

London N. Breed
MAYOR



Bivett Brackett
CHAIR

Alex Ludlum
VICE-CHAIR

Thor Kaslofsky
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Tamsen Drew
Dr. Carolyn Ransom-Scott
COMMISSIONERS

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE
COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HELD ON THE
18TH DAY OF APRIL 2023**

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 18th day of April 2023.

REMOTE ACCESS:

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

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Members of the public may provide public comment in-person at the noticed 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:** 2598 367 0207, **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 1:06 p.m. by Vice-Chair Ludlum. Roll call was taken.

Commissioner Drew - present
Commissioner Scott – present
Vice-Chair Ludlum - present
Chair Brackett - absent

Chair Brackett arrived late; all other Commissioners were present. Secretary Cruz noted that there was still one vacancy on the Commission.

2. Announcements

- a) The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will be held **in person** on Tuesday, May 2, 2023 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 phone, 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. We recommend 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: 2598 367 0207

Secretary Cruz read the updated 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 of Regular Meeting of April 4, 2023

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Commissioner Scott motioned to move Item 5(a) and Commissioner Drew seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Drew - yes

Commissioner Scott - yes

Vice-Chair Ludlum - yes

Chair Brackett - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT APPROVAL FOR THE MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 4, 2023, BE ADOPTED.

REGULAR AGENDA

- b) Workshop on Annual Housing Production Report Fiscal Year 2021-22 (Discussion)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; Elizabeth Colomello, Housing Program Manager

PUBLIC COMMENT – None

Commissioner Scott thanked Ms. Colomello for her report and commended her team, especially Sonia McDaniel for her hard work and help to the public. She referred to the question about great grandchildren being able to receive housing through the Certificate of Preference (COP) program and inquired about whether that question had been answered.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that this would be an appropriate question for the next item on the agenda.

Commissioner Drew commended staff for this report and for their hard work, especially regarding housing delivery. She wanted to provide the public some clarity on the housing timeline, whether market rate (MR) or affordable, and suggested that in the future they add a section in the report regarding the timeline for entitlement, pre-development, financing and construction and the length of time these might take, so they could be clear about when delivery would take place. Ms. Drew would love for the commission to set a goal for timeline and delivery of these really important projects, because the public can't wait for much needed housing units. Where OCII can be held be accountable, they should, as well as keeping key partners accountable and transparent about any obstacles as well.

Chair Brackett thanked staff and community partners for their hard work on the COP program and housing for San Francisco (SF) residents, especially during the pandemic. She commended the marketing effort and appreciated that they pushed back on the timeframe for housing availability. Ms. Brackett referred to 2021, which was not a reflective year for how OCII performed regarding the COP program, but noticed that 2022 also showed stagnancy in terms of application placement. She inquired about what the trends were that were prohibiting this and about what challenges they were facing in this regard.

Again, Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that this would be an appropriate question for the next item on the agenda.

- c) Workshop on Annual Certificate of Preference Marketing and Outreach Report Fiscal Year 2021-2022 from the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (Discussion)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; Pam Sims, Senior Development Specialist; Maria Benjamin, Deputy Director, MOHCD Homeownership and Below Market Rate Programs; Sonia McDaniel, Certificate of Preference Specialist

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Commissioner Drew requested more information on Lynx and the expanded outreach program.

Ms. Sims responded that in December 2021 the Commission approved a Personal Services Contract with Lynx Investigation after they responded to an RFP issued by OCII. Their goal was to make contact with originally displaced individuals who were potential COP holders. Ms. Sims reported that they started working in November 2022 and expected to be finished in May 2023. Then in June a report would be submitted to OCII including the individuals they found, individuals they could not find, deceased individuals and an overall summary of the work completed. Ms. Sims reported that the descendants were providing the information regarding the originally displaced individuals and stated that they were very excited to provide this information.

Commissioner Drew wanted clarification that the Lynx work was to find only originally displaced individuals and through that they were finding descendants. She inquired about whether that was the formal part of their scope of work.

Ms. Sims responded that it was not initially, but now they were looking at displaced family units, the head of household and the children living there. She explained that once one child was contacted, then the family relations contacted each other and all that information was being recorded.

Ms. Benjamin stated that this would be the basis of their expanded outreach campaign in order to reach those residents who might not understand the benefit of receiving the certificate for their housing or who had not moved forward.

Commissioner Drew referred to the fact that the SF Reparations Committee had issued their draft recommendations, which identified several areas of inquiry regarding the COP program. She requested an update from the Executive Director and inquired about what the next steps would be for the COP program and the Committee's recommendations.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that this would be included in the Executive Director's report which he would cover later.

Commissioner Drew referred to the staff memo and the major barrier for residents regarding access to permanent subsidies. She inquired about how many people were not able to access housing because they were under-income and what tools and resources were available to help those people access permanent subsidies.

Ms. Benjamin noted that this was always an issue. She responded that 13% of applicants were either over- or under-income for the opportunity that they applied for. She explained that the City did have resources and that they were working with the SF Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing (HSH) and the community development arm to make sure that COP holders were prioritized for subsidies. However, they still ran out of subsidies because there were just not enough subsidies available within the City's budget. That said, Ms. Benjamin reported that COP holders had priority and preference when the subsidies were available.

Commissioner Ludlum referred to the 85% of applicants who did not move forward and that the largest number were those who did not respond to the leasing agent. He inquired about how long a period did callbacks continue.

Ms. Benjamin responded that it depended on the leasing agent. However, they were required to make contact at least five different ways over a two-week period. She reported that because Sonia McDaniel was so integrated with the applicants, they responded when she called.

Commissioner Ludlum inquired about whether this was an issue with applicants not being comfortable with the leasing agent or not expecting them to call back.

Ms. Benjamin responded that when they applied, they applied for everything because they could and they would be at the top of every waitlist and lottery list. So then, after the lottery, when they really looked at the project details, like location, parking, rent, and square footage, it was at that time that they decided whether they wanted it.

Commissioner Ludlum inquired about whether there was a way to rework the process to discourage that kind of behavior. He pointed out that this had become a problem not only for the developers but for the public good as well as subsequent consequences if the units remained vacant for so long.

Ms. Sims responded that they were committed to housing COP holders and giving them every opportunity. This was why the leasing agent reached out multiple times and then Ms. McDaniel would get involved and make the calls. Ms. Sims explained that once they went through the COP holders, the process moved much more quickly.

Commissioner Ludlum stated that he was not suggesting that they shorten the window but perhaps present the specific unit materials earlier. He suggested that perhaps Ms. McDaniel could communicate to them to not apply for every unit if they really were not interested. Mr. Ludlum felt strongly that there should be an easy communication solution to prevent 85% of applications not moving forward, which was way too high, and they needed a goal to reduce that.

Ms. Benjamin responded that the 85% number was also artificially high because the 192 applications did not represent 192 people. She explained that in reality 82 applicants had submitted those 192 applications. This meant that 82 COP holders were applying for multiple opportunities. Ms. Benjamin stated that she had heard Ms. McDaniel tell people not to apply if they were not really interested in the unit. She stated that they could explain to people what happened to the process when they applied for everything. However, COP holders felt that this was their program and they wanted to support them as much as possible. Ms. Benjamin acknowledged that they needed to find ways to mitigate this issue.

Commissioner Ludlum referred to a part of the presentation that stated that some applicants withdrew their application when they found out about parking availability. He inquired about how pervasive an issue that was, whether they were finding that, in general, their projects were under-parked and whether this was a common reason for applicants to withdraw.

Ms. Sims responded that OCII projects were different because they usually had parking and MOHCD projects had less or none. So, this problem would not necessarily affect OCII projects. She also pointed out that COP holders got first preference because they went on lottery rank order to fill the parking spaces and if the COP holder wanted a parking space, they would get it in an OCII project.

Ms. Benjamin added that in the world of affordable housing, some projects had no parking and some had two spaces for all the Below Market Rate (BMR) residents. So, if there were three COP holders for those two spaces, lottery winners one and two would get the spaces but number three would not, and that person might decide to wait for another opportunity which included parking.

Commissioner Scott referred to the fact that she had talked to many residents and attended many meetings where depression and fear had set in. She pointed out that MUNI employees make too much money for affordable housing, but they still cannot afford to live in the City. Some of them grew up here and worked here and they sustained the City but they could not afford to live here. Dr. Scott felt strongly that the “make too much or make too little” situation was a set up for failure. She stated that she was hearing this over and over and that applicants knew they would be told that they made too much or they made too little. Yet at the same time, the City was finding ways to house the homeless, veterans, addicts, etc. They needed to try harder, maybe by lowering or raising the bar.

Dr. Scott pointed out that Ms. McDaniel did much of the work calling the applicants. She inquired about whether they were thinking of adding more positions like hers, giving her more help and having her instruct others on how to speak to applicants. Dr. Scott reported that when applicants spoke with Ms. McDaniel, her language was much simpler and understandable, and it was obvious that applicants responded to her in a very positive way.

Ms. Benjamin responded that Ms. McDaniel was unique and was doing a great job. She explained that there were three positions at MOHCD but only Ms. McDaniel's was filled. She added that one position was out for hire and another was under negotiation, so she hoped that help was on the way for Ms. McDaniel. Ms. Benjamin referred to AMI levels and reported that in 2017 there were adjustments made that OCII had mirrored to increase AMI levels in new projects. However, those projects took several years to come onboard and they were just beginning to see them now. So, there would be more room for people to be able to qualify. Ms. Benjamin reported that when they heard an applicant say that they made too much money for rental, they contacted that person immediately to talk about home ownership. They were hopeful with the projects coming onboard over the next year, such as Mission Bay (MB) 9A, that they would have many home ownership opportunities affordable at those AMI levels.

Commissioner Scott replied that she had heard residents at meetings say that they had spoken with Ms. McDaniel and that she had told them they could own their own home. And because of that, they were saving money for their own home, which was creating much hope.

Chair Brackett referred to conditions that were exacerbated during the pandemic. There had been many improvements regarding technology but there were many San Franciscans who had no access to WIFI or internet and therefore had no way of applying to these programs or of knowing about the changing AMI levels. This had created a hole in the information flow to those people with no access. Ms. Brackett stressed that they needed to make information available to the public, especially to marginalized groups. She inquired about whether there was a strategy in place to partner with certain organizations to hold a housing fair or an event that interested people could attend.

Ms. Benjamin responded that MOHCD had put much energy and funding resources into helping people obtain internet access and WIFI throughout the City. However, she pointed out that there were pockets in the City where there was no access. She explained that they were working to ensure that residents in those targeted neighborhoods got WIFI first and that they were investing in those communities to provide resources to help applicants with applications through drop-in clinics to help teach them how to use computers and access information. She reported that during the pandemic there were no public events, but they were working on bringing those back. She reported that they recently held a Housing Expo at an elementary school near the Opera House, but they did not do great outreach so they did not have a great response or get the attendance they expected.

Commissioner Scott referred to MOHCD attendance on Juneteenth and during July events. She reported that as people began to get one-on-one attention, things started to pick up. There was an opportunity to get the word out.

Commissioner Drew inquired about what the funding relationship was between OCII and MOHCD as housing successor regarding hiring additional Ms. McDaniels; she inquired about whether OCII could provide the funding for those positions and roles or whether MOHCD would provide the funding and whether OCII could help expand those positions.

Ms. Benjamin responded that OCII and MOHCD shared a Memo of Understanding (MOU) and that OCII paid for their share of the staffing for work on marketing, lease-up, and the COP program. She explained that with the Mayor's budget they worked out the need for additional staff through the budget process. However, she pointed out that they did have two vacant positions right now, so it would be difficult to ask for more.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that some of this would be the action item for the OCII annual budget and they would discuss the MOU with MOHCD. He clarified that it was very difficult to hire positions during the pandemic. Mr. Kaslofsky joked that, hearing about Ms. McDaniel's success at fielding calls, perhaps she should open an institute called the Sonia McDaniel Institute of COP Management. However, he indicated that filling those positions was crucial and he would like to work further with MOHCD on that issue. Mr. Kaslofsky suggested a broader strategy, such as taking the OCII housing workshop out on the road as well as large scale fairs, to CDC's and community meetings to discuss housing opportunities, OCII, MOHCD, the COP program, access to internet, among other items.

Chair Brackett referred to unit size and inquired about what applicants were actually asking for regarding unit size; inquired about whether they wanted larger units with more bedrooms or whether studios were sufficient.

Ms. Benjamin responded that sometimes what was available within their price range was too small, but they took it anyway. She reported that currently the City was building smaller units than before but indicated that the demand was there for larger units and was going to grow, especially for young families. Ms. Benjamin mentioned that some of the studios were very small on the MR side, but they did not dictate unit size as that was up to the developer.

Ms. Sims responded that OCII units tended to be larger than the MOHCD units. The COP holders very often did not want the unit they qualified for; they wanted a larger unit, and the three-bedroom units were very attractive. Ms. Sims explained that they did not realize this until they were in the leasing process, so pre-education would be very helpful in that regard.

Chair Brackett inquired about when they do not qualify for a three-bedroom whether it was because their family size was not big enough or that they did not have enough income.

Ms. Sims responded that it could be both.

Chair Brackett inquired about, when it was under-income, how they were leveraging other City program funding, such as Prop C money and other programs, to help people qualify other than just using tax increment.

Ms. Benjamin responded that the City had a large subsidy budget and a large subsidy demand and as projects came onboard, they used those subsidies. She explained that they provided funding to Catholic charities and to other non-profits that run those subsidy programs. She indicated that if

there was a subsidy available, and there was a three-bedroom unit and they had a three-person family but they could not afford that, then a COP holder would most definitely get that subsidy. But when the funding ran out and if the project came onboard at that time, they might not get the subsidy.

Chair Brackett recalled that she used to work with the city subsidy programs, namely with the Catholic Charities. One of her most disappointing memories was that the funding was available only the first 4-5 months of the year and then it ran out. She explained that only specific programs, like the veterans' program, were slated for the money to be stretched out for the whole year. She expressed concern that coming out of the pandemic, there would be many people who had not qualified or received subsidies to pay back rent, and who would be needing subsidies now to move, but the money would not be available year-round. She inquired about what they could do to ensure that the money would be available when new projects came onboard. So, for example, if they knew that in May 2024 a new project was coming onboard and this property would need to be leased up, they needed to make sure that there was a pot of money available for those number of units or whatever percentage needed to be set aside that could be accessed. Ms. Brackett asserted that it was not smart to continue doing what was failing. She stressed that they needed to be proactive to be able to match up the resources with those people that needed the resources and not have it just be a free for all for whenever people could qualify. They needed to be able to support the applicants applying and expecting to get into those units.

Ms. Benjamin agreed with that statement. She explained that MOHCD was working with the non-profits that they funded as well as with Mayor's staff to secure additional funding to meet the demand for rental subsidies, but it was not easy.

Chair Brackett noted that another problem was that the money was in one big pot, whether it was for back rent or other needs, and depending on what the demand was, it was pulled from the same pot.

Ms. McDaniel stated that now that the subsidy funds were managed in-house through MOHCD staff, they had a dropdown where a pocket of funding is reserved for the Displaced Tenant Housing Preference (DTHP) and COP programs but it was still limited funds. She reported that they did use the funds to house some COP holders in a recent project but mentioned that the funding was dwindling.

Chair Brackett inquired about the actual amount that was set aside versus what the actual demand was.

Ms. Benjamin responded that she did not have that information at that time.

Commissioner Brackett stated that it would be helpful to know that number so they could match up what was dedicated and what the demand was.

- d) Approving a budget for the period July 1, 2023, through June 30, 2024, and authorizing the Transmittal of the Budget and Interim Budget to the Mayor's Office and the Board of Supervisors (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 11-2023)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; Mina Yu, Budget and Project Finance Manager; Marc Slutzkin, Project Manager, Mission Bay (OCII)

PUBLIC COMMENT – None

Vice-Chair Ludlum referred to staffing levels and noted that there was a distinction between active recruitment and under recruitment and inquired about what the difference was; inquired about six salary savings

Ms. Yu responded that active recruitment meant that they had released the job description, were holding interviews, and were close to being provided offers. Under recruitment meant they had future plans in the upcoming year to fill those positions. She responded that they had a total of 55 FTE approved budgeted positions, but over the years they held certain positions open and vacant for salary savings or attrition savings because they might not fit the work plan. She explained that positions they knew they would not need in the coming year were called salary savings to hold them vacant. Ms. Yu reported that, prior to the 5% reduction, they had five positions that they had held vacant throughout the prior year's ROP's process, knowing that they would not need certain positions. Later, they determined that they would also hold open the senior engineer position.

Vice-Chair Ludlum referred to the vacant positions that were not being recruited for and inquired about whether they were in anticipation of a project to advance, which might require staff.

Ms. Yu responded in the affirmative.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that, since dissolution and more pronounced during COVID19, projects in the market of development were unpredictable. He explained that they had a number of vacancies, which were vacant positions and as projects ramped up or wound down, staff would transition to those projects, and that these were mostly hires in the housing division assigned to project areas. He indicated that the Hunters Point Shipyard and Candlestick Point projects were severely delayed and that these were positions that would otherwise have been working on those projects. Mr. Kaslofsky reported that if replacement housing was approved, there were major bond issuances which would take place in 2024. The first bond issuance would fund about 800 units of housing in 2025, which would mean that they were looking ahead to subsequent 2-3 years for hiring.

Commissioner Scott thanked staff for their report.

Commissioner Drew stated that it was important to understand how transparency and accountability worked with regard to budgets. She indicated that next year during the budgeting process she would like to see where OCII spent their money throughout the year. Ms. Drew recognized that there was not enough time to do this for this year, but in the future, she stated that it would be helpful to understand where they had spent the money to date and to have more timely submissions or reporting of budget to actuals. Ms. Drew admitted that she did not have a clear idea from this budget of what OCII's plan was for staffing for the year or for the future. She listed ROPs, the budget and then funded vs. unfunded. She inquired about how they would provide transparency in terms of what OCII was actually planning to spend and execute against and about how they would they hold themselves accountable to what they had indicated they would fund and not fund.

Ms. Yu responded that they had heard the budget to actual comment before. She stated that they could provide that information today regarding the operational budget, but because the remainder of the budget was long-term capital plans, it was tracked over multiple years so they had five-year trackers instead of annual trackers. Ms. Yu explained that extracting out just for a specific year would be a challenge because it did not tell the entire story and that was not how they were set up to

report. That said, their goal was to be able to provide that information in the future. Regarding the salary savings, she added that it was an unclear concept but part of the way that they were held accountable was that they had to report the salary savings in the budget submitted to the Mayor. The funding for those six positions was netted out of the operating budget, which was a line item, which was not included in this budget, but could be provided in the future.

Commissioner Drew stated that this would be helpful, and especially if it was something the Agency was putting forward to be presented to the Mayor or to the Board of Supervisors, the Commissioners needed to know and understand what was being presented to them.

Ms. Yu referred to the table in the Appendix showing the full roster of staffing positions with notes for what was active or what positions were filled and what were held for salary savings and what were under active recruitment or under future recruitment. She indicated that moving forward they would work on providing this in greater detail.

Vice-Chair Ludlum echoed Commissioner Drew's comments. He stated that he was used to private sector budgets which showed what was spent and what was budgeted. He indicated that he was not sure what to make of a \$300,000 reduction from a \$720M budget, but if what had actually been spent over the last year was shown, it would provide some context.

Executive Director Kaslofsky appreciated this feedback. He indicated that what they would do for next year would be to hold pilot meetings with Commissioners to preview the information with a project-by-project breakdown to look at the scale of things. He explained that when you have a five-year or seven-year affordable housing project, it was worked from a capital budget planning approach rather than an operational funding approach. However, they could show this in an operational timeframe and then show it over a capital period timeframe as well. For example, TB Block 3 project had been in design for two years and there was a community planning process that preceded it. So, part of that funding went into this year's budget along with a bond issuance and that project would be complete in about two years. Mr. Kaslofsky explained that they could show Commissioners the entire life cycle of a project with the money that was spent and put it into context with the amount that OCII was authorizing for the current fiscal year. He stated that they would not be able to do this for this budget but the feedback was warranted and they would provide that level of detail in the future.

Chair Brackett thanked Ms. Yu for her presentation along with comments by Executive Director Kaslofsky. She mentioned that there was a former Executive Director who had shared how the current annual budget matched up with the ROPS budget as well, which would also provide more detail. She stated that she understood why they presented the budget in this way but would like to see more breakdown detail going forward.

Commissioner Scott motioned to move Item 5(d) and Vice-Chair Ludlum seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Drew - yes
Commissioner Scott - yes
Vice-Chair Ludlum - yes
Chair Brackett – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION No. 11-2023, APPROVING A BUDGET FOR THE PERIOD JULY 1, 2023, THROUGH JUNE 30, 2024, AND AUTHORIZING THE TRANSMITTAL OF THE BUDGET AND INTERIM BUDGET TO THE MAYOR'S OFFICE AND THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, BE ADOPTED.

- e) Approving a budget and levy of special taxes for July 1, 2023 through June 30, 2024 for Community Facility Districts administered by the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 12-2023)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; Mina Yu, Budget and Project Finance Manager; Marc Slutzkin, Project Manager, Mission Bay (OCII)

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Commissioner Drew recalled that during the last meeting they had discussed use of these funds directly by Rec&Park. She inquired about whether they had assigned the level of service that Rec&Park would be providing and inquired about whether that was how the budget was derived.

Mr. Slutzkin responded that they were in the middle of finalizing the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with Rec&Park and the Port for the work in the upcoming fiscal years and within that there was a scope of services that was similar in the scope of services currently being provided by the private management company.

Commissioner Drew inquired about whether the MOA would be coming to OCII.

Mr. Slutzkin responded in the affirmative, hopefully by the May 18 meeting but indicated that it might be June 6.

Vice-Chair Ludlum stated that he could tell by his attendance at CAC meetings that the local community had been very vocal with Rec&Park and that they were being heard loud and clear.

Chair Brackett referred to the fact that this would be transferred over to Rec&Park and the Port. She inquired about whether the MOA included anything about adhering to OCII programs in terms of subcontracting out to small businesses, etc. for any services.

Mr. Slutzkin responded that this would be a two-step process. The first would be the MOA, so that on July 1 they could take over management because that was when the current management project ended. He explained that then there would be either an MOA or an MOU, which would define how the process would work going forward once the lease terminated because OCII would also be terminating the lease. Mr. Slutzkin stated he believed their policies would be following those of the City. However, they did not do much contracting because they would be self-performing landscaping and maintenance would be done by City employees, unlike OCII, which sourced this out by third parties.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that most of the work would be self-performed, meaning that Rec&Park would be doing most of the work themselves. To the extent that any subcontracting went on, they would be using the City's program which was the Local Business Enterprise program, which was the procedure whenever they contracted with City departments.

Mr. Slutzkin stated that the Port would probably outsource security but everything else would be in-house.

Vice-Chair Ludlum requested that they run through what areas each CFD represented.

Ms. Yu responded that CFD 1 was for South Beach Rincon Point; then she referred to the map on the slide. CFD 4, 5 and 6 were Mission Bay (MB); CFD 7, 8 & 9 were in the HP Shipyard/Candlestick Point project areas.

Vice-Chair Ludlum motioned to move Item 5(e) and Commissioner Scott seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Drew - yes

Commissioner Scott - yes

Vice-Chair Ludlum - yes

Chair Brackett – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION No. 12-2023, APPROVING A BUDGET AND LEVY OF SPECIAL TAXES FOR JULY 1, 2023 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2024 FOR COMMUNITY FACILITY DISTRICTS ADMINISTERED BY THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, BE ADOPTED.

f) Amending Resolution No. 34-2022 to revise the comparable City classification for the unrepresented position of Executive Assistant to the Executive Director (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 13-2023)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; Monica Davis Stean, HR and Administrative Services Manager

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Commissioner Scott thanked Ms. Stean for her report and thought this was a good move and well-deserved.

Vice-Chair Ludlum inquired about whether this was a promotion and a raise and asked what the raise would be.

Ms. Davis Stean stated that she did not have the salary chart with her but thought it would be an annual raise of approximately \$20,000.

Commissioner Drew wanted to confirm that the 0922 was also the job code for similar positions at the Port and the PUC.

Ms. Davis Stean responded in the affirmative.

Chair Brackett thanked Ms. Stean for this work and stated that it was very important that they paid comparable salaries to other departments. She stated that they had excellent staff and if they wanted to keep them, they needed to be compensated for their work. She was pleased to see

additions coming to the staff, especially for recordkeeping and microfiche which had been an issue for many years.

Commissioner Drew motioned to move Item 5(f) and Commissioner Scott seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Drew - yes

Commissioner Scott - yes

Vice-Chair Ludlum - yes

Chair Brackett – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION No. 13-2023, AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. 34-2022 TO REVISE THE COMPARABLE CITY CLASSIFICATION FOR THE UNREPRESENTED POSITION OF EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT TO THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, BE ADOPTED.

Executive Director Kaslofsky interjected that Ms. Stean had more information on the salary increase.

Ms. Stean stated that the new salary would be at the Step 5 salary and would go up \$5999 bi-weekly.

6. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items - None

7. Report of the Chair

Chair Brackett stated that she had no report.

8. Report of the Executive Director

Executive Director Kaslofsky had an update for something that was referenced in the Housing Report, which was the Legislation of Replacement Housing at the state. He explained that they had been working with Sen. Wiener (Scott Wiener, District 11) for introduction of a replacement housing program, which was a program to replace the 14,000 units demolished during urban renewal. They had about 5,800 units left, but that construction was ceased in 2012 during dissolution. Sen. Wiener introduced legislation in February 2023 and at a hearing on March 29 of the Governance and Finance Committee, the motion passed 7-0, which was a strong showing at the initial committee meeting. The next committee meeting would take place on May 2, which was the same date as the next OCII meeting. Mr. Kaslofsky reported that General Counsel. Morales would staff that OCII meeting while he attended the Housing Committee meeting in Sacramento chaired by Sen. Wiener. He expected positive conversations on this item. If approved there, Sen. Wiener and the rest of the Senate might take it to the floor which would probably happen during May and then potentially to hearings at the Assembly in June. Mr. Kaslofsky promised to keep Commissioners apprised of this matter.

Executive Director Kaslofsky updated on the Fillmore Heritage Center disposition. For background, he explained that in 2015 there was a long-range property management plan, which as part of dissolution, OCII was required to dispose of all physical assets, such as real estate, that they did not have an enforceable obligation for. This included the Fillmore Heritage Center, which housed the former Yoshi's space, a garage, and the 1300 Fillmore restaurant. Mr. Kaslofsky reported that the garage was going to the City and that action was already underway, which was for government purpose. The remaining property was going to be used for future development for an economic development opportunity. He reported that the Community Development part of MOHCD had issued

an RFP on February 28 and that the proposals were due for that solicitation on April 24. If anyone was listening and was interested in operating that space, they needed to get the RFP in soon.

Executive Director Kaslofsky discussed the objectives of the RFP, which was to be a catalyst for the revitalization of the Fillmore and the commercial corridor and the creation of employment opportunities for the community. These were objectives promoted by the community through listening sessions by the Mayor's Office. The objectives are for the use to complement the corridor's mix of uses which would help activate the corridor and provide community benefits including, but not limited to, small business partnerships, affordable community activation opportunities, job creation and minority women-owned enterprise opportunities. Any proposers would also need to demonstrate the capacity to financially activate the site and be financially viable and have a sustainable commercial operation there. He explained that the parcels would be transferring during the solicitation process; therefore, they imagined that by the end of this quarter and through quarter 3 of this year, the parcels would transfer through the Board of Supervisors property acceptance process, which OCII legal team was working on with the City's Department of Real Estate.

Executive Director Kaslofsky referred to Commissioner Drew's reference to the Reparations Task Force and reported that he had attended the Reparations Committee meeting on April 10, with other City agency colleagues. Mr. Kaslofsky also attended the Reparations Policy Subcommittee, which was charged with making recommendations to the Board in their final report. The Committee had some information requests which OCII is fulfilling, including a list of all current, active and sunseting development and disposition agreements, land disposition agreements and owner participation agreements since 1972. He indicated that the Committee also wanted a list of all redevelopment properties sold in harmony with the state mandate of long-range property management plans. So, he summarized, they were basically looking at the long-range property management plan from 2015 and tracking where OCII was in that process. OCII would be providing them with an updated list and an updated schedule of where those things were in process. Mr. Kaslofsky explained that the Reparations Committee was gathering information to make recommendations to address the past

injustices done to the African-American community in SF and their work continued through hearings and subcommittee meetings, making recommendations on specific aspects of their work and would be working on those policy recommendations through June with a final set of recommendations made to the Board of Supervisors then. Mr. Kaslofsky and other agency colleagues would be monitoring those recommendations and then would decide what to do at that point. During his testimony, he addressed the fact that it was difficult for OCII to expand anything in the COP program as it related to expansion of anything beyond preference, as per the current policy, and especially if it related to financial assistance of any kind relating to rental assistance or housing down payment. The Committee took that under advisement. They also had questions about OCII's minority hiring program, both for local hiring and contracting and they had questions about the location of some of the businesses, whether they were SF-based, for example. Mr. Kaslofsky stated that he would keep the Commission apprised of this matter.

Executive Director Kaslofsky also wanted to give a shout out to the head of the Policy Committee, Daniel Landry, who provided Mr. Kaslofsky with a book called Full City by author Lorenzo Gomez. The book had information about the history of the Western Addition and other areas of the City, which he would make available to Commissioners.

Commissioner Drew stated that the work of the Reparations Committee indirectly impacted OCII and recognized the detrimental impact of prior actions by this agency. She thought it would be helpful to hear Mr. Kaslofsky's perspective, perhaps through an informational memorandum, on the draft recommendations made by the Committee, indicated which ones fell within OCII's purview, what policy decisions OCII should be making moving forward, and how they could implement them. This in order to get an understanding of those policy recommendations as well as what expectations they were creating with regard to implementing them by OCII once those recommendations were finalized.

Commissioner Scott was pleased to hear that there was something clear that was happening for the Heritage Center.

Chair Brackett referred to the Heritage Center property. She stated that she was well aware of all the changes happening to the Center since prior to it being rebuilt and that it was an historical landmark, since it was the Black Panther party's newspaper location. Ms. Brackett indicated that there had been much discussion about what would happen to that property as well as subsequent RFP's that requested that whoever occupied that property to preserve the African-American heritage of that building. She was aware of the stress involved in the transfer of the property or the sale of the property in making sure that this actually happened. Ms. Brackett brought up the fact that the idea had come up with the Reparations Task Force that the property not be transferred to the City, but rather be given to the black community. She wanted to hear from the Executive Director how he felt about that idea and what OCII's position was on this regarding what had not happened, what had failed and what OCII was committing to do to ensure that this actually happened.

Executive Director Kaslofsky suggested that they put this topic on the agenda so they could discuss it further at a later meeting. He stated that he would also like to consult with their MOHCD partners who were managing this solicitation and perhaps members of the Human Rights Commission as well to gather more information and open it up for more discussion.

Chair Brackett agreed with that idea because she was concerned that such a large space with different breakouts and another RFP going out to activate such a large space without adequate resources would hinder the success of the long-term project and might harm the community that much more. She stressed that if OCII was offering something to the community, they needed to be mindful that it was properly resourced so they could truly meet their objectives.

9. Commissioners Questions and Matters

Commissioner Scott stated that at the last meeting she shared the meaning of the Community of Opportunity and the covenant with the African American nation and wanted to repeat it again. She felt that much of what they had heard today was addressing this. One of the covenants was a statement by Henry Ford which applied to the promotion given today. She read that statement. Then she read the list of covenants. She spoke about bringing pastors together. They gave out turkeys during the holiday season, had a van service for appointments and shopping, worked with Operation Homeless Connect with medical attention and basic services. This brought the community together for five years and brought back a sense of community and support for one another.

10. Closed Session - None

11. Adjournment

Commissioner Drew motioned to adjourn and Commissioner Scott seconded that motion.

Chair Brackett adjourned the meeting at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,


Jamie Cruz
Commission Secretary