

**Implementation Committee Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, April 19, 2018 5:30 PM – 7:30 PM**  
**Shipyard Office, 451 Galvez Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94124**

Attendees: Marian Currell (IC Chair, SFLC), Pastor Robert Cowan (FIA), Roberta Achtenberg (MD), Dr. Veronica Hunnicutt (CAC), Ed Donaldson (ACCE), Magaly Fernandez (SFLC), Alise Vincent (FIA), La Shon A. Walker (MD), Angelo King (PAC)

Guests: Tom Ryan (SFLC)

Staff: David Kim (TSFF)

The Chair called the meeting to order at 5:34 PM

**REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MARCH 2018 IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

The Chair asked everyone to provide their introductions. The Chair asked the Implementation Committee (IC) Representatives.

**Motion by FIA:** to approve the March 2018 Implementation Committee General Meeting Minutes with amendments.

**The motion was seconded by CAC.**

**In favor:** MD, FIA, CAC, SFLC

**Oppose:** none

**Abstain:** ACCE

**The motion passes; the March 2018 Implementation Committee General Meeting Minutes are approved.**

**SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS**

**WORKFORCE SUBCOMMITTEE**

The Workforce Subcommittee is on Tuesday, April 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2018 from 6:00 PM – 8:00 PM at Evans Campus City College of San Francisco to discuss about the Career Advancement Program grantees. The Subcommittee was interested in understanding job barriers, graduation rates, placements in order to assess their grantees. The Subcommittee is placing importance on how it can support the grantees in the future. Based upon their discussion, they were charged to provide recommendations and whether to propose another round of funding for any of the Career Advancement Program grantees. The Workforce Development Fund has around \$460,000 remaining. The Subcommittee Chair solicited written recommendations to support regranting the Career Advancement Program grantees, make grant amount modifications.

The Ed Fund received a list of District 10 union workers and were able to conduct outreach. However, they mentioned they faced issues in recruitment and communication, as not all of the list of participants were from District 10. The Subcommittee was interested in providing additional funds for the Ed Fund to conduct strategic outreach and communications. A lot of the placements that the Ed Fund stated were

brought through Jewish Vocational Services, and around 4 to 5 were from District 10. The Subcommittee wants District 10 to take advantage of this opportunity and are hoping to complete this by May.

The Workforce Collaborative (TWC) is interested in bringing a ship to Bayview, restoring it, and preserving it as an art collection. The Subcommittee is looking at this opportunity to bring stability to their programming and support a long-term effort dedicated for District 10 residents to become an institution. Master Developer stated that the Anchor Program showed the most immediate opportunity and was interested in hiring an individual to help support the participants who were not able to gain meaningful employment. Master Developer wants to ensure good follow up with these participants as the grants are about to be fully spent. The Subcommittee Chair added that TWC is interested in recruiting another cohort of 5 referred by the police community group. Faith In Action mentioned that there will be meeting for next Tuesday at Evans Campus to bring closure in discussing with Terri the next set of grants. Master Developer inquired whether the Subcommittee will be finalizing the recommendation that will come back to the Implementation Committee. The San Francisco Foundation responded that there needs to be majority consent to authorize the funds.

Faith in Action suggested that TWC conduct a survey of applicants close to graduation so that they could have worked on barrier removal issues beforehand. Faith in Action recommended hiring an individual that can assist with barrier removal, case management, and job placement. FIA is interested in conducting a survey to see what issues participants are facing and how do they help their course to remove their barriers to become maritime workers. The Subcommittee Chair had discussions with the TWC's Executive Director and shared that although the participant completed training and certifications, they started to realize the problems and modified their curriculum accordingly. TWC will be working with certification, collecting documentation, and overcoming barriers before proceeding with training. Since it is run by a small group of folks, the Subcommittee Chair is recommending providing funds to have another staff that can help with addressing personal challenges and barriers. The Subcommittee will convene on Tuesday, April 24<sup>th</sup> to finalize their recommendations to bring to the Implementation Committee for a vote and discussion.

## **HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE**

The Housing Subcommittee met on April 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018 from 5:30 PM – 7:30 PM at the Shipyard Office. The Subcommittee has committed to work on the following: 1. Receiving an updated landscape report by the Housing Consultant to receive a snapshot of the current housing market; 2. Opening up the process for the use of 1676 Newcomb Avenue and look at others uses of the building – workforce development, education, co-op grocery store. The Subcommittee discussed the importance of selecting an organization that is sustainable and consider creating partnerships between Bayview nonprofit and larger stable nonprofits when it comes to programming, as a lot of nonprofits are experiencing difficulties and hardships. With District 10 Benefits, Inc., 1676 Newcomb Avenue can be transferred back to the nonprofit and they can discuss furthermore. The Subcommittee spent the rest of the meeting discussing around the impact they wanted to see from their grantmaking, leverage funds, and impacts seen with spending funds in the police station. FIA inquired when the Housing Consultant can be completed with his report. The Subcommittee Chair responded that the Consultant is looking into the previous Housing Consultant report and making updates. Master Developer inquired whether the building is insured. The Subcommittee is responded yes. SFLC stated that Bayview Senior Services should be kept in the loop about the potential uses of the building and that there will be no guarantee that the

organization will be staying. The Subcommittee discussed about how it took two years with the plan and it was not robust enough. There were discussions in regards to whether Bayview Senior Services can partner with a larger organization that can facilitate. The Subcommittee wants to open this opportunity to understand the landscape better. The Subcommittee is looking into a co-op for 5030 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, San Francisco, CA 94117.

#### **FIVE POINT/MASTER DEVELOPER UPDATE REGARDING COMMUNITY BENEFITS**

MD provided a synopsis of community benefits for Hunter's Point Shipyard and Candlestick Point to date. The presentation outlined Phase I and Phase II development agreements, but for this portion of the conversation the focus will be on Phase II. Phase I programs are listed and those that have asterisks will be carrying over to Phase II. These include payments to The San Francisco Foundation, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, current active programs, community benefits program for Hunter's Point Shipyard and Candlestick Point (programs that they manage through nonprofits in community), OCII as part of obligations, the Core Community Benefits obligation funded through the Implementation Committee.

Highlights of active programs included Community Benefits Fund (which includes IC) and the Legacy Foundation/Fund (during Phase I, there was a \$1 million payment, disbursement was overseen by those members, and the first one will be \$25,000 for Hacker Hub program on 3<sup>rd</sup> Street administered by Urban Ed Academy. Part of Phase I obligations included first-time homebuyer education partnerships through SFHDC workshops since 2005 on a quarterly basis. MD has also made significant investments to community outreach for the first-time homebuyer program.

FIA asked for greater detail in regards to the outreach. MD responded that MD has been conducted these meetings quarterly since 2005, and over 1400 people were educated with these workshops. FIA further inquired what the results of the homebuyer program were since there was no housing in 2005. FIA was interested in understanding the population demographic of the first-time homebuyers. MD responded that on April 24<sup>th</sup>, they held a special focus group at SFHDC to go back in January 2014 where they had 314 individuals attending workshops. Those individuals will have a conversation with Five Point and SFHDC to find out their application status, updates on outreach, and continue the conversation. MD further explained that during 2008 to 2012, there was no work in District 10 due to the economic downturn. The project began in 2005 and to do date, minorities with job opportunities were 57%. MD inquired whether the 8600 jobs still exist. MD responded that it is both yes and no and depends on the scope of work. Every subcontractors have their individual scope of work, once that is completed – their work on the project is completed. MD was able to create 8600 individual jobs and this data was gathered by the city.

In references to the job training listed in the presentation, it is not related to the Implementation Committee Grants. The DDA does not allow leeway during economic downturns and won't account for real ups and downs in the business – meaning even if there is no revenue, MD is obligated to provide funds. First cohort in the math academies is sitting now, and they are look into have three cohorts with a total grant amount of \$385,000 for Young Community Developers for a 12 week session, half day, paid stipend and lunch to provide math skills necessary needed in entry-level labor union jobs for people with a high school diploma or GED. This program will be useful to the participants and the labor force, as labor union demographic is aging.

MD also partnered with the Garden Project (San Francisco jail in San Bruno) to support a program for men on parole and youth from Bayview. It will be a summer program and youth will be tasked to work at the garden year round at a 145 acre garden to grow vegetables, expand to contract with San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, propagate plants and flowers around developments, and give food and resources grown in the garden back to the Bayview community.

Implementation Committee is also part of the community benefits obligation. They also provided a \$500,000 grant for special projects such as providing school uniforms for young women who live in the District (Immaculate Conception Academy). MD has interest in conducting barrier removal programs such as paperwork, certification, etc.. MD contributed \$200,000 to YCD for this barrier removal program which will become a circular service – the funds used for barrier removal will go back to the community especially those are in need. This in conjunction to partnerships with Neighborhood Access Points from the city, as several of them are in Bayview. District 10 residents can access these services to find workforce opportunities. For example, a participant can get barrier removal funds from YCD – which was contributed by MD. Nonprofits and community organizations are able to use these funds however they would like to choose, if it used to mitigate barriers.

MD also provided \$1.2 million in funding to partner with Office of Immigrant Affairs with Omega's Boys Club to train youth to be community ambassadors in various districts to engage in conflict resolution. This is considering racial tensions happening in Bayview, and how to strengthen relationships between Black and Asian communities.

CAC stated its support for MD's engagement with the community and how their focus populations were for Black and LatinX. CAC further mentioned the importance of education and providing barrier removal efforts to help District 10 residents. MD agreed with additional funding needed for this work and has been working hard internally to better address community empowerment and development. MD stated also the maintenance of relationships with various developers, city agencies, and funders in coordinating this work.

ACCE inquired about the housing and development status of Candlestick Point and its relationship to additional funds arriving to the IC funds. MD stated that the obligation remains, and the attorneys are negotiating on a payment schedule. SFLC inquired whether if MD were able to coordinate a tour before any construction started to see a status update as there were a lot of incredible developments and forward movement regarding this work.

CAC stated that if the Implementation Committee is interested in learning more about housing, CAC has a Housing Subcommittee that conducts regularly discussing about various projects piece to piece. CAC recommended that the representatives be attending Housing Subcommittee Meetings and Environmental & Reuse meetings. CAC further stated that the Committee is doing its best and will not allow building and construction to happen on environmentally unsafe lands. MD can provide additional updates but will need a heads up to gather information accordingly – this presentation's focus was on the community benefits programs, CAC, and OCII.

The IC Chair requested if MD could provide another update on housing and development at the Shipyard. MD would like to coordinate a tour and stated that these presentations can be done on a big picture level rather than a quarterly basis – as MD has been engaged on a lot of community development work regardless of community benefits obligation. MD recommended that the IC has

rooms to do things that are creative and to move forward with that work as the funds overseen by OCII and DDA have strict obligations. By going for innovative projects, MD can use those results to go after public funds that always wants results. MD emphasized the importance of CBA funds to be additive and not duplicative.

**SELECTION OF 7<sup>TH</sup> COMMUNITY MEMBER – ACTION ITEM**

The Nominations Committee provided their recommendation for the 7<sup>th</sup> Community Member. They have selected Kimberley Hill-Brown and provided their explanation and candidate recommendation memo for review. SFLC responded that they were not able to propose someone, but they did appreciate Bruce Huie for bringing a different perspective by being from Potrero.

Motion by FIA: to accept the Nominations Committee recommendation and select Kimberley Hill-Brown as the 7<sup>th</sup> Community Member.

The motion was seconded by ACCE.

In favor: ACCE, CAC, FIA, MD, PAC

Abstain: SFLC

Oppose: none

The motion passes; the Implementation Committee accepts the Nominations Committee's recommendation and selects Kimberley Hill-Brown as their 7<sup>th</sup> Community Member.

**IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE COMMUNITY RESPONSIVE GRANTMAKING:**

PAC requested a document that can provide a synopsis of the grantmaking program. The Program Coordinator was planning to speak with the Senior Director of the Anchoring Communities about the full implementation from the grantmaking program. Without this concise document for a discussion, the Implementation Committee is not ready for a conversation. MD believes that The San Francisco Foundation has enough information to review and execute this work. ACCE recall that TSFF was going to provide a structure for a grantmaking program on a rolling basis for real estate acquisition work due to the nature of having to be flexible. FIA responded that from last Implementation Committee's meeting, the Subcommittee will conduct the due diligence to identify their grantmaking needs. The rolling program is dedicated for real estate acquisition, and the Subcommittee must decide in how much they want to contribute to that outside of this community responsive grantmaking program. The Workforce and Housing Subcommittee will need to resolve those outside of this grantmaking program. CAC inquired whether the IC can receive solicitations and bring it to various committees. PAC stated that the Implementation Committee needs to budget their grantmaking on an annual basis as there are real estate opportunities that the IC can focus on but wanting to be mindful of their real estate-related spending. FIA believes that TSFF received enough feedback to generate a memo that can outline the grantmaking program.

CAC stated the need to have a conversation around District 10 Benefits, Inc. and their relationship with the nonprofit. This has implications for what allocations and responsibilities look like for different entities. FIA recommended that since the IC has a brief discussion about the nonprofit, the IC needs to spend a solid portion of their time to have a discussion and look for an attorney. Once an attorney is

identified, this could help the Implementation Committee parse out the relationship between the IC and nonprofit. FIA is interested in understanding the relationship and then answer remaining questions. After understanding, completing the application to the IRS is easier. Difficulty is understanding the relationship as TSFF can do the drafting. CAC is requesting whether the IC needs a facilitator and whether TSFF can bring Adele along with Thor and Terri. Master Developer responded that they are not opposed to it with Adele's expertise in facilitation. However, MD believes that the IC needs to talk about this amongst themselves to become a stronger entity, furthermore as this work requires specific expertise with legal matters – they need to identify a legal counsel to have discussion. PAC requested for a scoring sheet for community responsive grantmaking. The San Francisco Foundation will send an updated version regarding the community responsive grantmaking and identify appropriate legal counsel for the discussion.

**UPDATES REGARDING SAN FRANCISCO HOUSING DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION'S (SFHDC'S) ACQUISITION OF 5030 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, San Francisco, CA 94124.**

San Francisco Housing Development Corporation (SFHDC) provided an update regarding their acquisition of 5030 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, San Francisco. To respond to Master Developer's inquiry:

- 5030 3<sup>rd</sup> Street is still in contract. SFHDC is currently identifying a source of revenue to cover the remaining rehab costs that is in scope. SFHDC does not have enough sources of revenue – the city maxed out their subsidy, first lender maxed out theirs based on rent. SFHDC needs \$175,000 to rehab all the units.
- SFHDC received funding from the Implementation Committee
- The financial contingencies were moved in December.

PAC inquired whether SFHDC brought these budgetary concerns when they first reached out to the Implementation Committee. SFHDC responded that it's a new development. MD inquired whether the RFP for HUD funding came out this month as planned and whether SFHDC applied for it. SFHDC responded that the HUD grant was released last year, and it was meant for properties along the corridor that needed capital improvements towards commercial space and was tied towards employment. If the organization hired a person from the community, the organization is eligible to receive up to \$15,000 per person – so able to have \$150,000. SFHDC was not able to apply as they did not have site control, but they have been in touch with HUD and are aware of another grant opportunity in April or May.

ACCE asked whether there will be a need for site control for the second round of RFPs. SFHDC responded that it most likely will be but depends on the timing of the application – if SFHDC is able to close before the grant is due. SFHDC was not able to conduct any repairs regarding electrical, upgrades, and plumbing as it is tied to the rehab money.

SFHDC is in discussion with Supervisor Malia Cohen and MOWD to offset some of the cost. SFHDC is considering putting some equity to close the building. PAC inquired what the nature of the \$175,000 need is. SFHDC stated that it'll cost \$150,000 for rehab as the electrical panels and meters are in the basement underneath the sidewalk. Since the sidewalk is in deterioration, rebar that is rusting, concrete crumbling, the entire sidewalk needs to be replaced with beams supported underneath. PAC inquired why this prevents SFHDC from closing and whether this is the owner's responsibility until SFHDC has the property. SFHDC hoped that it will be the owner's responsibility, but this is SFHDC's responsibility if they are using the city's funds and the city wants to know ahead of time that they have funding. In terms of

the gap, conversation with Malia Cohen MOWD, offset some of the cost of some scope – doing a combination of things to get funding, SFHDC will put in some equity as well to close the building.

SFHDC also encountered a seismic issue as they originally contracted a structural engineer to complete a report. SFHDC is aware that in 2023, there will be another ordinance that owners of 3 units or more (2 stories) will have to undergo another mandatory seismic retrofitting program. SFHDC was worried that 5030 3<sup>rd</sup> Street may not meet the requirements. The city was interested in learning whether SFHDC needed to do this work later, estimates, and financing structure. SFHDC went back to the engineer and reviewed the property and found that the walls were made of concrete and steel throughout the building and it is built to meet the current and future codes. PAC mentioned the importance of addressing the issue of site control, as a measure of site control can give opportunity for folks to purchase opportunity, which requires additional funding opportunities. The work will not be completed without funding and there should be discussion around placing funds around site control.

ACCE stated that from OEWD's and Supervisor Cohen's feedback there were interest in supporting SFHDC but won't know their allocation till June 1<sup>st</sup> during the budget cycle through participatory budget processes. SFHDC stated that the next time they look at a property to purchase to stabilize families, they would like to come to the IC first for acquisition. The site control, full proposals, financials will be quicker than the Mayor's office – SFHDC can go later for permanent financing to pay back the funds (a very similar version of the accelerator fund). ACCE stated that with the IC providing funds, the site could be opened for a co-op market. SFHDC responded that to an update in leasing the commercial space – Craftsmen & Wolves are taking steps back to look at things internally as a small business and were not interested to lease that space. SFHDC has built 24 months of vacancy and needs to produce \$6,000/month afterwards to pay first mortgage. Given the two-year buffer, SFHDC is also required to install a new bathroom as the new owner. SFHDC will also aggressively market the commercial space and are interested in providing the space for a light-weight gym, aerobics, and body mechanics. SFHDC will return back to the Implementation Committee to provide additional updates.

#### **IC GRANTMAKING PROCESS DISCUSSION: IC COMMUNITY RESPONSIVE GRANTS**

The San Francisco Foundation provided a presentation regarding the Implementation Community Responsive Grants. TSFF provided updates towards the guidelines, process/timeline, review, and the application template and made sure to address comments from the Implementation Committee regarding an easier application template and to address Implementation Committee's capacity needs.

PAC recommended that a rolling process would not be necessary, as the IC needs greater time to review the proposals. PAC recommended that they address with a couple cycles.

CAC brought up the concern that organizations and leaders will be either a nonprofit or fiscally sponsored project. CAC brought up two suggestions: one is to reach out to groups that need fiscal sponsorship and identify partners to work with them; second is to host grantmaking/grant writing workshops to help folks how to prepare for grants. CAC would like the community to be more involved and understand how the process works.

SFLC recommended that the applications and proposals should go into Housing and Workforce Subcommittees first, before sharing with the full Implementation Committee.

FIA inquired who will take upon this responsibility – whether it would be the IC or the nonprofit, and how much money would be allocated. The San Francisco Foundation stated that the IC will be giving out grants, and TSFF as a technical assistance provider will support the process.

FIA responded to SFLC stating that all IC representatives should collectively receive the applications as they had concerns that some of the proposals were brought to the Workforce Subcommittee, but they were not brought to the full Implementation Committee. Furthermore, FIA stated an interest in slating time to look at the proposals without interfering with their work.

PAC responded that the IC nonprofit's purpose is to hold real property. PAC further responded to SFLC that the proposals should be sent out to all the IC representatives via Basecamp, and if IC representatives are interested and want to advocate for certain projects – they could read and decide it.

CAC inquired what the process of TSFF recommendations and delegating proposals to Subcommittees would take. TSFF stated that they will update the presentation to include the points mentioned above and will work with Housing or Workforce IC Chairs and Consultants to foster proposal discussions during the Subcommittee Meetings. FIA stated a correction that needs to be made for the geography served to change Sunnydale into Vistacion Valley.

MD inquired whether an amount has been decided to allocate for a community responsive grant program. MD wanted to ensure that the community responsive grant program should be consistent with the goals of the Implementation Committee. MD wanted the Implementation Committee to be careful about funding allocation as the IC has limited resources and they want to make sure they are able to lead and drive opportunities within District 10. MD recommended allocating \$200,000 a year to responsive funding and provide grants up to \$25,000 that will be responsive towards emerging needs for community groups.

SFLC inquired whether the number of cycles has been discussed. PAC recommended that since the process will take 3 months, that the IC chooses to practice at most two cycles and at least one cycle. FIA inquired whether there is an organization or index where there is notice of things that are not being funded to identify gaps in funding. SFLC responded that the Workforce Consultant provided this information. FIA further stated that to address MD's perspective on the high numbers of applications, during every cycle the IC puts out areas that the IC is looking at – especially around gaps. FIA stated the importance of communicating with the Subcommittees to analyze of gaps.

SFLC inquired what sort of gaps the IC was looking into filling. FIA responded that the IC would be looking an important need that was not covered but aligns with Subcommittee priorities. SFLC further inquired where these resources and funding would come from the either of the two funds. FIA responded that the Subcommittee Chairs will have to have a conversation and dedicating funds to this cycle and set aside funds in order to make these decisions. FIA recommended that the Workforce Subcommittee sees how much they have for grant proposals and deplete half of the remaining Workforce Funds for this process.

PAC stated the importance of conducting budget planning and that if they start spending now, the IC has not carved out money specifically for different purposes. PAC recommended that prioritization of their funding allocation needs to be done. The San Francisco Foundation will investigate coordinating a consultant or a session that can accommodate grantmaking budget planning.

MD inquired what proposals were out in the community that could have been funded through Workforce or Housing funds. FIA responded that the Workforce Subcommittee has previously received proposals from Old Skool Café, and the Housing Subcommittee received information about funding work with housing and APRI. CAC further responded that there are a number of viable programs for workforce and would like a list of all workforce development activities in District 10 and bring in discussion.

SFLC recommended that the Implementation Committee takes another look at the priorities in Subcommittees and in communities.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS & PUBLIC COMMENT & NEXT MEETING – May 29<sup>th</sup>, 2018 ADJOURN**

San Francisco Housing Development Corporation is having their annual gala on May 11<sup>th</sup>, 2018 at the Cal Academy of Sciences.

Motion by PAC: to adjourn the April 2018 Implementation Committee Meeting

The motion was seconded by ACCE

Meeting adjourned at 7:37 PM.