

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE
COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HELD ON THE
18TH DAY OF MARCH 2014**

The members of the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure of the City and County of San Francisco met in a regular 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 18th day of March 2014, 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 1:05 p.m. Roll call was taken.

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

Chair Johnson was absent; Vice-Chair Rosales served as Acting Chair. All other Commission members were present.

2. Announcements

A. The next scheduled Commission meeting will be a special meeting held on Tuesday, April 1, 2014 at 4:00 p.m. (Location: Mission Creek Senior Community, Swift Conference. Center, 3rd Floor, 930 4th Street, San Francisco).

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 – None.

4. Matters of Unfinished Business – None.

5. Matters of New Business:

CONSENT AGENDA

a) Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting of February 18, 2014

Commissioner Ellington 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 – abstained
Vice-Chair Rosales – yes
Commissioner Singh – yes
Chair Johnson – absent

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY 3 COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE AND ONE ABSTENTION THAT THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 18, 2014, BE ADOPTED.

Acting Chair Rosales requested that they take Item 8a from Report of the Executive Director out of order.

8. Report of the Executive Director:

a) Update on the March 11, 2014 fire at a 172-unit market-rate apartment building located at 1200 Fourth Street in the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area.

Executive Director Bohee reported on the fire at this BRE Properties building, a 100% market-rate building, which had received design approvals from the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA) two years ago and referred to an informational memo on this item in Commissioners' packets. Ms. Bohee introduced Assistant Fire Chief Robert Postel to provide additional information on this event.

Executive Director Bohee then asked Catherine Reilly, Mission Bay Project Manager, to speak on this topic.

Commissioner Singh inquired about the cause of the fire and about why the structure went up so quickly; then inquired about when they would know the cause of the fire.

Assistant Chief Postel responded that they were still investigating the cause of the fire and replied that because there was no sheet-rock in place, which acts as a fire retardant, all the wood was exposed and the radiant heat and the direct fire impingement caused the fire to spread rapidly. Mr. Postel responded that he did not have an estimated date for completing the investigation into the cause.

Commissioner Ellington thanked the San Francisco Fire Department for their courage and hard work in putting the fire out so quickly. He inquired of Ms. Reilly about whether they were confident about the statement that there would be no impact on the timeline with respect to the surrounding projects; inquired as to whether they knew the BRE Properties' timeline in restarting the project.

Ms. Reilly responded that the developers had stated that they were moving forward with whatever minor repairs would be required and stated that any delay would be counted in a matter of weeks

only and that no one was talking about delaying progress. Ms. Reilly replied that BRE Properties were still in the assessment stage of damage and explained that they would have to deal with insurance, among other, issues before restarting any construction.

Acting Chair Rosales inquired as to whether there were any workers onsite at the time of the start of the fire.

Assistant Chief Postel responded that his understanding was that all the workers had left for the day about an hour before the fire started.

Commissioner Ellington inquired about whether there was anything they could do to move forward with the water supply issue given the fact that there were hundreds of homes being built and whether there was anything they could do to avoid this happening in the future with buildings being built so close together.

Executive Director Bohee responded that each of the broad area plans, either in Mission Bay, Transbay, or Hunters Point, or in new citywide projects in emerging areas like Park Merced and Treasure Island provided for the Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS), which had been processed through the infrastructure plans that the Board of Supervisors and the City had approved as backup and redundant systems, in addition to regular domestic water supply and also additional backup.

Assistant Chief Postel explained that there were two separate water systems in the City--the domestic water supply system, which the hydrants worked off of, and a high pressure gravity-fed water supply system with tanks at Twin Peaks, Haight-Ashbury and Jones Street. Mr. Postel explained that the latter was a grid system that worked out the large fire hydrants, which were like fire engines to the fire department because they provided large volumes of water with a lot of pressure. He stated that the gravity-fed system was instituted after the 1906 earthquake and that San Francisco was the only city in the country with this type of system. Mr. Postel added that, through the Public Utilities Commission (PUC), which owned the system, the fire department had been expanding this system into South of Market, China Basin and Twin Peaks and were in the process of expanding it into additional areas of the City. He called this an invaluable system for large fires.

Commissioner Singh inquired about whether any of the workers who had left the scene had seen anything that might have caused the fire.

Assistant Chief Postel replied that he could not comment on the fire investigation and that they had their own fire investigation unit working with the Police Department to try to determine the cause of the fire. He added that he was not able to address any security issues relating to the contractor.

REGULAR AGENDA

- b) Conditionally approving the transfer of operations of Pearl's Deluxe Burgers, LLC to the owner of the property located at 1001 Market Street and 4 Sixth Street, consistent with the terms of a Façade and Tenant Improvement Loan Agreement approved under the Six on Sixth Economic Revitalization Program; Former South of Market Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No.13-2014)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Christine Maher, Development Specialist, Real Estate Development Division; Sylvia Yee, owner of Pearl's Burgers; John Chow, new tenant and owner of the new restaurant; Mike Grisso, Senior Project Manager, Transbay; Amy Cohen, Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speaker: Tracy Everwine, Central Market Community Benefit District

Ms. Everwine stated that she had worked with Urban Solutions for 8 years and had also worked with former Agency staff to transform this area into a resource for the community and expressed her confidence in the new operators of this space, both tenant and landlord, who were very familiar with the community. She stated that the new operator has owned three successful businesses on Sixth Street over the past decade, were very community-serving, and had an accessible price point. Ms. Everwine stated that she felt the new operator would represent a very advantageous transfer for the community.

Commissioner Ellington inquired about what type of restaurant would be moving into that space.

Ms. Maher responded that it would be another burger restaurant.

Ms. Everwine stated that the new owner was available for comment. She stated that Pearl's had only served a lunch menu with a limited dinner menu and that the new owners would provide breakfast as well as lunch and dinner. Ms. Everwine indicated that breakfast has been missing in the community for a while, especially with all the construction going on in the area. She introduced John Chow.

Mr. Chow stated that he understood what was going on in the mid-Market area because he currently owned Little Griddle on 1400 Market Street. He stated that he wanted to introduce a café in that space where friends could come together and meet and added they would be focusing on offering a full menu for breakfast and lunch.

Commissioner Singh stated that he remembered being at the opening of the restaurant years ago and inquired as to whether Pearl's owner was present at the meeting; inquired as to why they were leaving. Mr. Singh inquired as to what the \$400,000 in funds had been used for and about why the new owner needed another \$600,000 for improvements; inquired as to whether there was any private investment in this space.

Ms. Yee stated that she and her husband were the owners of Pearl's and that they had another restaurant at Post. She indicated that it was a bittersweet moment for Pearl's to leave because she had been born and raised in San Francisco and that Sixth Street & Market was very dear to her. Ms. Yee explained that they had worked with the SFRA to try to be the catalyst business in the corner spot and that even though they still believed in the revitalization of that area, she felt that their type of restaurant was too early to be installed at that space. She indicated that Pearl's was a gourmet high-end burger restaurant for lunch mainly, no breakfast and with a limited dinner menu and that because they specialized in burgers, there had not been enough foot traffic at night to support their business and that they had lost too much money to continue. Ms. Yee added that she and her husband had considered changing their business model to be able to stay in that space but the risk was too high financially. She stated that they wanted to keep the spirit of the SFRA and the revitalization idea alive and to that end they had been working very hard with the landlord and new operator to ensure that a business would be installed that would keep the corner alive and build up that neighborhood. To the question about the funds, Ms. Yee responded that when they first started, they had had to gut the

entire place, which was in a blighted area, and install new walls, flooring, a new dining room and kitchen, two new bathrooms and make structural improvements, so that in the end 100% of the money from SFRA plus other funds had been used in the space for construction.

In regards to the new improvements, Ms. Maher responded that \$600,000 in funds had originally been granted or loaned for that project, which had been used for the renovations Ms. Yee referred to, but that there had been no new money used for this purpose.

Mr. Singh inquired as to whether there was any new money involved in the transfer and why they should forgive the \$400,000 loan.

Ms. Maher responded that the Yees had invested some of their own money into the project. She added that they were not forgiving the loan but had recommended following the program guidelines, which stated that if the new owner stayed in operation for four years, 4/5 of the loan would be forgiven and then at the end of the fifth year, the balance would be forgiven. Ms. Maher indicated that this was the same procedure for any loan granted at that time.

Executive Director Bohee added that the Sixth on Sixth loan program guidelines approved by the former SFRA allowed for a forgivable loan structure provided the owner stayed in business for a certain amount of time. She explained that this particular loan agreement included security against the property owner so that in the event of a default, the property owner would be able to step in and continue the retail operations.

Commissioner Singh insisted that this loan should not be forgiven.

Mr. Grisso responded that they were not forgiving anything. He explained that under the provisions of the loan agreement, a transfer of the business could take place and if the new business closed, then the loan would have to be repaid. He added that there were still a couple years left on the loan before it was to be forgiven. Mr. Grisso admitted that this was not an ideal situation but reminded the Commission that the original purpose of the investment by the SFRA at the time was to take a blighted useless area and turn it into a useable retail space. He indicated that Pearl's Burgers had accomplished that purpose and was still responsible for the loan; however, financially Pearl's Burgers could not continue. Mr. Grisso explained that another business would continue to keep the space occupied which meant that the original loan had been a success. Pearl's, as the initial tenant, was using the provision in their loan agreement that stated that they would be allowed to transfer the business to the property owner and the rent would be decreased. He pointed out that one of the requirements of the original agreement was that the rent could not be increased during the first five years of the loan, which meant that the property owner could not benefit inordinately from a SFRA loan. He stated that hopefully the next business would be more successful than Pearl's.

Acting Chair Rosales inquired as to whether the new owners would be adding any new improvements.

Mr. Grisso responded that the new owners would be making some minor changes to the space, like paint and signs, but would essentially be using the same space and basically would be benefiting from the previous owner's upgrades. He added that they had been granted a 30-day closing time in order to retrofit for the new business.

Commissioner Ellington inquired as to why they did not add the new owner to the loan agreement starting at this time.

Mr. Grisso agreed that Pearl's name remained on the loan agreement and that they would continue as the guarantor for the loan. He added that the property owner had provided collateral for the loan and those two entities would still be responsible for the loan. Mr. Grisso explained that staff did not think they would be able to get a new tenant in that space if the new tenant had to take on responsibility for a \$400,000 loan.

Commissioner Ellington reminded him however that the loan would be forgiven if the new tenant stayed in business for three more years.

Mr. Grisso stated that the loan would be forgiven if there were continuous business operations in that space for the entirety of the loan.

Commissioner Ellington inquired as to whether Pearl's would have the financial ability to repay the loan if the new tenant does not succeed within the next year.

Mr. Grisso responded that the building owner had put the building up as collateral so that would be the next place they would go to recover the funds.

Commissioner Mondejar stated that this would be a great deal for the new tenant because of the reduced rent as well as benefiting from the improvements that Pearl's had already put in.

Mr. Grisso responded that the new tenant would be paying less rent but it would still be at market rate. He stated that Sixth Street overall would be benefiting from the fact that there was a new tenant willing to occupy the space and that a business would continue there. Mr. Grisso added that he believed that Pearl's would not be leaving that space unless they had no other option because they had put so much time and money into the space.

Ms. Cohen stated that she was there when SFRA approved the original loan and felt that this transfer was the best possible outcome because the owners of Pearl's, the landlord and the new tenants were working together with the OCII staff to ensure a smooth transition. She stated that this transition had been difficult and reminded Commissioners that any retail on Central Market Street area was difficult to install. She thanked everyone for their hard work on this transitional operation.

Commissioner Mondejar inquired as to whether the building owners were present; requested confirmation regarding the fact was that the building owner was responsible for the loan and that it was in their interest that the business operation be continued because their building was attached to the loan.

Mr. Grisso responded that the building owner was present, and that the building owner was indeed on the hook for the loan because the building was serving as collateral on the loan. He stated that this was the reason that they had structured the loan agreement in that way because at the time that they entered into the agreement, they were not sure that Pearl's would be able to repay the loan if it came due.

Commissioner Ellington confirmed that staff interpretation of continuous business on the loan agreement was correct.

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

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY 4 COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO.13-2014, CONDITIONALLY APPROVING THE TRANSFER OF OPERATIONS OF PEARL’S DELUXE BURGERS, LLC TO THE OWNER OF THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 1001 MARKET STREET AND 4 SIXTH STREET, CONSISTENT WITH THE TERMS OF A FAÇADE AND TENANT IMPROVEMENT LOAN AGREEMENT APPROVED UNDER THE SIX ON SIXTH ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION PROGRAM; FORMER SOUTH OF MARKET REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Acting Chair Rosales announced that she would be taking a half-hour break and that Commissioner Ellington would fill in as Acting Chair in her absence.

Commissioner Singh motioned to move this item and Commissioner Mondejar seconded that motion.

Secretary Jones called for a voice vote on this item.

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY 4 COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT COMMISSIONER ELLINGTON WOULD SERVE AS ACTING CHAIR IN THE ABSENCE OF ACTING CHAIR ROSALES.

- c) Approving, consistent with the 2006 Transbay Streetscape and Open Space Concept Plan, and pursuant to the Transbay Implementation Agreement, an addendum to the Schematic Design Package for the Folsom Streetscape Improvements Project adding an east-bound separated bike lane, or cycle track, within the Folsom Street roadway; Transbay Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No.14-2014)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Courtney Pash, Assistant Project Manager, Transbay

PUBLIC COMMENT – None.

Commissioner Singh commented that everything looked good and was very pleased with the design.

Commissioner Ellington inquired as to whether they were working with the other major construction projects going on concurrently in that area; inquired as to whether this construction was consistent with the under-ramp park; noted that this project started on 2nd Street and ended on the Embarcadero and inquired as to how this would fit into the overall scope of Folsom and the Embarcadero regarding where start and finish would be.

Ms. Pash responded that the project would start the summer of 2014. She explained that they would redo the south sidewalk and that on the north side of Folsom Street, the OCII will be responsible for setting the curb line and repaving the roadway. She added that the other major construction projects on that street were OCII blocks (6, 8, & 9) and that the OCII would be building out the major improvements for those projects as well. To the park question, Ms. Pash replied that the under-ramp park would follow a year or two later because it had to be constructed at the same time or after the bus ramp that would carry buses from the Bay Bridge to the Transit Center running over the park. Ms. Pash indicated that they had been working closely with the Planning Department team on the Central SOMA EIR with the analysis of Folsom all the way out to 11th Street. She added that part of the reason they had allowed for a potential westbound cycle track in the future was that if that portion of Folsom Street shifted to two-way, it would serve as the connector. Ms. Pash stated that over the past few months, they have redone the striping from Folsom to 11th so that would serve as the connector to the Embarcadero.

Mr. Singh noted that the sidewalk was going to be 25' and inquired as to whether that would create a big traffic problem on Folsom during commute hours.

Ms. Pash responded that the north sidewalk would be 25', comprised of 10' plus a 15' setback that was part of the developer's requirement. They had set back the building by 15', which would allow for the 25' sidewalk. She responded that they had been working with the MTA, the Planning Department and its Traffic Division and noted that the area east of Essex Street was much less travelled by vehicles because the Bay Bridge was being accessed from the other side of the City. She added that Folsom Street currently was mainly used by buses going to the temporary terminal, which would be relocated in 2018.

Commissioner Ellington inquired about where the actual bus stops would be in comparison to the cycle tracks.

Ms. Pash responded that there would be no bus stops on Folsom Street.

Commissioner Mondejar inquired about community outreach and consultation in that area. She stated that she never travelled on Folsom Street during commute time because it was always too crowded at that time; inquired as to who was paying for this project.

Ms. Pash responded that this project has been agreed to unanimously by the CAC at the January 2014 meeting. She replied that the OCII would be paying for the entire project.

Executive Director Bohee added that the source of funds was existing tax exempt bonds proceeds, new requests for property taxes through the ROPS, developer fees and other sources. She explained that there were agreements with the Transbay Joint Powers Authority (TJPA), in which all new property tax dollars, all land sales and RFP's in Zone 1 would go to the Transit Center construction project. She added that in the broader district, the new highrise building construction in Zone 2 would generate new property tax and new tax increment bonds. She indicated that all sources and uses for this project would be presented in more detail at the April 1 meeting.

Commissioner Mondejar inquired as to how much this project would cost the OCII.

Ms. Pash responded that the Folsom Street project was estimated at \$15 million.

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

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY 3 COMMISSIONERS WITH TWO ABSENCES THAT RESOLUTION NO.14-2014, APPROVING, CONSISTENT WITH THE 2006 TRANSBAY STREETScape AND OPEN SPACE CONCEPT PLAN, AND PURSUANT TO THE TRANSBAY IMPLEMENTATION AGREEMENT, AN ADDENDUM TO THE SCHEMATIC DESIGN PACKAGE FOR THE FOLSOM STREETScape IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT ADDING AN EAST-BOUND SEPARATED BIKE LANE, OR CYCLE TRACK, WITHIN THE FOLSOM STREET ROADWAY; TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

- d) Authorizing a First Amendment to the Amended and Restated OCII Loan Agreement with Bayview Supportive Housing, LLC, a California limited liability company, to reduce the interest rate from 3% to 1.46% and clarify the distribution of surplus cash, for the development of 120 very low-income senior rental housing units plus one manager's unit at 1751 Carroll Avenue (formerly known as 5800 Third Street, Lot 3) (Assessor's Block 5431A, Lot 042). (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 15-2014)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Pamela Sims, Development Specialist

PUBLIC COMMENT – None.

Acting Chair Ellington inquired as to whether it was typical for a lending entity to lower interest rates after all the specifics has been agreed upon; stated that he was not able to understand the repayment process and inquired as to where the OCII was in line for repayment in comparison to other investors; inquired as to when this property would be transferred to the Mayor's Office of Housing (MOH). Mr. Ellington stated that this was a significant request and inquired if the developer was present at the meeting and wanted to make sure that someone from the development team was there as well.

Ms. Sims responded that under the former SFRA, it was typical to come back to the Agency to request lower interest rates. To the question regarding the succession of repayment, Ms. Sims replied that first tenant rents were repaid, then operating expenses and then debt service, in that order. She explained that conventional lenders were repaid above the line in the debt service category and that below the line, the developer would be repaid their 1/3 and then the OCII would be repaid their 2/3 of the cash flow to pay down the loans. To the question regarding transfer, Ms. Sims replied that ultimately, after construction was completed, this property would be transferred to the MOH. She indicated that the developer was present at the meeting and available for questions.

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

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

Acting Chair Ellington – yes
Commissioner Mondejar – yes
Vice-Chair Rosales – absent
Commissioner Singh – yes

Chair Johnson – absent

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY 3 COMMISSIONERS WITH TWO ABSENCES THAT RESOLUTION NO.15-2014, AUTHORIZING A FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE AMENDED AND RESTATED OCII LOAN AGREEMENT WITH BAYVIEW SUPPORTIVE HOUSING, LLC, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, TO REDUCE THE INTEREST RATE FROM 3% TO 1.46% AND CLARIFY THE DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS CASH, FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF 120 VERY LOW-INCOME SENIOR RENTAL HOUSING UNITS PLUS ONE MANAGER’S UNIT AT 1751 CARROLL AVENUE (FORMERLY KNOWN AS 5800 THIRD STREET, LOT 3) (ASSESSOR'S BLOCK 5431A, LOT 042), BE ADOPTED.

6. Public Comment on Non-agenda Items

Speaker: Diane Wesley-Smith, Property Manager, DIO

Ms. Wesley-Smith first read a statement about the definition and features of property management. She stated that she was a native San Franciscan, a real estate broker, a certified property manager and a business owner and that she was there to request assistance in navigating her inclusion as a property manager for the new construction projects going on in the City. Ms. Wesley-Smith stated that many of the developers had already decided who was going to manage all the new properties but that she wanted inclusion as a small business enterprise as well as a minority business owner, a homeowner and a voter. She stated that she qualified under the DDA to be a property manager and asked to have someone contact her from the OCII to help her in this process.

Acting Chair Ellington announced a short recess until the return of Vice-Chair Rosales. The meeting was reconvened at the return of Acting Chair Rosales.

7. Report of the Chair

Acting Chair Rosales had no report.

8. Report of the Executive Director

- c) Commissioner Mara Rosales, honored by CCSF for her work in the public and private sector as LBE Public Official Advocate of the Year, and George Bridges, OCII senior contract compliance specialist, honored by CCSF as LBE Advocate of the Year for his work at OCII – International Women’s Day Celebration in City Hall, March 10, 2014

Executive Director Bohee reported that both Vice-Chair Rosales and George Bridges, Senior Contract Compliance Specialist, had been recognized by other City agencies the previous week for their efforts in the furtherance of small minority women enterprises (LBE or DBE’s). Ms. Bohee stated that Ms. Rosales was recognized for her years of work in both public and private sector. She congratulated both Ms. Rosales and Mr. Bridges as well as the entire Commission for their work in this area.

Acting Chair Rosales thanked the Commission for their recognition and gave credit to the entire Commission and staff, stating that everyone needed to be recognized for their work in advancing public policy regarding small and local businesses in their contracts.

Commissioner Singh stated that compliance used to be comprised of two commissioners and inquired as to why there was only one now.

Executive Director Bohee responded that since dissolution, a number of staff had left the Agency and added that they were currently in the process of hiring a supervisor and an additional compliance specialist. Ms. Bohee explained that they had also entered into strategic memorandums of understanding (MOU's) with sister City agencies and recently with the Office of Economic Workforce Development to help the OCII with their local hiring goal compliance.

9. Commissioners' Questions and Matters

Commissioner Singh commended Commissioner Ellington for taking on the task of Acting Chair during the absence of Acting Chair Rosales and commented that he had done an excellent job.

10. Closed Session

Under California Government Code §54956.9, Conference with Legal Counsel for Existing Litigation:

- a) The 765 Market Street Residential Owners Assoc., et al, v. All Persons Interested in the Matter of the Validity of (1) Resolution No. 32-2013 of the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure of the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco and (2) Resolution 8-2013 of the Oversight Board of the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco; et al. (Superior Court, S.F. City and County, No. CPF-14-513433);
- b) Yerba Buena Consortium, LLP, et al v. City and County of San Francisco, et al, (Superior Court, Sacramento County, No. 34-2013-80001611); and
- c) Fillmore Center Associates, LP v. City and County of San Francisco, et al. (Superior Court, S.F. City and County, Nos. CGC-08-477064 & 08-480768).

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Acting Chair Rosales at 3:07 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Natasha Jones

Natasha Jones, Interim Commission Secretary