

London N. Breed
MAYOR



Miguel Bustos
CHAIR

Mara Rosales
VICE-CHAIR

Bivett Brackett
Efrem Bycer
Dr. Carolyn Ransom-Scott
COMMISSIONERS

Sally Oerth
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
7TH DAY OF DECEMBER 2021**

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 7th day of December 2021. 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:** 2492 620 4134

In accordance with Governor Gavin Newsom's statewide order for all residents to "Stay at Home" - and the numerous preceding local and state proclamations, orders and supplemental directions - aggressive directives were issued to slow down and reduce the spread of the COVID-19 virus. Individuals were encouraged to participate in the meetings remotely by calling in during the public comment section of the meeting.

REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

1. Recognition of a Quorum

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

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

Chair Bustos and Commissioner Scott were absent; all other Commissioners were present.

2. Announcements

- a) The next regularly scheduled Commission meeting will be held remotely on Tuesday, December 21, 2021 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 for 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:** 2492 620 4134

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

Vice-Chair Rosales requested that Item 5(d) from the Regular Agenda be taken out of order and discussed before the Consent Agenda.

- d) Authorizing the continuation of teleconferenced meetings and making findings in support thereof under California Government Code Section 54953(e) (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 43-2021)

Presenter: Sally Oerth, Interim Executive Director

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Commissioner Bycer motioned to move Item 5(d) and Commissioner Brackett seconded that motion.

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH TWO ABSENCES THAT RESOLUTION NO. 43-2021, AUTHORIZING THE CONTINUATION OF TELECONFERENCED MEETINGS AND MAKING FINDINGS IN SUPPORT THEREOF UNDER CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 54953(E), BE ADOPTED.

5. Matters of New Business:

CONSENT AGENDA

- a) Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting of November 16, 2021
- b) Authorizing a First Amendment to the Personal Services Contract with BLX Group, LLC, for arbitrage rebate consultant services to extend the term of the contract by three years to December 31, 2024 and to increase the not-to-exceed amount by \$17,995 from \$116,390 to \$134,345 (Action) (Resolution No. 41-2021)
- c) Approving the State Treasurer's form of resolution authorizing the investment of monies in the Local Agency Investment Fund (Action) (Resolution No. 42-2021)

Commissioner Brackett requested more details on Consent Agenda Items (b) and (c). It was confirmed by Mr. Morales, General Counsel and Deputy Director, that this meant the items would have to be removed from the Consent Agenda and added to the Regular Agenda.

Vice-Chair Rosales requested removal of Items (b) and (c) from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Commissioner Brackett motioned to move Item 5(a) and Commissioner Bycer seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Brackett - yes

Commissioner Bycer - yes

Commissioner Scott - absent

Vice-Chair Rosales - yes

Chair Bustos – absent

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH TWO ABSENCES THAT APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR THE REGULAR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 16, 2021, BE ADOPTED.

REGULAR AGENDA

- b) Authorizing a First Amendment to the Personal Services Contract with BLX Group, LLC, for arbitrage rebate consultant services to extend the term of the contract by three years to December 31, 2024 and to increase the not-to-exceed amount by \$17,995 from \$116,390 to \$134,345 (Action) (Resolution No. 41-2021)

Presenters: Sally Oerth, Interim Executive Director; John Daigle, Senior Financial Analyst/Debt Manager; Bree Mawhorter, Deputy Director, Finance & Administration

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Commissioner Brackett referred to the proposed amendment budget in the presentation where it stated that there would be an additional charge of \$2,565 to review Mello Roos for CFD #7 for fiscal year 2023-24 and requested more detail on this item.

Mr. Daigle responded that because interim reports were required, they knew there would be a report due during that window of time and this amount represented the budget for the analysis and preparation of that report.

Ms. Mawhorter responded that in 2014, CFD #7 issued Mello Roos bonds, so these bonds had already been issued. She explained that, because they had been issued as tax-exempt, they fell under IRS regulations which required the calculation of arbitrage rebate every five years. So the line item in the presentation was noting that a report would be due in 2023-24. Ms. Mawhorter explained that from the time these bonds were issued, the bond proceeds were placed in a trust account and invested and as long as the bond proceeds were unspent they could be earning investment income which could not exceed the interest being paid on the bond. So BLX was conducting calculations to find out if at any time more interest income was earned than was paid and if so, OCII would have to pay tax on that income and remit it to the IRS.

Commissioner Brackett motioned to move Item 5(b) and Commissioner Bycer seconded that motion.

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH TWO ABSENCES THAT RESOLUTION NO. 41-2021, AUTHORIZING A FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH BLX GROUP, LLC, FOR ARBITRAGE REBATE CONSULTANT SERVICES TO EXTEND THE TERM OF THE CONTRACT BY THREE YEARS TO DECEMBER 31, 2024 AND TO INCREASE THE NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT BY \$17,995 FROM \$116,390 TO \$134,345, BE ADOPTED.

- c) Approving the State Treasurer’s form of resolution authorizing the investment of monies in the Local Agency Investment Fund (Action) (Resolution No. 42-2021)

Presenters: Sally Oerth, Interim Executive Director; John Daigle, Senior Financial Analyst/Debt Manager

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Commissioner Brackett motioned to move Item 5(c) and Commissioner Bycer seconded that motion.

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH TWO ABSENCES THAT RESOLUTION NO. 42-2021, APPROVING THE STATE TREASURER’S FORM OF RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE INVESTMENT OF MONIES IN THE LOCAL AGENCY INVESTMENT FUND, BE ADOPTED.

- e) Adopting a Covid-19 Vaccination Policy applicable to Members of the Successor Agency Commission consistent with the vaccination requirements for Members of Policy Bodies of the City and County of San Francisco (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 44-2021)

Presenters: Sally Oerth, Interim Executive Director; Monica Davis Stean, HR and Administrative Services Manager

PUBLIC COMMENT – None

Vice-Chair Rosales inquired about whether fully vaccinated included boosters or just the two-dose vaccine.

Ms. Stean responded that it was her understanding that fully vaccinated meant just the first round of the vaccinations. She reported that the CDC Director had not clarified whether boosters were part of this protocol.

Vice-Chair Rosales inquired about the method of confirming their vaccination status.

Interim Executive Director Oerth responded that the exact method would be confirmed at a later date.

Commissioner Brackett inquired about how many employees this policy would impact.

Ms. Stean responded that 100% of OCII staff was vaccinated.

Commissioner Brackett motioned to move Item 5(e) and Commissioner Bycer seconded that motion.

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH TWO ABSENCES THAT RESOLUTION NO. 44-2021, ADOPTING A COVID-19 VACCINATION POLICY APPLICABLE TO MEMBERS OF THE SUCCESSOR AGENCY COMMISSION CONSISTENT WITH THE VACCINATION REQUIREMENTS FOR MEMBERS OF POLICY BODIES OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, BE ADOPTED.

- f) Authorizing a First Amendment to the Mission Bay South Housing Loan Agreement in the amount of \$1,500,000 for a total amount not to exceed \$5,000,000 with 350 China Basin Partners, LLC, a California limited liability corporation, for the development of 148 units of affordable homeownership housing, 400 China Basin Street (Block 9a); Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 45-2021)

Presenters: Sally Oerth, Interim Executive Director; Pam Sims, Senior Development Specialist, Housing Division; Michael Simmons, Principal, MSPDI

PUBLIC COMMENT – None

Commissioner Brackett referred to Item 1.34 (of Attachment 1 to the Memo) where it stated that there was no racial equity vision and expressed concern that the AMI was at 80-110%. She inquired from MOHCD whether there would be additional programs for people to purchase below the 80% AMI because the current AMI had increased considerably and the current AMI for housing for one person was \$79,250 per year. Ms. Brackett inquired about how they would deal with this in terms of equity for African American and Hispanic communities who were looking to become homeowners.

Ms. Sims responded that they were very conscientious about the AMI levels because this development would have an HOA and they wanted to make sure that the units were priced for individual households that could afford increases in the HOA dues. Therefore, she explained, they wanted to keep the AMI levels high enough for this development to make sure that residents could afford the HOA dues and not fail later.

Mr. Simmons responded that they were able to get African American and Latinos in as well as Certificate of Preference (COP) holders in during the last project they did with the Agency at 1345 Turk Street. He explained that with this project, COP holders would be the first people reached and then they would go broader. Mr. Simmons did not know if there were additional subsidies to lower the pricing but did not want to go too low because even if the mortgage was fixed, the HOA dues were variable and this had become an issue at other projects. He stated that they were cognizant of diversity in this project and would be doing extensive outreach at the appropriate time.

Commissioner Brackett stated that she was pleased to see all the different community organizations involved in the project, but wanted to see additional tools used to lower the monthly mortgage coming into the project, such as using the City's Down Payment Assistance Program (DALP). She advised Mr. Simmons to be creative in devising methods to allow people to come in with a lower monthly mortgage and in that way, they would be able to better afford the HOA dues and stay permanently.

Mr. Simmons responded that this property would qualify for a new HUD program to get San Francisco Housing Authority voucher holders into the project, and they would investigate this program as well.

Commissioner Bycer stated that he was supportive of the additional loan amount but inquired about why the additional amount beyond 2020 was required; inquired about whether this loan would be repaid over time or when construction closed.

Mr. Simmons responded that when they started this project, they were given a certain amount and they came in with their architect but did not have a team put together. He explained that now they have created the architectural team, and so were paying for more architecture time here. Mr. Simmons also expressed concern over the issue of indicator piles because at Block 9 and at Mission Rock there had been a lot of breakage which cost money and they were dealing with that issue right now.

Ms. Sims responded that the predevelopment funding would be rolled into the GAP financing loan, which would be one big loan and her goal was to bring it before the OCII Commission by February 2022.

Commissioner Bycer asked for clarification that the pile indicator program was about understanding the topography of the site and knowing where the bedrock was.

Ms. Sims responded in the affirmative and added it also dealt with the issue of how deep and how many and where the breakage would be because they did not want to waste any piles.

Vice-Chair Rosales stated that typically at this point OCII would be provided with a list of the contractors on the project as well as a list of the small and local businesses participating. It was understood that they had the architectural team identified. However, she inquired about whether there was a reason why the list of other participants was not included; inquired about what the design team or professional services team would be.

Ms. Sims responded that this was an oversight on her part, but indicated that the list in question would be pretty similar to what Commissioners had seen earlier in the year during the schematic design approval. She reported that Commissioners would see an updated list in February and at that time they would have subcontractors for the construction phase and more. Ms. Sims responded that they were currently at 74.6% in total participation.

Commissioner Brackett motioned to move Item 5(f) and Commissioner Bycer seconded that motion.

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

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

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY THREE COMMISSIONERS WITH TWO ABSENCES THAT RESOLUTION NO. 45-2021, AUTHORIZING A FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE MISSION BAY SOUTH HOUSING LOAN AGREEMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$1,500,000 FOR A TOTAL AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$5,000,000 WITH 350 CHINA BASIN PARTNERS, LLC, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY CORPORATION, FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF 148 UNITS OF AFFORDABLE HOMEOWNERSHIP HOUSING, 400 CHINA BASIN STREET (BLOCK 9A); MISSION BAY SOUTH REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT AREA, BE ADOPTED.

- g) Authorizing a Personal Services Contract with Lynx Insights and Investigations, Inc., a California Corporation, for a term not to exceed nine months, to search for and contact persons displaced by projects of the former Redevelopment Agency, in an amount not to exceed \$229,570; Citywide (Discussion and Action) (Resolution No. 46-2021)

Presenters: Sally Oerth, Interim Executive Director; Pam Sims, Senior Development Specialist, Housing Division; Majeid Crawford, Associate Director, New Community Leadership Foundation (NCLF)

PUBLIC COMMENT - None

Commissioner Brackett inquired about the methodology that would be used for this database; inquired about what would happen if they did not have a social security number (SS#). Ms. Brackett clarified that what they were dealing with here was not just dependents but also grandchildren and inquired about how they would be trying to reach those family members. She pointed out that the displacement also involved cities other than San Francisco (SF) and individuals who no longer lived in SF and inquired about whether this would require additional money to find those displaced who were now outside of SF; inquired about what the success rate was in finding people using their methodology.

Mr. Miller responded that Lynx was an investigations firm which used a variety of third-party databases under their investigators license with permissible use as well as people finder databases in a bulk search capacity. He explained that they planned to submit an initial bulk search for those people who had identifying information such as SS# and a second search to identify those without that information. Mr. Miller added that, working with OCII, they had actual household information such as head of household and dependents and they would work with algorithms which might identify family members. He responded that the search for grandchildren would be included in the outreach. Mr. Miller explained that the database work would identify current contact information for the almost 10,000 people on the list. Once they had that information, they would be speaking to and contacting the displaced individuals, understand the family situation and get information on the descendants. He responded that their investigation would be somewhat limited nationwide but would not be limited within SF or California. They would be working from SF but also would be calling people nationwide and using social media to possibly contact people all over the world.

Ms. Sims added that it had been stressed with the bidders that the intent of this contract was to find the dependents or children who were living in the units at the time of displacement. The real intent was to find the contact information for the displaced children.

Mr. Miller responded that they were provided with a sample record which was redacted but they were able to do a fair job in identifying the head of household so they had a good response. One head of household was identified with 8 dependents, with 2 descendants deceased. They were able to obtain three of the dependents' current contact information and 2 of the dependents they did not identify. He explained that they would make contact with the 3 dependents, who then would be able to put them in contact with the other 2 dependents that they did not identify.

Commissioner Brackett asked Interim Executive Director Oerth about whether the amount contracted was the total amount available for next year to be used in this specific category; she requested clarification that there was no other money in that bucket.

Interim Executive Director Oerth responded that this was the exact amount budgeted for this activity. She responded that they had requested an amount for a search effort for displaced households and this was the amount budgeted.

Commissioner Brackett stated that back in January, the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD) was supposed to report back on the actual information on COP status and to date OCII had still not received any of that data. She inquired about when Commissioners would be able to receive that data and review it.

Ms. Sims asked for clarification about whether she was referring to the Keane report.

Commissioner Brackett responded in the negative. She explained that during the COP subcommittee meeting, they had discussed that OCII wanted to get a full accounting of all of the different records that MOHCD had to date. At that time Ms. Sims had stated that they could not provide this information because some of the data was in a warehouse and they were having difficulty getting access to them due to COVID19. However, as soon as they got that information they would forward that on to the subcommittee for review. Ms. Brackett stated that she had requested this information many times and still had not received it. So now that they were requesting funds for an investigation to find COP residents, it was clear that there must be a source data and if so, they would like to see it first.

Ms. Sims responded that what Commissioner Brackett was referring to was the site occupancy records.

Interim Executive Director Oerth interjected that if what they were referring to were the site occupancy records, then some of the information on those records was considered private and would not be able to be distributed, which was why they were hiring a contractor with specific terms to protect that confidential information. She reported that staff had provided the numbers of households and individuals they believed to be part of this effort which would refine who would be eligible for a certificate. Ms. Oerth added that there was some original microfiche and digital information stored but they would not want to distribute that information to members of the public.

Commissioner Brackett stated that she appreciated the concern over privacy and that the subcommittee had never asked for resident names but what they had requested were the broad data and the numbers and addresses, which she was told staff and MOHCD would be able to provide. However, they were never provided with that information. Ms. Brackett suggested that they review the minutes of the last meeting of the COP subcommittee. She pointed out that the reason the subcommittee had not met since February 2021 was because they were waiting on the information from MOHCD. Since that time the RFP for this item was issued and obviously subsequent conversations had taken place without alerting the subcommittee, which included the COP member involved here. Ms. Brackett expressed concern over this.

Interim Executive Director Oerth apologized and stated they would go back to MOHCD. She explained that they had endeavored to provide the numbers of households and individuals as part of the broad data. She added that MOHCD was scheduled to come before the Commission in January to provide their COP report and to address the new law going into effect in January regarding the inclusion of descendants of displaced persons. Ms. Oerth stated she would follow up with MOHCD and with the COP Committee.

Ms. Sims clarified that the RFP went out in December and the COP committee was formed in January and stated that they did give updates regarding the RFP during the meetings during the beginning of the year.

Commissioner Brackett asked if Ms. Sims could clarify why the COP subcommittee was not provided the records when they made the specific request.

Interim Executive Director Oerth interjected that there must have been some misunderstanding regarding the request.

Commissioner Brackett clarified that the reason those requests were made by the subcommittee was because the previous attempt to locate COP holders was not successful, which was why there was such a low rate of COP holders being able to take advantage of housing opportunities.

Commissioner Bycer requested clarification regarding capturing data of the children of the dependents or third generation. He stressed that it would behoove them to aggressively capture information not just on dependents but also on their children as well as nieces and nephews and all descendants and collecting all this information at the same time. This was to make sure that they would not have to set this up all over again.

Interim Executive Director Oerth responded that they were waiting for information from MOHCD which was responsible for implementing the new law and which would provide information on all direct descendants, not just the first generation, and they anticipated seeing this in the January meeting. Ms. Oerth added that staff had strongly recommended that they find out whether they had accurate information from the displaced residents because they were missing some of that information and they were anticipating seeing how this program would work from MOHCD for direct descendants.

Commissioner Bycer stated that they needed to make sure they got the information for dependents who lived there first, if possible, and then the next generation information, because those individuals were beginning to age and their chances of capturing that information was becoming less likely.

Commissioner Brackett asked Mr. Morales about whether there was a study done in 2000 to get the initial information in the first place and to get the current information they had now. She inquired about whether this exact same search had already been done to find the children.

Mr. Morales responded in the negative. He explained that in 1999 the Agency expanded the COP program to include children who were listed on the site occupancy reports. Prior to that time only the head of household was eligible for priority in affordable housing and in 1999 the Agency changed their rules to allow minor children to become eligible for the preference. Later the SF Board of Supervisors became interested in exploring expansion of the program to children beyond those who were in the household at the time of the displacement, or rather, the grandchildren. He reported that the Agency looked into it but never adopted any policies to implement this. On the last day of the Redevelopment Agency, Commissioners urged the Board of Supervisors to follow up on that matter. This resulted in the state legislation which, ten years later, has now been adopted and goes beyond grandchildren to include all descendants. Mr. Morales added that, as far as additional City actions,

the City adopted an ordinance in 2008 to expand the supply of housing to include City funded housing that would be included in the COP Program, but indicated that this was a different issue.

Commissioner Brackett asked Ms. Sims if MOHCD ever contracted with the SF Housing Development Corporation to do this research.

Ms. Sims stated that she did not believe it did but would do some research to confirm.

Vice-Chair Rosales inquired about how the relationship between Lynx, NCLF and Alise Vincent Consulting was supposed to work.

Ms. Sims responded that Lynx would be doing the bulk database search and NCLF would work with Alise Vincent Consulting to train youth from the Western Addition and the Bayview to become investigators and to make the contact with the displaced residents. That information would be put into a report for OCII. She explained that this represented the bulk of the work – getting the contact information, confirming that the information was correct and then contacting the displaced residents. She added that this would take several months.

Mr. Miller added that Lynx would be involved with the training throughout the process as well alongside NCLF and Alise.

Vice-Chair Rosales commented that she had not seen a resume for Alise Vincent and inquired about whether Alise was a SF-based company as well as whether they were a certified SBE business company; she inquired about whether NCLF was a non-profit. Ms. Rosales agreed with fellow Commissioners about the importance of not having to repeat this all over again. She noted that after nine years on the Commission, they were still talking about this issue and needed to have a robust effort. She inquired about what other kind of marketing was being contemplated for this issue.

Ms. Sims responded in the affirmative to all questions above. She stated that the key would be the contact information that they find during the database search and in addition, creating a website for individuals to be able to register themselves, if they are a relative or descendant. Then MOHCD would contact them, confirm their status and submit their paperwork to receive a COP.

Mr. Crawford added that this was a local issue, but a national search and he referred to the earlier mentioned sample, that out of the 8 people in the household, they were able to identify 6 of them with just using the database of algorithms. Leaving two more and this was where they would reach out to the individuals who were still alive to locate the last two. He reiterated that this was powerful technology which was very successful. Mr. Crawford reviewed that the first step would be to run the database search and the algorithms and with that, they would find significant numbers of individuals who had passed away and then they could create the marketing strategy. Mr. Crawford described some of the members on their team and mentioned one person who was working with the city of Tulsa, OK, which had a website where one could enter their name and search their legacy, if any, with the Black Wall Street tragedy. He described another member, who was a survivor at Jonestown, who came to NCLF to help identify victims and to commemorate that tragedy with a public memorial at the Fillmore Heritage Center where 400 people attended. He mentioned that their President Board member was a potential COP holder because her mother had lost her home during urban renewal. Mr. Crawford responded to the question about what would happen if they called someone who had been living outside of the Bay Area for a long time and asked for information about their grandchildren. Those individuals might not want to share that information. Mr. Crawford understood that the job of NCLF would be to help those individuals overcome the resistance to providing that information. He stated that they wanted to make people excited about sharing this information.

Vice-Chair Rosales spoke about bringing together the recently displaced as well as the historically displaced and righting the wrong that was done. She inquired about how the training would be held, and whether it would be through a community-based organization, a non-profit, or through the City's workforce development office. She stated that she would like to know more about that in the future.

Mr. Crawford responded to Commissioner Bycer's question about the descendants and assured him that they would be able to get the information requested by the Commissioners.

Commissioner Brackett inquired about how the budget would be divided up between the three entities involved.

Mr. Miller responded that there were three groups: Lynx, their joint venture partners NCLF and Alise Vincent Consulting, and the third were the team members who would be employed and trained. The budget of nearly \$200,000 would be divided up as follows: \$73,000 to employ the 5 team members, \$70,000 for the Lynx staff doing the bulk database search and presenting results at the end, \$40,000 for NCLF and Alise Vincent, and expenses of \$16,000, approximately.

Commissioner Brackett clarified that the majority of the work then would be done with \$40,000.

Mr. Miller stated that everyone would have a role in this project and that the heavy lifting would be done by the team members and would take the majority of the time used. He explained that NCLF and Alise would be supporting, training and managing those members. Mr. Miller stated that the challenge facing Lynx was trying to locate these individuals without a date of birth or social security numbers. He was very proud of the solution they came up with and they would be working record by record.

Commissioner Bycer clarified that the only way they would get in touch with someone who was not in the database would be from someone whose name was in the database and then ask them to make that introduction. He inquired about whether there would be any other methods to contact these people. Mr. Bycer referred to the previously mentioned sample where they would be relying on information for 2 people from 3 dependents. He inquired about what would happen if those 3 people did not return the call or did not have the information on those other two individuals.

Mr. Miller responded that they were working with a list of names under 10,000 and the scope of the project was to find contact information for those people and he was confident they would be able to identify new names.

Mr. Crawford responded that there were several layers of marketing methodology that they would be using. So, in the situation described by Commissioner Bycer, they would use their lateral outreach to find those people by using people within their organization who might know someone in that family, or using social media searches or from friends and neighbors who might have known them. Also people would be able to call in if they lived in the Fillmore during that time and add themselves to the website. So they had several options.

Vice-Chair Rosales stated that there was a member of the public who wanted to speak and that she wanted to reopen Public Comment.

Mr. Morales clarified that Public Comment could be reopened unless a Commissioner objected and it would have to be reopened to everyone who wanted to comment as well.

Commissioner Brackett objected to reopening Public Comment because someone might complain that they did not reopen Public Comment to them in the future and she also felt that they were ready to move forward and vote on this item.

Commissioner Bycer asked for clarification to Commissioner Brackett's objection and inquired about whether they were at risk for reopening Public Comment.

Vice-Chair Rosales deferred to Mr. Morales for more guidance on this issue.

Mr. Morales responded that it would be questionable if they were to reopen Public Comment to consider only one additional comment. However, if they reopened Public Comment so that others could join in, that would be permitted. He added that the Agency had the discretion to make the call.

Commissioner Bycer motioned to move that Public Comment on Item 5(g) be reopened and Commissioner Brackett seconded that motion.

Secretary Cruz called for a voice vote to reopen Public Comment on Item 5(g).

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

Secretary Cruz reopened Public Comment and read the instructions for the public to call in.

Speaker: Don Steely, member of 377 Ironworkers Union, San Francisco

Mr. Steely stated that he wanted to speak about the DBI. He had been trying for the past 5 years to get in touch with somebody about how the non-profits and other organizations were making money off the disadvantaged and the poor. Now they were arresting these people. He stated that he had no one to reach out to for help after he gets blown off by DBI. He was complaining about his building, that it had no heat and was falling apart and stated that they had no permits for this building. He asked how it could get reconditioned without any permits. Mr. Steely stated that they were breaking the law. He named a few individuals who were responsible for the decay of his building and who were part of this corruption.

Commissioner Bycer motioned to move Item 5(g) and Commissioner Brackett seconded that motion.

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

Commissioner Brackett - no
Commissioner Bycer - yes
Commissioner Scott - absent
Vice-Chair Rosales - yes
Chair Bustos – absent

Vice-Chair Rosales asked for confirmation by Mr. Morales that a 2:1 vote with 2 members absent would carry.

Mr. Morales responded in the affirmative, that a majority of a quorum would carry the vote.

ADOPTION: IT WAS VOTED BY TWO COMMISSIONERS WITH ONE NO AND TWO ABSENCES THAT RESOLUTION NO. 46-2021, AUTHORIZING A PERSONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH LYNX INSIGHTS AND INVESTIGATIONS, INC., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION, FOR A TERM NOT TO EXCEED NINE MONTHS, TO SEARCH FOR AND CONTACT PERSONS DISPLACED BY PROJECTS OF THE FORMER REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY, IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED \$229,570; CITYWIDE, BE ADOPTED.

6. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items - None

7. Report of the Chair

Vice-Chair Rosales stated that she had nothing to report.

8. Report of the Executive Director

Interim Executive Director Oerth stated that she had nothing to report.

9. Commissioners' Questions and Matters

Commissioner Brackett requested that MOHCD come before OCII at the next meeting and present whether they had contracted with the San Francisco Housing Development Corporation regarding finding the descendants of COP holders in the past.

Vice-Chair Rosales confirmed that this would be a request to Interim Executive Director Oerth.

10. Closed Session - None

11. Adjournment

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

Vice-Chair Rosales adjourned the meeting at 3:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Jaimie Cruz
Commission Secretary