

Daniel Lurie
MAYOR



Dr. Carolyn Ransom-Scott
CHAIR

Vanessa Aquino
VICE-CHAIR

Bivett Brackett
Kent Lim
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
4TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2025**

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 4th day of February 2025.

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:** 2660 081 8667 **PRESS # PRESS #**
again to enter the call. Press *3 to submit your request to speak.

Secretary Cruz announced that there was a meeting to follow at 5:30 in the same room and that OCII would need to vacate by 5:00 p.m.

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

1. Recognition of a Quorum

Meeting was called to order at 1:03 p.m. by Chair Scott.

Roll call was taken.

Commissioner Brackett - yes
Commissioner Lim - absent
Vice-Chair Aquino - yes
Chair Scott - yes

Commissioner Lim arrived late; all other Commissioners were present.

2. Announcements

- a) The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will be held **in person** on Tuesday, February 18, 2025 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.
- a) **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: 2660 081 8667

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

NOTE: ITEM 4(a) IS CONTINUED FROM THE JANUARY 7, 2025 MEETING

- a) Authorizing a Personal Services Contract between the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco, acting in its capacity as administrator of Community Facilities District No. 1 (South Beach), and Korotkin Associates, a California corporation, to provide landscape maintenance and related services in Community Facilities District No. 1 (South Beach) for an initial term of three years with one option to extend for up to an additional three years, in an amount not to exceed \$1,823,152; Former Rincon Point-South Beach Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 02-2025)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; Marc Slutzkin, Deputy Director; Jim Morales, General Counsel and Deputy Director

Commissioner Brackett inquired about whether the Commission was approving the meeting notes from the last meeting.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that at that moment they were considering approval of the CFD contract.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: La Sonia Mansfield, Owner, Mansfield & Mansfield Construction Clean Up Company; Alice Rogers

Ms. Mansfield thanked OCII for working with her company to get this item passed. She stated that she was a native, born and raised in San Francisco (SF), a third-generation retired nurse and was

very proud to start this company and added that it had been difficult. She thanked Chair Scott for her help.

Ms. Rogers was in support of this item. She reported that the repair work had been held up due to the delay with this contract being approved. She related that the Beale Street cul-de-sac was experiencing a lot of graffiti, trash, debris and general heavy use and they were eager and ready to work with Ms. Mansfield to clean up this area.

Chair Scott asked Commissioners to be respectful and attentive to the time due to the time limit and moved that they put into motion that Commissioners speak only 15 minutes per item.

Vice-Chair Aquino seconded that motion.

Commissioner Brackett stated that they had many issues to discuss on the agenda and many guests that would like to speak. If there were issues in terms of the agenda that they did not want to address, then she recommended moving items to another day and meeting. Out of respect for the public, it had been the practice to allow the public to speak and for there to be robust discussion, especially since two of the agenda items dealt with critical things, such as the affordable housing annual report, which they only received once a year, the Small Business Enterprise (SBE) report as well as contracts.

Chair Scott responded that she was not suggesting that guest speakers be limited, but only Commissioners. Each guest speaker would have the usual three minutes to discuss their concerns.

Commissioner Lim stated that he disagreed and they should allow the Commissioners to speak.

Chair Scott clarified that she was not suggesting that Commissioners could not speak, but would be limited to 15 minutes.

Commissioner Brackett interjected that they could put it up as a motion and then vote on it.

Mr. Morales explained that this was not a debatable motion and would require a 2/3 vote to pass.

Vice-Chair Aquino motioned to move that speaking time per item be limited to 15 minutes for each Commissioner and Chair Scott seconded that motion.

Secretary Cruz called for a voice vote on the motion to limit speaking time per item to 15 minutes for each Commissioner.

Commissioner Brackett - no

Commissioner Lim - no

Vice-Chair Aquino - yes

Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY TWO COMMISSIONERS WITH YES VOTES AND TWO COMMISSIONERS WITH NO VOTES THAT SPEAKING TIME PER ITEM AT THIS MEETING BE LIMITED TO 15 MINUTES FOR EACH COMMISSIONER. THE MOTION FAILED.

Commissioner Brackett stated that the previous day she had attended the Board of Supervisors meeting at which both Planning Department officials and Office of Economic Development (OED) officials were present. She reported that blanket statements had been made that OCII had disposed of all of their properties older than 20 years old as a result of dissolution in 2012. She inquired about how OCII had been able to hold onto Community Facilities District No. 1 (CFD1) still under OCII care and control and monitoring and maintaining that property to this day and which had been in the OCII portfolio since 1988.

Mr. Slutzkin responded that OCII remained the administrators of the CFD's, notwithstanding dissolution, and OCII maintained control of CFD1 and all the CFD's until some later date.

Commissioner Brackett inquired about whether there were any plans to transfer that property over to the City when OCII was ultimately dissolved.

Mr. Slutzkin responded in the affirmative.

Executive Director Kaslofsky interjected that OCII did not own the property in CFD1.

Commissioner Brackett clarified that OCII was, however, responsible for maintaining the property.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Brackett inquired about whether there were any other parcels that OCII maintained in a similar fashion and/or owned and had responsibility for.

Mr. Slutzkin responded that OCII owned property in Transbay (TB), such as the Shipyard, but nothing in Mission Bay (MB). He added that the Ellis Street Driveway and the Fillmore Heritage Center were still under OCII ownership.

Commissioner Brackett inquired about whether Ellis Driveway/Center was under OCII ownership or MOHCD (Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development) ownership.

Mr. Slutzkin responded that it is under OCII ownership.

Commissioner Brackett inquired about whether that contract included transfer of that property to MOHCD.

Executive Director Kaslofsky started to speak and Commissioner Brackett asked that she not be interrupted as she was still asking questions.

Executive Director Kaslofsky interjected that this discussion was not on the agenda and if Commissioner Brackett wished to have a discussion about all OCII properties, they could hold a future workshop on it.

Commissioner Brackett responded that this was germane to the questions she was asking because it involved maintenance and all Commissioners had received letters from residents regarding the maintenance of the neighborhood. She felt it was important for her to ask questions about how other properties were being maintained so that when they approved these types of contracts, it would be ensured that the companies getting these contracts would do a good job. Ms. Brackett noted that the maintenance matter for CFD1 had been brought before OCII several times for extensions and that there was an extension in place currently. She asked for confirmation of that statement.

Mr. Slutzkin agreed with that statement.

Commissioner Brackett asserted that there was a company that had been maintaining it this entire time.

Mr. Slutzkin responded in the affirmative and added that the contract had ended on December 31, 2024 and that they were under a short-term contract which would last to the end of February 2025.

Commissioner Brackett stated that according to letters from neighbors, there had been a long-standing issue with lighting and blight, which had been going on for the past two years. So in terms of the current contract that they had extended for Forster & Kroeger Landscape Maintenance, Inc. up until December 31, they were not maintaining the property properly. However, every year that OCII re-issued that contract, Commissioners had been told that the property was being maintained correctly. In reality, it was not being maintained properly. Ms. Brackett contended that, without intervention, that same company might have received this contract again, if OCII had not followed the newest equity principles regarding fair contracting. She stated it was important for her to understand where they were and how they were going to make sure they had oversight and monitoring of these sites. She contended that this amounted to millions of dollars in contracts and yet this problem was still occurring.

Executive Director Kaslofsky stated that if Commissioner Brackett had specific complaints about this contract, she should let staff know. He reported that as maintainers of these different sites, including CFD1, OCII very often received information regarding maintenance from the City, Department of Public Works (DPW), the Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA), neighborhood residents, and special taxpayers from within the CFD about issues that needed attention, and OCII immediately reached out to those entities to get those issues resolved as quickly as possible. That was the process underway and he stated that if Ms. Brackett or anyone else had received information that OCII needed to attend to, then they should address them now.

Commissioner Brackett responded that all Commissioners had received complaints about that contract and she proceeded to read an email from a resident of South Beach, who was also the Vice-Chair of the Embarcadero Navigation Center Advisory Committee, who asked for support for maintenance of that area and stated that the Beach Street cul-de-sac area was under extreme duress. She referred to much-needed repairs that needed to begin. The writer stated that they had worked with OCII staff, Marie Munson and now Jasmine Kuo, to get trash cans installed in the park and to update the lighting system, which failed often due to vandalism. Unsafe conditions had developed in that area including unsightliness and illegal activity. These issues had come to her attention two years ago in March 2023. The writer felt that part of the problem was the use of the area by Navigation Center guests and their friends, homeless individuals and, in some instances, dealers. Ms. Brackett pointed out that this email was sent to the Commission Secretary, who had

forwarded it to all Commissioners a few days prior. She inquired about how this new contract would be different.

Mr. Slutzkin responded that he was pleased to see that the email referred to Ms. Munson addressing issues immediately and he felt that the new contract holders and OCII would continue to do that. He stressed that this was a city and that parks got used and sometimes parks got abused. The graffiti issue had been addressed immediately by the current contract holder once OCII informed them about it.

Executive Director Kaslofsky added that he recommended that OCII reach out to connect with the Navigation Center leadership and management to work with them on this issue.

Commissioner Brackett stated that the same thing had happened with the Ellis Street Driveway, where things did not improve. She mentioned that this had also been brought up at the Board of Supervisors meeting the previous day. Ms. Brackett was pleased that a new contractor would be taking over this work and hopefully they would see better results and receive less complaints.

Chair Scott stated that she had read about those conditions and she believed that the new contractor, Korotkin Associates, would do a better job to address all the neglected issues that had been ignored.

Commissioner Aquino thanked Mr. Slutzkin for the presentation. She stated that she was aware of the email and fully aware of the maintenance issues.

Commissioner Brackett stated that the project was broken down into three different phases: general maintenance, tree removal and the plaza. She asked for clarification regarding annual increases and actual asset work. She inquired about whether there was enough money to cover the deep clean-up that would be required to be done on a monthly basis and would be paid if additional work was required.

Mr. Slutzkin pointed out that there was a substantial contingency plan item for each year in the budget, which was \$180,000 in the first three year term and \$185,000 in the next three year term, so that if something came up that went above and beyond, they were confident it would be covered. This was why they had been very thorough about all the work that needed to be completed and were confident that the proposal considered all of that when it was submitted.

Chair Scott asked if there had been any consideration for global warming and the way the weather had been changing, looking at the tree wells and uprooted pavement by the tree roots. She inquired about whether there would be enough money to cover those types of issues when they suddenly appeared.

Mr. Slutzkin responded that one of the things that had changed in the OCII budget was that trees were now the responsibility of the DPW and any damage due from trees to the pavement was their job to fix.

Commissioner Brackett motioned to move Item 4(a) with the added condition and amended language that Korotkin Associates would come back before OCII before the 3-year approval time to make sure that everything was running smoothly and that these types of challenges were not still

lingering. She wanted to amend the contract to add that a report be submitted to OCII regarding the results of the contract holder.

Commissioner Lim seconded that motion.

Executive Director Kaslofsky stated that Commissioners would receive an annual update on the activities of each CFD when they brought the annual CFD budget. He noted that CFD1, like all the CFD's, were limited by the special tax that they assessed on the special taxpayers of that area, so they always had a ceiling. Commissioners would be receiving an annual report as well; however, they could receive additional reports if requested.

Vice-Chair Aquino requested additional clarification on what they were voting on.

Commissioner Brackett explained that the way this contract was currently written, it would get renewed automatically for the first three years unless the Executive Director decided that there was reason to discontinue the contract. On the third year, it would come back to OCII, so that Commissioners could verify that everything was going the way it was supposed to go and then they could approve it moving forward again. She was asking for a status update at the three-year mark because sometimes the annual update report did not contain all the issue details they might need to address.

Vice-Chair Aquino was not clear on the added updates and was concerned that they would be duplicating work or receiving double information.

Commissioner Brackett clarified that from 2012 to present, OCII had not been receiving sufficient detail on the maintenance issues and only found out about problems when notified by the public or residents of the affected areas. To avoid repeating the same mistakes made in the past, with this new company taking over the contract, she was asking to amend the contract to specify that Commissioners approve this at the three-year mark.

Executive Director Kaslofsky requested clarification on the amendment that Commissioner Brackett was asking for and also wanted more details on the report that was being requested.

Commissioner Lim believed that what Commissioner Brackett wanted was that after three years, the contract would have to come back before OCII before getting approval for any extensions.

Commissioner Brackett agreed with that statement.

Commissioner Lim stated that he was okay with that.

Commissioner Brackett stated that the normal report would suffice with photos included, so they could quantify not only written comments but also have visuals to see how the property was looking at that time. She remarked that the photos that residents recently sent with the emails were especially troubling.

Chair Scott was sure that Korotkin Associates would be on top of this and would be able to provide photos, because the public definitely would be providing feedback.

Executive Director Kaslofsky requested further clarification about whether to bring it as a status report or to bring it for OCII's approval. He inquired about whether Commissioner Brackett meant that she wanted OCII to approve it or that she wanted the status report before the Executive Director's approval.

Commissioner Brackett responded that she wanted both.

Executive Director Kaslofsky indicated that then it would have to be an action item on the agenda.

Commissioner Brackett agreed but indicated that it would be one action item because it would be providing Commissioners with the data that staff already collected.

Mr. Morales pointed out that this would require an amendment to the item, because now Commission approval would be required. He clarified that the added language would be "subject to Commissioner approval" and would read as...."for an initial term of three years with one option to extend, **subject to Commissioner approval**, for up to an additional three years...."

Secretary Cruz called for a voice vote on Item 4(a) as amended with the added language.

Commissioner Brackett - yes

Commissioner Lim - yes

Vice-Chair Aquino - yes

Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 02-2025, AUTHORIZING A PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACT BETWEEN THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, ACTING IN ITS CAPACITY AS ADMINISTRATOR OF COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 1 (SOUTH BEACH), AND KOROTKIN ASSOCIATES, A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION, TO PROVIDE LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE AND RELATED SERVICES IN COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 1 (SOUTH BEACH) FOR AN INITIAL TERM OF THREE YEARS WITH ONE OPTION TO EXTEND, SUBJECT TO COMMISSIONER APPROVAL, FOR UP TO AN ADDITIONAL THREE YEARS, IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$1,823,152; FORMER RINCON POINT-SOUTH BEACH PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

5. Matters of New Business:

CONSENT AGENDA

Chair Scott requested that the Consent Agenda item be pulled for further review and added to the Regular Agenda.

REGULAR AGENDA

- a) Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting of January 7, 2025

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Chair Scott suggested continuing the minutes to provide for more time to review.

Commissioner Brackett asked questions about the continuance.

Executive Director Kaslofsky interjected with a point of order that this item was pulled to continue it.

Commissioner Brackett motioned to move Item 5(a) and Vice-Chair Aquino seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Brackett - yes

Commissioner Lim - yes

Vice-Chair Aquino - no

Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE NAY THAT APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF JANUARY 7, 2025, BE ADOPTED.

- b) Workshop on Annual Certificate of Preference Marketing and Outreach Report Fiscal Year 2023-2024 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, Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD); Dr. Veronica Hunnicutt, Chair, Hunters Point Shipyard Citizen's Advisory Committee (HPSCAC)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Lynette Mackey, Lynx and New Community Leadership Foundation (NCLF); Oscar James, native resident, Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP) and Certificate of Preference (COP) holder; Nathaly Tucker, SF resident; Rene Tucker, husband of Nathaly Tucker; Janice Smith, native resident, BVHP and COP holder; Demetrius Williams, President of SF Hyper Local Building Trades Contractors Collective; La Sonia Mansfield, Owner, Mansfield & Mansfield Construction Clean Up Company; Ace Washington, community advocate; Kimberly Hill Brown, Chair of the Shipyard Implementation Committee; Dennis Williams, Executive Director, Fillmore Community Development Corporation; Queen Vanessa Banks, native resident, Hunters Point (HP)

Ms. Mackey stated that she was the community advocate for the Certificate of Preference (COP) program, who went out into the community to talk to people and help them to sign up and to follow up with their application process. She felt strongly that the program was working: the number of individuals getting their certificates was growing and the number of calls was growing as well. She explained that her job was to call individuals about something that happened in 1970 or earlier and usually the person on the phone did not know anything about it. So they had to find someone in the family who was familiar (with redevelopment and displacement) and then find the family members who were impacted and their descendants. Often that person was deceased. Ms. Mackey stressed that locating the displaced was a long process; sometimes it took 25 phone calls. She pointed out that a lot of displacement had happened but not all of it was caused by redevelopment. The COP program was offered for those who were displaced from redevelopment. She offered her help to anyone from any community who needed it.

Mr. James commended Dr. Hunnicutt and the CAC and stated they were doing a tremendous job in BVHP and had been doing it since the time the Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS) Advisory Board was created, without any pay, just like OCII Commissioners. He also commended Ms. Mackey and the workers at Lynx, who had contacted 8 family members of his from Madera to SF, all of whom got their certificates. He objected to the income ceiling that was placed on COP holders because they got jobs and worked hard, but now some of them were being told that they made too much money to be able to move back to SF. He felt that this was not right. Mr. James also expressed concern with the down-payment assistance program because he did not know anyone who had received a down-payment assistance loan for housing. He inquired about how many COP holders had been placed in home ownerships and how many had been placed in rentals. Mr. James requested that Ms. Sims and Ms. Benjamin provide their phone numbers verbally, so that those interested in contacting them could write it down.

Ms. Tucker wanted to highlight the challenges she and her husband had faced dealing with MOHCD while trying to purchase a home. She stated that her husband was a native San Franciscan and his family was displaced in the 60's. Despite claims that MOHCD was helping COP holders find housing, their experience showed otherwise. When Ms. Tucker joined the Zoom lottery to announce the winner of the housing lottery, the individual announced as the winner was not a COP holder but rather a regular SF resident. She stated that as soon as the host realized that Ms. Tucker was on the call, she was kicked off. Later they received a denial letter from Katherine Hy citing a 2% discrepancy due to Ms. Tucker's school employment schedule, which was 10 out of 12 months of the year. The Tuckers appealed the denial and after contacting Ms. Benjamin, they were told that the denial was in error but no formal acknowledgment was made. Additionally, MOHCD's Housing Counseling Service, META, offered no support throughout the entire process. They waited a month for response from a housing counselor. Ms. Tucker testified they had to navigate the entire process on their own with the direction of the online handbook as the only guide and the homebuying education course, which they had taken a year prior. It was only after involving Commissioner Brackett that they finally received any support, which allowed them to achieve home ownership in SF. She felt it was unfair that her husband had to work so hard just to be able to live in the city he was born in. Without the aid of Commissioner Brackett, they would have been denied the opportunity to live in the city they loved so much. She thanked OCII for letting her share her experience.

Mr. Tucker stated that his wife, Nathaly, had said it all regarding their experience, but he wanted to share that his family had come to SF in 1945 from Tennessee and Kentucky to seek work when the naval yard was being built. The COP program was critical for him. When they started the process in 2021, MOHCD denied everything, gave them a lot of red tape, and then stated that they were off by 1.8 - 2%. He stated that the entire process really broke his heart because his great-grandparents had come to SF seeking a better life, then got displaced and then when he was ready to use his certificate, it was denied based on insignificant differences. Mr. Tucker blamed all this on MOHCD. He cited Commissioner Brackett and two others in City agencies as the reason that he finally got into a home.

Ms. Smith stated that she and her brother were both COP holders. She stated that the certificates were very important to them but expressed concern about what would happen when they expired. She explained that her certificate expired in 2021 and she applied for an extension in 2023 but had not received it yet and also had not heard anything from MOHCD about the extension. She felt she should not have to start over to get an extension but did not know what to do. She was looking

forward to home ownership in SF within the next couple of years, through the COP program. Ms. Smith hoped things improved with the program.

Mr. Williams highly commended Dr. Hunnicutt and the CAC for reaching out and doing their due diligence in the Bayview and commended OCII for coming out and supporting the community and for making sure that people were held accountable. He stated that his organization wanted to build and be included. Mr. Williams expressed disappointment that they were left out of Transbay (TB) and the 50% hiring goal for construction workforce for each trade with special preference for BVHP residents. Mr. Williams stated that they were the community contractors and they wanted to be included because their goal was to build SF.

Ms. Mansfield stated that she was born and raised in SF and her parents settled here from Texas. She stated that Ms. Tucker's story really upset her and she thanked Commissioner Brackett for her assistance with that situation. Ms. Mansfield requested that OCII become part of MOHCD so that they could oversee what was going on there and get involved with any injustice that might take place. COP holders had already been through enough; they should not have to go through it again with MOHCD. She thanked OCII and Dr. Hunnicutt for their efforts and stated that COP holders were not just renters or consumers but rather that they were a vital part of the community.

Mr. Washington commended Dr. Hunnicutt for all her work and then proceeded to speak about the Fillmore. He was especially concerned about the Safeway closure and the garage. Mr. Washington recalled the beginnings of the COP program and when Mary Rogers had to sue the Redevelopment Agency to get the list of the displaced families and individuals to find the affected people.

Ms. Brown stated she was born and raised in and was a current resident of SF. She stated that she was not a COP holder but was qualified to be. She expressed concern about the COP program and how it was being run and how it was being administered to the community. Ms. Brown acknowledged that many COP holders might never return to SF due to the trauma experienced by displacement, but she recognized that many SF workers who were born and raised in the City had to commute to SF, because they could not afford to live there now. She wanted to see more transparency with the program and felt strongly that the COP certificates should never expire but be useable forever. Ms. Brown claimed that that problem needed to be looked at immediately. She regarded the recent behavior on the Commission as unacceptable and stressed that they needed to stand in unity because integrity was in play.

Mr. Williams stated that resources were sorely needed in the community for the COP program to support young adults, seniors and special needs residents. He was very pleased to find out that Ms. Mansfield, the black owner of the construction company, had received a contract, which was great news, but argued that there were many more qualified black women and community members who deserved to work as well. Mr. Williams stressed that low-income housing must be built to provide homes. He commended Dr. Hunnicutt and the CAC Oscar James and Demetrius Williams for their work in this matter. He stated that the AMI levels on new developments would make it difficult in the future for low-income residents to find housing. He also cautioned about placing COP holders in housing that they could not afford over time because sustainability was critical. Economic opportunities were needed but had been lost to Black and Latino contractors and developers.

Ms. Banks thanked OCII and stated that she was tired and the entire community was tired of having to fight for every little thing. She had attended the Oversight Board meeting on January 30, where she stated that her mother was one of the individuals displaced back in the 50's and she was

determined to find her mother's original COP. Her daughters were now COP holders but she described how the process of getting into housing was difficult and discouraging to many certificate holders. Many people were getting tired of fighting for housing but were told that they made too much money or not enough money. She felt strongly that SF should do better and do the right thing.

Commissioner Brackett wanted to make it clear that in 2020 during the pandemic she had asked about the COP program and whether MOHCD would continue it. She was told that everything was fine, except that later she discovered in the fine print that the program was to be cancelled in 2025. She fostered the support of the Executive Director and then Chair Miguel Bustos to re-ignite the program. An emergency meeting was called between Commissioner Brackett, Mr. Bustos, Ms. Oerth and general counsel in order to fix this and make sure that COP's never expired. After that meeting, on December 15, a resolution was passed by OCII to preserve COP A & C programs. The COP Subcommittee was then created by Mr. Bustos and Commissioner Brackett was made Chair with Atty. Mara Rosales (former OCII Commissioner) as Vice-Chair. Ms. Brackett named the other members of the committee, including Oscar James and Richard Hoshimoto from Japantown. That committee reached out to historians and individuals who had been working on COP legislation and with the help of many community members, they pulled in MOHCD and other City agencies, and made the program a realization once again. They pushed MOHCD to do something different and something new. Ms. Brackett explained that the displacement legislation came through City Attorney David Chu's office, which was advocated by the COP Subcommittee, and did not stop at the A & C certificates, but made sure that descendants had the opportunity to access the program as well. A 2010 Keane report stated that from a small sampling of COP holders, they determined that the majority of them were deceased. The Subcommittee started working on the descendanty program to make sure that descendants could move back into any affordable housing unit because not many had been built at that time. The Descendanty legislation ultimately passed and other developments took place, such as removing barriers, defining the process of how individuals got certified, adding a link to the OCII and MOHCD websites to access the COP program as well as advocating for other things, such as: a developer certificate program which was never created, a business certificate program for the 868 businesses in the Fillmore, which had not been addressed to date, and the promise made by the City that MOHCD would always have at least two employees working on the COP program, who would be assigned to tracking displaced residents and businesses. Ms. Brackett pointed out that this did not take place until the contract with Lynx was put in place to conduct those searches. She added that exhaustive searches of the full number of displaced individuals did not take place because the Subcommittee was told that the records the City had on file were incomplete and the City told them to start with small samples of the list. The Subcommittee agreed; however, Ms. Brackett stated that to date they had still not exhaustively looked for the displaced families. In fact, they had made contact with only 1,936 COP holders, although there were about 96,000 people eligible for the COP program. In the past 11 years, OCII has built 9,239 housing units and 91 COP holders had been housed so far. By these statistics, Ms. Brackett argued that the current program was not a success. They needed things to be fixed now, such as enhancements to the marketing program, such as SFMTA billboards which would go on the buses so people in SF could learn about the program. OCII funded four positions with MOHCD, which were finally filled, but for three years, only one person worked on the COP program.

Commissioner Brackett commented on the report given by MOHCD. It stated that in the past two years 0 (zero) COP holders had been housed in OCII projects. From 2022-2024, 44 COP holders accessed MOHCD projects. One of the things that the Subcommittee learned after the passing of the Descendanty bill was that Certificate D-holders did not have the same rights as Certificate A & C holders, which meant they did not have rights to citywide housing. Ms. Brackett held up the report

which listed the MOHCD projects and clarified that only A & C certificate holders had access to that housing and D-holders did not. As a result, OCII and Dr. Hunnicutt worked to pass SB593 to get back the 6,000 units of OCII housing so that all COP holders would have access to those units.

Commissioner Brackett also targeted the AMI levels. It was stated several times in the report that 50% of COP holders make 33% of Area Median Income (AMI); however, OCII was not building that type of housing right now. She acknowledged that OCII was building affordable housing, but that housing did not directly address the needs of COP holders. When the replacement housing bill was passed, the Subcommittee was told that there would be policies put in place to address that issue. It was noted that there were a limited number of subsidies available to help people make up the difference between what people make and what the units cost. However, there was still no replacement housing policy. Ms. Brackett reported that earlier in the month it was brought before the Oversight Board to use replacement housing funding to start the groundwork for building units in four different project areas. She lamented the fact that none of this was mentioned at the Subcommittee meeting held earlier in January. Later she received information about what AMI levels the units were being built. Most of the housing in Mission Bay (MB) would be 60% and lower with no units being available at the 0-30% range. Ms. Brackett stated that they would have to look into other means to subsidize. Once again, they were faced with housing being built that COP holders would not be able to afford. They were building senior units at 0-30% AMI but not for the regular population of COP holders who actually needed them. Ms. Brackett stated that there were funds that taxpayers had voted for and which were approved to be able to build the deeply affordable housing units that were needed. She inquired about what OCII was doing to partner and to make sure they were delivering those deeply affordable units that people needed. Ms. Brackett reported that she had gone to Sacramento with Dr. Hunnicutt and others who gave testimony regarding the 6,000 units that were needed for low-income residents. She felt strongly that they should not have to beg for scraps. COP holders were being told that there was no money for down-payment assistance so some applicants dropped out of the China Basin program. Parking was another issue and one of the reasons that COP holders rejected the housing was if they did not have access to parking.

Commissioner Brackett stated that she was not just complaining to be difficult, but wanted to air the issues that needed to be addressed. They should not be telling the community that everything was great, when they were not. This was why she went out in the community to advocate for individuals, such as the Tuckers, which was not really her role as a Commissioner. She advocated for the care and concern of COP holders, who were being traumatized again by this process. OCII must be about setting policy and enforcing it. Without policy, anything could happen. And even with policy, without enforcement, it meant nothing.

Commissioner Brackett reported that there would be 130 replacement housing units that would be built in the Shipyard. She announced that 250-340 units of affordable housing would be built in Transbay (TB), using some of the replacement housing there and also in Mission Bay (MB). She announced to the Commission that that was where some of the initial 600 units of replacement housing were going. For Commissioners to not be aware of where 10% of the replacement housing was going to go was not acceptable.

Executive Director Kaslofsky stated that staff and MOHCD people were available to comment on Commissioner Brackett's statements.

Executive Director Kaslofsky wanted to correct the record and stated that there were no TB replacement units planned. He added that the HP Shipyard items were just opportunities but there

was no staff dedicated to it and no funds available for it. They did long-range planning and they had only identified affordable housing opportunities at the Shipyard.

Ms. Sims referred to process improvements to the COP program as highlighted by Ms. Benjamin and explained that they came from individuals who were looking for their COP or from individuals who had received a COP. She explained that staff understood the barriers and that improvements were in place to address those barriers. The descendanty legislation, although introduced as an idea by then Executive Director Blackwell, did not gain any traction until Deputy Director Sally Oerth working with City Hall actually got the legislation passed. She could not speak to the developer certificate program but did address the business certificate program and stated that all the displaced businesses had received the Certificate B, which had not been used to date. Ms. Sims reported that she had certificate numbers for every one of the businesses in question. She pointed out that looking for and confirming contact information happened before the COP Subcommittee was established and that while Lynx was working on finding descendants, she explained that descendants were not in her purview because they were in a wind-down form and were concentrating on finding the original displaced individuals with certificates A & C. Descendants were being located as a result of their search for original displaced individuals. Ms. Sims clarified that the average AMI for COP holders who applied for housing was 44% AMI. She acknowledged that there were no COP holders who rented OCII units during 22-23 and 23-24 because they leased no projects during those years and were working on obtaining funding to build additional housing. She explained that the state made the funding that they needed for the affordable housing competitive. Regarding parking, all COP holders were at the top of the list and if, in fact, a COP holder applied for a unit, they would receive parking. Ms. Sims referred to the COP holders who had applied for 400 China Basin and stated that they would all be able to apply and obtain the Legacy In Town Homeownership Program funds per the Legacy Foundation in the Shipyard. As far as she knew, no COP holders had dropped out of the 400 China Basin process due to a lack of parking or a lack of down-payment assistance.

Chair Scott commended the good work being done by Lynx but asked for confirmation that the Lynx workers were not paid to help with the paperwork. She stated that this created a huge barrier for applicants because she was discovering that if applicants did not understand the process, they tended to walk away from it.

Ms. Sims agreed.

Chair Scott inquired about whether it was possible for the Lynx workers to start helping with the paperwork. Dr. Scott reported that it was very difficult to get through on the phone to SF Housing Development Corp. (SFHDC), MOHCD or to the Bayview Senior Services. She stated that she had tried to get through herself. She was aware that Ms. Mackey was trying to help with paperwork, but was told she did not get paid to do that.

Ms. Sims responded that what staff was currently doing was to ask the individuals contacted if they wanted to receive their COP. If the answer was yes, they were provided the link to complete the application, which she stated, was very straight-forward. Ms. Sims provided her own phone number to the public in the case that anyone was having problems with the application online. She stated that she would personally help if needed.

Ms. Benjamin stated that there were many misconceptions and misunderstandings being articulated here. However, she did not want to go into a long explanation to straighten them out to get to the

truth. Ms. Benjamin stated to the public that if they had questions about their COP, how to access it, how to procure affordable housing or the process itself, they could call 628 652-5801 and someone should answer. If they had to leave a message, she indicated that Cora usually returned the call by the next day. Ms. Benjamin clarified that the down-payment assistance program was alive and well for home ownership and COP holders were welcome to apply for that assistance. She related that there was a huge amount of bureaucracy to just get into affordable rental housing. But, additionally, to get into affordable home ownership, one had to go through the bureaucracy of the financial lending institutions as well and they had their own set of requirements. Ms. Benjamin contended that the majority of the problems that applicants encountered with home ownership had to do with the financing of their mortgage and not with the program, its assistance, or their understanding of it, but with the personal finances of financing a mortgage or a real estate transaction. Because of that, she announced that they had started a down payment assistance program, through the Dream Keeper program, to provide resources for culturally competent (black) COP holders, so that they could help with the complicated questions. The program would launch in March or April 2025 in order to provide more support for home ownership to COP holders.

Chair Scott returned to the original question about providing help with the paperwork. She stated that she herself had helped 25 home ownership applicants with the paperwork, step by step and holding hands and added that this was what Lynette Mackey had been doing. She stated that it was very successful when they could help each other culturally. Dr. Scott indicated that there was a cultural understanding of the language and communications, but the workers needed to be paid for that.

Ms. Benjamin responded that this was a question of contracts, etc. However, she did clarify that this kind of work was already taking place on a limited basis. With the coming of the descendants, there would be a need to grow that part of the process and she was sure the program would expand.

Vice-Chair Aquino thanked Ms. Benjamin and Ms. Sims and their teams for their hard work. She acknowledged that it took some time to develop a team and that there was still much more work to be done. However, it was encouraging to learn that the program was fully staffed with a dedicated team and welcomed new member, Laquana. Ms. Aquino advocated for focusing on the positive steps being taken while remaining mindful of the work ahead. She supported the statements made by Chair Scott as well as Commissioner Brackett but advocated keeping the momentum going forward.

Chair Scott stated that they had a hard stop at 5:00 p.m. with more items to address.

Commissioner Brackett requested a continuance of this item to the next meeting because she felt there were more things that needed to be addressed.

Executive Director Kaslofsky inquired about how much more time Commissioner Brackett thought she would need at the next meeting for this item.

Commissioner Brackett responded some time because she wanted to go back through the record and reflect on what had been said at previous meetings by MOHCD, the COP Subcommittee and by Ms. Sims. She also wanted to address the ways that they had asked to move forward and discuss what would happen in the future. Ms. Brackett was alarmed by the mischaracterization of things as described at this meeting and felt it was not right for staff to take credit or give credit to others for things that they knew they did not initiate, while it was on record in meeting minutes what actually

happened and how they got to this point. She felt strongly that when certain things got done by the community, credit must be given back to the community.

Commissioner Brackett motioned to continue this item to the next meeting and Commissioner Lim seconded that motion.

Secretary Cruz called for a voice vote on continuing Item 5(b) to the next meeting.

Commissioner Brackett - yes
Commissioner Lim - yes
Vice-Chair Aquino - yes
Chair Scott - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS THAT ITEM 5(b), WORKSHOP ON ANNUAL CERTIFICATE OF PREFERENCE MARKETING AND OUTREACH REPORT FISCAL YEAR 2023-2024 FROM THE MAYOR'S OFFICE OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, BE CONTINUED TO THE NEXT MEETING.

Chair Scott requested a five-minute recess.

Due to the time constraint, Executive Director Kaslofsky made a recommendation to the Commission that Item 5d) on the agenda be continued to the next meeting because some of the staff had to leave. He also recommended that Item 6, which legally required, be taken out of order. He summarized that they would finish up Item 5c) and then proceed to Items 7-10 in the interest in time.

After some discussion and clarification, Commissioner Brackett motioned to continue Item 5d), move Item 6 up on the agenda and continue Items 7-10 to the next meeting and Chair Scott seconded that motion

Secretary Cruz called for Item 6 to be called next.

6. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

Speakers: Demetrius Williams, President of SF Hyper Local Building Trades Contractors Collective; Gloria Berry, District 10; Dennis Williams, Executive Director, Fillmore Community Development Corporation and micro real estate developer

Mr. Williams described his organization as a bunch of contractors from the Bayview (BV), who get together every Tuesday at 8:00 am at 1550 Ennis to discuss contracting opportunities coming down the pipeline to the BV. He emphasized the requirements of inclusion and understanding. Mr. Williams read a statement from the Collective to OCII which stated that even though they appreciated the intent of the policy, which was established to foster inclusion, diversity and equality in SF, they were finding themselves constantly passed over for opportunities with no resources available to explain why or to address the concerns. They would appreciate feedback from OCII in understanding the policies currently being implemented and specifically wanted to ask the following questions:

1. Was there a unit responsible for enforcing these policies and if so, what was
2. Who held the developers and owners responsible for not meeting the goals of these policies

3. Were there assistance programs available to help BVHP residents meet the contracting requirements
4. Were there reports on the outcomes of the policies and if so, were they produced monthly, quarterly or annually and were they accessible to the Collective
5. What resources were there for contractors or developers who failed to meet the policy requirements
6. Who were the members of the C.A.C.
7. What avenues were available for raising objections to projects that the Collective believed bypassed local residents or violated the policies

His last question referred to what had happened at both MB and TB in the recent past. Overall, they were trying to figure out who they would go to for accountability, what were the recourses and how would they make sure that inclusion was involved for community contractors. Mr. Williams stated that he would not have been present at this meeting if there were contractual opportunities for his Collective because they would be busy working.

Ms. Berry stated that she was born and raised in D5 in the Fillmore. She stated that she could no longer live there because her whole building had been evicted due to conversion to condos. Ms. Berry stated that she had tried twice earlier to call in but was unsuccessful because every time she raised her hand, it was lowered. She stated that she was in support of Mr. Williams and his statement regarding black contractors. This matter had been brought up with City Attorney Chu, who hid behind Prop 209. She suggested that if one was not able to say the word "black", then use "culturally competent" or "those most harmed by the systems in San Francisco" or any other way to get black contractors hired, especially on projects affecting black communities. Ms. Berry also stated that as far as marketing and outreach on any matter, all City departments were guilty of doing a poor job, because if there was misinformation in the community, then the marketing was not being done correctly. She requested that OCII keep in mind that any program that qualified people one way or another caused pain. Individuals seeking housing had to search through obituaries, family secrets, and get involved with others who did not want to speak about the past. So this entire process resulted in trauma being inflicted on those trying to be eligible for many different programs. Ms. Berry stated that OCII needed to be cognizant of that and perhaps bring on professionals who could help individuals with this trauma. She challenged the statements that workshops being conducted through MOHCD or other entities were successful and was incensed over the statement that it was the fault of individuals' personal finances that they were not getting into housing. Lastly, she stated that the call-in system with raising of the hand did not work.

Mr. Williams stated that it had been very difficult to listen to this meeting for three hours. He referred to "Commissioner Maria" (Benjamin) who referred to "black folks" several times and even gave an example when she was speaking about them in a very condescending manner and stated that even her voice changed when she spoke about blacks as if to mimic them. He was very disturbed by this. Mr. Williams referred to Commissioner Brackett's comments about OCII's lack of compliance and accountability and the response by other Commission members resulted in a back-and-forth bickering match for two hours. Mr. Williams contended that her findings indicated what was wrong and how to fix it by OCII and she continued to be challenged about it. Mr. Williams stated that Black History Month had given him the strength of Ms. Brackett's passion and a renewed commitment to black SF which was under-represented. He resented how Ms. Brackett was being treated by other members as if she did not know what she was talking about and suggested that an oversight committee look into the current behavior of the Commission. He felt that Ms. Brackett should be held in higher regard. People were suffering due to the COP program. Mr. Williams advocated that if

there was no housing being built, then prepare to build it and make a comprehensive plan. He pointed out that some Commissioners took pride in the success at the Shipyard or Candlestick without acknowledging the black history of those communities. Black developers were being left out of these projects as well as black contractors, truckers and cleaning crews and again repeated that this was wrong.

Commissioner Lim inquired about whether the Commission was obligated to answer the questions posed by public comment.

Chair Scott responded in the negative and that Commissioners just had to listen.

c) Workshop on Annual Housing Production Report Fiscal Year 2023-2024 (Discussion)

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

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speakers: Demetrius Williams, President of SF Hyper Local Building Trades Contractors Collective; Oscar James, native resident, BVHP; Gloria Berry, D10; Dennis Williams, Executive Director, Fillmore Community Development Corporation and micro real estate developer;

Mr. Williams stated that he was very disturbed by the information he heard from this presentation.

Mr. James agreed with Mr. Williams' statement. Mr. James stated that residents of this community grew up, worked and lived there and if they were not benefitting from the development of the area, then no one else should be benefitting either.

Ms. Berry stated that she had a problem with the word "inclusion" being used in the presentations and inquired about at what point would people be held accountable for blatantly lying about presenting information with no data. She scolded OCII for bragging about housing being built with the idea that it was trickling down to the black community. She stated that market rate (MR) housing was not necessary in SF because there was a plethora of MR housing in SF. What the City needed was not affordable housing, but deeply affordable housing. Ms. Berry stated that she wished people would stop lying.

Commissioner Brackett stated that she and Commissioner Lim still had many questions regarding this item and asked that it be continued to the next meeting.

Commissioner Brackett motioned to continue Item 5c) to the next meeting and Chair Scott seconded that motion.

Chair Scott stated that they all had the same goals and concerns and noted that all Commissioners had different ways to express those concerns. However, she wanted to affirm that they were all moving toward a better city and she thanked Executive Director Kaslofsky, Ms. Sims and staff for their work in the right direction.

11. Adjournment

Chair Scott asked for a motion to adjourn.

Vice-Chair Aquino motioned to adjourn and Commissioner Lim seconded that motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

for Lucinda Nguyen
Jaimie Cruz
Commission Secretary