th St, Suite 212, Los Angeles, CA 90014</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>$18,500</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bright Green Strategies</td>
<td>Green Consultant</td>
<td>150 Felker St., Suite H, Santa Cruz, CA 95060 / 2150 Allston Way, Suite 400, Berkeley, CA 94701</td>
<td>$45,210</td>
<td>$45,210</td>
<td>$90,420</td>
<td>$90,420</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$90,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill Morris</td>
<td>Landscape Architect</td>
<td>249 Front St, San Francisco, CA 94111</td>
<td>$77,134</td>
<td>$77,134</td>
<td>$154,268</td>
<td>$154,268</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$154,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Siu and</td>
<td>Mechanical / Engineering Plumbing</td>
<td>657 Mission St, San Francisco, CA 94105</td>
<td>$91,200</td>
<td>$91,200</td>
<td>$182,400</td>
<td>$182,400</td>
<td>$182,400</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.W. Associates (under Tommy Siu contract)</td>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>68-12th Street, Ste 300, San Francisco, CA 94103</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$170,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KPFF / Rivera Consulting Group</td>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>221 Main Street, Ste 800, San Francisco, CA 94105</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gale Associates, Inc.</td>
<td>Waterproofing</td>
<td>2570 W. El Camino Real, Suite 320, Mountain View, CA 94040-1313</td>
<td>$39,450</td>
<td>$39,450</td>
<td>$78,900</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telamon</td>
<td>Civil</td>
<td>855 Folsom Street, Unit 142, San Francisco, CA 94107</td>
<td>$28,250</td>
<td>$28,250</td>
<td>$56,500</td>
<td>$56,500</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$56,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGEO</td>
<td>Geotechnical Engineer</td>
<td>332 Pine Street, Ste 300, San Francisco, CA 94101</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCA, Environmental Inc.</td>
<td>Environmental Engineering Permitting</td>
<td>650 Delaneyce Street, #222, San Francisco, CA 94107</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Acoustical Engineering</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>Interior Design &amp; FFE Design Surveyor</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,243,244</td>
<td>$1,243,244</td>
<td>$2,486,488</td>
<td>$1,342,988</td>
<td>$802,400</td>
<td>$301,188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

San Francisco SBE: 50.37%
# Preliminary Job Projection - Alice Griffith Phases I & II (Blocks 2 & 4)

Prepared by McCormack Baron Salazar

## Alice Griffith Block 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$36,500,000 rounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Costs</td>
<td>$17,520,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction duration</td>
<td>18 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Developer job projection**: 200 to 250 construction jobs
- **Total construction work hours**: 4,250 labor hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of units</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Type per building</td>
<td>Type V A; Type I A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Types (e.g. townhomes)</td>
<td>Multi-family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>1.244 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Alice Griffith Block 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$36,000,000 rounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Costs</td>
<td>$17,280,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction duration</td>
<td>18 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Developer job projection**: 200 to 250 construction jobs
- **Total work hours**: 4,250 labor hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of units</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Type per building</td>
<td>Type V A; Type I A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Types (e.g. townhomes)</td>
<td>Multi-family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>1.238 acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>