



**BUILDING INSPECTION COMMISSION (BIC)
Department of Building Inspection (DBI)**

REGULAR MEETING

Wednesday, April 19, 2023 at 9:00 a.m.

City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place, Room 416

Watch SF Cable Channel 78/Watch www.sfgovtv.org

WATCH: <https://bit.ly/418UzC3>

ADOPTED May 17, 2023

PUBLIC COMMENT CALL-IN: 1-415-655-0001 / Access Code: 2492 104 0778

MINUTES

- 1. The regular meeting of the Building Inspection Commission was called to order at 9:07 a.m. Call to Order and Roll Call.**

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

Raquel Bito, **President, Excused** Jason Tam, **Vice-President**
Alysabeth Alexander-Tut, **Commissioner, arrived 9:15a.m.**
Bianca Neumann, **Commissioner**
Angie Sommer, **Commissioner**
Earl Shaddix, **Commissioner**

Sonya Harris, **Secretary**
Monique Mustapha, **Assistant Secretary**

D.B.I. REPRESENTATIVES:

Patrick O’Riordan, **Director**
Christine Gasparac, **Assistant Director**

Matthew Greene, **Chief Building Inspector**
Neville Pereira, **Deputy Director, Plan Review Services**
Alex Koskinen, **Deputy Director, Administrative Services**
Carl Nicita, **Legislative Affairs Manager**

CITY ATTORNEY REPRESENTATIVE:

Peter Miljanich, **Deputy City Attorney**

Ramaytush Ohlone Land Acknowledgement:

The Building Inspection Commission acknowledges that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone, who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula. As the indigenous stewards of this land and in accordance with their traditions, the Ramaytush Ohlone have

never ceded, lost, nor forgotten their responsibilities as the caretakers of this place, as well as for all peoples who reside in their traditional territory. As guests, we recognize that we benefit from living and working on their traditional homeland. We wish to pay our respects by acknowledging the Ancestors, Elders, and Relatives of the Ramaytush Ohlone community and by affirming their sovereign rights as First Peoples.

2. President's Opening Remarks.

President Bito was not in attendance, so this item was not addressed.

3. General Public Comment: The BIC will take public comment on matters within the Commission's jurisdiction that are not part of this agenda.

There was no General Public Comment.

4. Discussion and possible action on the time allowed for remote public comment.

Secretary Harris said this item was a new directive to give an allotted time for public comment and the standard was twenty minutes, but if the Board wanted to change it there needed to be a motion to do so.

Vice President Tam asked was the standard twenty minutes.

Secretary Harris said that was the number that was given for remote public comment on each item. Each commenter would have the standard three minutes to speak, but the total time for remote public comment on an item would be twenty minutes unless the Board made a motion today to extend the time limit.

Commissioner Neumann asked what was the thinking behind those allowed to speak remotely and those speaking in person. She was hesitant to limit the ability to make public comment, while it was to encourage in person participation, that would be difficult for a lot of people and if there was an important issue she would want to be sure the Board would be able to hear what everyone had to say.

Vice President Tam and Commissioner Neumann had some discussion and Commissioner Neumann asked would the Board be able to extend the time as needed for each item.

Deputy City Attorney (DCA) Peter Miljanich said at the next meeting it was allowed to extend the remote public comment.

Commissioner Neumann said she still did not think twenty minutes was enough time.

Secretary Harris said a motion could be made to add more time, and if there was a second that would be carried.

Commissioner Neumann asked the other Commissioners to weigh in on the item.

Secretary Harris said this was a new policy, since the city had gone back to in-person meetings and the only remote option was for public comment.

Commissioner Shaddix said as long as the time would be flexible in the case there was a large in-flux of remote comment, perhaps the President would at that time extend the time limit.

Commissioner Neumann said it would be at that moment it becomes the Board's discretion whether it wants to continue to hear something whereas the Board would be limiting the ability to comment. This reminded her of the Single Room Occupancy (SRO) groups, which took over an hour of comments and what does the Board feel may be an appropriate amount of time.

Vice President Tam said as the Board had not dealt with extending or shortening time limits for remote public comment he was not sure.

Commissioner Neumann asked if Commissioner Alexander-Tut would weigh in on the issue.

Secretary Harris said for the record Commissioner Alexander-Tut was present and explained the agenda item being discussed.

DCA Miljanich said from the government policy and good governance perspective it was suggested not to contemplate revising the allowable amount of public comment for a particular agenda item at a future meeting, and that the decision should be taken more broadly at the beginning of the meeting for all items to avoid the appearance of impropriety or bias. If the concern was there would not be enough time, a motion should be made to allow for a longer standard amount of time as Commissioner Neumann was suggesting.

Commissioner Alexander-Tut said she was not inclined to place a limitation on remote public comment, given the Commission has not had a hot topic in more than three years and typically does not have substantial public comment.

Commissioner Alexander-Tut said as a mother who also works full-time she understands how difficult participating in person can be, and that burden should not be a requirement in order to give feedback. There may be instances where other commissions have made that decision because of business needs, but she did not believe that applied to the BIC and if there was a lot of remote public comment the issue must have been very important.

Vice President Tam asked was the time limit a requirement?

DCA Miljanich said the Board may choose to not have a time limit a time limit, the agenda notices included the standard twenty minutes which would be revised on future agendas.

Vice President Tam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Sommer, to allow a total of sixty minutes for remote public comment.

Public Comment:

Mr. Jerry Dratler said that he has attended the BIC meetings for more than ten years and he was frequently the only person who made public comment, so the discussion was about an issue that did not exist within the BIC and the only time in the last ten years he had seen an issue with the time limit was during the Single Room Occupancy (SRO) item a few months back.

Mr. Dratler said the Planning Commission had a lot more participation and when there were a lot of speakers for public comment in those meetings, the Planning Commission reduced the speakers time and

he believed a sixty-minute limit would not be experienced at the BIC.

Secretary Harris Called for a Roll Call Vote:

President Bito	Excused
Vice President Tam	Yes
Commissioner Alexander-Tut	Yes
Commissioner Neumann	Yes
Commissioner Shaddix	Yes
Commissioner Sommer	Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 027-23

5. Discussion and possible action regarding Board of Supervisors Ordinance (File No. 230373) amending the Existing Building Code to require buildings with 15 or more stories constructed after 1998 to conduct and submit façade inspection reports, in addition to other requirements.

Legislative Affairs Manager Carl Nicita gave an update on recently enacted State or local legislation as follows:

- **File No. 230373** – Review and approval of an ordinance requiring façade inspection reports for buildings constructed after 1998 with 15 or more stories.
- The way it is now: Chapter 5F of the Existing Building Code provides a schedule for owners of buildings that are five stories or taller to submit inspection reports documenting the safety of the façade of their buildings, but buildings that received a building permit are exempt.
- Proposed amendments: Revise the exemption for buildings built after 1998 from a blanket exemption to one that only applies to buildings 14 stories or shorter, and require an initial façade report for buildings 15 stories or taller by November 1, 2023 or within six months of notification from DBI, whichever is sooner.
- Intent of ordinance is to respond to window failures, which occurred during the recent storms.
- The Code Advisory Committee (CAC) considered the ordinance, and provided some recommendations to the BIC.
- The CAC recommended that DBI focus specifically on the glazing of a building, instead of the complete façade.
- Also, suggested that a qualified engineering firm should be hired to do the study.
- Mr. Nicita recommended that the Commission make a recommendation for approval of File No. 230373 to the Board of Supervisors with the following conditions:
 - DBI procure a study of all recent window failures by a qualified engineering firm to establish criteria for glazing system-specific façade inspections.
 - That criteria is used for the glazing system-specific façade inspections under proposed ordinance File No. 230373.
 - DBI staff suggests requiring buildings with 15 stories or more and built after 1998 to submit these inspection reports, as proposed in the ordinance.

Public Comment:

Mr. Jerry Dratler said fifteen stories seemed to be an arbitrary limit and there were many shorter buildings with glass curtain wall issues that would be exempt from the proposed the legislation.

Mr. Dratler said 555 Fulton was an example of a curtain wall problem and the problem was probably due to the developer's policy of importing foreign building products that may not be compliant with the United States (U.S.) building product standards.

Mr. Dratler said there was an area of concern for public safety that the proposed legislation did not address concerning the use of imported building products that did not meet the U.S building standard

Commissioner's Questions and Comments:

Commissioner Shaddix asked was there a timeframe on the study the Code Advisory Committee requested on the failures of the glazing?

Mr. Nicita said the Department was working on taking advantage of the Mayor's office emergency declaration which would reduce the contracting requirements allowing the Department to quickly onboard an engineering firm to complete the study produced by the end of August 2023.

Commissioner Shaddix asked if the study was complete by August, would those repairs be required to be done by the end of the year or beginning of 2024.

Mr. Nicita said the intent was to get ahead of the next rainy season, but that timeline was to be determined.

Commissioner Alexander-Tut asked about the history of violations for the type of code violations over fifteen story buildings.

Director O'Riordan said all of the failures had occurred during the storms were fifteen or more stories and it was true the city had glazing failures in the past. What the Department would do was write a Notice of Violation, ask for the area to be made safe, and an engineering report be provided of the adjacent areas and other facades of the building.

Commissioner Alexander-Tut asked if the Department had other mechanisms to expedite the Notice of Violation process.

Director O'Riordan said in those cases the Department would work with the City Attorney to exert more pressure on the building owner in regards to achieving compliance.

Commissioner Alexander-Tut said was there something the Department could write into the legislation to gain more enforcement power for example having shorter timelines for compliance and stronger penalties for failure to meet those timelines because the Department currently had violations that had been sitting for a while.

Director O'Riordan said the Department understood the issue was of grave concern to the community and staff would reach out to the City Attorney's office if the Department deemed the normal violation process was causing additional issues in the meantime.

Commissioner Alexander-Tut said her feedback to Supervisor Peskin's office was to consider enforcement timelines and strengthening language around giving the Department and the city more tools for enforcement.

Commissioner Sommer asked was DBI recommendation to approve legislation with the three recommended amendments and what did it mean, would Supervisor Peskin include the recommended

amendments or rework the language.

Mr. Nicita said correct and Supervisor Peskin did not have to consider the recommendations or the committee could adopt the recommendations or amend them and if those amendments were outside of today's discussion the item would return to the BIC.

Commissioner Sommer said the recommendation approval with modifications would suggest an overall approval of the effort however with updates.

Mr. Nicita said the Department thought the recommendations were additive to what Supervisor Peskin proposed and some of them may be done administratively under the Mayor's emergency order. All are pieces of the puzzle in addition to what Supervisor Peskin had proposed.

Commissioner Sommer said she agreed with the Code Advisory Committee's report to investigate further to better inform legislation that was being developed.

Commissioner Sommer said the language in the proposal read the building owners had to submit a façade study which may be changed to be a glazing study but was submission to be immediate or did it have a timeframe.

Mr. Nicita said in the legislation it states the timeframe was within six months of notification from DBI or by November 1, 2023 whichever was sooner. Those timelines were standard as the Department would notify the building owners at the same time and expect those reports at the same time.

Commissioner Sommer asked would there be a recurring evaluation period such as for balconies?

Mr. Nicita said after the initial inspection the evaluation would be required every ten years.

Vice President Tam asked if it was felt that ten years was sufficient, given the elements and wear and tear. He says there was still a life safety issue in ten years a lot could happen with the winds of the past winter.

Mr. Nicita said the studies would inform that and the Department was relying on complaints and building engineers who were intimately familiar with their properties who were hopefully keeping tabs on the conditions of the buildings and with the totality ten years did seem sufficient but would take the BIC's recommendation of a shorter time period as well.

Vice President Tam asked if Mr. Nicita saw any other amendments in the future to this legislation.

Mr. Nicita said the Department had discussions with the Supervisors office and they were in agreement with the recommendations from staff and any amendments would be in this realm.

Vice President Tam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Shaddix, to recommend approval with modifications as listed above of Ordinance File No. 230373.

Secretary Harris called for a Roll Call Vote:

President Bito	Excused
Vice President Tam	Yes
Commissioner Alexander-Tut	Yes
Commissioner Neumann	Yes
Commissioner Shaddix	Yes
Commissioner Sommer	Yes

RESOLUTION NO. 028-23

6. Discussion and possible action regarding Board of Supervisors Ordinance (File No. 230212-2) amending the Planning, Building, and Fire Codes to codify the annual waiver of awning replacement fees and awning sign fees applied for during the month of May, to annually waive fees to new awning installations applied for during the month of May, in addition to other requirements.

Legislative Affairs Manager Carl Nicita gave an update on recently enacted State or local legislation as follows:

- **File No. 230212-2** – Review and approval of an ordinance to amend the Building Code to add a permit fee waiver for new awning installations each May during Small Business Month, expanding the existing fee waiver which currently applies only to awning replacements.

Ms. Tita Bell, Legislative Aide to Supervisor Engardio made the following points on File No. 230212-2:

- The substitute legislation had two changes.
- To add references to the Fire Code for the intent to waive fees related to the installation of new awnings, replacement of existing awnings and pedestrian level lighting that were required in the Fire Code.
- The other substitution removes the requirement of the Planning Department and DBI to certify the applicant was a small business.
- The hope was for the applicant to be able to self-certify.

Commissioner Questions and Comments:

Commissioner Shaddix said he was involved with a lot of these programs and asked if the online portal only need the business account number (BAN) to self-certify.

Ms. Bell said she was hoping that would be the way the system would work but there were two definitions of a small business: One was used by the treasurer which had to do with gross receipts and the other was defined by the number of full-time employees. She said the legislation was relying on the latter and was working with the Planning Department to work out those details.

Commissioner Shaddix mentioned an online portal. He said one would need a business account number, and if this would be an opportunity to certify as a small business.

There was no public comment.

Commissioner Alexander-Tut made a motion, which was seconded by Vice President Tam, to recommend approval of Ordinance File No. 230212-2.

Secretary Harris Called for a Roll Call Vote:

President Bito	Excused
Vice President Tam	Yes
Commissioner Alexander-Tut	Yes
Commissioner Neumann	Yes
Commissioner Shaddix	Yes
Commissioner Sommer	Yes

The motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. 029-23

7. Update on unpermitted awning complaints and community outreach

Communications Manager Patrick Hannan gave a presentation and update on unpermitted awning complaints and community outreach as follows:

- Awnings – Background information and enforcement
- Small Business Awning Compliance Program: Mayor Breed and Supervisor Peskin Ordinance, key components, draft webpage and process
- Community outreach – 90 days

Also, Mr. Hannan discussed the following points:

- The process is for people to legalize awnings.
- There were 182 complaints from districts such as Chinatown, Richmond, and Haight.
- In the previous year DBI only received 44 complaints.
- The new website section regarding awnings will contain the following information:
 - The website will describe exactly what a person (property owner) needs to do to get an awning permitted.
 - DBI has a record so if someone files a complaint later, the Department will have that information.
 - The Department is working with the Office of Small Business, including Katy Tang and her staff. In addition, DBI is working with the Mayor and Supervisor Peskin in a collaborative effort.
 - There will be the ability to create online videos using You Tube and We Chat.
- DBI plans to hold an Open House at the Permit Center, and do additional media outreach to get the word out about awning compliance.

Commissioner's Questions and Comments:

Vice President Tam thanked Mr. Hannan, the Mayor's office, and Supervisor Peskin's office for really hearing the community and said this was a great compromise to resolve the issue.

Vice President Tam asked if the 61 Notices of Violation were the life safety checks completed.

Mr. Hannan said all 182 complaints had been reviewed and the 61 complaints were earlier in the process. Notices of Violations were issued; However, the Department was not conducting further enforcement on those properties pending the new process.

Vice President Tam questioned as long as those property owners complied by the end of the year, they would not incur any fees or penalties.

Mr. Hannan said that was correct.

There was no public comment.

8. Commissioner's Questions and Matters.

- a. **Inquiries to Staff.** At this time, Commissioners may make inquiries to staff regarding various documents, policies, practices, and procedures, which are of interest to the Commission.
- b. **Future Meetings/Agendas.** At this time, the Commission may discuss and take action to set the date of a Special Meeting and/or determine those items that could be placed on the agenda of the next meeting and other future meetings of the Building Inspection Commission.

Secretary Harris said the next Regular Meeting of the Building Inspection Commission was May 17, 2023, and there would be a Special Joint Meeting of the Building and Planning Commissions held on May 11, 2023 at 1:00 p.m.

Commissioner Shaddix asked perhaps for the June BIC meeting, an update on the vacancy tax for the named commercial corridor and what DBI showed as vacant storefronts.

Commissioner Alexander-Tut asked would the BIC and Planning Commission's joint meeting set their own remote public comment time limits since both commissions had their own rules.

Secretary Harris said she presumed the Planning Commission's rule would be preferred.

Deputy City Attorney Miljanich said he did not have an answer for Commissioner Alexander-Tut's question, but would confer with the Planning Commissions counsel and report back before the joint meeting.

Commissioner Alexander-Tut asked how would the public comment time limit apply to language services.

Secretary Harris said members of the public who require translation or persons with disabilities were allowed more time and typically with language services the time would be doubled.

9. Director's Report.

a. Director's Update [Director O'Riordan]

Director O'Riordan provided the following points for the month of March 2023 update:

Director O'Riordan shared a note of appreciation from a customer that said they were so impressed by the service of Joanna Chang and Matthew Armour of the Technical Services Division. The customer said he emailed technical questions and got a good answer the same day, and that was the type of service that helped do the job better from the beginning and understand the Building Code to design a safer building.

Site Permit Process Improvement:

- DBI, the Permit Center and City Planning hosted a stakeholder feedback session on the site permit process improvements April 19, 2023. The core of the plan was to bifurcate the Site Permit process with Planning overseeing the entitlement phase and DBI focusing on building permit review and issuance. The meeting would be held from 4:00-5:30 p.m.
- The Department believed the plan would substantially reduce the timeline for developing new housing in some cases by more than one year.

- We will report the feedback and provide a more detailed proposal at the joint Building Inspection and Planning Commission meeting. After stakeholders give their input the Department would introduce legislation to be considered by the Board of Supervisors and ultimately Mayor Breed.

b. Update on major projects.

Director O’Riordan gave an update on major projects for March 2023 as follows:

- Major projects are those with valuation of \$5 million or greater filed, issued, or completed.
 - 1 permits filed
 - \$51.4 million in valuation
 - 126 net units
- Major projects with permits issued.
 - 1 issued
 - \$23.5 million in valuation
 - 0 net units
- Major projects with Certificate of Occupancy
 - 4 issued
 - \$78.6 million in valuation
 - 108 net units

c. Update on DBI’s finances.

Deputy Director of Administrative Services Alex Koskinen gave an update on the Department’s March 2023 finances as follows:

- Year-end Revenues projected at \$52.8 million, \$5.4M (9%) below budget, based on actual revenues collected for the first 9 months
- Year-end Expenditures budget was 59% spent year to date.
- Year to date (YTD) salary and fringe actuals are trending 72%, projected to be \$660K above budget at year end.
- Year to date (YTD) number of permits were 10% lower than the previous year
- YTD valuation was 6% lower than the previous year
- Q3 activity had slowed

Mr. Koskinen gave a brief update on the fee study and made the following points:

- At this stage there was more work needed to refine some of the underlying estimates of the fee study.
- Three of the major components determining costs: conducting a time study to allocate those cost to each fee, seeing how much time it took to process each fee, and estimating the volume of number of permits for each type of permit to estimate the total revenue that would be received.
- The first part had been completed and a rate had been developed for administrative services, permit services, inspection services.

- The time study was being refined going fee by fee, department by department to determine how much time it took to process a permit fee for a \$50 to \$200 million valuation project.
- The estimated volume was a critical piece to estimate a volume too high then we may under collect revenue and it was important to get that number as close to correct as possible.
- The Department planned to work with the Office of Economic Analysis at the Controller's Office come up with the best estimate.
- In one to two months the Department would present a final report and because of the upcoming budget deadlines the plan was to have an across the board increase by some amount and return and update the Building Code based on the completed fee study.

Vice President Tam asked if there was a draft of the fee study?

Mr. Koskinen said there were preliminary numbers but there were significant concerns about the volume data, and some of the time study underlying assumptions needed to be changed and there was a completed model and were refining the inputs to give output the Department thought reasonable.

Vice President Tam asked when would the finalized report be ready the BIC to review.

Mr. Koskinen said the timeline was one to two months, however more work needed to be done in regards to the timing of legislation and there were some questions that needed to be resolved. If the fee study was complete the budget may not be changed or if the change was done by budget trailing legislation the Department may be able to change that before the Mayor signs the budget August 1st. Also, the timeline of the effectiveness of those fees, the earliest possible effective date would be October 1st. For the fiscal year 2023-2024 the Department would only be able to collect $\frac{3}{4}$ of the higher revenues. The Department was also working with the Mayor's Office to align any policy goals to ensure any changes to fees would not harm any economic recovery.

d. Update on proposed or recently enacted State or local legislation.

Legislative Affairs Manager Carl Nicita gave an update on recently enacted State or local legislation as follows:

- **File No. 220878-2:** Ordinance amending the Planning and Building Codes to increase fines and penalties for violations of Planning and Building Code violations.
- **File No. 230373:** Ordinance amending the Existing Building Code to require buildings with 15 or more stories constructed after 1998 to conduct and submit façade inspection reports; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.
- **File No. 230212-2:** Ordinance amending the Planning, Building, and Fire Codes to codify the annual waiver of awning replacement fees and awning sign fees applied for during the month of May, and to indicate that the Planning Code, Building, and Fire Code waivers pertaining to pedestrian street lighting as well as awning replacement, awning installation, and awning sign fees are keyed to permit application in May rather than permit issuance in May.
- **File No. 230374:** Ordinance amending the Building Code to outline the site permit application process, define and limit the scope of Building Official review of site permits, and require simultaneous interdepartmental review of site permits; and affirming the Planning Department's determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.
- **File No. 230167:** Ordinance amending the Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code to create a Permit Prioritization Task Force responsible for recommending permit prioritization guidelines

to the Department of Building Inspection, Planning Department, and the Department of Public Works, requiring those departments to review and update their permit prioritization guidelines periodically, and requiring the commissions that oversee each department to approve the department’s permit prioritization guidelines; and affirming the Planning Department’s determination under the California Environmental Quality Act.

- **File No. 230147:** Hearing to review the Budget and Legislative Analyst’s policy analysis report on repurposing commercial real estate for residential use to address the City’s need to produce additional affordable and market rate housing and commercial vacancies, particularly in the Downtown office market.
- **File No. 230331:** Hearing on emergency safety response, department coordination, and mitigation strategies on high-rise window breaks as a result of increased storms; and requesting the Department of Building Inspection, Department of Emergency Management, and Fire Department to report.
- **File No. 230302:** Hearing to review the monitoring and oversight of City and County of San Francisco contracts with Tenants and Owners Development Corporation (TODCO) and review the number of historical complaints filed against TODCO buildings; and requesting the Department of Homelessness and Supportive Housing, Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development, Department of Building Inspection, and Planning Department to report.

e. Update on Inspection Services.

Chief Building Inspector Matthew Greene presented the following Building Inspection Division Performance Measures for March 1, 2023 to March 31, 2023:

• Building Inspections Performed	5,470
• Complaints Received	438
• Complaint Response within 24-72 hours	435
• Complaints with 1st Notice of Violation sent	74
• Complaints Received & Abated without NOV	224
• Abated Complaints with Notice of Violations	46
• 2nd Notice of Violations Referred to Code Enforcement	35

Chief Building Inspector Matthew Greene presented the following Building Inspection Division Performance Measures March 1, 2023 to March 31, 2023:

• Housing Inspections Performed	1,164
• Complaints Received	535
• Complaint Response within 24-72 hours	504
• Complaints with Notice of Violations issued	200
• Abated Complaints with NOVs	460
• # of Cases Sent to Director's Hearing	47
• Routine Inspections	240

Chief Building Inspector Matthew Greene presented the following Building Inspection Division

Performance Measures for March 1, 2023 to March 31, 2023:

• # Housing of Cases Sent to Director’s Hearing	85
• # Complaints of Order of Abatements Issues	18
• # Complaint of Cases Under Advisement	0
• # Complaints of Cases Abated	163
• Code Enforcement Inspections Performed	554
• # of Cases Referred to BIC-LC	1
• # of Case Referred to City Attorney	1

Chief Building Inspector Matthew Greene said Code Enforcement Outreach Programs are updated on a quarterly as follows for the 2nd quarter:

• # Total people reached out to	33,807
• # Counseling cases	410
• # Community Program Participants	4,753
• # Cases Resolved	787

Secretary Harris called for public comment on items 9a-d.

Public Comment:

Mr. Jerry Dratler said he had three questions as follows:

- What programs were not funded as the expenditure page of the finance reports stated the city grant program was budgeted for \$5.7 million but had been projected to \$4.9 million.
- The Services to other departments budget for 2022 was \$26 million and the current projected was \$21 million and how was the Department able to achieve a \$5 million reduction.
- Non-operating was budgeted at \$20 million for 2022 and budgeted for 2023 at \$25 million and the YTD actuals were slightly less than \$2 million, what was the projected total for 2023.

10. Review and approval of the minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 15, 2023.

Commissioner Alexander-Tut made a motion, seconded by Vice President Tam, to approve the Regular Meeting minutes of March 15, 2023.

The motion carried unanimously.

RESOLUTION NO. BIC 030-23

11. Adjournment.

Vice President Tam made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Alexander-Tut to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:24 a.m.

RESOLUTION NO. BIC 031-23

SUMMARY OF REQUESTS BY COMMISSIONERS OR FOLLOW UP ITEMS	
Commissioner Shaddix asked perhaps for the June BIC meeting, an update on the vacancy tax for the named commercial corridor and what DBI showed as vacant storefronts. – Shaddix	Page 9

Respectfully submitted,



Monique Mustapha, Assistant BIC Secretary



Edited By: Sonya Harris, BIC Secretary