

Daniel Lurie
MAYOR



Dr. Carolyn Ransom-Scott
CHAIR

Mark Miller
VICE-CHAIR

Mahsa Hakimi
Kent Lim
Earl Shaddix
COMMISSIONERS

Thor Kaslofsky
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE
COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HELD ON THE
7th DAY OF APRIL 2026**

The members of the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure of the City and County of San Francisco met in a regular meeting in person at 1:00 p.m. on the 7th day of April 2026.

REMOTE ACCESS:

WATCH LIVE ON SFGOVTV: <https://sfgovtv.org/ccii>

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Members of the public may provide public comment in-person at the noted location or remotely via teleconference (detailed instructions available at: <https://sfocii.org/remote-meeting-information>). Members of the public may also submit their comments by email to: commissionsecretary.ocii@sfgov.org; all comments received will be made a part of the official record.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:

DIAL: 1-415-655-0001 **ENTER ACCESS CODE:** 2661 718 4293 **PRESS # PRESS #**
again to enter the call. Press *3 to submit your request to speak.

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

1. Recognition of a Quorum

Meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by Chair Scott.

Roll call was taken.

Commissioner Hakimi – late arrival
Commissioner Lim - present
Commissioner Shaddix - present
Vice-Chair Miller - present
Chair Scott - present

Commissioner Hakimi arrived late. All other Commissioners were present.

2. Announcements

- a) The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will be held **in person** on Tuesday, April 21, 2026 at 1:00 pm at City Hall in 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 from Participants dialing in:
Please be advised that a member of the public has up to three minutes to make pertinent public comments on each agenda item unless the Commission adopts a shorter period on any item. It is recommended that members of the public who are attending the meeting in person fill out a "Speaker Card" and submit the completed card to the Commission Secretary. All dial-in participants from the public will be instructed to call a toll-free number and use their touch-tone phones to provide any public comment. Audio prompts will signal to dial-in participants when their audio input has been enabled for commenting.

PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN: 1-415-655-0001 ACCESS CODE: 2661 718 4293

Secretary Cruz read the instructions for the public to call in.

- 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 March 17, 2026

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Commissioner Shaddix motioned to move Item 5(a) and Commissioner Hakimi seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Hakimi - yes
Commissioner Lim - yes
Commissioner Shaddix - yes
Vice-Chair Miller - yes
Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FIVE COMMISSIONERS THAT APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF MARCH 17, 2026, BE ADOPTED.

REGULAR AGENDA

Agenda Item Nos. 5(b) and 5(c) related to Transbay Block 4 West were presented together but acted on separately

- b) Authorizing an Exclusive Negotiations Agreement and a Predevelopment Loan Agreement in an amount not to exceed \$5,000,000, with Transbay Block 4 West, LP, a California Limited Partnership, for the development of approximately 314 affordable rental housing units at Transbay Block 4 West; Transbay Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 07-2026)
- c) Authorizing an Infrastructure Development Agreement in an amount not to exceed \$1,000,000 in predevelopment funds with Transbay 4 Tehama LLC (an affiliate of Transbay Block 4 West, LP), a California Limited Liability Company, to design and engineer the East Tehama Street Extension adjacent to Transbay Block 4; and providing notice that this action is within the scope of the Transbay Terminal/ Caltrain Downtown Extension/ Redevelopment Project Final Environmental Impact Statement/ Environmental Impact Report, a program EIR, and is adequately described therein for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act; Transbay Redevelopment Project Area(Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 08-2026)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; Jasmine Kuo, Development Specialist, Housing Division; Sean Wils, Senior Project Manager, Mercy Housing

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Commissioner Shaddix referred to page 7 and the Execution of Ground Lease and to the 4200 sq. ft. of ground lease and inquired about whether that was one parcel of 4200 sq. ft. or whether the plan was to break that up into several parcels.

Ms. Kuo responded that the plan was envisioned as one space and to install a small grocery store, because affordable groceries were missing in this neighborhood. She reported that if they were unable to get a grocer, they planned to subdivide this space.

Executive Director Kaslofsky added that Mercy Housing was the developer of adjacent Transbay (TB) Block 2 parcel, which project was completed. He explained that they did an extensive amount of outreach about what the community needs were at that time and that space would include a family restaurant. The idea of a medium community grocery store/market had been at the top of the list for a long time. He concluded that if this was not possible, they would break it up into smaller units for others to use.

Vice-Chair Miller commended staff for the presentation and was pleased with the amount of amenities that were being provided, which was so important for the future residents there to make the spaces livable and to stay and raise their families. He was also pleased about the 314 bicycle parking spaces because there were more and more riders and pedestrians in that neighborhood.

Chair Scott referred to the elevators and inquired about what floors they intended on placing seniors and those with mobility challenges.

Ms. Kuo responded that seniors would not be restricted to certain floors and the elevators would service every floor of the building. She informed that the accessible units would be scattered throughout the building.

Chair Scott was pleased that this would be for the community as well as be cross-generational because it was a time for restoring the sense of community. She inquired about whether there was a plan for having younger residents on a certain level and seniors on another or whether they would all be mixed together.

Ms. Kuo deferred to Mr. Wils to respond.

Mr. Wils repeated that there would not be any units restricted for seniors and residents of all ages were welcome. He explained that due to Fair Housing Law, they could not restrict certain age groups to certain parts of the building and added that accessibility units would be shared and spread evenly throughout the building. Mr. Wils pointed out that when they brought potential residents in to see the units, whether through the coordinated management system or through the DAHLIA lottery system, they shared the floor plans and designs with them and provided them with options of which units they preferred. He indicated that if there were still units available, they were open to discussing resident preferences.

Chair Scott expressed concern over this issue because she felt that generations had changed from when younger people had respect for seniors. She stressed that this was a cultural difference and the younger generation today was different and expressive and she did not want them to be set up for failure. Dr. Scott suggested they hold discussions regarding cultural respect, manners and customs.

Executive Director Kaslofsky appreciated Chair Scott's advice. He stated that the task of creating community and mutual resident respect was left to the property management of Mercy Housing and the Young Community Developers (YCD) and he had confidence in their ability to provide that.

Chair Scott stated that she also had great confidence in Mercy Housing and YCD and she was pleased that they had already thought about this, because it was an ongoing concern with the older generation in dealing with the younger generation.

Commissioner Hakimi inquired about details regarding the agreement. She requested clarification that the term of the loan, which was \$5 million plus one point for the second loan, was a transition loan just to start the design and to get into the actual construction contract. Ms. Hakimi asked for confirmation that this was a 3-year period to pay back with an option of a 12-month extension to be approved by the Executive Director and that it would not come back to OCII.

Ms. Kuo responded in the affirmative.

Executive Director Kaslofsky noted that Commissioner Hakimi had implied that there might be another construction developer but clarified that these would be the only developers who would build, design and construct the building.

Commissioner Hakimi referred to section 3.3 of the loan agreement, where it stated that for the maturity of this loan, the loan would be forgiven or put into a different loan for the construction, which she assumed was the main loan. She asked for confirmation that these terms were temporary until the other contract came into existence and then that would be the obligation.

Ms. Kuo responded in the affirmative.

Executive Director Kaslofsky asked Ms. Kuo to outline the evolution of the project. He referred to the Exclusive Negotiation Agreement (ENA) and the first loan and stated that they anticipated coming back for another loan. He deferred to Ms. Kuo for more information.

Ms. Kuo responded that the item before them today was for the pre-development loan, which would cover expenditures until they got to the point of construction. Then once they had all their other financing in place, they would return to OCII for a Gap loan approval, which was the larger loan that Commissioner Hakimi was referring to, in order to build the entire project.

Commissioner Hakimi stated it was her understanding that this loan was not payable until three years with a 12-month option depending on the timeline and then at that point it would roll into the larger loan.

Ms. Kuo confirmed that statement.

Vice-Chair Miller noted that the first and principal development issue listed was the cost per square foot and cost containment. He inquired about the cost of this project in these inflationary times, because cost was already high per square foot and because it was so expensive to build affordable housing. Mr. Miller inquired about whether they had a handle on cost containment strategies.

Ms. Kuo responded that the cost per square foot was higher than comparable projects; however, she pointed out that the cost per unit was lower. In terms of cost containment strategies, she explained that they would be looking to minimize the number of floor plates to ensure that each floor could be stacked efficiently, which would bring down construction costs. She deferred to Mr. Wils for more information.

Mr. Wils responded that one of the main components of the job was how to keep costs down. He listed some the strategies they were using, such as making sure the floor plates were the same, having one exterior skin system, and exploring a variety of HVAC systems with different air pathways. He explained that they had a new set of design standards getting standardized products in bulk in a more consistent basis for better pricing and also looking into prefabricated materials. Mr. Wils highlighted that the key decision was going from two buildings to one building, which would result in a 9% reduction in cost while still maintaining the same amount of units and spaces. He confirmed that they were looking into a number of different strategies to contain costs.

Commissioner Shaddix suggested a walk-through for the Commissioners and he advocated that they do this on a weekend. He stated that he would like to hear more about the vision especially regarding the grocery store.

Executive Director Kaslofsky stated that all Commissioners were welcome to visit the site as long as no business was discussed during the visit.

Mr. Morales added that this would have to be noticed.

Executive Director Kaslofsky corrected his statement and stated that it would have to be two at a time instead and that they go in shifts, no talking. [laughing] He stated they could connect with Mercy Housing to get a walk-through of the site.

Vice-Chair Miller motioned to move Item 5(b) and Commissioner Hakimi seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Hakimi - yes

Commissioner Lim - yes
Commissioner Shaddix - yes
Vice-Chair Miller - yes
Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FIVE COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 07-2026, AUTHORIZING AN EXCLUSIVE NEGOTIATIONS AGREEMENT AND A PREDEVELOPMENT LOAN AGREEMENT IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$5,000,000, WITH TRANSBAY BLOCK 4 WEST, LP, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF APPROXIMATELY 314 AFFORDABLE RENTAL HOUSING UNITS AT TRANSBAY BLOCK 4 WEST; TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Commissioner Hakimi motioned to move Item 5(c) and Commissioner Shaddix seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Hakimi - yes
Commissioner Lim - yes
Commissioner Shaddix - yes
Vice-Chair Miller - yes
Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FIVE COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 08-2026, AUTHORIZING AN INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$1,000,000 IN PREDEVELOPMENT FUNDS WITH TRANSBAY 4 TEHAMA LLC (AN AFFILIATE OF TRANSBAY BLOCK 4 WEST, LP), A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, TO DESIGN AND ENGINEER THE EAST TEHAMA STREET EXTENSION ADJACENT TO TRANSBAY BLOCK 4; AND PROVIDING NOTICE THAT THIS ACTION IS WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE TRANSBAY TERMINAL/ CALTRAIN DOWNTOWN EXTENSION/ REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/ ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, A PROGRAM EIR, AND IS ADEQUATELY DESCRIBED THEREIN FOR PURPOSES OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

d) Workshop on the budgets and levies of special taxes and the Annual Appropriations Limits for July 1, 2026, through June 30, 2027 for Community Facilities Districts administered by the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco (Discussion)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; Mina Yu, Deputy Director of Finance and Administration; Jasmine Kuo, Development Specialist, Housing Division; Nikki Henry, Development Specialist, Mission Bay (MB) Project; Inder Grewal, Development Specialist, Hunters Point Shipyard/ Candlestick Point (HPS/CP)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Ace Washington, Western Addition (WA) resident; Randall Evans, Western Addition (WA) resident

Mr. Washington stated that he had been coming to meetings of the Redevelopment Agency and OCII for almost 40 years. He wanted to know what happened to OCII coverage of the Fillmore. He listed all the areas, streets and projects that were going on in the WA. He asked that OCII come back to the WA for help.

Mr. Evans stated that he had been listening to how OCII was splitting up the budget. He recalled that 4,700 blacks had been displaced, 2,500 Victorian homes destroyed and 800 businesses erased from the community during redevelopment and that then the area was closed out. Mr. Evans felt strongly that OCII get back to the WA and complete the projects they started, especially the Certificate of Preference (COP) project. He remarked that it was difficult to say all that needed to be said in three minutes. Mr. Evans stated that it was a shame to just leave WA and it was like the residents there did not even exist anymore. OCII needed to respond to the situation in the WA. Mr. Evans recalled that he had started talking about this when he was 18 and now he was 70, but they were still there and the WA needed help from OCII.

Vice-Chair Miller thanked the speakers for coming up for public comment. Regarding the parks in this part of OCII jurisdiction, he stated that he was amazed at how well maintained the parks were and how many amenities there were for the residents. Mr. Miller was very pleased that the Community Facilities Districts (CFD) was in place to support these expenditures.

Executive Director Kaslofsky thanked Vice-Chair Miller for his comments. He also wanted to acknowledge the City's Rec Park Department, who provided the gardeners and landscaping professionals, which had been maintaining MB for the past few years and the people of MB were very grateful for their ongoing work and this would transition to HPS as well.

Chair Scott thanked Mr. Washington for have been a voice for such a long time for the WA and thanked Mr. Evans for his participation in this discussion. She stated that she and her family had been working for decades in the City and she was very concerned about District 5 (D5). Dr. Scott relayed that she had lived in Haight-Ashbury and Lakeview and many other areas in SF and pointed out that many of these places had issues that needed to be addressed. She told the speakers that they had not been forgotten.

e) Workshop on OCII's Budget for the period July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2027 (Discussion)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; Grace Longardino, Staff Accountant IV; Nikki Henry, Development Specialist, Mission Bay (MB) Project; Laura Shifley, Development Specialist, Transbay (TB) Project; Inder Grewal, Development Specialist, Hunters Point Shipyard/Candlestick Point (HPS/CP); Elizabeth Colomello, Housing Program Manager; Nicholas Jones, Debt Manager; Monica Davis Stean, HR Administrative Services Manager

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speaker: Ace Washington, WA resident; Randall Evans WA resident

Mr. Washington stated he was pleased that he had heard the mention of Freedom West during the presentation because it was in the WA. He had been listening to discussions about all the money going to different areas in the budget and inquired about when some of that money would be going to the WA. Mr. Washington stressed that he had been coming to OCII meetings for 35 years and

expressed frustration at the lack of interest and action in the WA. He stated that he now understood that the Mayor was the person to lobby for help in the WA.

Mr. Evans stated that OCII was talking about events that took place in WA but then it was closed down and now the dollars were being spent in MB, TB and HPS. He wanted to speak for the City of SF because basically there was only one black community and the only people who would be taking care of blacks were blacks. Mr. Evans pointed out that lots of work was getting done in Hunters Point and Candlestick, but he stressed that the situation was getting dire in the WA and that area needed help. He stated that he needed more than three minutes to talk about this and he felt like he had earned that right. Mr. Evans inquired about what happened to the workshop OCII promised to connect with the WA as well. He felt they had been shut out. Mr. Evans was pleased that the Freedom West project was underway, but he expressed concern that there would be a repeat in the WA of what happened during redevelopment.

Commissioner Shaddix referred to the Candlestick budget for 2027 and noted that the budget was \$34 million for construction dollars. He inquired about whether that would exist just on paper because they would not really see construction at Candlestick in 2027.

Mr. Grewal responded and clarified that the budget for the full Phases 1 & 2 at Candlestick would be \$13.8 million, which would cover staff time, infrastructure review, and money set aside for community benefits as they worked with the Legacy Foundation to identify partners and programming. He explained that it did not include future construction at Candlestick, which would be paid for by the developer and not by OCII, and which would eventually be reimbursed through tax increment generated by property tax revenue increases.

Executive Director Kaslofsky interjected that the construction spending would occur through FivePoint and would not run through OCII except for infrastructure reimbursements, which would eventually occur. He explained that there was approximately \$110 million in the first phase of infrastructure construction planned for third quarter of 2026, which was still on track. He added that permitting was nearing completion and a final action was planned for mid-May at the Board of Supervisors. Then the first activity would be soil importation to level the area where the construction would be undertaken. Mr. Kaslofsky explained that the construction costs are not represented in this budget because it would come through as a reimbursement.

Commissioner Shaddix noted in the 2026-2027 budget summary that \$300 million would be set aside for MB, \$163 million would be set aside for TB and only \$39 million would be set aside for poor little Candlestick. He inquired about whether May would be the time they would be looking for some news.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that May was the planned schedule for the Board of Supervisors hearings and later for infrastructure construction comprised of leveling the property. He specified that on-site construction would begin in the third quarter of 2026.

Commissioner Shaddix thanked staff for all the hard work that went into the presentation.

Ms. Yu pointed out that the \$39 million in the budget summary did include the affordable housing portion in the project area also. She clarified that what Mr. Grewal presented was just the infrastructure/non-housing portion of the budget, but the summary included an additional \$20 million that would go for an affordable housing project.

Vice-Chair Miller commended staff for all the work and all the numbers in the budget. He was pleased that the Freedom West project had some funding and was pleased to see the HPS/CP teaser photos. He inquired about whether Under Ramp park would come under the auspices of Caltrans if the environmental issues surfaced there.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that there were two parties involved: the Transbay Joint Powers Authority and Caltrans. He explained that the contamination in question was on Caltrans property. He added that OCII was in partnership with the Department of Public Works (DPW), which was the lead agency helping OCII with construction management and reimbursement of the Water Board and the investigatory costs in this matter. Mr. Kaslofsky clarified that once they understood the full scope of the contamination, they would have a better idea of what the schedule would be and whether it was a feasible project based on the amount of contamination found.

Chair Scott announced that staff would be back later in April to request approval of this budget.

6. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

Speakers: Ace Washington, WA resident; Randall Evans, WA resident; Jim Johnson, native San Franciscan

Mr. Washington stated that he was there to represent residents of the Western Addition. He requested that OCII create an agenda item in an upcoming meeting so that the WA residents could come as a group to speak to Commissioners. He requested that OCII come back to the WA for at least two years to monitor projects that needed attention in that area. He went ahead and listed all the issues, including Yoshi's, Buchanan Mall, Safeway, Hayes Valley, Fillmore Center, the Muni station, among others. He also wanted Mayor Lurie to be present to hear their issues.

Mr. Evans felt strongly that they should not have to continue to return to ask for things that should already be considered and acted upon by OCII. He suggested that OCII revisit the WA and put a word in to Mayor Lurie for help. Mr. Evans spoke about the problems with the youth in the WA because they were not treated as part of the community. He stated that they were not willing to compromise on many of the decisions that were being made in the Fillmore and that their issues required more time to discuss seriously.

Mr. Johnson stated that he had been requesting that the City fix the signs on the Fillmore Heritage Center building. He stated that the problem was that the pictures of the famous black singers and actors who had performed at the Center had fallen down and had remained like that for over a year. Mr. Johnson recalled that he had taken photos of the damage and distributed them to the Board of Supervisors before the Super Bowl. He was distressed that when people came in from out of town and went to the Fillmore, they saw what a mess the area was in. Mr. Johnson stated that he

produced a TV show at the African-American Art & Culture Center twice a week. Last time he was at the Center, the elevator was not working. When he asked a City worker why the City had not repaired the Fillmore photos, the worker responded because they had not received a request to do so. Mr. Johnson stated that the building had been empty for a long time and they were trying to create space for cooking classes or skills classes, a place to teach their youth something so they could go on and work or start their own business. He stressed that the Fillmore Center building had been built to revitalize the Fillmore community but the City was not doing what it was supposed to do. He suggested Commissioners visit the Fillmore to see for themselves what he was talking about.

7. Report of the Chair

Chair Scott announced that during Holy Week, the Tabernacle had come together to celebrate the holiday. During this time they discussed affordable housing and what they were doing and it was discovered that some of the visitors were Certificate of Preference (COP) holders; however, many of these people were unaware of the program. Dr. Scott was able to share information with many of the visitors but was hoping OCII could get an update from Lynx on the program. She stated that there were still many people who needed information about the COP program.

8. Report of the Executive Director

Executive Director Kaslofsky reported on his trip in mid-March to Washington, D.C., called the City Trip D.C., which was a joint effort with civic, public and private SF leaders. Mayor Lurie's office partnered with the SF Chamber of Commerce to advance several SF initiatives that required federal funding or policy support, such as housing, infrastructure and economic recovery as well as OCII's redevelopment mission. Mr. Kaslofsky reported that the group from SF met with federal elected officials to discuss federal funding for the HPS Navy remediation, funded by the federal military budget, and infrastructure funding for the CP project. As was mentioned during the meeting, there was a \$20 million federal grant. They met on Capitol Hill with California elected representative, in particular Speaker Emeritus Nancy Pelosi and Senators Schiff and Padilla. The SF delegation included Bay Area representatives Jimmy Gomez (CA-34), Jared Huffman (CA-02), Kevin Mullin (CA-15), Zoe Lofgren (CA-18), and John Garamendi (CA-08). He reported that for the HPS, the Navy spent about \$50-\$70 million and nationally, only \$30 million was allocated nationally. Mr. Kaslofsky pointed out that each year they had to advocate with elected officials to have more money designated for HPS. He added that other communities in the nations are in need of federal money for certain projects had to do the same. Mr. Kaslofsky reported that all of these SF residents and officials recognized the need to clean up HPS for the health and revitalization of the community. He reminded everyone that the HPS was designated to contain 3,000 homes and was projected to produce over 7,000 jobs over time. Mr. Kaslofsky reported that there was a \$20 million grant provided for Candlestick but had not been granted yet, through the RAISE, now called BUILD project. The trip afforded everyone involved the opportunity to address priorities for the City as they continued to seek federal funding and support.

9. Commissioners' Questions and Matters

Commissioner Shaddix brought up the fact that at the last meeting they had discussed having a presentation from the Arts Commission or whoever was in charge of the art at the Shipyard to discuss what the art assets currently were and what was in the pipeline regarding new art to be installed or considered. He inquired about who was in charge of maintenance for the Fillmore Cultural Center building and how they could help get the items fixed that were mentioned during Public Comment.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded to Commissioner Lim's comments regarding the Western Addition and Freedom West. He explained that the Mayor's Office had been working with Freedom West for years on a four-square block neighborhood cooperative and the City was nearing a development agreement to revitalize and fix the area. He reported that the City posted a Notice of Funding availability or a procurement for affordable housing funds for the project, which had been approved for 200 units for a senior housing project. Mr. Kaslofsky announced that the City had asked OCII to fund a portion of this project, which was still under discussion and which was why it had not been brought before the Commission yet. He reported that SB 593 would be the source of the funding for this project, which funds would be allowed to be used outside of OCII's project areas and outside of OCII's contractual obligations. He added that SB 593 would be funding other OCII projects as well.

Executive Director Kaslofsky addressed Commissioner Shaddix's question and stated that he had read the minutes from the last meeting regarding the HPS artwork discussion. He responded that

they were preparing an informational memorandum to be discussed at a future meeting. He reported that currently there were 10 federally-funded pieces of artwork at HPS Phase 1 and there was information regarding that artwork on the OCII website. He announced that SF Rec&Park and the Arts Commission would be maintaining those pieces as well as restoring them. Mr. Kaslofsky reported that OCII had received outreach from a local artist who had received an Arts Commission grant for temporary art and there was a program to install temporary art throughout the City. OCII was talking to the Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) about creating a workshop for that artist to talk to the communities in Indian Basin or HPS to find a location for the temporary art. He added that more information would be forthcoming on both these topics.

Executive Director Kaslofsky addressed Commissioner Shaddix's question about the Fillmore Heritage building. He reported that since 2015, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) and the Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) had been working to get the building occupied and reused. He confirmed that any property management issues with that building, such as maintenance or temporary use, would go to MOHCD, which had the lease on the building.

Commissioner Shaddix inquired about, if he were to go to the Fillmore Heritage building and take photos of the disrepair, who those photos should be sent to. He stated that the description of the building by residents in the area was very hard to hear and that it was an important building and deserving of better care.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that he would be happy to work with Commissioner Shaddix and Chair Scott on this issue to find the appropriate person to contact at MOHCD.

Chair Scott commented that the heartfelt public comments made during the meeting had moved her and she expressed concern that they had fixed the entire City for the Super Bowl, but not the D5 corridor. She suggested that Commissioners tour areas of D5 and D10 altogether, if possible, to become more informed of the status of those areas. Dr. Scott inquired about the D5 CAC activity and whether there even was a D5 CAC.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that he was not aware of any D5 CAC. He reported that the former WAPAC (Western Addition Project Area Committee) was closed out in 2008 with the expiration of the area.

Chair Scott thanked Commissioners for their comments and concerns.

10. Closed Session - None

11. Adjournment

Chair Scott asked for a motion to adjourn.

Commissioner Lim motioned to adjourn and Commissioner Hakimi seconded that motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:23 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Jaimie Cruz
Commission Secretary