MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE
COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HELD ON THE
30th DAY OF APRIL 2013

The members of the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure of the City and County of San Francisco met in a special meeting at Mission Creek Senior Community, Swift Conference Center, 3rd floor, 930 4th Street in the City of San Francisco, California, at 4:00 p.m. on the 30th day of April 2013, at the place and date duly established for holding of such a meeting.

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

1. Recognition of a Quorum

   Meeting was called to order at 4:11 p.m. Roll call was taken.

   Chair Christine Johnson - present
   Theodore Ellington - present
   Vice-Chair Mara Rosales - present

   Commissioner Singh arrived at 4:20 p.m. and Commissioner Mondejar arrived at 4:30 p.m.

   Announcements

   Secretary Jones read announcements regarding the following:

   A. The next scheduled Commission meeting will be held on Tuesday, May 7, 2013 at 1:00 p.m. at City Hall, Room 416, San Francisco, CA.
   B. Announcement of Prohibition of Sound Producing Electronic Devices during the Meeting
   C. Announcement of Time Allotment for Public Comments

2. Report on actions taken at previous Closed Session meeting, if any – None.

3. Matters of Unfinished Business – None.

5. Matters of New Business:

CONSENT AGENDA

ALL MATTERS LISTED HEREUNDER CONSTITUTE A CONSENT AGENDA, ARE CONSIDERED TO BE ROUTINE BY THE COMMISSION, AND WILL BE ACTED UPON BY A SINGLE VOTE OF THE COMMISSION. THERE WILL BE NO SEPARATE DISCUSSION OF THESE ITEMS UNLESS A MEMBER OF THE COMMISSION OR THE PUBLIC SO REQUESTS, IN WHICH EVENT THE MATTER SHALL BE REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA AND CONSIDERED AS A SEPARATE ITEM:

a) Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting of April 16, 2013
PUBLIC COMMENT -- None.
Commissioner Ellington motioned to move Item 5 (a) and Vice-Chair Rosales seconded this motion.

Secretary Jones called for a voice vote on this item.

Commissioner Ellington - yes
Rosales - yes
Johnson - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY 3 COMMISSIONERS WITH TWO ABSENT THAT THE MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 16, 2013, BE ADOPTED.

REGULAR AGENDA

b) Adopting environmental review findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and conditionally approving a Revised Schematic Design for Park P6, a Children’s Park in Mission Bay South, pursuant to the Owner Participation Agreement with FOCIL-MB, LLC; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 12-2013)

Presenters: Sally Oerth, Deputy Director; Lila Hussain, Associate Planner, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure; Tom Fitzgerald, Landscape Architect, Royston Hanamoto Alley and Abbey, Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director

PUBLIC COMMENT

Presenters: Corinne Woods, Chair, Mission Bay CAC; Andrea Jones, V.P., Bosa Development; Judy Langley, Mission Bay resident; Donald Langley, Mission Bay resident; Terry Leeder, Mission Bay resident; Donna Dell’Era, Mission Bay resident

Ms. Woods stated that this park is desperately needed and will create the beginning of the Mission Bay neighborhood and indicated that there was tremendous community input dealing with this project.

Ms. Jones talked about the increase in Mission Bay of families with young children and asked the Commission to please endorse this item.

Ms. Langley endorsed this project and asked the Commission to move forward with this project.

Mr. Langley stated that he has watched as the community has grown and asked the Commission to move forward with this project as quickly as possible.

Mr. Leeder stated that the number of children under age 10 has increased very quickly in the neighborhood and endorsed this project.
Ms. Dell’Era said she had been there since 2005 and now her grandchildren come to visit her and they need a structured playground to play in. Ms. Dell’Era stated that this has been a real community project and asked the Commission to move forward with this project.

Commissioner Ellington stated that he liked the current designs much better than the 2005 designs and inquired about the gate surrounding the entire park and the access points as well as how they decided to place the tables and benches around the playground. Mr. Ellington then inquired about bike racks and about the maintenance plan.

Ms. Hussain indicated where the gates and entry points would be located. She continued to describe the final look of the park and indicated that they wanted a gathering area for the play area as well as other locations. She stated that they had provided adequate benches everywhere for seating opportunities. Ms. Hussain indicated where the bike racks will be located. Ms. Hussain responded that Carolyn Weir who works for MJM and who maintains all the parks in Mission Bay will maintain the park through the use of CFD funds.

Commissioner Singh asked about capacity of the park and about the number of benches.

Mr. Fitzgerald responded that this play area is almost the size of the play area in Dolores Park and that it could handle a large number of children.

Ms. Hussain did not have the exact number of benches but stated that she could get that information for him.

Chair Johnson asked about bathrooms within the park site, access to water, whether the playground will be restricted to adults accompanied by children and whether there would be matching facilities inside as well as outside the playground as far as bike parking, water access, etc. Ms. Johnson then suggested that there will be water access inside the playground area as well. Ms. Johnson inquired about the resiliency of the matting in the school-age children play area and what were the plans to fix or replace it once the matting starts to break down.

Ms. Hussain responded that the conversation with the community was about a balance of space to have enough room to maximize the playground and also provide bathrooms. Ms. Hussain indicated where the water fountains will be located and responded that the playground will be restricted to children with adults. She stated that the water facilities and bike racks will be located outside the playground.

Regarding the matting, Mr. Fitzgerald responded that it is the typical rubber surfacing seen in most San Francisco parks and that over time, the quality has improved. Mr. Fitzgerald added that irrigation in the subsurface also contributes to the breaking down of the matting. He stated that they have a 5-10 year warranty on the surfacing so they will have to piece it out and replace it, which is the usual procedure in high traffic areas.
Commissioner Singh asked about the completion date of the park, what the cost would be and who would be maintaining it.

Ms. Hussain responded that construction will be completed by summer 2014 with a total cost of $3.345 million and that MJM will maintain the park.

Commission Mondejar inquired about pets and how they will be managed.

Ms. Hussain responded that pets are not allowed in fenced playgrounds but that there was an existing dog park north of the park. She added that dogs will be allowed in the park but not within the fenced area.

Executive Director Bohee clarified that all of the infrastructure costs are borne by the master developer, FOSSIL-MB, LLC, because it is part of their obligation to pay for that and they get paid back by tax increment and special taxes from the Mello-Roos.

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

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

Commissioner Ellington - yes
Mondejar – yes
Rosalas – yes
Singh – yes
Johnson - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY 5 COMMISSIONERS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED THAT RESOLUTION NO. 12-2013, ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND CONDITIONALLY approving a REVISED SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR PARK D6, A CHILDREN’S PARK IN MISSION BAY SOUTH, PURSUANT TO THE OWNER PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT WITH FOCLIL-MB, LLC; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

c) Adopting environmental review findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and conditionally approving a Combined Basic Concept and Schematic Design for a new residential project on Block 12 East in Mission Bay South, pursuant to the Owner Participation Agreement with FOCLIL-MB, LLC; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 13-2013)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Catherine Reilly, Acting Project Manager, Mission Bay Project Area; Andrea Jones, V.P., Bosa Development; Chris Dikeokos, Dikeokos Architects; Cliff Lowe, Cliff Lowe and Associates; Bemi Jauhal, Director, Sales and Marketing, Bosa Development
PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Corinne Woods, Chair, Mission Bay CAC; Terry Leeder, Mission Bay resident

Ms. Woods stated that this project is very dear to her heart because it is right outside her office window and was grateful to the staff in their efforts to break up the enormous façade. Ms. Woods also spoke about garbage issues, bus & transport services and streetscape and stated that this was the last condo project in Mission Bay and would love to see this move forward.

Mr. Leeder asked that they make sure that there is enough bike storage in the building because without adequate bike spaces, people store their bikes in their apartments and then transport them through the building that results in damage to the building.

Chair Johnson commented that she lives on Berry Street and has three bikes stored within her apartment and sympathized on the bike storage comment.

Commissioner Ellington commented that he liked the design and the balconies and how they had maximized the space to its full potential. He inquired about the elevated park and wanted to know if it was on top of the parking structure, whether the public space in or around the building was just for residents, how many of the units were 1, 2 or 3 bedrooms and how they decided which units were to be assigned the number of bedrooms. Mr. Ellington commented that there is more need for space now with more families moving in.

Ms. Jones responded in the affirmative to the first two questions. Ms. Jones responded that there are 17 one-bedroom & 1-bedroom plus den units, 205 2-bedroom or 2-bedroom plus den units and 45 3-bedroom or 3-bedroom plus den units. She explained that the average size unit is 1400 sq. ft. because Bosa builds larger units than most condo developers.

Commissioner Singh inquired about the square footage of the one and two-bedroom units and how many parking spaces there were. Mr. Singh also asked about spaces for bikes and for visitors’ bikes. Mr. Singh inquired about how large the storage space was.

Ms. Jones responded that the one bedroom units ranged from 750-800 sq. ft. The 2-bedroom units ranged from 1200-1500 sq. ft. She explained that Mission Bay requires one parking space for each residential unit and that there were 27 spaces allocated for bikes. Ms. Jones added that each unit has their own enclosed storage space, which can be used for bikes, but because demand for bike storage was so high, there was room within the garage to add bike racks. She responded that there are no spaces allocated for visitors and that the storage area is 4’x6’.

Commissioner Ellington commented about the need for more bike space because 20 units to one bike space were not going to be enough because of the demand.

Chair Johnson mentioned that including more spaces for bikes was a condition for the Commission to approve this resolution.
Commissioner Mondejar inquired about parking as well as about sound issues.

Ms. Jones responded that parking was in the middle of the building and that the parking area could not be seen from the outside.

Chris Dikeokos responded that residents complain about sound issues and so they are very aware of this concern. He added that the building is concrete and that there are two separate walls between the units so the air space, insulation, dry wall, and caulking all contribute to better sound control between the units.

Chair Johnson thanked everyone for their presentation and thought the design was very good. Ms. Johnson inquired about commercial retail because she noticed that there was not a lot of engagement between the building and the sidewalk along that long block and inquired as to whether any thought had been given to benches, lighting or mini-parklets. Ms. Johnson then inquired about the pricing of the units as well as about the transparency between the two towers. Ms. Johnson inquired about the red and blue accent glass. Ms. Johnson inquired about whether the lap pool was heated, what the construction schedule was, about the transit access and what Muni line would stop there and where.

Ms. Jones responded there was no retail in that space because there would not be enough people travelling there for that space to be retail, so all retail will be on 4th Street. However, she indicated that there will be a café on the corner. Ms. Jones added that around the entire project, there will be entryways as well as a pedestrian walkway with landscaping and seating. She indicated that there will be bike racks, trash cans and other items to liven up that area. Ms. Jones explained that pricing will be from $500,000 to $2 million. Ms. Jones demonstrated the walkway which will look like a tube between the two towers and added that they are still working on the accent glass and refining certain elements. She added that the lap pool will not be heated. Ms. Jones responded that there would be a 30-month construction period which would start this summer and extend to 2015. She added that Muni line 10 will go through there, but was not sure where the stop will be.

Vice Chair Rosales inquired about the recycled glass.

Ms. Jones responded it would be included within the landscaping.

Chair Johnson asked everyone to review the resolution before voting because there were contingencies added such as bike spaces and garbage collection.

Commissioner Singh commented that he would like to see more bike space and bigger storage spaces.

Chair Johnson asked about whether the roof design will be slanted or squared.

Ms. Jones responded that they are still working on that part of it and explained that all roofs are square or rectangle except for the one which is at a slant.
Commissioner Ellington motioned to move Item 5(c) and Commissioner Mondejar seconded this motion.

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

Commissioner Ellington - yes
Mondejar - yes
Rosales - yes
Singh - yes
Johnson - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY 5 COMMISSIONERS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED THAT RESOLUTION NO. 13-2013, ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND CONDITIONALLY APPROVING A COMBINED BASIC CONCEPT AND SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR A NEW RESIDENTIAL PROJECT ON BLOCK 12 EAST IN MISSION BAY SOUTH, PURSUANT TO THE OWNER PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT WITH FOCIL-MB, LLC; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

d) Authorizing, pursuant to the Transbay Implementation Agreement, a personal services contract with the San Francisco County Transportation Authority in an amount not to exceed $365,585 to complete construction documentation for the realignment of the Folsom Street Off-Ramp; Transbay Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 14-2013)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Mike Grisso, Sr. Project Manager, Transbay

PUBLIC COMMENT -- None.

Vice-Chair Rosales inquired about the services rendered for $185,000 that have not yet been paid.

Mr. Grisso responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Ellington inquired about the stoplight going to the right and asked whether drivers will be able to turn on a red light.

Mr. Grisso responded that there will be a new stoplight installed at a particular location and that the lights will be coordinated. He responded that he assumed that drivers will be allowed to turn right on red to not delay traffic and that it will be a yield.

Chair Johnson inquired about the construction schedule and whether it will impede Blocks 6 or 7.

Mr. Grisso responded in the negative.

Commissioner Singh motioned to move this item and Vice Chair Rosales seconded this motion.

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY 5 COMMISSIONERS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED THAT RESOLUTION NO. 13-2013, AUTHORIZING, PURSUANT TO THE TRANSBAY IMPLEMENTATION AGREEMENT, A PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH THE SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED $365,585 TO COMPLETE CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTATION FOR THE REALIGNMENT OF THE FOLSOM STREET OFF-RAMP; TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

e) Workshop on OCII’s Fiscal Year 2013-2014 Budget: OCII’s asset management, affordable housing, and administrative activities. (Discussion)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Leo Levenson, Deputy Director-Finance and Administration; Tracy Reynolds, Manager, Development Services Manager; Sally Oerth, Deputy Director; Robert Bryan, City Attorney; Gigi Whitley, Deputy Director, Mayor’s Office of Housing

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Peter Cohen, SF Council of Community Housing Organizations

Mr. Cohen explained that his organization works on affordable housing and community development. Mr. Cohen stated that this is a long haul project and emphasized that there will be huge community level activities and that much will be dependent on what the Commission does in the future. Mr. Cohen stated that he wanted the community to be involved with Commission staff in all of these things & looked forward to working with them.

Commissioner Singh inquired why they are giving all the housing to the Mayor’s Office of Housing. Mr. Singh inquired as to what will happen with future housing development and why they are building the housing now just to be transferred later.

Ms. Oerth responded that they are complying with the process of the dissolution decision; namely, that as they retire the enforceable obligations, they are in effect dissolving the redevelopment agency and ultimately they will retain no enforceable obligations. Ms. Oerth explained that in the future, OCII will own the land and will provide funds to an affordable housing developer. Once construction is completed, the developer will own the building and land will be transferred to the City as Housing Successor Agency.

Mr. Bryan added that the dissolution law gave the City the option of accepting the housing assets and obligations but if the City did not elect to do that, under the dissolution law, the housing assets and obligations would go to the Department of Housing & Community Development.

Vice-Chair Rosales inquired as to where the Housing Authority fits into all of this. Ms. Rosales stated that it seemed like three agencies were all doing the same thing and inquired as to why all housing does not come under the Mayor’s Office.

Ms. Oerth responded that the Housing Authority is not involved in the Commission’s housing portfolio but that they are involved in the revitalization of public housing sites.
Ms. Whitley responded that Mayor Lee has directed Olson Lee, the Director of the Mayor’s Office of Housing and the City Administrator to step in and start a process to re-envision the San Francisco Housing Authority, which is now experiencing significant financial and operational problems. She explained that there is an ongoing process in partnership with US Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") and working with the community and that recommendations will be given to the Mayor who will consider those and more clearly define and distinguish the roles of the different city and state housing agencies.

Commissioner Mondejar inquired about how long the Mayor’s Office of Housing has been in existence and about what will happen with all the housing that the Commission is now approving for the next few years.

Ms. Whitley responded that the Mayor’s Office of Housing is a division of the Mayor’s Office and that they do not have a separate commission and have various budgets and approvals that go through the Board of Supervisors, the Planning Commission, the Board Use Commission, etc. and they have an internal staff that reports to the Mayor. She explained that the Mayor’s Office of Housing works closely with HUD and that this Office has other responsibilities that the Housing Authority does not have.

Chair Johnson responded that the distinction between the Mayor’s Office of Housing and the Housing Authority has to do with the type of funds and that a comparison between the two entities should not be made. Ms. Johnson explained that the Mayor’s Office of Housing has more flexibility in figuring out how to fund the resources and the property management of the assets being transferred. She added that the Housing Authority is reliant on HUD which does not give enough money to upgrade or maintain the properties that are under the Housing Authority.

Commissioner Mondejar suggested a centralized approach to the housing issue rather than a decentralized approach because, unlike the Mayor’s Office of Housing, some city and state agencies develop a life of their own without any checks and balances.

Vice-Chair Rosales inquired about a reference to a budget overview concerning liquidated damages of $7.4 million in Mission Bay.

Ms. Oerth responded that this referred to Block 7 in Mission Bay South under DDAs with UCSF. She explained that UCSF was going to build that as affordable housing but will not be doing that now so they will pay the liquidated damages. Ms. Oerth added that the Commission will use those funds to build the affordable housing on Block 7 West and they anticipate those funds coming in.

Chair Johnson inquired about what the phrase “governmental purpose” means and also inquired about which public entity the Mexican Museum will be transferred to.

Ms. Reynolds responded that this phrase refers to the governmental purpose of fulfilling the federal mandate under the CDBG requirements and added that it is a “such as” phrase used for examples, such as parks, police, fire, local admin buildings, streets, and museums. Ms. Reynolds responded that the original plan was for the Mexican Museum to be transferred to the developer and then the developer would transfer it back to the Commission. However, under AB1484, that may not be possible and it was not certain where it would be transferred to from the developer at this moment.

Vice-Chair Rosales inquired about the Fillmore Heritage Center commercial space.
Ms. Reynolds responded that it was the commercial space. She explained that the whole project is three legal parcels and the Commission still owns the garage and the commercial parcel, which has Yoshi’s and the art gallery.

Chair Johnson inquired as to whether there was any chance that the DOF might give the affordable housing fees paid by the developer to the Commission, if they are adding the in lieu fees to the SB2113 fees and about the project dependency on the Mission Bay North bonds to be issued next year.

Ms. Oerth responded to the first question that it might be possible but that after they complete the due diligence reviews and receive the certificate of completion, the process would go through the ROPS but she added that she believed DOF would want them to use those developer funds because it would offset tax increment funds. Regarding the fees, Ms. Oerth responded that it depends on where the fees are coming from. If they are coming from a Transbay developer, the fees would be going to a Transbay project to meet those obligations. If unrelated, then they would probably go into a project but they are primarily funding with replacement housing dollars. Ms. Oerth responded that for the North, the bonds would be used to refinance existing debt.

Executive Director Bohee responded that subsequent steps would have to be taken, the Commission would look at capacity, authorize the issuance of the bond and then it would go to the Oversight Board and the State DOF.

Vice-Chair Rosales inquired as to whether the source of funding is the reason why the project specific affordable housing is being built more quickly than the replacement housing. Ms. Rosales also inquired about the status of the 6,790 new affordable housing units certified in 2003 and asked about how people who lost that housing get rights to those units.

Ms. Oerth responded in the affirmative but stated that it really is case by case depending on the project and its own constraints. In the Shipyard, the DDA requires that they do the Alice Griffith Public Housing Replacement Project first. In Mission Bay, production requirements mandate that they build new units rather than replace old units. Ms. Oerth explained that the 2113 funds are bringing in new affordable housing citywide. She added that 2113 funds are being used in many of their projects and are an important source of funds, if project area funds not otherwise available. In Alice Griffith the public housing replacement units could not be funded using the 2113 funds because they have to be used for new units, but those funds can be used for new affordable housing units. Ms. Oerth responded that they have 5,800 units still to be built and that the Certificate of Preference program deals with the issue of displaced household members and has been transferred to the Mayor’s Office of Housing for management. She explained that certificate holders need to apply to get first preference. State law requires for replacement housing to be built at the same income and affordability levels as the housing that was destroyed.

Chair Johnson stated that they need to have a separate workshop for Commissioners in the future on the Certificate of Preference program. Ms. Johnson inquired about the Commission’s proposed housing role and the interaction between the Commission and the Mayor’s Office, and asked about whether it would make sense to have updates added to the official process around housing projects in order to understand the key terms and be informed about progress.

Ms. Oerth responded that it would be possible to have updates around specific interim milestones such as when something goes to loan committee as more terms are finalized.
Chair Johnson asked what the action item for the next meeting would be. Ms. Johnson then inquired as to whether the Commission would be allowed to spend parts of the budget approved by the Commission between the period of Commission action and the Board of Supervisors review or whether everything is on hold during that period of time.

Executive Director Bohee responded that there will be a budget approval resolution, which is then will be forwarded to the Mayor’s Office Budget Office for review and to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Levenson stated that they are still working on the resolution wording for the meeting but indicated that the meeting will address the following:
- The Commission’s budget control level as the Commission can choose the level of control they wish to administer over the budget;
- Project as well as non-project budgets and the flexibility to move funds around within those projects;
- Staffing budgets;
- The possibility of giving the Executive Director the power to discuss budget items with the Mayor and to make minor changes and then submit it to the Board without having to come back to the Commissioners. Mr. Levenson added that any changes made would be reported back to the Commission and then a final budget document would be presented to the Commissioners for final approval.

Mr. Levenson explained that this budget starts July 1 because the Board needs time for its review and approval. He explained that in the meantime, there is an interim budget resolution, which allows them to start spending, and which is approved by the Budget Committee and the Board of Supervisors. The resolution will then be sent to the Board by the end of June for approval by the end of July.

Ms. Bohee added that they will also be discussing the outcome of the due diligence reviews and the ROPS review, as they expect to get a response from the state on the totality of the housing balances, use of property tax and potential future bonding, so it may be possible that they will come back to the Commission before the budget gets sent to the Budget Office for additional adjustments.

Commissioner Mondejar inquired about replacement housing and where Commissioners could get more historical background information about the units that were destroyed.

Ms. Oerth responded that staff could gather some information for Commissioners as well as some memos prepared earlier for the former Agency on this issue and added that they would like to submit to the state a request for a final and conclusive determination about the replacement housing but this has not yet been submitted.

Mr. Levenson added that on the point of bonding that the projection for 2014-15 drops back to the 2012-13 levels because they have not added any further initiatives that might happen and that if they did get the authority to bond, it would also be included in the budget.

Vice-Chair Rosales inquired about contract compliance.

Mr. Levenson responded that those are positions that are needed in the future and they are working with the Mayor’s Office on the hiring process.

6. Public Comment on Non-agenda Items – None.
7. **Report of the Chair** – None.

8. **Report of the Executive Director**

   Status of State Department of Finance Housing and Non-Housing Due Diligence Reviews and Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule (ROPS 13-14A) submittal.

   Executive Director Bohee stated that this was a continuation of the discussion during the last meeting. She explained that they expected a determination from the state on all the outstanding issues: fund balances for housing, fund balances from other funds review, request for new property tax, bonding for Mission Bay, debt service and other ROPS items. Ms. Bohee explained that on the housing side, they had their Meet & Confer in December and the Commission had agreed to full-blown audits and that the state had asked for an extension to May 17. For the other funds due diligence review, Ms. Bohee indicated that they had their Meet & Confer with DOF staff to explain to them why the Commission has restricted balances and why they should be allowed to maintain funds for the Mexican Museum, the Museum of Diaspora and the Yerba Buena Center. She added that the state had agreed to take off the top other restricted assets bonds so just the unrestricted cash is in contention. Ms. Bohee stated that they had met with DOF in Sacramento recently and that the funds in question deal with property tax, requests for Mission Bay, staffing costs in Transbay for housing projects, other debt service and related items. She added that the meeting was more about information sharing and that they have established a good working relationship with the DOF. Ms. Bohee reported that they will report back as they receive more information.

9. **Commissioners’ Questions and Matters** – None.

10. **Closed Session:** – None.

11. **Adjournment**

    It was moved by Commissioner Singh, seconded by Commissioner Ellington and unanimously carried that the meeting be adjourned at 7:48 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Natasha Jones
Interim Commission Secretary

ADOPTED: