

Edwin M. Lee
MAYOR



Marilyn Mondejar
CHAIR

Miguel Bustos
VICE-CHAIR

Leah Pimentel
Mara Rosales
Darshan Singh
COMMISSIONERS

Nadia Sesay
INTERIM 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 AUGUST 2017**

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 August 2017, 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 1:02 p.m. Roll call was taken.

Commissioner Pimentel – present
Commissioner Rosales - present
Commissioner Singh – present
Vice-Chair Bustos - absent
Chair Mondejar - present

Vice-Chair Bustos was absent. All other Commission members were present.

2. Announcements

A. The next scheduled Commission meeting will be a regular meeting held on Tuesday, August 15, 2017 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 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 - None

REGULAR AGENDA

- a) Authorizing the Executive Director to Extend the Term of the Agreement for Operation of a Child Care Center (Yerba Buena Gardens) with South of Market Child Care, Inc., a California nonprofit public benefit corporation; Former Yerba Buena Center Redevelopment Project Area D-1 (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 29-2017)

Presenters: Nadia Sesay, Interim Executive Director; Denise Zermani, Senior Development Specialist, Real Estate Division; Jim Morales, General Counsel and Deputy Director; Noushin Mofakham, Executive Director, South of Market Child Care, Inc.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speaker: Ace Washington, community activist

Mr. Washington congratulated Commissioners on changes in positions resulting from the recent election. He spoke about renaming Justin Herman Plaza in San Francisco and about the decreasing population of the black community in the City.

Commissioner Singh inquired about who would be operating the center and whether they were present at the meeting; inquired about why Commissioners were no longer invited to meet with the Yerba Buena (YB) group to discuss issues and be informed about functions like they used to since YB was still under the jurisdiction of OCII; inquired about whether OCII funded the childcare center.

Ms. Zermani responded that the Executive Director of the Center, Noushin Mofakham, was present at the meeting.

Chair Mondejar advised that Interim Executive Director Sesay would probably be the appropriate person to respond to the second question.

Ms. Zermani reminded Commissioners that the YBC Redevelopment Project Area had expired; however, OCII was still involved as property owners and asset managers. The meetings they used to have when YB was a project area and those all went away with the expiration of the project area. She responded in the negative, that OCII no longer funded the childcare center.

Commissioner Pimentel commended staff for helping 44% of low income families with childcare in San Francisco. She stated that this would bring real peace and comfort to families because often families spent more than they made on childcare so it was crucial to family life. Ms. Pimentel inquired about whether the center would transfer over to property management after August 18, 2107; inquired about the status of the Yerba Buena Gardens (YBG) assets; inquired about how much money would be released for maintenance of YBG; inquired about where the YBG maintenance workers came from.

Ms. Zermani responded that OCII staff would continue to manage the agreement until the property was transferred to the City and then the agreement would transfer along with the real estate to the City. She explained that OCII would continue to manage the property after August 18, and until it transferred to the City. However, if they did not renew the agreement at this meeting, the agreement would expire. Ms. Zermani reported that the total YBG asset package was very large with multiple buildings, open space, a bowling alley, among other facilities, consisting of 2½ blocks. The entire space would transfer to the City as one transaction and then the City would step into OCII's former role as manager. Ms. Zermani responded that of OCII's total budget for YBG of \$8 million, about \$3-4 million was for maintenance and capital projects. She explained that this revenue came from big leases on the property, such as the Marriott and the Metreon, and all that money came to OCII and was restricted for maintenance, security, and capital projects. She added that all that revenue would transfer to the City with the property as well. Ms. Zermani responded

that OCII had a contract with MGM Management Group to provide day-to-day maintenance. She reported that MGM contracted out with sub-contractors and that all workers were union.

Mr. Morales cautioned Commissioners that this agenda item only covered the childcare center extension and nothing else and advised that if they wanted to discuss the YBG matters, they needed to put it on the agenda for a future meeting.

Commissioner Rosales inquired about what the funding source was for the childcare center; inquired about how they decided what children would be permitted into the center.

Ms. Zermani deferred to the Executive Director of the childcare center to respond to that question since OCII did not fund the center.

Ms. Mofakham responded that they had several funding sources: tuition from private families, subsidized contracts from the State as well as from the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF), foundation support and fundraising. She responded that the City had an early care and education comprehensive database system that included 3,500 low-income children waiting for subsidized care. They also had a scholarship program with five full scholarships which came from fund raising and foundation support.

Commissioner Pimentel inquired about how they decided preference for low-income families; whether it was based on zip code or other criteria; inquired about how long the waiting list was.

Ms. Mofakham responded that for subsidized low-income children, the City prioritized homeless families as first priority, children under Child Protective Services next and the rest were based on needs and database process that the City managed. She reported that there were 35 children on the waitlist for infant and toddler spots. For private families the infant care waitlist was three years because there was a great demand for infant and preschool care.

Chair Mondejar inquired about the total number of children at the center; inquired about what the ratio was between private funds and state/city-funded sources.

Ms. Mofakham responded that there were 90 children at YB and 48 at another school on Natoma Street between 7th and 8th. She responded that funding was 50/50 between private and state/city subsidized programs.

Commissioner Singh motioned to move Item 5(a) and Commissioner Rosales seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Pimentel - yes

Commissioner Rosales - yes

Commissioner Singh - yes

Vice-Chair Bustos - absent

Chair Mondejar - yes

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY FOUR COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE ABSENCE THAT RESOLUTION NO. 29-2017, AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO EXTEND THE TERM OF THE AGREEMENT FOR OPERATION OF A CHILD CARE CENTER (YERBA BUENA GARDENS) WITH SOUTH OF MARKET CHILD CARE, INC., A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT PUBLIC BENEFIT CORPORATION; FORMER YERBA BUENA CENTER REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA D-1, BE ADOPTED.

b) Workshop on the January – June 2017 Report on OCII Small Business Enterprise and Local Hiring Goals Practices (Discussion)

Presenters: Nadia Sesay, Interim Executive Director; Bruk Solomon, Contract Compliance Specialist; Raymond Lee, Contract Compliance Supervisor; Ken Nim, Compliance Program Manager, CityBuild, Office of Economic Workforce Development (OEWD); George Bridges, Contract Compliance Specialist; Marivic Bamba Chennault, Director, Clark Construction Group.

Speaker: Ace Washington, community activist; Nick Colina, owner, Anco; Pete Varma, Representative, National Association of Minority Contractors (NAMC); Elias Rosas, Clark Construction

Mr. Washington commended Mr. Solomon on his presentation. However, he pointed out that the Western Addition was not included in the presentation. Mr. Washington expressed concern that there was so much activity going on in Southeast San Francisco, but inquired about what was going on in the Fillmore.

Mr. Colina stated that his family had owned a 3rd generation Mexican-owned structural steel company in San Francisco since 1969. He had been present for an OCII meeting a year ago for Blocks 10A and 11A and he reported that he still did not have a contract for that work. Mr. Colina stated that he was seeking an opportunity to win a piece of the pie. He had been told by agency representatives that bonding would help subcontractors and he reported that he had also filled out many prequalification statements, but has been passed over by contractors over and over again. Mr. Colina wanted to know what he had to do as a small business to get project work. He asked to see the SBE numbers for the developers and also inquired about what happened if the developers did not meet the SBE requirements. He believed they should not have the right to bid for upcoming projects if they did not meet those requirements. Mr. Colina reported that he had gone through the 10-month training class offered by Clark Construction, which instructed his company in bonding, insurance, contracting, among other things, and which had been very helpful, but did not guarantee contracts. Mr. Colina also pointed out that there were no requirements for LGBTQ groups and he believed they should also be included in the workforce requirements for the future.

Mr. Varma stated that he was there regarding subcontracting opportunities for his members under OCII jurisdiction. He commended OCII on their progress in working with their association members. Mr. Varma pointed out that in the report, construction and supplier subcontractors were grouped together as an SBE total of 47.5%; however, he recommended unbundling these groups so they could see the percentages for construction subcontractors separately from suppliers. He stated that to group these together was convoluted because construction and supplies were two different industries and were measured under two different guidelines. Mr. Varma explained that suppliers had to have a minimum of \$10 million and construction subcontractors had to have a minimum of \$14 million. Separating the two industries would provide a clearer picture of what was going on with the different industries and who was winning contracts. In areas of performance by ethnicity, Mr. Varma pointed out that African-American participation had increased to 11%, Asian and Pacific Islanders participation was at 12.1% and Latino participation had climbed to 5.1%, so there had been progress but he thought there could be more. He referred to the graph on page 4, which stated that 32.2% of dollars for construction and supplies were awarded on the contract. Mr. Varma inquired about what happened to the remaining 18% to get to 50%. He referred to Mr. Colina's comments and commended Clark Construction which, he stated, was one of the best examples of contractors collaborating with smaller subcontractors to help them move forward.

Mr. Rosas stated that he was very grateful for the training opportunity offered by Chase Citybuild and Clark Construction. He announced that he was a graduate of the Chase Training program and had been hired by Clark Construction. He stated that it had been difficult but now he was looking forward to a great future with a great job. Mr. Rosas thanked OCII for their help.

Commissioner Singh referred to the 56 projects totaling over \$3.2 billion outlined in the presentation and inquired about the breakdown of cost percentage by project area; inquired about when all of these projects would be completed.

Mr. Lee responded that one of the attachments provided a breakout of where the projects were located but he did not have a percentage breakdown by project area. He reported that construction costs for Bayview Hunters Point (BVHP), which was really the Hunters View Phase II project, totaled \$86 million; the Hunters Point (HP) Shipyard/Candlestick Point project totaled \$392 million; Mission Bay (MB) was \$1.4 billion; Transbay (TB) was \$1 billion and YBC at 706 Mission totaled \$360 million. By those numbers, the highest percentage of money would be in MB, then TB, then Candlestick/HP Shipyard, YBC, and BVHP. Mr. Lee commented that he believed the developers would like all this work to be completed sooner rather than later. He reported that the Warriors Chase Center is scheduled for completion in the third quarter of 2019, for many TB projects in 2020; and Candlestick Point was an ongoing project.

Commissioner Rosales commended staff on the report and presentation. She referred to the joint venture SBE credit approach and requested verification that not only construction joint ventures but also professional services joint ventures were provided the SBE credit; inquired whether they were witnessing many joint association partnerships; referred to page 8, "Six months activity SBE profile" and inquired about why African-American professional services providers, architects and engineers were 0 across the board, even though there were 24 firms that were available.

Mr. Lee responded in the affirmative. He reported that the SBE policy has a provision for associations to accommodate the professional services field. Mr. Lee explained that the SBE policy makes a distinction between associations and joint ventures, which, unlike associations, are considered to be separate entities created for a particular construction endeavor that requires a separate contractor's license. Mr. Lee stated that for many design projects that were brought forth by developers, developers are encouraged to break out scope for an associate architect or associate structural engineer, for example. Staff encourages these partnerships because the architectural fees, for example, were with the architect and unless the architect, as the prime, was itself a small business, it would be difficult for that team to reach the 50% goal. Accordingly, prime architects are encouraged to break out the architectural fee to include an SBE associate architect. Regarding the absence of African-American professional services participation this past six months, Mr. Lee cautioned that the report only covered the previous six months and that only 20 contracts had been awarded over that period of time, which are not indicative of the agency's overall experience. Mr. Lee pointed out that in past reports there had been a real diversity of participation in professional services including African Americans. He stated that he would include the aggregate project information by minority groups in future reports.

Commissioner Rosales requested a follow-up report to this one, because they were not getting the full picture. She stated that she would give these results so far an "F", but perhaps if information projects to date, it deserved more of a B-, but they needed to see the bigger picture. Ms. Rosales pointed out that they were aware of the percentages of contracts and the dollars, but inquired about whether these were the same companies and contractors for construction and professional services. She requested a breakdown of firms by contracts and ethnicity.

Mr. Lee responded that they should expect a great deal of diversity within professional services in some of the upcoming projects and that this would be reflected in the upcoming six-month report. He reported that 31 firms had received 40 construction contracts. Mr. Lee stated that they could provide the information requested.

Commissioner Pimentel inquired about how companies were finding subcontractors, especially new subcontractors. She inquired about whether there was some kind of general meeting where they all got to meet and greet; whether there was some kind of process for new subcontractors to find out about work opportunities and contracts and be able to inform developers about their unique talents. Ms. Pimentel pointed out that the report indicated that San Francisco workers spent longer time on the projects and inquired about why this was the case.

Mr. Lee responded that they had a robust marketing process, which also included trade associations and minority business development centers. He explained that each developer

reached out to SBEs in the CMD database for direct solicitations to applicable firms for the type of work that needed to be done. The developer was required to work with OCII and advertise those solicitations on the City's and OCII's websites. For professional services, developers went through a two-step process: first, a request for qualifications (RFQs); and second, a request for proposals (RFPs). Respondents are first requested to submit statements of qualifications rather than full proposals because, as Mr. Lee explained, requests for qualifications were easier for small businesses to provide a response, noting that a statement of qualifications is akin to a resume. The developers then worked with OCII to short list firms, which made it easier for a new small business to be considered for a contract. After that, RFP's were requested from the shortlisted firms. Mr. Lee reported that OCII was involved in the interviews between the developer and the small business. Mr. Lee responded that on average San Francisco workers were working 32% longer on a project than non-San Francisco workers. He explained that trying to reach the 50% local workforce goal was difficult and because they were impressing upon employers to maintain a 50% workforce, employers were keeping San Francisco workers on the projects longer than non-San Francisco workers.

Chair Mondejar commended staff on the presentation. She inquired about the monthly compliance meetings mentioned during the presentation between OCII and contractors and inquired about attendance. She referred to the shortage of San Francisco (SF) workers and inquired about whether developers and contractors were recruiting from outside of SF to make up for the shortage.

Mr. Lee qualified that those meetings were with the Shipyard project and that they had just begun establishing a standing monthly meeting with the Warriors contractors with the first meeting scheduled for August 11th. He confirmed that attendance had been consistent. Mr. Lee deferred to Mr. Nim for more detail on the shortage question.

Mr. Nim introduced other people in his organization that worked with OCII and who were present on a daily basis at the job sites working with contractors. He thanked Commissioners for supporting their program and attending their events. Mr. Nim stated that during his last presentation to OCII, the unemployment figure for the City was at 3.1% and now it was at 2.9%, so the percentage of available SF workers was lower. He reported that the construction industry was fluctuating because once a project finished, very often workers went back to a different project and many of the union halls were empty now, especially since it was summertime. As a result, contractors have workers from other areas but those areas were short of construction workers as well. Mr. Nim explained that Citybuild worked with contractors and developers in sponsoring new apprentices and this was a way to build the pipeline for future workforce as new projects came onboard.

Commissioner Rosales inquired as to whether the 2.9% was City-wide; inquired about whether they had looked at different pockets of the City for unemployment numbers; inquired about whether they could look at the employment vs unemployment level by industry, such as construction.

Mr. Nim responded in the affirmative. He responded that they had looked at different pockets of the City and reported that the unemployment rate in BVHP, for example, was 16-20%, which was a challenge. Most of the public housing in the City was concentrated in the BVHP area and OEWD targeted these areas specifically for training and employment opportunities in construction, hospitality, technology and health. He explained that they hosted a special monthly training workshop in the Sunnydale area for recruitment of jobs at the airport. No training was required and he reported that many of the vendors working at the airport had come through their program. Mr. Nim responded in the affirmative and stated that he would forward the report containing the unemployment information to OCII.

Commissioner Singh inquired about who was the certifying entity for SBE contracts.

Mr. Lee responded that OCII accepted other governmental certifications, which meant similar small business certifications conducted through a governmental entity. He explained that they accepted

SF certifications carte blanche, including the City's micro LBE and small LBE program, with the exception of the City's SBA LBE program, because the SBA LBE size standard exceeded the threshold established by OCII. Mr. Lee explained that they also accepted certifications by the State of California Department of General Services, which had a micro and small business program. He reported that the State had recently increased their size standards to \$15 million from \$14 million, which meant that now OCII had an added level of due diligence to perform to make sure those companies met OCII standards. Mr. Lee added that they also accepted certification by Caltrans and the Disadvantaged Business Enterprise program, which again required extra due diligence to make sure the company met OCII standards.

Chair Mondejar referred to professional services and the statement of qualifications. She inquired about whether that meant that they did not have to be certified through OCII; inquired about small businesses and programs that provided assistance to small businesses with bonding requirements; she referred to Next Steps and inquired about what "encouraging supplier participation" meant; inquired about the Emerging Leaders Peer Network and how OCII was participating.

Mr. Lee responded that the statement of qualification pertained to work experience and not small business certification. On the matter of SBE certification, Mr. Lee explained that OCII would identify among the pool of applicants whether they had been certified by the City or the State, and if not through these agencies, where they had been certified to make certain they had been certified by a governmental entity. Mr. Lee clarified that regarding Phase I of the Shipyard Area, Lennar had foregone bonding requirements as part of the community benefits. For Phase II, there was a provision that allowed it, but so far he has not seen where Lennar had required bonding of small businesses. Mr. Lee explained that the MB and TB contracts had included subguards, which meant the general contractors effectively build into their contracts the cost of insuring the small contractors. Mr. Lee was not sure about Clark Construction, but he did know that they prequalified their prime subcontractors. He deferred to Ms. Chennault for more detail on this question.

Ms. Chennault responded that in terms of the Warriors project itself, given the size of each of the packages, which was in the millions of dollars, bonding was required; however, she explained that much of the SBE participation was on the lower tier level, so lower tier subcontractors were not required to bond.

Mr. Lee responded that in the pre-bid meetings and their public presentations, including the Capital Assistance Program financed by Five Point, they conducted outreach events to suppliers. OCII had made a conscious effort to state that the 50% SBE goal included suppliers and that obtaining supplies and material from SBEs was one of the ways that a contractor could achieve the 50% overall goal.

Mr. Bridges responded that Bridge Housing is convening the peer network. He explained that these were emerging leaders trying to understand better how to work with the compliance departments on their nonprofit housing development throughout the City. Mr. Bridges announced that he along with other individuals would be presenting their SBE program as well as the City's LBE program to them, which would be a lunchtime presentation on August 30th.

Commissioner Rosales referred to page 6 of the memo and inquired about what the following sentence meant: "staff continues to assess the viability of collecting payment information from private developers on non-affordable housing projects"; clarified that these referred to OCII's properties; inquired about whether they were deluged with complaints regarding non-payment.

Mr. Lee responded that this meant looking at the monthly payment information while the project was still ongoing, which was difficult. He explained that gathering payment information was easier when the project was complete, but they were trying to assess how to gather ongoing monthly payment information on private projects. He noted that there was no contractual obligation for monthly payment information written into the contracts for private developments and the administrative effort needed to gather and retain the information was formidable and better captured in an electronic format. Mr. Lee clarified that payment information on OCII properties were

reviewed based on monthly pay applications. He responded in the negative regarding payment complaints and added that when they receive inquiries about payment issues, they work directly with the developer to resolve them.

Chair Mondejar added that in the past subcontractors had come before the Commission for public comment regarding non-payment or slow payment, which resulted in staff working with the developers to make sure the subcontractors were getting paid.

Mr. Lee agreed with that statement and reported that he and his staff had an open door policy regarding issues that came up with contractors.

Chair Mondejar noted requests for follow-up reports as well as separating the construction and supplier information in the next report. She thanked Mr. Lee and staff for the presentation and all their hard work.

6. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

Speaker: Ace Washington, community activist

Mr. Washington requested the opportunity to sit down with the Interim Executive Director Sesay to discuss him doing a presentation at an upcoming meeting on the Fillmore, the black out-migration and changing the name of Justin Herman Plaza. He pointed out that there was no mention at all of the Western Addition any more. Mr. Washington announced that the Heritage Center was closing and that there was much corruption currently going on in the Western Addition. He requested that OCII attend the Town Hall Meeting on September 13 sponsored by London Breed and he requested that it take place at the Heritage Center.

7. Report of the Chair

Chair Mondejar stated that she had no report.

8. Report of the Interim Executive Director

- a) Informational Memorandum 72 Townsend Marketing Outcomes Project Report; Rincon Point-South Beach Area (Discussion)
- b) Informational Memorandum Dr. Davis Senior Residence (1751 Carroll Avenue) Marketing Outcomes Project Report; Bayview Hunters Point Area (Discussion)

Presenters: Nadia Sesay, Interim Executive Director; Maria Benjamin, Director, Home Ownership & Below Market Rate Programs, MOHCD; Pamela Sims, Senior Development Specialist, Housing Division

PUBLIC COMMENT – None

Commissioner Singh inquired about how much the down payment was on a \$101,000 affordable home; inquired about the interest rate; how much was the rent for a BMR home.

Ms. Benjamin responded that they required 5% down; 3% could come from gifts and 2% had to be sourced by the buyers themselves. She responded that the interest rate depended on what they could get; market rate interest rates were currently at 3.75% – 4.5%. She responded that rent for a two-bedroom was \$1200-1300/month.

(Ms. Brooke Barber, former COP Program Coordinator, confirmed that the estimate Ms. Benjamin provided were accurate but did not speak into the mic so her response was inaudible).

Commissioner Pimentel referred to the District Attorney (DA) Referral Program and inquired about whether those referrals fell within the same qualifications or whether it was a separate program. Ms. Pimentel commended the donation program for the senior center and described some of the items that she had donated, which included some very large and heavy items. She described this as a win/win situation for the seniors who needed furnishings as well as for those folks who needed to get rid of belongings.

Ms. Benjamin referred to Ms. Sims for information on the DA Referral Program.

Ms. Sims responded that DA referrals usually involved the witness protection program and they had concurred with this because they needed the subsidies. She explained that if the DA's office had someone from Witness Protection they needed to place, they referred that person to the Housing Authority who put them on their list, but the referred person still needed to meet the qualifications for that housing site. She added that this probably included people from other states, because the Witness Protection program was a federal program.

Commissioner Rosales thanked everyone for the report and commended staff for their hard work on the presentation. She referred to page 2 of the Dr. Davis memo, Attachment 1, which stated that of the 26 COP holders housed, 8 were originally from the Western Addition and another 18 were from HP. Ms. Rosales inquired about whether these were all seniors who had left the City and now were returning to the City. She wondered out loud why a senior who had been living outside of SF for many years would want to return to SF at this point in their lives. Ms. Rosales requested clarification that everyone in the report who had been housed were from SF and were changing residences in SF from renters to homeowners.

To the senior question, Ms. Benjamin responded that first, the rent subsidy and also that perhaps the SF program was more beneficial to them.

Ms. Sims responded that many of the seniors who returned to SF were veterans who were rent-burdened and that they liked the support services on site.

Chair Mondejar thanked Ms. Benjamin and staff for the very thorough and comprehensive report.

Commissioner Rosales inquired about whether the Mayor and Board of Supervisors had heard these presentations and were aware of the level of detail within them. She felt strongly that they needed to understand all the work that was being done to correct history and that this was in effect historical displacement mitigation regarding COP holders.

Ms. Benjamin responded in the affirmative but not with this amount of detail. She agreed that the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors should be receiving this information as well.

9. Commissioners' Questions and Matters

Chair Mondejar welcomed Jaimie Cruz, the new Commission Secretary.

Commissioner Pimentel thanked staff and everyone else for the presentations. She requested information regarding how much they released annually altogether for workforce; she requested maintenance information and the total number of maintenance workers that maintained their jobs from OCII projects. Ms. Pimentel referred to CityBuild and inquired about what kind of apprentice training programs and certifications did these workers have to have to get these jobs; she inquired about the scope of apprentice work.

Interim Executive Director Sesay responded that she would follow up on these questions and get the answers for Commissioner Pimentel.

10. Closed Session - None

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Mondejar at 3:21 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Interim Commission Secretary