

Housing on Public Land

Board of Supervisors
Land Use & Transportation Committee
December 7, 2020



*Mayor's Office
of Housing &
Community
Development*





Who Has Control Over Public Land?

- City and County of San Francisco
 - Non-enterprise departments, such as Real Estate Division and Public Works
 - Enterprise agencies, such as SFO, SFMTA, SFPUC, Port of SF
- San Francisco Unified School District
- City College of San Francisco
- BART
- State and Federal Agencies





City Policy Framework for Public Land

- City's Surplus Property Ordinance (2002)
- General Plan Policy (Housing Element 2014)
- Public Land for Housing Program (established 2014)
- Proposition K for Affordable Housing (voter-approved 2014)
- Proposition K for Surplus Property (voter-approved 2015)
- Zoning changes for affordable & educator housing on public land (voter-approved 2019)



Public Land - Opportunities

- Maximize provision of affordable housing in the city
- Leverage City land and resources to create more and deeper affordability
- Achieve geographic housing balance across the city
- Target housing opportunities to historically underserved populations
- Meet City's range of affordability needs
 - Extremely and very low-income, low-income, moderate-income
- Meet City's varied programmatic needs
 - Families, seniors, transition-age youth, veterans, homeless, educators



Public Land - Site Selection

- Surplus Sites – underutilized or surplus land owned by non-enterprise City departments
 - Sites without identified department purpose or public service need; tend to be small and irregular parcels
 - Few remaining developable surplus sites across the City
 - Per ordinance, sites deemed surplus are made available to MOHCD to analyze for affordable housing feasibility
- Joint Development Sites – partnerships with City enterprise agencies or non-City agencies
 - Sites may have active enterprise agency uses requiring redevelopment, relocation, or fiscal need
 - Tend to be larger, multi-acre sites



Public Land - Development Criteria

- Candidate Sites for 100% Affordable Housing
 - Infill, single building parcels – 10,000 sf minimum, 100 to 130-unit yield
 - Most cost-effective construction type – 5-story wood frame over podium
 - Tax credit financing – provides funds for 1/3 of total development cost; project must be competitive
 - Total development cost – must meet underwriting guidelines for MOHCD and other funders
 - MOHCD gap funding – availability determined according to development timeline



100% Affordable Case - 1950 Mission

- 36,590 sf parcel owned by SFUSD, transferred to MOHCD in 2013
- 157 low-income units, 40 for homeless families
- Complete October 2020
- \$105 million total development cost - MOHCD funding \$45 million
- Complex site acquisition and swap including three parcels with different owner agencies (SFUSD, State, City)





Public Land - Development Criteria

- Candidate Sites for Mixed-Income and Mixed-Use
 - Large, multi-acre sites – yield significant units, affordability requirements vary by project, City contribution may be required to meet affordability goals
 - Sites requiring new infrastructure – streets, sub-surface utilities, open space, bike/pedestrian improvements
 - Sites with active public/civic purpose – fire stations, bus yards, city facilities, schools, libraries, other institutions
 - Sites with high overall development cost – market-rate units create funding for infrastructure and affordable units in excess of affordable units funded by City
 - Enterprise agency sites where joint development may provide revenue for agency needs



Mixed-Income Case - Balboa Reservoir

- 17-acre SFPUC surface parking lot
- City RFP process selected development team
- 1,100 units, 50% affordable housing
- New streets, parks, utilities, amenities
- Project approved in August 2020; construction anticipated to begin in 2022
- City to fund 187 of 550 affordable units with ~\$45 million in MOHCD funding



Public Land - Development Process

- Inter-Agency Partnership – collaboration among City departments and land-owning agency
- Feasibility Analysis - financial proforma modeling to determine construction cost, development capacity, affordability, other fiscal constraints/needs
- Community Planning - public outreach throughout process to identify community priorities, concerns, compromises
- Developer Selection - City issues request for proposals to select a developer partner
- Program Development - housing affordability type/level, community benefit package, uses, density, amenities
- Entitlement & Implementation – Environmental review, City approvals, permits, construction, new units open

How Can We Maximize Affordable Housing?

- Increase funding for the 100% affordable pipeline
 - State funds, local voter-approved bonds, philanthropy
 - Market rate in lieu fees for affordable housing
- Reduce total development costs
 - Address factors contributing to city's high costs: approvals and permitting, state funding reform, labor and materials
- Expand developer capacity to include representation of underserved communities
- Leverage market rate development to increase overall number of affordable units

