

**MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING OF THE
COMMISSION ON COMMUNITY INVESTMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO HELD ON THE
1ST DAY OF JULY 2014**

The members of the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure of the City and County of San Francisco met in a regular meeting at City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 416, in the City of San Francisco, California, at 1:00 p. m. on the 1st day of July 2014, at the place and date duly established for holding of such a meeting.

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

1. Recognition of a Quorum

Meeting was called to order at 1:15 p.m. Roll call was taken.

Commissioner Ellington – present
Commissioner Mondejar – present
Vice-Chair Rosales – present
Commissioner Singh – present
Chair Johnson – present

All Commission members were present.

2. Announcements

A. The next scheduled Commission meeting will be a regular meeting held on Tuesday, July 15, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. (City Hall, Room 416).

B. Announcement of Prohibition of Sound Producing Electronic Devices during the Meeting

Please be advised that the ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing of or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic device.

C. Announcement of Time Allotment for Public Comments

3. Report on actions taken at previous Closed Session meeting - None

4. Matters of Unfinished Business – None

5. Matters of New Business:

CONSENT AGENDA

a) Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting of May 20, 2014

PUBLIC COMMENT – None

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

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

Commissioner Ellington – yes
Commissioner Mondejar – abstained, not present
Vice-Chair Rosales – yes
Commissioner Singh – yes
Chair Johnson – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY 4 COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSTENTION THAT THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETINGS OF MAY 20, 2014 BE ADOPTED.

- b) Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting of June 3, 2014.

PUBLIC COMMENT – None

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

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

Commissioner Ellington – yes
Commissioner Mondejar – abstained, not present
Vice-Chair Rosales – yes
Commissioner Singh – yes
Chair Johnson – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY 4 COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSTENTION THAT THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETINGS OF JUNE 3, 2014 BE ADOPTED.

REGULAR AGENDA

- c) Approving a resolution confirming the issuance of Special Tax Refunding Bonds for Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco Community Facilities District No. 7 (Hunters Point Shipyard Phase One Improvements) in an amount not to exceed \$40,000,000, approving a Preliminary Official Statement and authorizing the execution of a final Official Statements and approving other documents and actions properly relating thereto; Hunters Point Shipyard Project Area (the “Confirming Resolution”). (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 47-2014)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Thor Kaslofsky, Project Manager, Hunters Point Shipyard; Anna Van Degna, Director, Stifel Nicolaus

PUBLIC COMMENT – None

Commissioner Singh had a question about the reference to the \$21 million in performance bonds; inquired about the \$5 million corporate guarantee; inquired about the current interest rate.

Mr. Kaslofsky responded that the reference to the \$21 million in performance bonds, which were required by the City and by the State Map Act when there was an infrastructure permit, the performance bonds are to be placed in the custody of the Department of Public Works to be used in the event that the developer defaulted and did not complete the infrastructure. To the second question, Mr. Kaslofsky responded that the \$5 million corporate guarantee for Phase I was a requirement under the Phase I Disposition and Development Agreement to be used if the developer defaulted on the Phase I DDA in the event that there were outstanding costs. Mr. Kaslofsky deferred to Ms. Von Degna of Underwriters to respond to interest rate question.

Ms. Van Degna responded that the current estimated interest rate was 5.7% and added that since market conditions were subject to change, she estimated it to be from 5.5% to 6%.

Commissioner Singh motioned to move Item 5(c) and Commissioner Mondejar seconded that motion.

Secretary Nguyen called for a voice vote on Items 5(c).

Commissioner Ellington – yes
Commissioner Mondejar – yes
Vice-Chair Rosales – yes
Commissioner Singh – yes
Chair Johnson – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY 5 COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 47-2014, APPROVING A RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL TAX REFUNDING BONDS FOR REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT NO. 7 (HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD PHASE ONE IMPROVEMENTS) IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$40,000,000, APPROVING A PRELIMINARY OFFICIAL STATEMENT AND AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A FINAL OFFICIAL STATEMENTS AND APPROVING OTHER DOCUMENTS AND ACTIONS PROPERLY RELATING THERETO; HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD PROJECT AREA (THE “CONFIRMING RESOLUTION”), BE ADOPTED.

- d) Adopting environmental review findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, and conditionally approving a Major Phase Application for a residential project with HPS Development Co. LP, and Marinship Development Interests, LLC on Block 52, generally bounded by Friedell Street, Kirkwood and Jerrold Avenues, for 74 housing units at the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 1, including a) Schedule of Performance Report, b) a Major Phase and Project Housing Data Table, and c) a combined Basic Conceptual and Schematic Designs, and d) form of Vertical Disposition and Development Agreement; Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Project Area. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 48-2014)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; Thor Kaslofsky, Project Manager, Hunters Point Shipyard; Danny Cook, Executive Vice President, Lennar Urban; Al Norman, Marinship Development Interests, LLC; Veronica Hinkley Reck, Architect, Ignition; Nashilu Mouen, Housing Market, Lennar Urban; Maria Benjamin, Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speaker: Linda Richardson, Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP) resident

Ms. Richardson spoke in support of this item and about the success of working together with the community. She stated that this project was in compliance with the Hunters Point development plan and that she was very happy with the color schemes and construction materials.

Commissioner Ellington inquired about the size of the retail space and the types of retail that would be appropriate for the space; inquired about parking within the building and on the street; commented about how appreciative he was to Al Norman in partnering with the Community Builders Program and Lennar.

Mr. Kaslofsky responded that it would be 1200 to 1500 square feet and that the exact size would be based on additional study. He indicated that this part of the Shipyard was new in terms of its development without many retail opportunities and so the concept was to have some kind of convenience store there. This would represent one of two retail opportunities: Block 1 would have a larger 9,000 sq. foot retail site but this one would be in the heart of and within walking distance from the Hilltop neighborhood.

To the parking question, Ms. Hinkley Reck responded that parking depending on the building. The two podium-style buildings, 1 & 2, would have parking below the units in a parking garage style; in Buildings 3 & 4, each unit would have their own dedicated parking spaces in their own personal garage; Building 5 was podium style with parking lifts with individual spaces and electrical charging stations.

Commissioner Singh stated that he was pleased with the color coordination and that he thought everything looked very good.

Vice-Chair Rosales commented that the purple and green colors were bold and would make a stunning impression and applauded the architects on the design. She inquired about the Community Builder Program and requested more information about how that worked; inquired if this was the first time they were embarking on this type of a plan.

Chair Johnson responded that the program was part of the Community Benefits package for Phases I & II.

Mr. Kaslofsky responded that the Community Builder Program worked the same for Phase I and II in the Community Benefits programs. He explained that as part of the 2003 Phase I DDA, approximately 30% of the blocks were selected to be community builder blocks. Lennar and the Redevelopment Agency had conducted an RFQ in 2005 to seek local developers, which had to be located in the Bayview, to partner with other developers or to be on their own if they had experience, and to work with Lennar to develop those units. Those blocks had all been laid out and each one had a community builder assigned to them. Mr. Kaslofsky reviewed the 3 types of programs: fee-based, where the community builder would operate as the project manager and get a percentage of the fees but Lennar would be the developer; joint venture, in a partnership with Lennar; or independent, which meant they would buy the land and develop it on their own. In each case, a vertical DDA would have to be signed with the OCII. Within 30 days of the appraisal, the community builder would have to decide which program they would want to enter into--either on their own or in partnership with Lennar. Mr. Kaslofsky responded that this was the first time that one of the community builders had decided to follow the independent option. He explained that Blocks 53 & 43 had had community builders but they had decided to follow the

fee-based option. He added that Mr. Smith and Mr. Norman believed they had the financial capacity and the experience to move forward with development of this project.

Commissioner Mondejar stated that she was very pleased with the color scheme and that it felt very welcoming. She inquired about transportation plans for the project; inquired about the type of retail stores they want to attract there;

Mr. Kaslofsky responded that the Muni No. 19 was a regular bus line that ran through the Shipyard and that service was expected to expand and that the 3rd Street light rail was about 10-15 blocks away. He explained that on the southern side of the shipyard there were other transit lines which would be tied back in as development in Phase 2 occurred and intensified. A rapid transit bus was planned as well and they imagined a greater investment by Muni to install all the necessary transportation for this project in the future. To the retail question, Mr. Kaslofsky responded that although early in the project, there had already been many discussions about retail and that there were constant requests for more amenities in the communities. They were considering coffee shops, fresh produce markets, and dry-cleaning types of services.

Chair Johnson stated that she was very happy to see construction rising up from the ground. She inquired about the design and what their strategy would be for the color scheme for the entire hilltop and hillside area; inquired about rooftop space. Ms. Johnson pointed out that on the infrastructure designs, they had reclaimed water as one of the underground utilities and inquired about whether they would be installing a grey water system for this building; on the parking lifts. Ms. Johnson recalled that there had been an idea for parking lifts in Mission Bay South but they were eliminated because of costs and inquired whether the idea of the lifts was final or could they still be eliminated.

Mr. Kaslofsky responded that there has been much consideration by Lennar about marketing the Shipyard and that the color schemes were subject to change and would not be applied until the final architectural finish was considered; however, he added that he was sure all the color schemes would be synched up and integrated.

Mr. Cook responded that this was a very appropriate comment about the colors because there was a high level of sensitivity to the color scheme. He explained that they had required the architects to look at the project as a composite so that there would not be major conflicts with other architecture of the buildings in the hilltop. He stated that they had wanted the color to make a bold statement but without having a lot of froufrou. Mr. Cook added that they had recommissioned the master plan architect, IBI, to walk through the entire hilltop in order to look at it consider as a whole.

Ms. Hinkley Reck added that they had looked at not only the architectural elements and style but the different surrounding colors as well and indicated that the other color would be teal, not orange. To the rooftop space question, she responded that they had aligned the balconies to be able to go up to the top floor with balconies because they were condominium for-sale units. Ms. Hinkley Reck added that over the garage in the townhomes, there would be raised decks. Currently they were considering incorporating solar on the rooftops.

To the grey water question, Mr. Cook responded that they were installing the entire infrastructure for the system to be hooked up, but that the City had to bring the water source to the project.

Executive Director Bohee added that just like in Mission Bay, the pipes had been installed for over a decade and that the City was going through reviews to identify the source for the reclaimed water. She added that the City would provide the source through SFPUC.

To the lifts question, Ms. Hinkley Reck responded that they were final and should not be too cost prohibitive because there would be no excavating required to incorporate them.

Chair Johnson pointed out that this building was going to provide 2 to 1 parking spaces to units and believed that it would work for this location. She added that street parking would probably dwindle eventually because of no available street parking. Ms. Johnson pointed out that a change had been made in the DDA to give the OCII a head start in marketing to Certificate of Preference holders so they would know that there was a lottery and she stated that this was much appreciated. She inquired about how they were going to market that head start and about what would they gain with the extra 16 months.

Mr. Kaslofsky responded that there had been many discussions about the marketing piece and explained that the first step was to integrate the vertical DDA into what was going on citywide, not just with affordable housing but with Certificate of Preference holders as well. He stated that the head start was crucial because they had found that there was not enough time to work with Certificate of Preference holders in order to get them ready for first time home buyership or affordable housing purchases in general.

Ms. Mouen responded that there would be two mailings with marketing info and pricing, the first of which would be sent out 60 days after the schematic design approval to give heads up preference to Certificate of Preference holders. She explained that each mailing was linked to an San Francisco Housing Development Corporation (SFHDC) workshop, at which they would be able to review the limited equity program as well as the specific units for that residential project, then learn what the next steps would be for Certificate of Preference holders to get a mortgage for one of the units. The idea was that to give support and follow up via SFHDC along all the required steps. Ms. Mouen indicated that applications would be available across BVHP and District 10, which could be dropped off at certain locations across the City. She added that sales associates would refer any Certificate of Preference holder or anyone dropping off an application to the HomeOwnershipSF Agency and to other organization providing that support. Ms. Mouen indicated that they were hopeful this would give them enough time to get prepared to get into those homes.

Ms. Benjamin responded that she was very pleased about the extended time because one of the things that HomeOwnershipSF Agency did was to delve deep into the issues that barred people from becoming homeowners, which could take months to resolve. She indicated that several Certificate of Preference holders had attended the most recent workshop as a result of the mailings and they were working to prepare for this opportunity. Ms. Benjamin explained that when they were ready to move in, they would receive more specifics about the units and then would able to see them to "start the dream".

Mr. Kaslofsky added that they were trying to create a pool of ready Certificate of Preference holders. He explained that after approximately 60-180 days, when holders had been through all the workshops and credit preparedness classes and get into the lottery and hopefully be selected.

Ms. Benjamin added that they were also seeing a sustained amount of new Certificate requests and stated that they believed this was a result of the arising opportunities and the excitement around them.

Vice-Chair Rosales commended staff and others for their success in the outcome of the marketing piece regarding the Certificate of Preference holders.

Chair Johnson inquired about what the criteria was for rental to owner transition or for residents to be able to purchase their units; inquired about how the units would convert from rental to for sale; inquired about where the entrances were in the building.

Mr. Kaslofsky responded that currently this was a for-sale development and explained that the developer had the right, prior to the execution of the vertical DDA, which would happen within 12 months after this meeting date, to decide whether they would offer rental or for sale. At that point the decision would be locked in and they would have to amend the vertical DDA in order to change it. He explained that if they were to convert the homes later to rental, it would have to come before the Commission again and they could be marketed as rental units. He added that the vertical DDA would have to be amended if certain units were to be sold or if the project in general was to be converted to from rental back to for sale. To the entrances question, Mr. Kaslofsky responded that this was still in the conceptual stage but stated that the specific entrance and exits would be coming later.

Chair Johnson and Vice-Chair Rosales commended staff for the excellent results in the SBE topic.

Commissioner Singh inquired if the architect had done any other projects for the City; inquired about the view from the podium; stated he had a concern about not having enough parking. Mr. Singh stated that most people in San Francisco had two cars and they needed more parking.

Ms. Hinkley-Reck responded that she had worked on Octavia Court in Hayes Valley, the first parcel HUD Section 811 project which was one of the parcels liberated when the highway came down. She added that she had been associate architect on Mission Bay Blocks 2 & 5. To the view question, Ms. Hinkley-Reck responded that they had opened it up and aligned it with a park so that there were views to the water through the townhouses.

In response to the parking question, Mr. Kaslofsky responded that the Design for Development for Phase I limited the maximum amount of parking to 2 to 1 (two spaces per unit) and, therefore, they had achieved the most they could do as far as parking. He indicated that they could increase the parking in the Design for Development and added that most developers would want to have more parking because they could charge for it. However, Mr. Kaslofsky stressed, in terms of urban planning, the City was looking to have less parking and more reliance on public transportation. To Mr. Singh's statement regarding two cars, Mr. Kaslofsky responded that if someone had two cars, they should get the purple unit in Block 52 (laughter). He added that there would also be excess parking spots for additional cars.

Vice-Chair Rosales inquired about parking for visitors.

Mr. Kaslofsky responded that there would be on-street parking for visitors surrounding the entire block throughout Phase I and, as part of the Conditions for Approval, they would be conducting a parking study, especially because of the retail location issue. He added that there would be parking everywhere except where there were driveways.

Chair Johnson added that in the new buildings being built, she had noted that usually some parking spots were set aside for visitor parking and inquired if that was not happening in this project.

Mr. Kaslofsky responded that he could not recall any general use parking for visitors in any of the previous designs.

Chair Johnson corrected to say parking for visitors of residents in the building.

Mr. Kaslofsky responded that if a resident had two parking spots, a visitor could use one of those spots. He indicated that the on-street parking would also be ample but there would be no visitor designated parking area inside the building.

Chair Johnson thanked staff for their hard work on this project.

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

Secretary Nguyen called for a voice vote on Items 5(d).

Commissioner Ellington – yes
Commissioner Mondejar – yes
Vice-Chair Rosales – yes
Commissioner Singh – yes
Chair Johnson – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY 5 COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 48-2014, ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, AND CONDITIONALLY APPROVING A MAJOR PHASE APPLICATION FOR A RESIDENTIAL PROJECT WITH HPS DEVELOPMENT CO. LP, AND MARINSHIP DEVELOPMENT INTERESTS, LLC ON BLOCK 52, GENERALLY BOUNDED BY FRIEDEL STREET, KIRKWOOD AND JERROLD AVENUES, FOR 74 HOUSING UNITS AT THE HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD PHASE 1, INCLUDING A) SCHEDULE OF PERFORMANCE REPORT, B) A MAJOR PHASE AND PROJECT HOUSING DATA TABLE, AND C) A COMBINED BASIC CONCEPTUAL AND SCHEMATIC DESIGNS, AND D) FORM OF VERTICAL DISPOSITION AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT; HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Items 5 (e) and 5 (f) related to Authorizing a Personal Services Contract for Bond Counsel Services and for Disclosure Counsel Services were presented together but acted on separately

- e) Authorizing a Personal Services Contract with Jones Hall, a Professional Law Corporation, for Bond Counsel Services in an amount not to exceed \$122,500 related to the issuance of City and County of San Francisco Redevelopment Financing Authority Tax Allocation Refunding Revenue Bonds, Series 2014B and Taxable Tax Allocation Refunding Revenue Bonds, Series 2014C. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 49-2014)
- f) Authorizing a Personal Services Contract with Curls Bartling, P.C., a Professional Law Corporation, for Disclosure Counsel Services in an amount not to exceed \$60,000 related to the

issuance of City and County of San Francisco Redevelopment Financing Authority Tax Allocation Refunding Revenue Bonds, Series 2014B and Taxable Tax Allocation Refunding Revenue Bonds, Series 2014C. (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 50-2014)

Presenters: Tiffany Bohee, Executive Director; John Daigle, Senior Finance Analyst

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

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

Secretary Nguyen called for a voice vote on Items 5(e).

Commissioner Ellington – yes
Commissioner Mondejar – yes
Vice-Chair Rosales – yes
Commissioner Singh – yes
Chair Johnson – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY 5 COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 49-2014, AUTHORIZING A PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH JONES HALL, A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION, FOR BOND COUNSEL SERVICES IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$122,500 RELATED TO THE ISSUANCE OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO REDEVELOPMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY TAX ALLOCATION REFUNDING REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2014B AND TAXABLE TAX ALLOCATION REFUNDING REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2014C, BE ADOPTED.

Vice-Chair Rosales motioned to move Item 5(f) and Commissioner Mondejar seconded that motion.

Secretary Nguyen called for a voice vote on Items 5(f).

Commissioner Ellington – yes
Commissioner Mondejar – yes
Vice-Chair Rosales – yes
Commissioner Singh – yes
Chair Johnson – yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED UNANIMOUSLY BY 5 COMMISSIONERS THAT RESOLUTION NO. 50-2014, AUTHORIZING A PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH CURLS BARTLING, P.C., A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION, FOR DISCLOSURE COUNSEL SERVICES IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$60,000 RELATED TO THE ISSUANCE OF CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO REDEVELOPMENT FINANCING AUTHORITY TAX ALLOCATION REFUNDING REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2014B AND TAXABLE TAX ALLOCATION REFUNDING REVENUE BONDS, SERIES 2014C, BE ADOPTED.

6. **Public Comment on Non-agenda Items – None**
7. **Report of the Chair**

Chair Johnson announced that she had no report. She announced that she had attended a Rules Committee hearing regarding her nomination to the Planning Commission, which was before the Board of Supervisors with full support. She stated that the next hearing would be either on July 7 or 8 and if successful, this meeting would be her last OCII meeting.

Commissioner Singh inquired as to who would be replacing her.

Chair Johnson responded that the Mayor's Office would be making that decision.

8. Report of the Executive Director

Executive Director Bohee announced that there would be a resolution thanking and commemorating Chair Johnson for her service. She pointed out the great stewardship that all the Commissioners had provided in shaping the City during the dissolution period amongst the confusion and uneasiness of the community and our development partners. She added that the leadership of all the Commissioners and hard work of the staff had helped keep all of the projects moving forward, and that we continued to make progress with all the housing issues.

Vice-Chair Rosales stated that they should have an agenda item on an upcoming meeting commending Chair Johnson so that she could speak and so that they could respond to her.

Executive Director Bohee stated that Chair Johnson would be able to speak on Item 6 as well as have her own calendar item.

Executive Director Bohee announced that they had received four respondents for Transbay Block 5, an office RFP, in which they had made a series of changes in response to OCII suggestions to include a workforce consultant. The four respondents were J. Paul Company, Boston Properties, Kilroy Realty and Golub with the Buck Company, and indicated that each one had brought on specific workforce consultants. Ms. Bohee explained that the next steps would include a panel, a financial evaluation and then a recommendation, which would be coming before the Commission.

Ms. Bohee announced a groundbreaking ceremony on July 29th at 11:00 a.m. for 474 Natoma, a 60-unit family South of Market rental building. She also announced that she and Chair Johnson had been present at the Bayview Hill Gardens grand opening the previous Friday, which was a 70-plus unit building for the formerly homeless, including two Certificate of Preference holders, and also with excellent numbers for SBE and local hiring.

Ms. Bohee also announced that there would be a tour offered to Commissioners and staff for the wonderful views in the area. She recalled inspirational stories from families now living in the units and that this had been made possible through the work of the Commission and staff over the past two years and spoke about how this has changed many lives.

Chair Johnson spoke about how extremely inspirational the speakers had been at that event. She recalled in particular one woman, who had been a drug addict for 20+ years and used to hang around the Franciscan Hotel, who was now 6 years sober, living at Bayview Hill Gardens, and who had gone back to school to get her bachelor's degree in social work.

Vice-Chair Rosales added that it was gratifying to hear that the work the OCII was doing was really making a difference.

9. Commissioners' Questions and Matters

Commissioner Singh stated that he was going to miss Chair Johnson.

Chair Johnson thanked everyone and appreciated everyone who came out in her support at her hearing the previous day.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Johnson at 2:53 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Lucinda Nguyen, Interim Commission Secretary