

**MINUTES OF A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE  
OVERSIGHT BOARD OF THE CITY AND  
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HELD ON THE  
30TH DAY OF JANUARY 2025**

The members of the Oversight Board of the City and County of San Francisco met in a special meeting in person at 10:00 a.m. on the 30th day of January 2025 at City Hall, Room 408, 1 Dr Carlton B. Goodlett Place, San Francisco, CA 94102

**The Oversight Board will convene hybrid meetings that will allow in-person attendance, remote access, and public comment via teleconference. Members of the public may provide public comment in-person at the notified 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](mailto:commissionsecretary.ocii@sfgov.org); all comments received will be made a part of the official record.**

**WATCH ON WEBEX: <https://bit.ly/4ayPgBM> (Stream will go live 5 minutes before the event)**

**ENTER NAME, EMAIL ADDRESS**

**ENTER PASSWORD: obpublic**

**[Instructions for watching livestream: <https://bit.ly/3ZdRqk5> ]**

**[Instructions for providing public comment: <https://bit.ly/3vyFJqw>]**

**TO LISTEN TO THE LIVE MEETING OR TO PROVIDE PUBLIC COMMENT:**

**DIAL: 1-415-655-0001 ENTER ACCESS CODE: 2664 641 4442 PRESS #, then PRESS # again to enter the call. When prompted, press \*3 to submit your request to speak.**

**1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Van Degna at 10:03 a.m.

Roll call was taken.

Board member Moses Corrette - present

Board member Licinia Iberri - absent

Board member Janice Li - present

Vice-Chair Lydia Ely - present

Chair Anna Van Degna - present

Board member Iberri arrived late. All other Board members were present. It was noted that seat for the City and County of San Francisco and the seat for San Francisco Community College were still vacant.

Chair Van Degna read the obligatory land statement.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Special Meeting of January 16, 2025**

**PUBLIC COMMENT - None**

Board member Li motioned to move Item 2 and it was seconded by Board member Corrette.

Voice vote was taken for Item 2.

Board member Corrette - yes  
Board member Iberri - absent  
Board member Li - yes  
Vice-Chair Ely - yes  
Chair Van Degna - yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR BOARD MEMBERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE SPECIAL MEETING OF JANUARY 16, 2025, BE ADOPTED.

**3. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

- A. The next scheduled Board meeting will be a special meeting held in person at City Hall on Thursday, September 4, 2025 at 1:30 p.m. in Room 408.
- 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.
- B. Announcement of Time Allotment for Public Comments:  
Please be advised a member of the public has up to three minutes to make pertinent public comments on each agenda item unless the Board 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 Board Secretary. All dial-in participants from the public will be instructed to call a toll-free number and use their touch-tone phones to register any desire to provide public comment. Audio prompts will signal to dial-in participants when their audio input has been enabled for commenting.

**DIAL:** 1-415-655-0001      **ENTER ACCESS CODE:** 2664 641 4442

**PRESS #, then PRESS # again to enter the call. Press \*3 to submit your request to speak.**

**4. CONSENT AGENDA - None**

**5. REGULAR AGENDA**

A. Approving the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule for July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026  
("ROPS 25-26") (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 01-2025)

Presenters: Executive Director, Thor Kaslofsky; Rosa Torres, Deputy Director, Finance and Administration; Deputy City Attorney John Givner

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

Speakers: Bivett Brackett, OCII (Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure) Commissioner; Dr. Carolyn Scott, Chair, OCII; Queen Vanessa Banks, native resident, Hunters Point; Janice Smith, native resident, Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP); Ace Washington, community advocate; Cathy Davis, Executive Director, Bayview Senior Services; Dwayne Gangs, BVHP Coordinating Council, Bivett Brackett for Maika Pinkston; Alisha Rochelle, BVHP Coordinating Council; Dennis Williams, Jr., D C Williams Development Company and Board of Supervisors awarded community leader

Ms. Brackett stated that she was there to speak on behalf of the community as well as OCII to report on things that had gone wrong throughout this ROPS process; specifically that this issue had not been brought before OCII when it met on January 7, 2025. She noted that the Commission had not met during November or December 2024. Ms. Brackett stated that she had been serving on the Commission since 2019 and was appointed by former Mayor London Breed. She related that during the height of the pandemic one of the first things that took place was the motion to sunset the Certificate of Preference (COP) program, a program which was the only guarantee for the families displaced by redevelopment to have the opportunity to move back to San Francisco (SF) or to be able to move into affordable housing that OCII had been building. Later they were able to preserve the program and they set up the COP Subcommittee, which Ms. Brackett currently chaired. The subcommittee had been working with MOHCD (Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development) on initiatives in order to fix the COP program. She reported that in the last 10 years, the program had housed only 81 people out of the 12,000 displaced individuals. Over the years they had worked with David Chiu, now SF City Attorney, to pass the Descendancy Bill to give access to descendants of COP holders to citywide housing and through that process, they discovered that certain certificate holders (D-holders) did not have the same access to housing as others, but were limited to only OCII housing rather than citywide housing. Ms. Brackett reported that in 2012 when the Redevelopment Agency was dissolved, they lost 6,000 units of replacement housing in the Fillmore. She worked with the then Executive Director and CCSF (City and County of SF) to get those units back, an action which was approved, and which would reserve those units for COP holders who were locked out of citywide housing. The subsequent replacement housing bill (SB 593) was passed in 2023 and OCII was assured that policies would be set up to ensure that the replacement housing would be open to COP holders. However, she recently learned that much of the housing scheduled to be built would not be available to COP holders who averaged at 33% of and below AMI (Area Median Income) and that most of the housing to be built, while it is considered affordable, would not meet the needs of COP holders. Because SB 593 was passed specifically to address the harm done to COP holders and the displacement of African Americans, Japanese community members in the Fillmore district and other community members, Ms. Brackett requested that the Oversight Board include language to the current ROPS stating that replacement housing

funding specifically target COP holders and those thresholds that this housing was intended to be used for.

Dr. Scott identified herself as OCII Chair and she acknowledged that they were all there to right the wrongs that had been done to the SF community. She asked that the Board approve the ROPS because holding it back would do more harm than good. Dr. Scott spoke about working toward the improvement of SF families and communities and encouraged working for the betterment of families who could work, thrive and live in SF.

Ms. Banks stated that she owned one of the original COP certificates because her mother was one of the individuals displaced back in the 50's. She spoke about her daughter who was now a COP descendant but described how the process of getting into housing was difficult and discouraging to many certificate holders. She felt strongly that SF should do better and do the right thing. Ms. Banks stated that she needed her daughter to be in SF to help her now as she was getting older. She requested help from the Board to straighten this process out so that COP holders could come back to SF.

Ms. Smith stated that she had lived in SF for 64 years and she encouraged the Board to help with the COP program. She spoke about the disabled brother who she cared for and they were both COP holders and hoped that the COP program would not be taken away from her community. She deferred to Ms. Brackett to answer what percentage of COP holders were in housing.

Ms. Brackett responded that, over the past 10 years, almost 10,000 units had been built and less than 1% of the units belonged to COP holders.

Ms. Smith continued that justice must be done. She stated that she had grandchildren and wanted Board members to think about how they would feel if their houses were taken away from them.

Mr. Washington advocated for stopping the ROPS for more discussion so that the community was aware of what was going on. He spoke about redevelopment effects in the Western Addition and the Fillmore. He was concerned that the community had no control. OCII cancelled the last meeting due to lack of quorum, so the community was left out of the ROPS.

Ms. Davis stated that her agency was the one responsible for about 80% of COP holders getting into housing because they did the case management and the necessary work. She wanted to ensure that the COP program was included in the ROPS for the next year. She supported comments by Ms. Brackett, especially concerning the COP-D holders not being able to get into all the housing, which OCII had been supporting, but they needed citywide support for the D-holders. She commended OCII for finding all the D-holders and felt strongly that now they needed to find them housing. Ms. Davis stated that it was difficult and sad to discover how very few individuals had actually found housing through the program and she wanted to get more individuals into housing. She stated that her agency was committed to building housing on Mission Bay Block 4E and they were helping with Freedom West and they wanted to get more COP holders into housing there. She stated that COP holders truly did believe that the COP program would be able to get them into housing and every City agency involved in this program should be working to expand this program and include it in all housing being built.

Mr. Gangs stated that he had been in SF since 1964 and he felt strongly that the African-American community had been squeezed out of SF and now did not have a chance to get into anything, especially housing. He asked that the Board consider and help the African-American community.

Ms. Brackett came to the podium to state that she would speak later on behalf of Ms. Pinkston who had to leave due to a medical issue.

Chair Van Degna deferred to Mr. Givner regarding Ms. Pinkston.

Mr. Givner clarified that a member of the public could not cede their time to another individual; however, an individual could read a statement from the original speaker that the original speaker had planned to make.

Ms. Brackett proceeded to read the statement by Ms. Pinkston, which referred to the Affordable Housing Funding and Financing Recommendations Report from the Affordable Housing Leadership Council which had convened as part of the implementation of the SF 2020 housing element update. That council had met to discuss the future of affordable housing for the City and found that extremely low-income renters struggled to find affordable housing they could afford without subsidies. With President Trump now proposing to cut funding for Section 8 voucher programs, vulnerable families would not be eligible for the program because they would not be able to meet the 30% of income threshold needed to qualify for the units being built by OCII. She stated that this was important because while they were building they needed to be intentional about what they were building and at what AMI. It was not that they were against this project but that they sought to ensure that it did not create a ceiling at 15%-30% AMI, which would leave those individuals, primarily COP holders, who were only making 0-30% AMI, unable to attain those units. The City report also stated that over the past five years the biggest opportunity to build these extremely affordable units which were needed would be through tax increment dollars which were used by the Redevelopment Agency's replacement housing funding and City funding, combining that funding with other cross-sector financing deals and adding philanthropic dollars to projects and partnerships to be able to provide the extremely affordable housing needed in SF. Ms. Brackett stated that Mayor Lurie deeply wanted to see the end to the homeless crisis in SF, but this issue could not be resolved if the City was only building housing for people making 30% of AMI and above. She added that a large portion of the SF homeless population were COP holders and if the City did not do something to build for those people, they would continue to be homeless and miss out on jobs and other helpful benefits.

Ms. Rochelle referred to the deadline date of February 1, 2025 and stated that she was learning that COP holders were not able to access the housing being built and inquired about how they could remedy the situation and ensure that COP holders were able to access what was originally designed for them. She stated that what she was hearing was a lot of red tape and inquired about where this meeting was supposed to take them.

Secretary Cruz inquired about whether Ms. Rochelle was finished with her comments.

Ms. Rochelle responded that she was hoping for an answer.

Secretary Cruz responded that the Board was not able to respond to Public Comment.

Executive Director Kaslofsky interjected that Public Comment was solely an opportunity for the public to put statements on the record. He explained that the Board did not respond during the Public Comment period; however, the Board would have the opportunity to discuss the issue after Public Comment was closed.

Mr. Williams reminded everyone that the COP program was started by the Redevelopment Agency for black residents wrongly displaced by that same agency and the aim of it was to correct the racially-discriminating wrong. He felt strongly that OCII must not repeat that wrong. He stated that just like the Latino community was now afraid of being deported, so was the black community in fear of again being displaced and living with no hope of any economic recovery. He explained that OCII had a civic duty to do everything within its power to make sure this did not happen, especially in 2025. Mr. Williams explained that SF rents were just too high for low-income residents and new affordable housing at the 30% AMI was not attainable, so revisions to this must be done. He commended Ms. Brackett for her work at this meeting and especially for exposing (at the last OCII meeting) the continuous non-compliance with hiring percentages of qualified black LBE contractors and referred to one project where notwithstanding the mandated 50% local hiring, only 5.7% local hiring was obtained and inquired about whether that was not illegal. He stated that local hiring was virtually non-existent on OCII development projects and noted that since 2023, only four contracts had been awarded of \$161 million. He inquired about how many of those contracts had been awarded to local black real estate developers and inquired about where the partnering opportunities were. Mr. Williams stated that he, as a real estate developer in SF, was dismissed from discussions with Kathy Davis regarding the OCII-awarded Mission Bay (MB) senior development (project). He was told that there were no partnering opportunities for him. OCII was alerted of this behavior but nothing was done about it. Mr. Williams felt strongly that changes were needed in this regard to give the LBE's, micro developers and COP holders the opportunity to thrive successfully. He commended all the speakers who came forward today to speak on this issue.

Vice-Chair Ely reviewed the comments made by Executive Director Kaslofsky at the beginning of the meeting which indicated that the role of the Oversight Board (OB) was extremely limited in terms of approving the ROPS and as representatives of the SF taxing entities, this was what they were there for. She stressed that the topic of how COP holders could be housed most effectively through OCII projects and other City projects was of utmost importance to her. However, in her role as a Board member, it was not something she could speak about. She noted that in the ROPS there was \$325,000 in replacement housing money that they were approving at this meeting and she requested confirmation from staff that this replacement housing funding was truly intended to advance additional affordable housing projects and was not designated for any particular project.

Executive Director Kaslofsky clarified that it was \$340,000 and that this was the second tranche of SB 593 authorized funding that they were seeking, which they also did in the 2024 ROPS. He explained that there was a planning process that took place before affordable housing construction began and staff would work with the developer of the project, if selected, to plan that project. Mr. Kaslofsky reported that they had sites in Mission Bay (MB) on Block 4E, which was adjacent to the police station and the Chase Arena, designated for affordable housing and that they had allocated

just over \$200,000 on the last ROPS for environmental review for that project. He explained that there was public solicitation and they had selected Curtis Development, a black-owned development team, and partnered with the BVHP Multi-purpose Senior Center. OCII was now working with that team on the project and the \$340,000 was for staff time to work on that project.

Vice-Chair Ely asked for confirmation that this project and any other project supported with replacement housing funds, whether for staff time, environmental review, or construction, would be subject to the COP referral requirements that were currently in place.

Executive Director Kaslofsky responded that there were no exceptions to the COP policy and that all OCII-produced housing, including this project, projects under construction at Hunters Point (HP) Shipyard and Transbay (TB) were all subject to the COP policy. He added that any affordable housing properties transferred over to MOHCD during the post dissolution 2012 period were all subject to the COP program and the leasing or sale of those units must first be marketed to COP holders, who had the first opportunity to 100% of all those units. If 100% of those units were not selected by COP holders, then they would be placed under the other preferences that the City had under Chapter 47, the City law that applied to preferences and housing.

Ms. Brackett approached the podium to add comment to Executive Director Kaslofsky's response. She stated that they had had affordable housing projects where the ceiling was 50-120% AMI, which meant that although COP holders had access to it and would have first rights, it did not truly guarantee them access because it had been reported to OCII that 85% of COP holders did not qualify to even apply for that housing. So while they got preference, there really was no preference if the units were not set at an affordability rate of COP holders, which, according to OCII data, was 33% of AMI.

Chair Van Degna reminded the public that Public Comment was closed.

Board member Corrette thanked the OCII Commissioners for being present at this meeting and for discussing policy issues which Board rarely heard and typically were not their concern. He explained that the OB oversaw the finance wing of projects versus the policy wing of projects. He stated that he appreciated hearing from OCII Commissioners and the public about some of the issues going on. He acknowledged that the OB was normally a quiet body and having public comment was rare, but he hoped that this would change and that the OB would be available to listen more. Building on an earlier question, Mr. Corrette referred to the third WHEREAS in the resolution, referring to SB 593 and had one correction to the first line of the third paragraph, which read, "In October 2023 and becomes" and stated that this should read "became". He inquired about, as it related to SB 593 and the 5,482 units, the correlation between the COP's and AMI requirements for these developments.

Board member Iberri wanted to add to Board member Corrette's question in order to understand where the policy discussion was regarding the critical population and their actual AMI and production of housing that would meet their AMI requirement and implementation to address this need.

Executive Director Kaslofsky advised the Board that there would be an OCII meeting on Tuesday, February 4, 2025, which would include a workshop on the COP program. He invited all Board

members to attend that meeting. He responded that SB 593 required the production of that housing under that authorization to include very low, low and moderate income. Regarding OCII's production historically, 60% of its housing had been at 50% AMI or below. As an example, the TB project under construction currently with 330 units at Folsom and Main, which was not replacement housing, would be delivered in 2026 and they were able to obtain subsidies for those units through their City partners. Mr. Kaslofsky gave a breakdown of the units and their AMI levels: 40 units would be at 0-30% of AMI; 106 units would be at 40-60% AMI. That was an example of the AMI levels and productivity they were targeting. He added that one of the sites was for seniors and the other was for families.

Chair Van Degna asked for a motion to move Item 5A.

Vice-Chair Ely motioned to move Item 5A and it was seconded by Board member Li.

Voice vote was taken for Item 5A with the correction suggested by Board member Corrette to the resolution.

Board member Corrette - yes

Board member Iberri - yes

Board member Li - yes

Vice-Chair Ely - yes

Chair Van Degna - yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FIVE BOARD MEMBERS THAT APPROVAL OF RESOLUTION NO. 01-2025, APPROVING THE RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION PAYMENT SCHEDULE FOR JULY 1, 2025 TO JUNE 30, 2026 ("ROPS 25-26"), BE ADOPTED.

## **6. NEW MATTERS FOR FUTURE CONSIDERATION**

Executive Director Kaslofsky stated that he had no announcements at this time.

## **7. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

Speakers: Ace Washington, community advocate; Bivett Brackett, OCII Commissioner; Dr. Carolyn Scott, Chair, OCII; Dennis Williams, Jr., D C Williams Development Company; Alisha Rochelle, BVHP Coordinating Council;

Mr. Washington stated that he was disappointed at the outcome of this meeting and stated that approval of this ROPS without the inclusion of the community was not right. He spoke about the Western Addition and the Fillmore, who no one talked about anymore. He pointed out that the new Mayor and the new Board of Supervisor did not know what was happening in the Fillmore and the community needed to have representation.

Ms. Brackett thanked the Board for listening to OCII Commissioners and the public about problematic situations in the City. She felt strongly that former Mayor Breed and the new Mayor Lurie was tasking everyone in City government to take responsibility now to make changes to help



the community. She invited Board members to come to OCII meetings to learn about the COP program, the history of redevelopment and the replacement housing that the Board would continue to be approving further in the future.

Dr. Scott also thanked the Board and the community members for being at this meeting. She mentioned that she had been in SF since the 40's and had family members who were COP holders. Dr. Scott was grateful that they were allowed now to sit at the table, when they never were before. She wanted to see City agencies and communities work together and move together to unravel and reveal and to right the wrongs. She believed that together they could make this happen, but not one person could do this alone. Working toward the betterment of the community and the City was what she looked forward to doing as a Commissioner. Dr. Scott stated that she did want to hear the opinions of Board members and thanked them for their questions and input.

Mr. Williams stated that he wanted to make sure that his previous comments were not misconstrued to be a personal attack on the MB project, Cathy Davis or staff, but he felt that he needed to be transparent because there was a problem when partnerships were not allowed between business owners in SF. He asserted that when no one stepped in as a leader, it was egregious to talk about working together. He felt strongly that cross lateral relationships must continue between the micro developers and LBE contractors all the way to truck drivers, who were out of work and who had been waiting for jobs. Mr. Williams stated that he had been attending meetings and working on this for five years to no avail. Joint ventures and limited partnerships must take place. He referred to the Shipyard, where many homes were supposed to be built, but the AMI was too high, which would cause new developments to be too high as well. The community needed to be trained and be put to work. He referred to the Fillmore as being a food desert because their Safeway was gone. Seniors were put at risk trying to get to other markets now. He commended Mr. Washington for his work in the community. He asked for City agencies to do better.


Ms. Rochelle thanked the Board for listening to all the public comment. She stated that there was a disconnect between the policy being made and the financing being spent and issued. She encouraged everyone to definitely work together but stated that it all had to make sense.

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

Board member Corrette motioned to move Item 8 and it was seconded by Vice-Chair Ely.

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Van Degna at 11:18 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Jaimie Cruz  
Board Secretary