

Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure

RESOLUTION NO. 10-2014

Adopted March 4, 2014

RESOLUTION ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND CONDITIONALLY APPROVING A COMBINED BASIC CONCEPT AND SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR AN INSTITUTIONAL BUILDING TO BE BUILT BY FAMILY HOUSE, INC. ON BLOCK 7 EAST IN MISSION BAY SOUTH TO PROVIDE TEMPORARY HOUSING FOR FAMILIES RECEIVING MEDICAL TREATMENT IN SAN FRANCISCO, PURSUANT TO THE OWNER PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT WITH FOCIL-MB, LLC; MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA

WHEREAS, On September 17, 1998, by Resolution No. 190-98, the Commission of the former Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco (“Redevelopment Agency”) approved the Redevelopment Plan for the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (“Plan”). On the same date, the Redevelopment Agency Commission adopted related documents, including Resolution No. 193-98 authorizing execution of an Owner Participation Agreement (“South OPA”) and related documents between Catellus Development Corporation, a Delaware corporation (“Catellus”), and the Redevelopment Agency. On November 2, 1998, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors (“Board of Supervisors”), by Ordinance No. 335-98, adopted the Plan. The Plan and its implementing documents, as defined in the Plan, constitute the “Plan Documents”; and,

WHEREAS, On September 17, 1998, the Redevelopment Agency Commission adopted Resolution No. 182-98 which certified the Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (“FSEIR”) as a program EIR for Mission Bay North and South pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 (Program EIR) and 15180 (Redevelopment Plan EIR). On the same date, the Redevelopment Agency Commission also adopted Resolution No. 183-98, which adopted environmental findings (and a statement of overriding considerations), in connection with the approval of the Plan and other Mission Bay project approvals (the “Mission Bay Project”). The San Francisco Planning Commission (“Planning Commission”) certified the FSEIR by Resolution No. 14696 on the same date. On October 19, 1998, the Board of Supervisors adopted Motion No. 98-132 affirming certification of the FSEIR by the Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Agency, and Resolution No. 854-98 adopting environmental findings and a statement of overriding considerations for the Mission Bay Project; and,

WHEREAS, Subsequent to certification of the FSEIR, the Redevelopment Agency and Successor Agency, as defined below, has issued several addenda to the FSEIR, as described below. The addenda do not identify any substantial new information or new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects that alter the conclusions reached in the FSEIR. Hereinafter, the Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report, including any addenda thereto, shall be collectively referred to as the “FSEIR”; and,

WHEREAS, The first addendum, dated March 21, 2000, analyzed temporary parking lots to serve the AT&T Ballpark. The second addendum, dated June 20, 2001, analyzed revisions to 7th Street bike lanes and relocation of a storm drain outfall provided for in the Mission Bay South Infrastructure Plan, a component of the South OPA. The third addendum, dated February 10, 2004, analyzed revisions to the Mission Bay South Design for Development (“Design for Development”) with respect to the maximum allowable number of towers, tower separation and requires step-backs. The fourth addendum, dated March 9, 2004, analyzed the Design for Development with respect to the permitted maximum number of parking spaces for bio-technical and similar research facilities and the Mission Bay North OPA with respect to changes to reflect a reduction in permitted commercial development and associated parking. The fifth addendum, dated October 4, 2005, analyzed the UCSF proposal to establish a Phase I 400-bed hospital in the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (“Mission Bay South”) on Blocks 36-39 and X-3. The sixth addendum, dated September 10, 2008, addressed revisions of the UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay. The seventh addendum, dated January 7, 2010, addressed the construction of a Public Safety Building on Block 8 in Mission Bay South; the eighth addendum, dated May 15, 2013, addressed the third Mission Bay South OPA amendment on Block 1 to allow residential uses in addition to a hotel. The ninth addendum, dated May 30, 2013, addressed the fourth Mission Bay South OPA amendment to allow an institutional use on Block 7 East; and,

WHEREAS, Catellus, the original master developer of the Mission Bay North and South Redevelopment Project Areas, has sold most of its remaining undeveloped land in Mission Bay to FOCIL-MB, LLC, (“FOCIL-MB”), a subsidiary of Farallon Capital Management, LLC, a large investment management firm. The sale encompassed approximately 71 acres of land in Mission Bay, and the remaining undeveloped residential parcels in Mission Bay South. FOCIL-MB assumed all of Catellus’s obligations under the South OPA and the Redevelopment Agency’s Owner Participation Agreement for Mission Bay North (collectively, the “OPAs”), as well as all responsibilities under the related public improvement agreements and land transfer agreements with the City and County of San Francisco (“City”). FOCIL-MB is bound by all terms of the OPAs and related agreements, including the requirements of the affordable housing program, equal opportunity program, and design review process; and,

WHEREAS, Under California Assembly Bill No. 1X26 (Chapter 5, Statutes of 2011-12, First Extraordinary Session) (“AB 26”) and the California Supreme Court’s decision in California Redevelopment Association v. Matosantos, No. 5194861, all redevelopment agencies in the State of California (the “State”), including the Redevelopment Agency, were dissolved by operation of law as of February 1, 2012, and their non-affordable housing assets and obligations were transferred to certain designated successor agencies; and,

WHEREAS, Under the provisions of AB 26, the City was designated as the successor agency to the Redevelopment Agency (“Successor Agency”), commonly known as the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure (“OCII”), to receive the non-affordable housing assets and obligations of the Redevelopment Agency; and,

WHEREAS, In June of 2012, the California legislature adopted Assembly Bill 1484 (“AB 1484”) amending certain provisions of AB 26, and the Governor of the State signed the bill and it became effective on June 27, 2012. Among other things, AB 1484 provided that a successor agency is a separate public entity from the public agency that provides for its governance; and,

WHEREAS, Subsequent to the adoption of AB 1484, on October 2, 2012 the Board of Supervisors of the City, acting as the legislative body of the Successor Agency,

adopted Ordinance No. 215-12 (the “Implementing Ordinance”), which Implementing Ordinance was signed by the Mayor on October 4, 2012, and which, among other matters: (a) acknowledged and confirmed that, as of the effective date of AB 1484, the Successor Agency is a separate legal entity from the City, and (b) established this Successor Agency Commission, commonly known as the Commission on Community Infrastructure and Investment (the “Commission”), and delegated to it the authority to (i) act in place of the Redevelopment Agency Commission to, among other matters, implement, modify, enforce and complete the Redevelopment Agency’s enforceable obligations, (ii) approve all contracts and actions related to the assets transferred to or retained by the Successor Agency, including, without limitation, the authority to exercise land use, development, and design approval, consistent with applicable enforceable obligations, and (iii) take any action that the Redevelopment Dissolution Law (AB 26 and AB 1484, as amended in the future) requires or authorizes on behalf of the Successor Agency and any other action that this Commission deems appropriate, consistent with the Redevelopment Dissolution Law, to comply with such obligations; and,

WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors’ delegation to the Commission includes the authority to grant approvals under specified land use controls for the Mission Bay Project consistent with the approved Plan and enforceable obligations, including design review; and,

WHEREAS, The Plan and the Plan Documents, including the Design Review and Document Approval Procedure, designated as Attachment G to the South OPA (“DRDAP”), provide that development proposals in Mission Bay South will be reviewed and processed in “Major Phases,” as defined in and consistent with the Plan and the Plan Documents. Submission of design plans and documents for any specific building (“Project”) must be consistent with the requirements established for each Major Phase, though the DRDAP allows for a Major Phase to be amended by a schematic design submittal if the overall submittal is still consistent with the Plan and Plan Documents. The DRDAP sets forth the review and approval process for Major Phases and Projects; and,

WHEREAS, On November 1, 2005 by Resolution No.178-2005, the Redevelopment Agency Commission approved the Master Developer’s Major Phase Application for Blocks 2-7 and 13 (“Major Phase”) in the Mission Bay South. The Major Phase was amended twice by the Redevelopment Commission, the first on September 18, 2007 (Resolution No. 101-2007) and the second on June 7, 2011 (Resolution No. 77-2011) to adjust the maximum unit count for the private residential parcels, once by the Oversight Board on June 11, 2012 (Resolution 7-2012) to adjust the maximum unit count for the private residential parcels, as well as once by the Commission on January 21, 2014 (Resolution No. 6-2014) to reflect approved changes to the number of units on Block 7 West and the institutional use on Block 7 East; and,

WHEREAS, On June 4, 2013 by Resolution No. 28-2013, the Commission authorized a fourth amendment to the South OPA, to allow Family House Inc. (the “Developer”) to develop a 96,000 square foot facility on Block 7 East that would include approximately 80 extended stay rooms and associated common areas and program space to support families of patients primarily receiving treatment at UCSF Mission Bay Medical Center; and,

WHEREAS, On June 10, 2013 by Resolution No. 6-2013, the Oversight Board approved the fourth amendment to the South OPA, which was also provided to the State Department of Finance (“DOF”) where it was not selected for review by the DOF and was therefore deemed approved; and,

- WHEREAS, Pursuant to the Plan and Plan Documents, including the DRDAP, the Developer submitted a Combined Basic Concept and Schematic Design application for Block 7 East (“Schematic Design”). The institutional use building consists of 80 guest rooms that share common areas, administrative and other program-supporting space, and associated parking and open space; and,
- WHEREAS, OCII staff has reviewed the Schematic Design for purposes of compliance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines; and,
- WHEREAS, The FSEIR is a program EIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15168 and a redevelopment plan EIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15180. Approval of the Schematic Design is an undertaking pursuant to and in furtherance of the Plan in conformance with CEQA Section 15180 (“Implementing Action”); and,
- WHEREAS, OCII staff, in making the necessary findings for the Implementing Action contemplated herein, considered and reviewed the FSEIR, including the ninth addendum, and has made documents related to the Implementing Action and the FSEIR files available for review by the Commission and the public, and these files are part of the record before the Commission; and,
- WHEREAS, The FSEIR findings and statement of overriding considerations adopted in accordance with CEQA by the Redevelopment Commission by Resolution No. 183-98 dated September 17, 1998, reflected the independent judgment and analysis of the Redevelopment Agency, were and remain adequate, accurate and objective and were prepared and adopted following the procedures required by CEQA, and the findings in said resolutions are incorporated herein by reference as applicable to the Implementing Action; and,
- WHEREAS, OCII staff has reviewed the Schematic Design submitted by the Developer and finds it acceptable and recommends approval thereof, subject to the resolution of certain conditions; and, now, therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, That the Commission finds and determines that the Schematic Design submission is an Implementing Action within the scope of the Project analyzed in the FSEIR and requires no additional environmental review pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15180, 15162 and 15163 for the following reasons:
1. The Implementing Action is within the scope of the Project analyzed in the FSEIR and no major revisions are required due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of significant effects previously identified in the FSEIR.
 2. No substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the Project analyzed in the FSEIR was undertaken that would require major revisions to the FSEIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects, or a substantial increase in the severity of effects identified in the FSEIR.
 3. No new information of substantial importance to the Project analyzed in the FSEIR has become available which would indicate that (a) the Implementing Action will have significant effects not discussed in the FSEIR; (b) significant environmental effects will be substantially more severe; (c) mitigation measures or alternatives found not feasible which would reduce one or more significant effects have become feasible; or (d) mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those in the FSEIR will substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment;

and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Commission has reviewed and considered the FSEIR findings and statement of overriding considerations and hereby adopts the CEQA findings set forth in Redevelopment Commission Resolution No. 183-98, which are incorporated herein, and those set forth above; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Commission approves the Combined Basic Concept and Schematic Design for the building on Block 7 East subject to the following conditions:

1. The building and landscaping materials, colors, finishes, and architectural detailing shall be subject to further review and approval by staff during the Design Development phase to ensure the richness, quality and diversity shown in the Schematic Design is achieved. Material and color samples shall be provided as part of the review. A material and color mock-up of sufficient size to be built on the construction site during an early phase of construction shall be prepared for staff review and approval to ensure consistency with this Schematic Design.
2. The design of the first floor shall be subject to further review and approval by staff during the Design Development phase to ensure that the pedestrian realm is as active and visually interesting as possible, recognizing the need for a certain level of privacy for the building users. The frontage on Mission Bay Boulevard North in front of the utility rooms will be designed to create an attractive entry courtyard, through the use of landscaping, trellises, or other features.
3. The final design of the utility rooms housing the pump station control room and emergency generator, as well as any other required space for associated equipment, shall be subject to final approval by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission staff.
4. The design of the trash and recycling areas shall be subject to further review and approval by staff during the Design Development phase to ensure that they allow for internal pick-up by the solid waste collector to avoid trash and recycling bins on-street.
5. All building signage shall be subject to further staff review and approval. A signage plan shall be prepared prior to or concurrent with Design Development documents for staff approval, pursuant to the Mission Bay South Signage Master Plan.
6. Prior to the start of any construction, the Developer and their general contractor shall meet with staff to discuss noise regulations and hours of construction operation.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting of March 4, 2014.

Natasha Jones

Commission Secretary