

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE
COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HELD ON THE
5TH DAY OF AUGUST 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 5th day of August 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 Mondejar – present
Commissioner Singh – present
Chair Rosales – present

All Commission members were present.

2. Announcements

A. The next scheduled Commission meeting will be a regular meeting held on Tuesday, August 19, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. (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 - None

4. Matters of Unfinished Business – None

5. Matters of New Business:

CONSENT AGENDA

a) Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting of July 1, 2014

PUBLIC COMMENT – None

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

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

Commissioner Mondejar – yes

Commissioner Singh – yes

Chair Rosales – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY 3 COMMISSIONERS THAT THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF JULY 1, 2014 BE ADOPTED.

REGULAR AGENDA

- b) Authorizing a second amendment to the Personal Service Contract with Overland, Pacific and Cutler, Inc. (OPC), a California corporation, to extend the contract term to end on December 31, 2017 and to increase the budget by \$456,383 for an aggregate total of not to exceed \$645,143 to provide continued tenant relocation services at the Hunters Point Shipyard in compliance with the Disposition and Development Agreement for Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 61-2014)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Thor Kaslofsky, Project Manager, Hunters Point Shipyard; Marty McKee, President, Shipyard Trust for the Arts

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Espinola Jackson, Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP) resident; Ace Washington, community activist

Ms. Jackson recalled that when the artists came to the Shipyard, the community was not aware that the Shipyard was a Superfund site and reminded everyone that it continued to be one. She recalled that when the Navy came in, they had set up a Restoration Advisory Board (RAB), but the board members did not support the DDA at that time because the area was not cleaned up enough for residential occupancy. Ms. Jackson stated that she felt sorry for the people moving into that area because they would get sick from the contaminated land. She reminded Commissioners that they needed to be in contact with the PUC staff because the Mayor had just approved \$5 million for the Shipyard.

Mr. Washington expressed his concern for the black Americans in San Francisco and spoke about urban renewal. He announced that he was going to launch the Washington Post California to show the history of events in the City.

Commissioner Singh thanked Ms. Jackson for her history lesson. He inquired from Ms. McKee about how many people worked for her organization; inquired about who would be installing the solar system; inquired about the rental cost and whether it would be monthly; and inquired about the total space was.

Ms. McKee responded that there were 8 board members and one administrative assistant. She explained that the administrative assistant had committed to doing much of the organizational and administrative work in the studio assignment project and that she would be the person getting

paid. Ms. McKee responded that they were not sure who would be doing the solar work yet. They had received two bids, one from Luminalt, a Potrero Hill company and from Red Dipper, a BVHP company and those bids had been presented to Lennar for pricing.

Mr. Kaslofsky reemphasized the fact that Lennar was doing the design work and would be doing a bid for a general contractor to do the construction of the artists' building. He explained that the general contractor would select a subcontractor for the solar installation but that process had not started yet. Mr. Kaslofsky responded that the starting rental amount would be \$1.11/sq. feet and that it would be a per month rental. He responded that the net square footage was approximately 58,000 sq. ft. and the total space was 98,000 sq. feet gross.

Commissioner Mondejar inquired about how much money they were intending to raise, so that the five artists who had indicated that they might not be able to afford would be able to stay. She inquired whether they had an exact amount that they would need in order to provide a subsidy for the artists in need.

Ms. McKee responded that they would like to double their take. She explained that they net about \$10,000/year and that they use that money for operating expenses and to support other local programs. Their goal would be to raise an additional \$5,000 - \$10,000 as seed money as a cushion before the proceeds from the savings on the solar kick in. She added that based on surveys, phone calls, interviews, etc., they had identified five artists in need and if STAR were to subsidize the entire amount needed, which was the difference between what the artists were currently paying for rent and what they would be paying in the new space, they estimated they would need \$19,000 to help the needy artists.

Chair Rosales inquired about the timeline relating to the statement that when the leases were presented, there could be a change in circumstances.

Mr. Kaslofsky responded that they estimated obtaining an Intent to Lease or a lease document closer to the start of construction for the artists' studios, which would be in early 2016. He added that construction schedules often change but that they were expecting construction to begin in mid-2016.

Chair Rosales stated that they would have some leeway to do some fundraising by then.

Mr. Kaslofsky responded that people's financial circumstances also change rapidly.

Ms. McKee stated that getting artists together was like herding cats and that they were continuing their outreach efforts in order to be very clear on this issue and to be able to communicate to artists what was going on.

Commissioner Singh inquired about what other expenses they had.

Ms. McKee responded that they sponsored an artist-in-residency program and small education programs with schools in BVHP. For example, she explained, they recently spent \$500 to sponsor a summer camp to send 60 children to the Exploratorium for the day. When the local schools are involved in a specific art project, they try to contribute to those programs. Ms. McKee added that most of the funds are used for operating expenses and for paying their administrative assistant, but they do operate on \$20,000/year. She confirmed that she was the key go-to person of the organization.

Commissioner Mondejar inquired about what their annual budget was; inquired about exactly how many artists they were talking about.

Ms. McKee responded that their annual budget was \$19,000/year and that they hoped to increase this as they grew their programs. She explained that historically, they had always been an advocacy organization, not a fundraising organization, but were bringing in new board members who were more familiar with fundraising. She added that this would be new for them. Ms. McKee indicated that they would continue to accumulate savings from the solar forever and that once all the artists were relocated, any additional funds would be used to subsidize studio space in the new artists building for local Bayview and Hunters Point artists, so that there was a community component to this as well. Ms. McKee responded that there were 137 artists being displaced and that there were a number of studios that were shared.

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

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

Commissioner Mondejar – yes

Commissioner Singh – yes

Chair Rosales – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY 3 COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 61-2014, AUTHORIZING A SECOND AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL SERVICE CONTRACT WITH OVERLAND, PACIFIC AND CUTLER, INC. (OPC), A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION, TO EXTEND THE CONTRACT TERM TO END ON DECEMBER 31, 2017 AND TO INCREASE THE BUDGET BY \$456,383 FOR AN AGGREGATE TOTAL OF NOT TO EXCEED \$645,143 TO PROVIDE CONTINUED TENANT RELOCATION SERVICES AT THE HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE DISPOSITION AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR CANDLESTICK POINT AND PHASE 2 OF THE HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD; HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

- c) Conditionally authorizing the Executive Director to consent to an amendment of the lease between Third and Mission Associates LLC, a California limited liability company, and The California Historical Society, a California non-profit public benefit corporation, consistent with an Agreement for Disposition of Land for Private Development for property at 680 Mission Street; Former Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Project Area D-1. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 62-2014)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Christine Maher, Senior Development Specialist, Real Estate Division

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Anthea Hartig, Executive Director and CEO, California Historical Society (CHS); Tom Owens, President Emeritus, California Historical Society; Ace Washington, community activist

Ms. Hartig gave some background on CHS, which was founded in San Francisco in 1871 and registered as a non-profit in the state of California in 1885. She requested that the Commission conditionally approve this lease amendment. Ms. Hartig expressed gratitude to Third & Mission

Associates/Related and to Bill Witte for his efforts to provide additional non-profit space. She explained that CHS had been designated as beneficiary of the public benefit in The Paramount Tower project of approximately 17,000 sq. ft. of basement and 3rd floor space. CHS had invested almost \$300,000 in attempting to utilize the 10,000 sq. ft. that they are currently seeking to lease back, including constructing an elevator to the 3rd floor space, but the 3rd floor space was not able to be made workable for their purposes. In 2009 CHS started conversations with Third & Mission Associates/Related to release that space back to them. In 2011 the parties arrived at the present lease deal and embarked on negotiations with the Former Redevelopment Agency. CHS agreed to relinquish \$946,949 out of the \$2.5 million to the Former Redevelopment Agency and agreed to the lease amount in 2011. Ms. Hartig stated that they had continued to work with and cooperate with former Redevelopment Agency staff, currently OCII staff, and had waited until May of 2014 in the hopes that this deal could move forward and that the initial payment could be released to CHS. She stressed that they have waited four years for this to happen. Ms. Hartig added that CHS worked with about 130 other institutional non-profit partners, so they there were well aware of the difficulties facing these types of organizations. Ms. Hartig asked Commissioners to authorize the Executive Director to concur with the lease amendment once the condition of approval had been passed by the Board of Supervisors for the additional 4100 sq. ft.

Mr. Owens reaffirmed the statements of Ms. Hartig and explained that he was the original negotiator with Related back in 2009 when he was CHS president. He asked that the Commission authorize this item.

Mr. Washington stated that he would like to have the black community work with Related Company in the construction of new buildings in the City.

Commissioner Singh asked Bill Witte about whether would there be any commercial space developed from the vacated space.

Mr. Witte responded that if the Commission approved this, they probably would not lease that space out, but would expand the amenities and modernize the common areas in The Paramount, because it was a 12-year old building.

Commissioner Mondejar pointed out that originally CHS had taken the space because they needed more space to store their collection and now they were ready to give up that space and inquired what they would do for the needs for additional space for their collection.

Ms. Hartig responded that they still had some of the original gifted space in the basement of The Paramount, which they continued to use, but which was still awkward for them to use. So at this point they were still looking for additional space. She added that they had not used the 3rd floor space that they were leasing back.

Commissioner Mondejar stated they were happy that they finally were able to find a way to work out this problem.

Chair Rosales concurred that this was a very creative resolution of the concerns presented and allowed the lease amendment to go forward and offer space to non-profits in San Francisco. She thought that this represented good collaboration toward a satisfactory solution.

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

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

Commissioner Mondejar – yes

Commissioner Singh – yes

Chair Rosales – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY 3 COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 62-2014, CONDITIONALLY AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO CONSENT TO AN AMENDMENT OF THE LEASE BETWEEN THIRD AND MISSION ASSOCIATES LLC, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, AND THE CALIFORNIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY, A CALIFORNIA NON-PROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION, CONSISTENT WITH AN AGREEMENT FOR DISPOSITION OF LAND FOR PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT FOR PROPERTY AT 680 MISSION STREET; FORMER YERBA BUENA CENTER REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA D-1, BE ADOPTED.

- d) Authorizing an Amended and Restated Loan Agreement with Mission Bay Block 7 Housing Partners, LP, a California limited partnership (consisting of The Related Companies of California, LLC, a California limited liability company, and Chinatown Community Development Center, a California nonprofit public benefit corporation), for a total aggregate loan amount of \$16,975,000, for the development of a 200 unit low-income affordable family rental housing (including two manager's units) development at 588 Mission Bay Boulevard North (Block 7 West), and adopting findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 63-2014)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Jeff White, Housing Program Manager

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Dr. Espinola Jackson, BVHP resident; Ace Washington, community activist

Dr. Jackson questioned what the word "affordable" meant in terms of housing. She stated that nobody living within the BVHP community would be able to meet the standards set up by the City for affordability, but rather only the new people coming into the community would be able to afford to live there. Dr. Jackson recalled that she had received a letter from Olson Lee from the Mayor's Office of Housing, letting her know that after 2016, her Certificate of Preference would no longer be valid. Ms. Jackson reminded the Commission that it was the Board of Supervisors that had set up the Certificate of Preference program, not the Mayor's Office.

Mr. Washington spoke about the history of the city and the black community and also referred to Olson Lee in the Mayor's Office of Housing.

Commissioner Singh talked about tenants not paying more than 30% of their income to rent and pointed out that 30% was a lot of money. He stated that he agreed with Dr. Jackson regarding affordability. Commissioner Singh inquired about how many stories the building would have.

Mr. White responded that this was how the rents were set and pegged and explained that they used the rents published by the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), which were based on the HUD rents. He added that a one bedroom would be \$980/month, which was low compared to San Francisco rates for a one-bedroom, which were

approaching \$3,000/month. Mr. White responded that the building would have 200 units and be four stories high.

Commissioner Mondejar inquired about the marketing plan to reach out to the target population; inquired as to whether these were all rental units; inquired about getting an update on the Certificate of Preference program.

Mr. White responded that there was no marketing plan yet but that they would have one within a month after construction loan closing. He explained that they would have 18 months to work on their outreach plan and to help people with rental readiness, for example, credit counseling and help with preparation for the lottery system. Mr. White responded that this building would be all rental. Mr. White responded that they would be talking about the Certificate of Preference program during the next agenda item.

Executive Director Bohee added that as part of the MOU which the Commission approved with the MOHCD, MOHCD is required to prepare a report 90 days after Project Lease Up for all OCII-funded projects and provide that report to the Commission. She added that there was an annual reporting on overall marketing as well.

Chair Rosales pointed out that Attachment B contained the names and fees associated with the professional service consultants on the project but again requested an identification of the MBE category by ethnicity, so that the Commission could be more responsive to the ongoing complaints and concerns that African-Americans did not have access to contracting opportunities. She added that with this information, they would be better informed.

Executive Director Bohee responded that to the extent that they had that data either through the City's database or other third party sources, they would make sure to include that information for the Commissioners in order to help them see the full picture.

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

Secretary Nguyen called for a voice vote on Items 5(d).

Commissioner Mondejar – yes

Commissioner Singh – yes

Chair Rosales – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY 3 COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 63-2014, AUTHORIZING AN AMENDED AND RESTATED LOAN AGREEMENT WITH MISSION BAY BLOCK 7 HOUSING PARTNERS, LP, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP (CONSISTING OF THE RELATED COMPANIES OF CALIFORNIA, LLC, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, AND CHINATOWN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CENTER, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION), FOR A TOTAL AGGREGATE LOAN AMOUNT OF \$16,975,000, FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 200 UNIT LOW-INCOME AFFORDABLE FAMILY RENTAL HOUSING (INCLUDING TWO MANAGER'S UNITS) DEVELOPMENT AT 588 MISSION BAY BOULEVARD NORTH (BLOCK 7 WEST), AND ADOPTING FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

- e) Authorizing a preference in Successor Agency affordable housing to Displaced Tenants who have received Ellis Act Housing Preference Certificates from the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development to the extent that the preference is consistent with the Successor Agency's enforceable obligations, Redevelopment Plans, and applicable law. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 64-2014)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Jeff White, Housing Program Manager; Maria Benjamin, MOHCD

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speaker: Ace Washington, community activist

Mr. Washington expressed concern about the changes in the make-up of City agencies and the fact that there were some people that were holding dual positions within the City. He endorsed involvement of the community in all projects.

Commissioner Singh stated that he thought it was a very good program and inquired how long it would take to house all the people mentioned in the presentation; inquired about whether there was something they could do about landlords selling their rent-control property in order to be able to evict the current tenants.

Ms. Benjamin responded that she was not sure they would ever all be housed. She explained that, unlike the Certificate of Preference program, in the Ellis Act Housing Preference program (EAHP) participants could only use their certificate one time. Ms. Benjamin stated that they had housed 10 families so far. She explained that since 2012, some of these people had become homeless or were living with relatives and that many were seniors. She stated that at first there was a large pool of people to house because the program allowed Ellis Act evictees from January 1, 2012. Some of these people had resources themselves and would not apply for the certificate because they would be able to handle housing on their own. Ms. Benjamin stated that as long as they kept the units coming, they could continue placing these families in units. Like Certificate of Preference holders, she added, many of these people could not afford the inclusionary housing, because inclusionary housing was geared toward a higher income than they had, so they would rather wait for 100% affordable housing or housing based on 30% of their income instead of paying a set rent. She added that these people would face many of the same problems the Certificate of Preference holders were currently facing. Ms. Benjamin responded that there was some legislation proposed to fight the landlord eviction problem but that nothing had been resolved.

Chair Rosales requested more clarification dealing with the target population or long-term tenants and inquired whether they had a base number for all possible Ellis Act victims; inquired whether the information about the displaced tenants came from the Rent Board or how did anyone know who to reach out to; inquired as to whether the evictions were in multiple languages; inquired as to whether part of the outreach was connected to community-based organizations (CBO).

Ms. Benjamin responded that they did not have a target base because these were privately-owned buildings and the Rent Board did not keep data on the tenants themselves, but rather how much rent was being charged. She explained that the Rent Board received the names of the tenant when the landlord filed the notice of intent to withdraw the unit from the Rent Board. Ms. Benjamin added that sometimes tenants had been there for so long that there were different and additional tenants living in the unit other than the name on the lease. She explained that if those people

could prove that they had been in the unit for a certain amount of time with a disability or an illness, with documentation to prove that they had actually been living there for the past ten years, then they would be provided with a certificate. Ms. Benjamin responded that it was required by the ordinance that when the landlord filed a notice of intent to withdraw the unit, they had to send their tenants information about EAHP. Ms. Benjamin responded that it was required that the notices be in multiple languages and added that the MOHCD and the Rent Board did provide multiple language services. She responded that they were closely connected to the tenant advocacy and legal service provider CBO's and that, in fact, they had used their expertise in creating the procedures and policies for the EAHP program. She added that all of the tenant and housing counseling organizations and legal service providers were aware of the ordinance and were sending people to them all the time. Ms. Benjamin introduced Vanessa Doyle as the EAHP program coordinator, who would be working with evicted tenants in the process.

Commissioner Mondejar requested clarification on the statement that this program would not apply to new housing; she pointed out that out of 800, they had issued only 82 certificates and inquired about what exactly the outreach process was, other than using CBO's.

Ms. Benjamin responded that EAHP only applied to 20% of new housing units, so that 20% of new housing units would be set aside for it. For example, if there was a building with 100 affordable units and there were 100 Certificate of Preference holders, all of those units would go to the Certificate of Preference holders, because they would always have first priority. However, if there were 100 units, of which 20 units had been set aside for EAHP and 40 Ellis Act people applied, a lottery would be held, those 20 units would be filled and the rest of the applicants would have to go back into the general population lottery and take their chances there. If none of the Certificate of Preference holders qualified, then they would go directly to the EAHP holders to fill those units. Ms. Benjamin responded that the most critical outreach opportunity would happen when tenants received their eviction notice and were also given the information about EAHP. She added that Ellis Act evictions were not 30-day evictions, so that tenants had more time to go through the process. She deferred to Ms. Doyle for the average amount of time that tenants had to move out and/or enter the lotteries after receiving the eviction notice.

Ms. Doyle responded that they had four months and if they were seniors or had a disability, they had one year.

Commissioner Mondejar requested clarification that EAHP holders would also have to meet eligibility requirements for these units; inquired as to whether they would be able to apply again if they did not qualify; inquired as to whether the number of applicants for the EAHP program would increase.

Ms. Benjamin responded that, just like a Certificate of Preference holders, EAHP holders would have to meet the eligibility requirements for these units. To the question about applying again, she responded in the affirmative and stated that they could apply again and be part of a pool until they used that certificate, which they could use only once for rental or purchase. She added that this would also apply for the down-payment assistance program, so if they wanted to purchase a market-rate home, they would be given priority for the program's down-payment assistance funds. Ms. Benjamin responded that she thought the 82 applicants would be the biggest push because there were so many people waiting for this program to launch in April 2014. She explained that they had gone back to January 1, 2012 to find tenants who had been evicted and had a waiting list of 40 people who were waiting for the program to launch so they could sign up. Ms. Benjamin added that the number of applications was already beginning to slow down, perhaps to 10/month.

Chair Rosales inquired about whether the number 82 (EAHP applicants) referred to individuals or households.

Ms. Benjamin responded that the 82 referred to individual certificates but each certificate could represent individuals or families and stated that they could find out the exact number for each certificate holder's household.

Ms. Rosales raised another issue, indicated in the attachment from the Planning Department on page 5, which stated that of November 5, 2013, MOHCD had conducted 7 lotteries in 2013, including 3 rental and 4 ownership lotteries, with 3,048 applicants, among which only 17 had been Certificate of Preference holders, all for rental units. She inquired about the 700 active Certificate of Preference holders that Ms. Benjamin had mentioned in her presentation and compared it to the 17 Certificate of Preference holders mentioned in the document and asked why so few Certificate of Preference holders were actually participating and whether this meant that the EAHP holders were trumping the Certificate of Preference holders.

Ms. Benjamin assured Chair Rosales that the EAHP program would not trump the Certificate of Preference program. She explained that there were various reasons why Certificate of Preference holders would not apply for property or qualify for some of the properties. One had to do with not meeting the developer's eligibility criteria, and another reason was choice, in that Certificate of Preference holders did not want to apply for some of the inclusionary opportunities that were available. She explained that currently they had different buckets of affordable housing, such as inclusionary housing, non-profit, developer-driven housing, 100% affordable housing, and each had their own set of eligibility requirements. They were discovering that their applicants often met the income requirement for 100% affordable units (30% of their income used for rent and a sustainable amount of rent); however, often the eligibility requirements were tougher in those buildings than they were in an inclusionary housing building. Ms. Benjamin indicated that she had no data to back this up but added that they were working on addressing this issue so that the eligibility requirements were more consistent across all affordable housing.

Chair Rosales again pointed out the low turnout for recent lotteries: 17 households out of 700 Certificate of Preference holders and inquired about whether this low level of participation could be attributed to fatigue and if Certificate of Preference holders were wondering whether to bother with this at all.

Ms. Benjamin responded that this was a possibility but for others it was more about waiting for the right opportunity and for the right neighborhood. She added that this was a pretty much guaranteed thing for Certificate of Preference holders.

Commissioner Mondejar countered, however, that Certificate of Preference holders still have to qualify and that they have to keep on qualifying all the time.

Chair Rosales responded that this was where the marketing and outreach and preparation came into play and if people were prequalified and ready when the opportunity arose, the preference program would work better.

Ms. Benjamin responded that they had issued 38 new certificates this year, which spoke to the continued success of the program. She stressed that candidates were excited when they applied. However, she concurred that they needed to work on more consistent eligibility requirements and marketing strategies across the different levels of affordable housing. Ms. Benjamin agreed that

working with development partners to start marketing earlier and in phases would also improve the program. The first phase would be to get the word out and then start working with CBO's to help people prepare so that within the next 12-18 months they would be able to take advantage of the opportunities when they came up.

Chair Rosales inquired about the recommendation regarding a 3-year review of the program and stated that she preferred a shorter review period for more regular reporting to be able to resolve problems as they arose.

Ms. Benjamin responded that they planned to do an annual review before the Board to report and then do a program evaluation after 3 years.

Chair Rosales clarified that this meant an annual report but a review of the entire program every three years and concurred that there would be a potential sunset at the end of three years.

Commissioner Singh inquired about what the plan was if after three years there were still too many evictions.

Ms. Benjamin responded that they would continue to issue EAHP certificates and she was hopeful that there would be some legislative fix on the state level that would address the eviction problem by that time.

Executive Director Bohee clarified that the resolution's resolved clause could be amended to include an annual report in addition to the three-year review whether to extend, modify or cancel the EAHP program. She clarified that a Commissioner needed to propose a motion to make the amendment.

Chair Rosales moved to make the modification to the last resolve clause to read that the "OCII shall review the application of the EAHP under this resolution within 3 years of its adoption, after an annual staff report, to decide whether to extend, modify or cancel the EAHP".

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

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

Commissioner Mondejar – yes

Commissioner Singh – yes

Chair Rosales – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY 3 COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 64-2014, AUTHORIZING A PREFERENCE IN SUCCESSOR AGENCY AFFORDABLE HOUSING TO DISPLACED TENANTS WHO HAVE RECEIVED ELLIS ACT HOUSING PREFERENCE CERTIFICATES FROM THE MAYOR'S OFFICE OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TO THE EXTENT THAT THE PREFERENCE IS CONSISTENT WITH THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY'S ENFORCEABLE OBLIGATIONS, REDEVELOPMENT PLANS, AND APPLICABLE LAW, BE ADOPTED.

6. Public Comment on Non-agenda Items

Speaker: Ace Washington, community activist

Mr. Washington inquired as to whether the Mayor planned to appoint more Commissioners to the OCII and if so, suggested that he appoint a community member to sit on the OCII. He also inquired about Senate Bill 1404 regarding the housing issues and whether that would be included on a future agenda. He requested a hearing be held about this issue in the community. Mr. Washington also asked that the OCII hold one of the future meetings in the Western Addition and suggested Yoshi's lobby for the meeting place.

7. Report of the Chair

Chair Rosales stated that she had no report but announced that she had been asked by the Mayor to distribute the Mayor's Policy on Commissioner Attendance to each Commissioner. She explained that the policy extended to all City agencies in setting consistent attendance for agency meetings for fiscal year 2014-2015.

8. Report of the Executive Director

- a. Informational Memorandum on the University of California, San Francisco's (UCSF) Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) for the UCSF Mission Bay campus; Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area.

Executive Director Bohee stated that both memos were posted on the website. As an update, she explained that in 2013, Lori Yamaguchi, Associate Vice Chair for Campus Planning at UCSF had presented their long-range development plan for Mission Bay in order to set forth the planning and development of their campuses for the next 15-20 years. Ms. Bohee informed that UCSF has developed about 82% of its campus to date but still has developable land. She stated that UCSF has significant properties in Mission Bay, with acquisitions of blocks 33 & 34, Family House, and other parcels, and as part of their long-range development plan, this was an opportunity for the public and other interested entities to have a say in their growth plans. Ms. Bohee indicated that UCSF was still in need of more space for research uses as well as for additional housing units. She stated that UCSF was available to come back for another presentation if needed and that they were currently presenting their long-term develop plan before the City Planning Commission.

- b. Informational Memorandum on the results of the initial phase of the selection process for evaluating the proposals submitted in response to the Transbay Block 5 Request for Proposals; Transbay Redevelopment Project Area.

Executive Director Bohee explained that since the OCII had approved and authorized the issuance of the Transbay Block 5 RFP for office, they had received 4 proposals by the end of June after the RFP was issued in April from Boston Properties, Golub, Jay Paul Company, and Kilroy Realty. Of the four, Golub had submitted the highest purchase price at \$172,500,000, with Boston Properties, Jay Paul and Kilroy following consecutively. Based on the initial recommendations from the selection panel, which included members of the City Planning Department, the Transbay CAC, the Transbay Joint Powers Authority and OCII staff, Ms. Bohee announced that they would be bringing forward an exclusive negotiations agreement with Golub in September.

Executive Director Bohee also announced that Senate Bill 1404, co-sponsored by the City and Senator Mark Leno, confirming the replacement housing obligation, had made it through the legislative process, except for consideration on the Assembly floor, which was expected to

happen in mid-August, and then would be sent to the Governor for his consideration. She explained that the Governor had until October 1 to sign or veto the bill. Ms. Bohee added that implementation of those funds would be a policy matter that would come back before the OCII, so this decision was significant for the Commission.

Chair Rosales inquired about whether they had a lobbying firm and inquired about how the Commission lobbied at the state capital.

Executive Director Bohee responded that the City used the firm, Shaw Yodder Antwih, Inc., for its lobbying efforts and added that since this was a City-sponsored bill, which would greatly affect the OCII, the Commission could make use of that firm to advance its goals and objectives in Sacramento.

9. Commissioners' Questions and Matters

Commissioner Mondejar inquired about a memo from Secretary Nguyen.


Executive Director Bohee responded that it was correspondence from Dennis G. MacKenzie of Round the Diamond regarding a proposal for the Warriors project.

10. Closed Session – None

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Rosales at 3:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Lucinda Nguyen, Interim Commission Secretary