

London N. Breed  
MAYOR



Miguel Bustos  
CHAIR

Mara Rosales  
VICE-CHAIR

Bivett Brackett  
Alex Ludlum  
Dr. Carolyn Ransom-Scott  
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  
1ST DAY OF NOVEMBER 2022**

The members of the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure of the City and County of San Francisco met in a regular meeting via teleconference at 1:00 p.m. on the 1st day of November 2022. The public was invited to watch the meeting live on SFGOVTV: <https://sfgovtv.org/ccii>

**PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN:** 1-415-655-0001 **ACCESS CODE:** 2484 827 0132

In accordance with the numerous local and state proclamations, order and supplemental directions, aggressive directives have been issued to slow down and reduce the spread of the COVID-19 virus. Individuals are encouraged to participate in the meetings remotely by calling in during the public comment section of the meeting. Visit the SFGovTV website ([www.sfgovtv.org](http://www.sfgovtv.org)) to stream the live meetings or watch them on demand.

**REGULAR MEETING AGENDA**

**1. Recognition of a Quorum**

Meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by Chair Bustos. Roll call was taken.

Commissioner Brackett - absent  
Commissioner Ludlum - present  
Commissioner Scott - present  
Vice-Chair Rosales - absent  
Chair Bustos - present

Vice-Chair Rosales was absent and Commissioner Brackett arrived late; all other Commissioners were present.

**2. Announcements**

- a) The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will be held remotely on Tuesday, November 15, 2022 at 1:00 pm.
- b) Announcement of Time Allotment for Public Comments from participants dialing in:  
Please be advised 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. Please note that during the public comment period, 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. Comments will be taken in the order that it was received.

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:** 2484 827 0132

Secretary Cruz read instructions for the public to call in.

3. **Report on actions taken at previous Closed Session meeting** - None
4. **Matters of Unfinished Business** - None
5. **Matters of New Business:**

**CONSENT AGENDA**

- a. Approval of Minutes of Regular Meeting of October 18, 2022

**PUBLIC COMMENT** - None

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

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

Commissioner Brackett - yes  
Commissioner Ludlum - yes  
Commissioner Scott - absent  
Vice-Chair Rosales - yes  
Chair Bustos - yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT APPROVAL FOR THE MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING OF OCTOBER 18, 2022, BE ADOPTED.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

- b. Authorizing a Personal Services Contract with Urban Analytics, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company for fiscal consultant services, in an amount not to exceed \$84,000, related to the issuance of Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco Tax Allocation Bonds to fund Transbay infrastructure improvements and refund Mission Bay South Subordinate Tax Allocation Bonds Series 2016D (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 38-2022)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; John Daigle, Debt Manager

**PUBLIC COMMENT** – None

Commissioner Scott thanked Mr. Daigle for the report.

Commissioner Ludlum motioned to move Item 5(b) and Commissioner Scott seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Brackett - yes

Commissioner Ludlum - yes

Commissioner Scott - yes

Vice-Chair Rosales - absent

Chair Bustos - yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 38-2022, AUTHORIZING A PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH URBAN ANALYTICS, LLC, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY FOR FISCAL CONSULTANT SERVICES, IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$84,000, RELATED TO THE ISSUANCE OF SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO TAX ALLOCATION BONDS TO FUND TRANSBAY INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS AND REFUND MISSION BAY SOUTH SUBORDINATE TAX ALLOCATION BONDS SERIES 2016D, BE ADOPTED.

**Agenda Item Nos. 5(c) through 5(h) related to Transbay Block 2 were presented together but acted on separately**

- c. Adopting environmental review findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act related to the approval of amendments to the Redevelopment Plan for the Transbay Redevelopment Project Area and the Development Controls and Design Guidelines for the Transbay Redevelopment Project, the Schematic Designs for the development of two mixed-use residential projects on Block 2 of Zone One of the Transbay Redevelopment Project Area, and related actions, such activities being within the scope of the previously- approved Transbay Terminal/Caltrain Downtown Extension/ Redevelopment Project Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report, a program environmental impact report, and adequately described therein for purposes of the California Environmental Quality Act; Transbay Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 39-2022)
- d. Approving the Report to the Board of Supervisors on the Amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Transbay Redevelopment Project Area in connection with the development of a mixed-use residential project on Block 2 of Zone One of the Transbay Redevelopment Project Area, and authorizing transmittal of the Report to the Board of Supervisors; Transbay Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 40-2022)
- e. Approving an amendment to the Redevelopment Plan for the Transbay Redevelopment Project Area in connection with the development of a mixed-use residential project on Block 2 of Zone One of the Transbay Redevelopment Project Area; referring the Plan Amendment to the Planning Commission for its report and recommendation to the Board of Supervisors; recommending the Plan Amendment to the Board of Supervisors for adoption; Transbay Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 41-2022)

- f. Approving an amendment to the Development Controls and Design Guidelines for the Transbay Redevelopment Project in conjunction with the approval of two mixed-use affordable residential projects at Transbay Block 2; Transbay Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 42-2022)
- g. Conditionally approving the Schematic Design of a mixed-use affordable housing project of approximately 184 rental units, approximately 1,959 square feet of retail space, and an approximately 6,447 square foot childcare facility at the eastern half of Block 2 of Zone One of the Transbay Redevelopment Project Area; Transbay Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 43-2022)
- h. Conditionally approving the Schematic Design of a mixed-use affordable housing project of approximately 151 rental units for seniors and approximately 2,945 square feet of commercial space at the western half of Block 2 of Zone One of the Transbay Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 44-2022)

Presenters: Thor Kaslofsky, Executive Director; Kim Obstfeld, Senior Development Specialist; Owen Kennerly, Co-Principal, Kennerly Architecture and Planning; Sade Borghei, Mithun; Michael Kaplan, Mercy Housing; Shana Hurowitz, Mercy Housing; Mike Neumann, Wu Yee Children's Services; Abigail Brown, Chinatown CDC; Joanna Ladd, Chinatown CDC; Julia Katz, Mercy Housing Commercial Division

Commissioner Ludlum referred to the term family housing being used during the presentation. He noted that half the units were studios and one-bedrooms and inquired about who would be living in those units; he inquired about whether calling it a family housing project was really a branding exercise.

Mr. Kaplan responded that in order to make the project financially viable, they needed to get a diverse community mix and include some smaller units. He explained that the major metric of the funding source was cost per unit so having smaller units would help reduce the overall cost/unit to offset the larger two- and three-bedroom units. This project was comprised of 184 units with many families living in a condensed space so it was a balance of 50% larger units for larger families and 50% smaller units. Mr. Kaplan responded that with affordable housing, family is the broadest category, then supportive housing and senior housing and this just meant that anyone was eligible to apply to live there and it was not restricted to a certain type of resident. He added that there were small families that would live in one-bedroom units because having three individuals in a one-bedroom unit was allowed. He added that a single parent with a child was quite common in a one-bedroom unit.

Commissioner Ludlum inquired about whether applicants would go through the same Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) selection process as other projects.

Mr. Kaplan responded in the affirmative.

Commissioner Scott referred to the family units and inquired about the number of studios and one-bedrooms for a family. She explained that many times families were disappointed that as their family size grew, they had no place to move up to. Dr. Scott referred to the announcements that in 2023 many of the programs for food and security would cease and inquired about how they would ensure that there would be food programs available. She reported that lack of parking and not being close to affordable stores presented a problem for many families and inquired about whether the stores that were nearby and within walking distance offered healthy food and were affordable. She inquired about childcare security as well as residential security.

Mr. Kaplan responded that for the Mercy affordable housing in Transbay (TB), they had a food bank that came twice a week and he deferred to Ms. Hurowitz to discuss the food services.

Ms. Hurowitz responded that for their other properties in the area, they had partnerships with both the SF-Marin Food Bank and they did onsite food distribution once a week, which was available to all residents in the building. She explained that they also had a partnership with Food Runners, a local organization that brought food in from other resources, like Whole Foods, Trader Joe's or other grocery stores that they partnered with that brought food onsite. They had outside service coordinators between Mercy Housing and ECS and were available to bring access to CalFresh or other programs that they might be eligible for. Ms. Hurowitz reported that they also had emergency food available to those in need of food.

To the childcare security question, Ms. Obstfeld deferred to Mr. Neumann for more detail.

Mr. Neumann responded that there was a single point of entry into the building and indicated that this door was locked at all times. He explained that when families arrived, they buzzed in, were acknowledged and then allowed in. The main entry point had a video camera and an intercom and he added that they paid special attention to what was going on at all times. Mr. Neumann agreed with Commissioner Scott that security was critical. He reported that he had 13 childcare facilities throughout the City and they had had no incidents during his 10-year tenure at Wuyee.

To the residential security question, Mr. Kaplan responded that they had 24-7 front desk coverage to ensure there was always someone onsite to monitor the entrance to the building.

Commissioner Brackett requested clarification on the senior housing in Building West. She referred to the fact that the manager's unit would be a two-bedroom and all other units were either studios or one-bedroom units and inquired about why that was. Ms. Brackett requested more information about dividing up the retail space. The presentation indicated three separate areas but during the slow post-Covid recovery, she inquired about how they expected to lease out the space or whether they intended to create smaller spaces.

Ms. Obstfeld deferred to Ms. Brown for more information.

Ms. Brown responded that they had faced challenges in the past getting people to take on the role of property manager at their other properties and this was a way for someone to stay long-term at the property and create relationships with the tenants in the building.

Ms. Ladd responded that they wanted the person in that role to be available to tenants with families and offered the larger unit to that role for maximum flexibility for the resident manager.

To the retail space question, Ms. Katz responded that they had considered this a lot since 2020. She thought that these spaces were very thoughtfully sized. Some of the spaces were between 500-1,000 sq. ft., which might appeal to a smaller business owner and they were offering below market rate rents for all the spaces. The goal was to bring in affordable resources and services to the tenants and to the community and in order to do that they needed to keep rents low. She added that they were working to cultivate relationships with small businesses and services to find the best fit for these spaces.

Commissioner Brackett inquired about what type of outreach had been done in the larger business community to see what demand was for different size commercial spaces. She recalled that it was very difficult to fill the retail spaces in the Mission Bay (MB) Mercy Housing development. They were carved out in such a way that they remained vacant for a very long time. The problem was that small businesses would get the space once it was released and then it turned out the space did not fit in with their business needs. Ms. Brackett suggested that they work with potential businesses prior to the build-out to find out what their needs were, like coffee shops or restaurants that needed special amenities to be able to work. She requested that they be more intentional about how the space was carved up so that they did not end up with a bunch of empty spaces that no one wanted because it did not fit in with anyone's business needs.

Ms. Katz responded that they had retail spaces throughout San Francisco, most recently in SOMA, and were always being called by different small businesses interested in their spaces, including brokers in the financial district and TB. She stated that they did not currently know what kinds of businesses would be coming into those spaces. He explained that they had relationships with small business umbrella groups and Eastcut CBD and would be working over the next two years to develop more relationships like those. Ms. Katz responded that they were aiming to work early with small businesses that did not have the capital upfront to put into the buildout, so they were planning on building a warm shell to make it easier for small businesses to come in and have as little work as possible to do. She reported that they could provide a tenant improvement allowance reimbursement or connect them to zero interest loans for that initial capital. She stated that she wished they had done that for MB.

Chair Bustos thanked Commissioner Ludlum for his question regarding unit sizes. He referred to materials and to the new federal building, which was made of pre-made concrete, and which he thought looked like a prison. He referred to his WOW factor and expressed concern that the texture would seem very cold for a place that they wanted to seem very warm and welcoming for seniors and families.

Mr. Borghei responded that he agreed with Chair Bustos regarding the federal building, which was very smooth, flat and gray with no character. He stated that there were many different ways to work with concrete to make it more appealing. He acknowledged that the quality and character of this building needed a richer feel to it which concrete could display if done properly. He added that color tones and texture could also help warm up the exterior and make it feel more welcome to residents and families.

Commissioner Scott referred to the fact that she had toured some of their buildings and that when less expensive materials had been used, the buildings tended to look old and deteriorated quickly. She stated they looked terrible and then it cost more to repair and repaint. Referring to the interior, Dr. Scott requested that they use a glossy paint, because it lasted longer and always looked fresh, clean and new.

Mr. Borghei responded that they were trying to be careful with the cost but their materials had been selected for the character and the quality of the building to make it feel more solid and durable, rather than only consider cost-effectiveness. The interiors would be gypsum board, painted and insulated and would have the look and feel of regular residential apartment units, not exposed concrete.

Mr. Kennerly added that Mercy required that they use an eggshell finish, which was washable, so all walls were washable and durable. He explained that this was middle gloss, low luster with some glossiness to it, so that it could be washed. He stated that the problem with higher glossiness was that it revealed imperfections in the wall finishes like seams, so this was a trusted way of finishing the walls which Mercy had been satisfied with for a long time.

Mr. Borghei added that there would be a similar solution on the CCDC and senior buildings as well.

**PUBLIC COMMENT - None**

Commissioner Scott motioned to move Item 5(c) and Commissioner Ludlum seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Brackett - yes  
Commissioner Ludlum - yes  
Commissioner Scott - yes  
Vice-Chair Rosales - absent  
Chair Bustos - yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 39-2022, ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT RELATED TO THE APPROVAL OF AMENDMENTS TO THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA AND THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROLS AND DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR THE TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT, THE SCHEMATIC DESIGNS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF TWO MIXED-USE RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS ON BLOCK 2 OF ZONE ONE OF THE TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, AND RELATED ACTIONS, SUCH ACTIVITIES BEING WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE PREVIOUSLY- APPROVED TRANSBAY TERMINAL/CALTRAIN DOWNTOWN EXTENSION/ REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT/ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, A PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT, AND ADEQUATELY DESCRIBED THEREIN FOR PURPOSES OF THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT; TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

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

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

Commissioner Brackett – yes  
Commissioner Ludlum - yes  
Commissioner Scott - yes  
Vice-Chair Rosales - absent  
Chair Bustos – yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 40-2022, APPROVING THE REPORT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ON THE AMENDMENT TO THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MIXED-USE RESIDENTIAL PROJECT ON BLOCK 2 OF ZONE ONE OF THE TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, AND AUTHORIZING TRANSMITTAL OF THE REPORT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS; TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

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

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

Commissioner Brackett – yes  
Commissioner Ludlum - yes  
Commissioner Scott - yes  
Vice-Chair Rosales - absent  
Chair Bustos – yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 41-2022, APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR THE TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF A MIXED-USE RESIDENTIAL PROJECT ON BLOCK 2 OF ZONE ONE OF THE TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA; REFERRING THE PLAN AMENDMENT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR ITS REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS; RECOMMENDING THE PLAN AMENDMENT TO THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS FOR ADOPTION; TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

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

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

Commissioner Brackett – yes  
Commissioner Ludlum - yes  
Commissioner Scott - yes  
Vice-Chair Rosales - absent  
Chair Bustos – yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 42-2022, APPROVING AN AMENDMENT TO THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROLS AND DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR THE TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE APPROVAL OF TWO MIXED-USE AFFORDABLE RESIDENTIAL PROJECTS AT TRANSBAY BLOCK 2; TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.



Commissioner Scott motioned to move Item 5(g) and Commissioner Ludlum seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Brackett – yes  
Commissioner Ludlum - yes  
Commissioner Scott - yes  
Vice-Chair Rosales - absent  
Chair Bustos – yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 43-2022, CONDITIONALLY APPROVING THE SCHEMATIC DESIGN OF A MIXED-USE AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECT OF APPROXIMATELY 184 RENTAL UNITS, APPROXIMATELY 1,959 SQUARE FEET OF RETAIL SPACE, AND AN APPROXIMATELY 6,447 SQUARE FOOT CHILDCARE FACILITY AT THE EASTERN HALF OF BLOCK 2 OF ZONE ONE OF THE TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA; TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

Commissioner Scott motioned to move Item 5(h) and Commissioner Ludlum seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Brackett – yes  
Commissioner Ludlum - yes  
Commissioner Scott - yes  
Vice-Chair Rosales - absent  
Chair Bustos – yes

**ADOPTION:** IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 44-2022, CONDITIONALLY APPROVING THE SCHEMATIC DESIGN OF A MIXED-USE AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROJECT OF APPROXIMATELY 151 RENTAL UNITS FOR SENIORS AND APPROXIMATELY 2,945 SQUARE FEET OF COMMERCIAL SPACE AT THE WESTERN HALF OF BLOCK 2 OF ZONE ONE OF THE TRANSBAY REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

**6. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items - None**

**7. Report of the Chair**

Chair Bustos stated that he had no report.

**8. Report of the Executive Director**

- a. Informational Memorandum on the Certificate of Preference Program: Descendants Update (Discussion)

Executive Director Kaslofsky announced that the previous week he and Benjamin Brandin (Project Manager, Transbay) attended a fundraiser for the Eastcut Community Benefits District, which would be operating the Under-Ramp Park area in TB, a park which would be developed over the next two years. He explained that they were in the process of naming this the Sports and Dog Park and they had to conduct fundraising for the operations. Mr. Kaslofsky and Mr. Brandin spoke about OCII's effort to construct the park working with the Transbay Joint Powers Authority and Caltrans to accomplish this. He thanked Mr. Brandin for his work on this project.

Executive Director Kaslofsky announced that the next day there would be a graduation at the CityBuild Academy, at 55 Filmore at 5:30 p.m., for the graduates of the CityBuild training academy. He indicated that this was of particular interest to OCII because of the construction workforce hiring of these graduates for the OCII projects.

Executive Director Kaslofsky announced that on November 5-6, Artspan would hold open artist studios for artists at the Greyhound Building in the TB Terminal area. He thanked Aaron Foxworthy (Deputy General Counsel/Acting Real Estate Development Services Manager) and Jasmine Kuo (Development Specialist), who updated them about these events.

Executive Director Kaslofsky announced an update on the OCII website. He reported that they had been working since 2018 to revamp the website to make it more user-friendly, more interactive, have more detail and to refine the outdated look it had. He stated that the final version would be launched in early November.

Executive Director Kaslofsky provided an update on Certificate of Preference Program: Descendant Legislation Implementation. As background, Mr. Kaslofsky explained that in 2021, OCII and community members organized to get Assembly Bill 1584 passed by the State. This provided a statewide affordable housing preference for people who were descendants of those displaced by Redevelopment and OCII had been in the process of implementing this. In August 2022 Commissioner Scott requested an update on the process and the result was the informational memorandum on the status of the program. Pam Sims (Senior Development Specialist, Housing Division, OCII) presented this update.

**PUBLIC COMMENT- None**

Commissioner Brackett thanked the OCII and the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) teams for their work on this. She referred to the fact that about 1/3 of the applicants were approved and 1/3 had been rejected. Ms. Brackett inquired as to why those applicants had been rejected.

Ms. Sims responded that the primary reason for rejection at this time was that applicants were not providing adequate documentation and/or that the lineage to a displaced member of the household was not proven. She added that once applicants provided the necessary additional documentation, their application could be approved.

Executive Director Kaslofsky stated that this was still a new process for MOHCD staff and that OCII was working closely with MOHCD staff on this. He stated that they would be providing support to this process so those applicants who did qualify would actually qualify.

Commissioner Scott requested that they stay on top of this situation. She stated that she had worked with applicants who were qualified and then at the end they were told that they did not qualify and no one knew why they became disqualified. Dr. Scott stressed that they needed to improve the qualifying process and also needed to let applicants know that there were two phases to the process. Applicants were getting through Phase one and thinking that their application was moving forward only to be held up in Phase two. Commissioner. Scott requested clarification about what was holding back applicants from getting the needed housing.

Chair Bustos thanked Ms. Sims for her work and help on this. He requested another update by the end of the year.

## 9. Commissioners Questions and Matters

Commissioner Scott stated that at several recent meetings she had attended, community leaders were asking about how hard OCII had been working at training, instructing, mentoring and preparing residents for housing and home ownership. She reported that they said there was not enough of it available and that the few places that were providing this support were overwhelmed. Dr. Scott requested help to ensure that there were resources they could direct applicants to with staff that was available and capable. Complaints included that the workers had no answers, the lists were too long and applicants could not get a foothold. Dr. Scott inquired about how OCII could help remedy this problem.

Executive Director Kaslofsky reported that MOHCD provided financial support and contracts with the housing support agencies. He suggested they get an update from MOHCD and details regarding this problem. He stated that he would work on that and provide an answer to this.

## 10. Closed Session - None

## 11. Adjournment

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

Chair Bustos adjourned the meeting at 2:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Jaimie Cruz  
Commission Secretary