

**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 JULY 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 City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 416, in the City of San Francisco, California, at 1:00 p.m. on the 30th day of July 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 1:11 p.m. Roll call was taken.

Commissioner Ellington – present  
Commissioner Mondejar - present  
Vice-Chair Rosales – present  
Commissioner Singh – present

Vice Chair Rosales presided until the arrival of Chair Johnson at 1:30 p.m.

**2. Announcements**

A. The next scheduled Commission meeting will be a regular meeting held on Tuesday, August 6, 2013 at 1:00 pm (City Hall, Room 416).

B. Announcement of Prohibition of Sound Producing Electronic Devices during the Meeting

Please be advised that the ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing of or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic device.

C. Announcement of Time Allotment for Public Comments

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

**4. Matters of Unfinished Business – None.**

**5. Matters of New Business:**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

a) Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting of July 2, 2013

**PUBLIC COMMENT – None.**

Vice Chair Rosales asked for an edit to the minutes on Page 7, Item 9, where the reference to Supervisor George Warren should be Doris Ward.

Commissioner Singh motioned to move Item 5(a) and Commissioner Mondejar seconded that motion.

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

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

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY 4 COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT THE MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF JULY 2, 2013, BE ADOPTED.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

- b) Authorizing a Personal Services Contract with M.J.F & Associates, a sole proprietorship, to manage OCII’s Hunters Point Shipyard Site Office and to provide outreach and administrative support services to the Hunters Point Shipyard Citizens Advisory Committee and OCII for a 3-year term, beginning July 1, 2013 and ending June 30, 2016, and a total contract amount not to exceed \$784,205; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 37-2013)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Amabel Akwa-Asare, Assistant Project Manager, Hunters Point Shipyard; Micah Fobbs, MJF & Associates

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Speakers: Dorris Vincent, Resident BVHP, Shipyard CAC

Ms. Vincent stated that she was the Chair of the Business & Employment Subcommittee and endorsed this item. She paid homage to Willie B. Kennedy by having her staff stand to be honored for the work this group had accomplished.

Commissioner Singh inquired as to: how much time was left in Ms. Kennedy’s contract; what kind of experience does MJF & Associates have to take on this role; what the financial responsibility is for the contract; whether the position was advertised; what kind of jobs had MJF & Associates done in the past; how many people did Mr. Fobbs manage.

Ms. Akwa-Asare responded that the original contract was a 39-month term and there was exactly three years remaining, which is what they were proposing with MJF & Associates. Ms. Akwa-Asare responded that Mr. Fobbs had been working side by side with Ms. Kennedy managing the site office for the past eight years and the area that Mr. Fobbs would need to enhance and put more time into would be outreach to the community. Ms. Akwa-Asare added that Mr. Fobbs would also be taking on staff coordination and overall financial responsibility for the contract and would have to make sure that payments would be made on time and that payroll was met. Ms. Akwa-Asare responded that they had not advertised the position because the procurement process

for the current contract was a sole-source method, which was done to make sure there was no interruption in the service and to ensure a seamless transition between the old contract and the new one. Ms. Akwa-Asare invited Mr. Fobbs to respond in more detail to his previous experience.

Mr. Fobbs responded that he managed the site office and listed out many of the duties involved there: prepared meeting agendas, consulted with the CAC members, set up facilitation and sub-contracting, was involved with day-to-day operations, met and consulted with tenants at the Shipyard, providing base access, and that overall he did anything and everything that needed to be done that was within his scope of service. Mr. Fobbs responded that he managed two other people.

Vice Chair Rosales motioned to approve Item 5(b) and Commissioner Ellington seconded that motion.

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

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

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY 5 COMMISSIONERS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED THAT RESOLUTION NO. 37-2013, AUTHORIZING A PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH M.J.F & ASSOCIATES, A SOLE PROPRIETORSHIP, TO MANAGE OCII'S HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD SITE OFFICE AND TO PROVIDE OUTREACH AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT SERVICES TO THE HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND OCII FOR A 3-YEAR TERM, BEGINNING JULY 1, 2013 AND ENDING JUNE 30, 2016, AND A TOTAL CONTRACT AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$784,205; HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

- c) Authorizing a personal services contract with Treadwell & Rollo, a Langan Company, a New Jersey corporation, for a contract 3-year term, with a total aggregate budget amount not to exceed \$1,114,299, to provide environmental technical services in connection with; (1) the development at the Hunters Point Shipyard and (2) the remediation and transfer of property at the Hunters Point Shipyard from the U.S. Department of the Navy to the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 38-2013)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Thor Kaslofsky, Project Manager, Hunters Point Shipyard; Dorinda Shipman, Principal, Treadwell & Rollo

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Speakers: Dorris Vincent, Resident BVHP, Shipyard CAC

Ms. Vincent endorsed this item and hoped the Commission would approve this contract.

Commissioner Ellington asked Mr. Kaslofsky to explain how the property land transfer works.

Chair Johnson asked if they could save that question for the next item regarding the clean-up process.

Commissioner Ellington asked Ms. Shipman to explain the process of reviewing the Navy's work as far as the actual service.

Ms. Shipman responded that the types of documents that the Navy was providing to regulatory agencies included both CERCLA or the Superfund federal program documents and documents related to the clean-up of petroleum hydrocarbons, which process was overseen by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Ms. Shipman explained that these documents could consist of sampling work plans or sampling results. Then typically if there was an issue found that needed remediation or clean-up, the Navy would prepare an assessment of the different alternatives in order to meet the property use risk level. She explained that this was because some portions of the shipyard property were slated for commercial, some for residential and some for recreational use, each of which would have varying health risk levels for humans. Ms. Fishman added that there were also risk levels for ecological receptors, which were mainly aquatic receptors of the Bay. Ms. Shipman stated that her company looks at the work and the clean-up efforts that the Navy would be proposing and makes sure that the Navy is appropriately managing risks and preparing the property for re-use as intended by the OCII.

Commissioner Ellington inquired about how the level of clean-up was determined per use of the land.

Chair Johnson asked if they could save that question for the next item regarding the clean-up process.

Commissioner Singh inquired as to: what the other problems are that may be coming up as mentioned in Ms. Shipman's presentation; whether any new regulations have come up.

Ms. Shipman responded that as the clean-up has proceeded, different issues have been brought to light. In recent years the Navy has made significant progress in the clean-up of potential radiological contamination related to the former National Defense Laboratory which was located in the Shipyard. The Navy has also been doing soil vapor sampling to make sure that soil gas levels in the ground do not migrate into enclosed spaces, which is an issue regulators have been studying closely in the past decade. Ms. Shipman indicated that as time goes on, new regulations may come up or new regulatory items may come up that they will need to study to make sure everything is safe for reuse. Regarding new regulations, Ms. Shipman responded that an example would be the soil vapor and indoor vapor intrusion assessment.

Commissioner Singh asked if that was a new regulation.

Ms. Shipman responded that those regulations had been developing over the past decade or so.

Vice Chair Rosales motioned to approve Item 5(c) and Commissioner Ellington seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Ellington – yes  
Commissioner Mondejar – yes

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

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY 5 COMMISSIONERS AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED THAT RESOLUTION NO. 38-2013, AUTHORIZING A PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH TREADWELL & ROLLO, A LANGAN COMPANY, A NEW JERSEY CORPORATION, FOR A CONTRACT 3-YEAR TERM, WITH A TOTAL AGGREGATE BUDGET AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$1,114,299, TO PROVIDE ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNICAL SERVICES IN CONNECTION WITH; (1) THE DEVELOPMENT AT THE HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD AND (2) THE REMEDIATION AND TRANSFER OF PROPERTY AT THE HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD FROM THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY TO THE OFFICE OF COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE; HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

- d) Workshop and update on the progress of the U. S. Department of the Navy’s remediation program at the Hunters Point Shipyard; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Wells Lawson, Senior Project Manager, Hunters Point Shipyard and Candlestick Point; Amy Brownell, San Francisco Public Health Department;

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Speaker: Oscar James, resident Bay View Hunters Point

Mr. James stated that he had been dealing with the Shipyard since 1973 and had brought up the subject of toxicity at that time when he was on the task force with Aliotto & Burton, at the time when people were saying that the Shipyard was not contaminated and subsequently, it has been proven that it was contaminated. Mr. James stated that his concern had always been the clean-up and especially the clean-up of Parcel E. Mr. James stated that he was aware there are still radiation rods in Parcel E. He stated that he was against the use of a cap there because in an earthquake, a cap would not be sturdy enough to protect people from the contamination and, therefore, he was still requesting 100% cleanup of the site. Mr. James stated that KPOO should be present at this meeting so that the community was aware that this issue was being addressed because the Shipyard was a superfund site and a brown field site, a fact that was not mentioned at all during in the presentation. Mr. James stated that he was in full support of the Shipyard being developed for use but wanted everyone to know that there were still serious problems with Parcel E.

Chair Johnson stated that she did not see the map that showed the clean-up methods for each parcel and requested that Commissioners be provided with one.

Commissioner Singh inquired about durable covers; the Navy involvement in Mission Bay and Emeryville; the problem with Parcel E that Mr. Oscar had mentioned.

Ms. Brownell responded that durable covers were the development itself, meaning the streets, buildings, sidewalks and two feet of clean soil, which were all very durable. She explained that regulators believed that people would/could not dig or kick aside two feet of soil, and, therefore, believed that it would retain its durability. Ms. Brownell responded that there used to be a rail road yard and an industrial area in Emeryville, which resulted in a great deal of contamination,

but which has now been completely redeveloped into residential and retail areas. To the Parcel E2 landfill question, Ms. Brownell indicated that Commissioners could review Attachment 5 in their packets which contained information about Parcel E2. Ms. Brownell responded that the Navy had gone through a lengthy process before making the decision to cap that parcel in place. She explained that the Navy had presented to the Board of Supervisors subcommittee in 2011; that there was also a public review process in 2012, and then the archicology hired an independent consultant to review the decision. Ms. Brownell stated that the Navy had issued detailed responses to all the comments received by the independent consultants who reviewed their decision as well as to all the agencies that had reviewed it. She stated that everyone concluded that the best remedy was the one that the Navy had chosen.

Commissioner Singh inquired as to whether the Navy had done this already or whether it was going to be done.

Ms. Brownell responded that the decision had been made and the Navy now had to prepare the documentation, such as the remedial design and construction drawings to carry out the plan and then it would be implemented over the next three years.

Commissioner Ellington inquired about: his previous question regarding whether there are different kinds of special remedies for each area of specific use; the numbers for caps and cover-ups and how they came up with those numbers; who would be facilitating the oversight after the transfer of the land after development and asked for details on that process; Article 31.

Ms. Brownell responded that because of the remedies the Navy had chosen, they would be the same across the board for each use area, so there would not be any variation in the actual remedies between commercial or residential areas; the only difference would be in the clean-up effort. Ms. Brownell explained that the numbers used for testing and sampling, which indicate the level of contamination, are different based on whether future use will be for commercial/industrial or residential and that difference is based on how long people will be remaining at the site. People could stay at a residential site 24/7; however, in commercial areas, people usually remain there for a limited time just to work and then leave. Ms. Brownell explained that the remedy included soil removal and then the use of durable covers. In the case of the presence of volatile chemicals, plastic is used in the foundation to prevent vapor intrusion. She indicated however, that in the end, no one will be in contact with the soil or any vapors except for maintenance workers and they would make sure that the residual levels were low enough so that maintenance workers would be able to work safely. Ms. Brownell responded that the two feet of soil was common in brown fields to make sure that no one was casually interacting with the soil; for landfill area where garbage, chemicals and radiation were disposed of, there would be a minimum of 6 feet of soil, a demarcation layer and also an impermeable liner so that everyone would know to not dig down into that area. Ms. Brownell responded that the City and the Health Department would take on oversight roles at the moment of transfer. She explained that before any construction was started, any applicant who applied for a permit, where they may be disturbing soil, would have to submit plans to the Health Department, including a dust control plan, a soil importation plan (if importing soil), and a transportation and disposal plan, all of which would have to be approved before they started building. Then during construction, dust control and storm water would continue to be monitored and handled until development was completed. After that, the Health Department would continue its oversight with annual inspections and reporting. The other regulatory agencies would also continue their roles with required annual inspections and reporting of parcels with durable covers to make sure there were no cracks, potholes or any earthquake damage. If there were, they would have to verify that these problems were fixed and report on how they were fixed. Ms. Brownell added that the

Department of Toxic Substance Control would mainly be involved, but the EPA, the Water Quality Control Board and even the Navy would also still be involved. She responded that Article 31 is part of the Health Code.

Vice Chair Rosales inquired about: whether the baseline standards for clean-up were really baseline, whether all regulatory agencies agreed with that baseline and whether there was a minimum standard that was uniform for all agencies; regulatory concurrence and whether that meant that each agency had to concur for the action or the approval to be valid.

Ms. Brownell responded that there were standards used across all regulatory agencies and sites. However, she explained, at each site, a specific analysis would be done for that particular site and those standards would be modified based on the site conditions. She gave as an example, the superfund site with groundwater contamination in Palo Alto/Mt. View, where groundwater wells are used for drinking water. At that site, they had to use a standard that allowed people to use that water for consumption. At Hunters Point, that standard would not be used because the ground water was not going to be consumed. In addition, the naturally occurring rock on the Hunters Point Hill in Parcel A, which got pushed down into the Bay, contained high levels of several metals, including arsenic, manganese, nickel, and zinc, which had to be considered during the clean-up there. Those levels are then used in the risk assessment calculations to verify whether this was really a contaminant or just naturally-occurring metals found on that site. Ms. Brownell responded that there was a federal facilities agreement at Hunters Point between the Navy, the USEPA, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control and the Regional Water Quality Control Board, which meant that three oversight agencies were overseeing the Navy. She explained that those three agencies had to concur on the Finding of Suitability to Transfer as well as concur that the Navy had performed all the remedies as required, and that they were suitable for the intended use. Ms. Brownell explained that, in addition, those agencies have other agencies that help them with their work, such as the California Department of Public Health, which verifies all the radiological issues.

Vice Chair Rosales inquired about whether: the Department of Public Health also has to concur; some of her staff support included the consultant that the OCII had just hired.

Ms. Brownell responded that the Department of Public Health would concur in their own independent way, because they did not have an official role as far as alerting the Navy of their concurrence, although, she added, the Navy would be aware if the Department had not concurred. She explained that, more importantly, the Department of Public Health would come to the OCII who would accept their concurrence. Ms. Brownell responded in the affirmative that she uses Treadwell & Rollo and stated that she could not do her job without their input.

Chair Johnson pointed out that they had discussed remediation methods for clean-up and if Commissioners were interested, there was good overview in the feasibility study and the proposed plan contained a comparison of all the potential remediation options with cost and technical assessments of one type of remediation versus another; in case, for example, there was a question as far as why the durable cover option was chosen over the soil removal option were chosen.

Commissioner Mondejar thanked Ms. Brownell for her presentation and inquired as to: whether Ms. Brownell herself was satisfied with all the remedies and whether Ms. Brownell would recommend all the reviews; whether there was anything else that Ms. Brownell might be concerned about.

Ms. Brownell responded that she had been involved with this process for 20 years and as stated in the summaries, all the parcels were at different stages. She admitted that there were times when she was not satisfied, but when this happened, the Department of Public Health would engage with the Navy and the regulatory agencies to let them know they were not satisfied, sometimes quite strongly, and if they had to, raise the stakes and get congressional members involved. Ms. Brownell stated that the Public Health Department makes it very clear that if the issues are not resolved, the Department will not recommend transfer of the parcel. By the time the Health Department would come to the OCII, they would have made sure that all the issues were resolved or they would not have brought it forward. Ms. Brownell assured Commissioners that by the time the Health Department comes to the OCII for Parcel D2 transfer, there will be no further concerns.

Chair Johnson inquired about the Navy's public input process and how that was going since the Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) was dismantled a long time ago.

Ms. Brownell responded that the RAB was dissolved in 2008 or 2009 and in the meantime, the Navy has implemented a robust process with community meetings every two months in order to present the latest documents. She indicated that many public meetings were held during the Parcel E2 landfill decision, which provided opportunity for public input in addition to the required public meeting. Ms. Brownell mentioned that the Navy had also been offering bus tours and indicated that one was coming up on August 24<sup>th</sup>. She added that regular fact sheets are sent out and that from what she has seen, the Navy has been able to engage new people in the process who had not been involved before and was doing a better job of keeping the community informed.

Vice Chair Rosales inquired about how the future property owners would be informed about any of the risks, the remedies, mitigations, etc.

Ms. Brownell explained that it all started with the deed, which would list all the restrictions that the owners would have to comply with and in addition, the Article 31 process, which would send building permit applicants to the Health Department, where permit requirements would be listed out as well. She added that for Parcels A and D2, there was no contamination and there were no restrictions on those parcels. Ms. Brownell explained that the Health Department was working with the city attorneys and with Lennar on the other parcels to make sure they had a robust, multi-layered process so that all the issues were being handled.

Chair Johnson stated that having gone through the process as a former resident of Treasure Island, the documentation and staff were well prepared so that a renter would be made aware that he/she could not dig in the ground or drink the water. Ms. Johnson added that the documentation listed out the activities that were prohibited and if the renter wanted to know why, the property managers would be able to provide an explanation.

## **6. Report of the Chair**

### **a) Discussion of broadcast alternatives for Commission meetings**

Chair Johnson reported that she had asked staff for information on broadcast services, pricing, audience, etc., and after meetings with the Executive Director, she was ready to move forward with SFGovTV. This decision was based on the fact that their pricing was competitive and that they were a standard for many other departments and commissions in the City for broadcasting

their meetings. Ms. Johnson also stated that being part of the City, SFGovTV would constitute an internal sourcing. She indicated that they should be able to begin broadcasting soon.

Chair Johnson reported that she would like to have one of the meetings in the next few months be located at an alternate site.

## **7. Report of the Executive Director**

Executive Director Bohee reported that there were two informational memorandums in their packets that were not action items. The first was a report on the status of insurance procurement, both property and liability. Ms. Bohee reminded Commissioners of a proposal that was set forth a few months back to join Bay Cities and ERMA, which were risk pools that the former Redevelopment Agency was a founding member of. However, those risk pools did not accept the new OCII as a member and, as a result, staff secured coverage with the current purchasing authority under \$50,000 with Alliant for a limited period of time. Ms. Bohee reported that during the first meeting in September, Commissioners will be considering a year-long contract for coverage and indicated that quotes were attached in the informational memo.

Executive Director Bohee reported that Kaiser was proposing opening a medical office in Mission Bay within the existing R&D district right across from UCSF and not far from the hospital on Owen Street. Ms. Bohee pointed out that this did not require OCII approval and that she was bringing this to Commissioners' attention because Kaiser was considering another site, in Potrero lower Dogpatch and there had been a great deal of concern over that because that site was not zoned for medical/biotech office use. Ms. Bohee explained that the new location would be in an existing building that already has building permits and piles and secured approvals from the previous Agency. Ms. Bohee stated that Alexandria Real Estate Equities Investment Trust was owner of the site and that there were certain land use findings that still needed to be made pursuant to the requirements of the redevelopment plan. She stated that if all the criteria are met, Kaiser is expected to commence construction of the approximately 200,000 sq. ft. structure in December.

Commissioner Singh inquired as to: whether the 200,000 sq. ft. was for the medical office only; what the office would be used for; whether it would be in competition with UC.

Executive Director Bohee responded in the affirmative and stated that this would simply be a medical office building so that Kaiser could serve their clients in that sector of the City. Ms. Bohee responded that they would not be competing with UC because this office would serve existing Kaiser clientele as part of a planned expansion.

Chair Johnson added that this would not include a hospital with an emergency room, but rather a medical and administration office.

Vice Chair Rosales inquired when it would be operational.

Executive Director Bohee responded that it would take about 18 months to two years to become operational.

Commissioner Singh inquired about Kaiser's rates.

Executive Director Bohee responded that many of the City agencies are negotiating Kaiser rates and that Kaiser is pushing hard for appropriate transparency. She mentioned that there was great

urgency to resolve any issues with Kaiser with respect to providing health benefits for existing city employees and retirees.

Chair Johnson inquired as to when the insurance item would be coming back before Commissioners.

Executive Director Bohee responded it would be on September 3.

## **8. Commissioners' Questions and Matters**

Commissioner Ellington thanked staff for the electronic copies of documents.

Commissioner Singh commended Natasha for her very good work.

Commissioner Mondejar stated that she and Commissioner Singh had taken a tour of Mission Bay/Transbay and that she had taken a tour of Hunters Point and thanked staff for setting up the tours and for the information given during the tours.

## **9. Closed Session:**

- a) Pursuant to Government Code § 54957.6 to confer with its designated representatives, but take no action, regarding negotiations with 1) the International Federation of Professional and Technical Engineers (IFPTE) Local 21 representing the Engineers and Architects bargaining unit, the Management/Supervisory bargaining unit, and the Professional/ Technical bargaining unit; and 2) the Service Employees International Union (SEIU) Local 1021 representing a miscellaneous employees bargaining unit. OCII negotiators: Tiffany Bohee, Leo Levenson, Carol Isen, Vitus Leung, Jessica Huey, April Ward.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT on Non-Agenda Items**

Speakers: Oscar James; Alex Tonisson, Union Representative, IFPTE Local 21

Mr. James stated that Kaiser Hospital was first started in the Potrero Hill area as the Kaiser Shipyard Hospital and that the original building was still there. Mr. James voiced a concern over the Mexican Museum and with all museums in the City and asked the OCII to make sure that all museums have open sessions for schools to attend on a free basis. Mr. James stated that it was very important that children be exposed to the history, culture and customs of other races and nationalities and in this way have a better relationship and understanding of other races and nationalities to bring more harmony later in life.

Mr. Tonisson stated that his union represents a majority of the workers at the former Redevelopment Agency and that they have been in negotiations since June 2012 for a new contract. Mr. Tonisson stated that AB26 dissolved redevelopment throughout the state and that process has been very complicated and has put a strain on all parties. He explained that in June 2012, AB26 was modified with AB1484, which provided that separate former Redevelopment Agency employees would not automatically become employees of the sponsoring entity. However in February 2012 all employees were laid off from the Redevelopment Agency and hired by the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF). They received lay-off notices and were hired by the City's Administrator's Office as R class employees by civil service and were currently City employees. Mr. Tonisson indicated that now at the bargaining table, the union was being told that because of AB1484, members were no longer City employees but were employees of the OCII. Mr. Tonisson stated that the union and their legal counsel disagreed with this interpretation and that they have requested evidence of this transition through the City Attorney's Office; however, they have

received no response for six months. Mr. Tonisson stated that members want their full civil service rights recognized and want to make sure their CALPERS pension and health care benefits are recognized. He indicated that they have already taken up to 18% pay cuts when their salaries were matched to the CCSF and that they were paying 7% into their pension to match the CCSF. Mr. Tonisson stated that they used to represent 54 employees and now there are only 24, so these employees were in effect doing more work for less pay and less job security. Mr. Tonisson asked the Commission to take some action in this situation and to direct management to start bargaining in good faith. He added that due to the sequence of events, the union had been forced to file an unfair practice charge regarding this behavior and the refusal to bargain in good faith and, in the meantime, was asking the OCII for their help.

**10. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned by Madame Chair Johnson at 4:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Natasha Jones*

Natasha Jones  
Interim Commission Secretary

**ADOPTED:**