

Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development  
City and County of San Francisco



Edwin M. Lee  
Mayor

Olson Lee  
Director

**TEFRA Hearing Minutes: Phase II Rental Assistance Demonstration Projects**

320-330 Clementina Street  
350 Ellis Street  
1750 McAllister Street  
1760 Bush Street  
2698 California Street  
3850 18<sup>th</sup> Street  
Alemany (938 Ellsworth Street)  
John F. Kennedy Towers (2451 Sacramento Street)  
Mission Dolores (1855 15<sup>th</sup> Street)  
Ping Yuen North (838 Pacific Avenue)  
Ping Yuen (655, 711-795 and 895 Pacific Avenue)  
Rosa Parks (1251 Turk Street)  
Westbrook (40 Harbor Road)  
Westside Courts (2501 Sutter Street)

San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development  
1 South Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94103

October 30, 2015  
1:00 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.

The hearing was called to order by Adam Cray, Senior Project Manager, San Francisco Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development ("MOHCD"), at 1:00 p.m. Those in attendance included: representatives from MOHCD's developer partners, several MOHCD staff members, and twelve public housing residents from six of the phase II Rental Assistance Demonstration ("RAD") projects.

**1. Explanation of the Purpose of the Hearing**

Mr. Cray explained that the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 (TEFRA) is a federal law requiring any issuer of tax-exempt bonds to provide a reasonable opportunity for interested individuals to express their views, either orally or in writing, on the issuance of the bonds and the nature of the improvements and projects for which the

bond funds will be allocated. Thus, as the issuer of the tax-exempt bonds financing the fourteen phase II RAD projects, the City and County of San Francisco held the TEFRA hearing to provide those interested in discussing the projects the opportunity to comment and ask question.

## **2. Comments and Questions from Interested Parties**

Following the explanation of the hearing's purpose, Mr. Cray solicited comments and questions from those assembled regarding each of the phase II RAD projects. The comments and questions, which related to six of the fourteen projects, were as follows:

### **a. Ping Yuen (655, 711-795 and 895 Pacific Avenue)**

Mr. Wong and Mr. Vuong, both Ping Yuen residents, asked questions and commented about (1) the historical status of the Ping Yuen project, (2) the fact that many residents are elderly and do not want to be relocated during renovations or due to over-housing, (3) general relocation logistics, and (4) a lack of trust for RAD developers. Regarding the project's historical status, Mr. Wong requested that the RAD developers "sign off" on Ping Yuen becoming a "historical asset" due to the outcome of a civil rights law suit involving the project and asserted that, due to the project's historical status, a transfer of its ownership may not be legal. Ms. Dodge of Chinatown Community Development Center ("CCDC") acknowledged that, while not officially designated a landmark, the project is historically significant and explained CCDC will respect that significance. Ms. Ely from MOHCD then summarized the historic review process.

Regarding relocation, Ms. Dodge noted that relocating residents during construction would be necessary but that CCDC would cover all moving costs and would work diligently to minimize stress on residents. In reference to a follow-up question regarding relocation logistics, Ms. Dodge then described the relocation plan and budget and explained that a significant amount of funds have been set aside to assist with construction-related relocation. She also stated that permanent relocation due to over-housing would be discussed on a case-by-case basis and that CCDC would seek volunteers willing to downsize their units.

Following Ms. Dodge's comments, Ms. Ely identified the documents describing tenant rights under the RAD program and underscored several portfolio-wide rules regarding relocation and displacement, including the requirement that all residents be allowed to return to their project (though not necessarily their unit) following construction-related relocation.

### **b. 350 Ellis Street**

Mr. Shkolnik, a resident of 350 Ellis Street, questioned the scope and proposed footprint of the project's rehabilitation plan, particularly building additions that would lead to a loss of parking. He asserted that so much money should not be spent to renovate the building since the building had been extensively repaired in recent years following a fire.

Mr. Shkolnik also mentioned that he had tried several times to contact the project's developer, Tenderloin Neighborhood Development Center ("TNDC"), to discuss his concerns but that he had not been able to connect with representatives from TNDC who were able to address his concerns.

Mr. Cray explained the type of project costs that were reflected in the TEFRA hearing notice and referred Mr. Shkolnik's design-related questions to Mr. Lauderbach, a representative of TNDC present at the hearing. Mr. Lauderbach agreed to discuss Mr. Shkolnik's concerns immediately following the hearing.

Denise, a resident of 350 Ellis Street, expressed concerns about leaks at the project and indicated that she fully supports the rehabilitation efforts the RAD program will help facilitate. She stated that the project is "really in need of help."

**c. John F. Kennedy Towers (2451 Sacramento Street)**

Mr. Richardson, a resident of John F. Kennedy Towers, commented that the RAD program is "critically important" because it gives residents an opportunity to organize for the betterment of their homes.

**d. 320-330 Clementina Street**

Mr. Durham, a resident of Clementina Towers, and his sister Ms. Durham-Young inquired about (1) Mr. Durham's right to return to his unit following renovations, (2) whether or not Mr. Durham's rent would be increased as a result of the RAD program, (3) availability of housing vouchers for temporary relocation, (4) and bedbug abatement.

Ms. Ely of MOHCD explained that the only reasons a resident might not be able to move back into his or her unit following renovations were related to right-sizing and accessibility. That is, households that are over-housed might be asked to move to a smaller unit so that their unit can be assigned to a household that is under-housed, and households in units renovated to be accessible to disabled residents might be asked to move to make those units available to disabled residents. However, Ms. Ely underscored that, while residents might be asked to permanently leave their units for these reasons, no residents will be required to permanently leave their projects. Also, Mr. Potluri, a representative of TNDC, explained that permanent relocations within projects due to right-sizing and accessibility will be determined on a case-by-case basis and offered to speak with Mr. Durham following the meeting regarding his own situation.

Regarding rent increases, Ms. Ely noted that, for the vast majority of tenants, the formula for determining rent under the RAD program will be the same as the formula to which residents are currently subject. Thus, she explained, any rent increases residents experience are unlikely to have been a direct result of the RAD program. Ms. Ely also noted that housing vouchers will not be available for temporary relocation.

Finally, Mr. Cray and Ms. Ely explained the bedbug abatement process employed in phase I of RAD and noted that a similar process will likely be employed for phase II.

**e. Mission Dolores (1855 15th Street)**

Mr. Fong, a resident of Mission Dolores, expressed concern that the renovation budget for his building might not be sufficient to remedy all of the building's problems. He noted specific problems with the building's elevators and air handling system and stated that he was unsatisfied with recently completed renovations. Mr. Fong also expressed his concerns regarding relocation and his desire to see planters installed in the project's backyard and to be kept informed of the progress of renovations.

Ms. Ely explained the top rehabilitation priorities for all RAD projects: life safety, building envelope, and accessibility. Mr. Parillon of BRIDGE Housing Corporation further explained that the renovation of Mission Dolores would be extensive and that the minor renovations completed thus far have been to prepare some units for temporary occupancy during renovation. He also mentioned that, because there are several vacant units at the project, many residents will be relocated to units on-site during rehabilitation, rather than relocated off site. Finally, Mr. Parillon stated that residents will be informed of renovation via frequent on-site meetings.

**f. 1760 Bush Street**

Ms. McNulty, a resident of 1760 Bush Street, explained that she "supports RAD 100 percent." She also requested that building construction begin no earlier than 10:00 a.m.

*The hearing was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.*