



## Potrero Yard Neighborhood Working Group Meeting Minutes

Monday, June 24, 2019, 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.  
Islais Creek Motor Coach Facility, 1301 Cesar Chavez Street

*Note - the meeting minutes capture the overall tone of the group's discussion and is not meant to be an exact transcription.*

### Attendees

#### Present:

Claudia DeLarios Moran  
J.R. Eppler  
Kamilah Taylor  
Magda Freitas  
Mary Haywood Sheeter  
Scott Feeney  
Thor Kaslofsky

#### Not Present:

Alexandra Harker  
Alexander Hirji  
Erick Arguello  
Roberto Hernandez  
Ryan MacPhee

#### SFMTA Staff:

Adrienne Heim  
Deanna Desedas  
Jonathan Rewers  
Kerstin Magary  
Licina Iberri  
Rafe Rabalais

#### Other Attendees:

Peter Lauterborn  
(consultant)

### Minutes

#### Item 1. Meet & Greet

#### Item 2. Working Group Member Announcements

Licina Iberri asked the group if they have anything to announce, such as attending community meetings? She explained that project staff (Rafe and Rosie) attended the Mariposa - 18th San Bruno - Utah Street Neighborhood Association (MUNA) meeting and Claudia DeLarios Moran also attended. Some MUNA stakeholders had concerns about increased density and the general bus operations in that location and questioned if the bus yard could be relocated to a different site.

At the Northeast Mission Business Association (NEMBA) meeting they brought up housing configuration and how that will fit in with the neighborhood's needs.

Mary Haywood Sheeter explained there was a [Franklin Square Park meeting](#) at Sports Basement that involved discussions around the park's safety, cleanliness and lack of bathroom access. Supervisors Ronen and Walton were in attendance along with staff from SF Public Works and SFPD. They promised there would be a Pit Stop restroom trailer at the park soon.



Licinia Iberri asked Mary Haywood Sheeter if there had been direction on that meeting on who residents could call when concerns arise, because Magda had asked prior to the meeting for more information on this same question.

Magda Freitas stated that homelessness is on the rise, especially around Hampshire Street. So, lighting around the area should be considered. Kerstin Magary agreed to follow up with Magda and her neighbors on issues and potential solutions.

### **Item 3. Tour of Islais Creek Division**

Thor Kaslofsky asked staff who worked on the project (i.e. advisory, consultants, etc.).

Magda Freitas asked staff how long did it take to acquire the land?

Kerstin Magary stated that it was a 28-year process between SF Port, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, Caltrans, and Cargill Corporation (company that processed Copra)

Magda Freitas asked staff what was the total cost for the facility?

Kerstin Magary replied approximately \$124 million.

Mary Haywood Sheeter asked staff what is Copra?

Adrienne Heim explained that Copra is dried coconut meat used to feed livestock.

Thor Kaslofsky asked staff why there aren't more lines running out of the facility?

Licinia Iberri explained that the facility is only open Monday through Friday at this time.

The group then went for a facility tour, starting in the upstairs operator and dispatch areas, then through the locker and break facilities, then maintenance mezzanine and finally maintenance shop floor. During the tour, the following questions and comments arose:

Licinia Iberri explained that the 2nd floor restrooms and lockers also include access for the maintenance staff. As a result, maintenance staff must go upstairs, oftentimes with dirty hands, which make it difficult to access the space. So, there should have been amenities near their workspace. She went on to say that a Lactation room is part of the Citywide ordinance to include in all city buildings.

Thor Kaslofsky asked was a water source required for the lactation room?

Licinia Iberri explained when the room was designed they didn't require a water source. Potrero Yard will have a sink included with two separate private rooms for lactation.

How much time do employees spend in the building? Before and after a shift?



Kamilah Taylor explained that it depends, but she would stay longer if she didn't bring her car.

While entering the maintenance room, Licia Iberri explained that the lifts allow staff to go above grade and not under the pit. However, they learned that there's a desire to have both the lifts (e.g. lifts take time to raise) and pits.

Licia Iberri explained that all maintenance offices look out on the maintenance floor and noted that Potrero Yard will incorporate more efficient parts storage to make the storeroom more efficient and improve the maintenance workflow.

#### **Item 4. Discussion of July 27 Outreach Event**

Magda Freitas asked staff about the future height and massing.

Licia Iberri stated that the next community event will focus on modernizing the bus yard, especially since many attendees at the March community meeting wanted to know. We'll discuss the yard's functions and explain what we do know around the future height and mass of the yard.

Thor Kaslofsky asked staff if the event is open to the public and if there are activities for children.

Licia Iberri replied yes.

Rafe Rabalais explained the two March workshops focused on height, mass and housing concepts including affordability. Now, we want to refocus on the transit functions.

Claudia DeLarios Moran asked staff if the yard can be built without housing financing it.

Rafe Rabalais stated that we know we must build the yard with or without housing. Yet, including housing above the yard has been considered for policy reasons and potentially to assist with financing the yard.

Claudia DeLarios Moran replied the public is confused about that aspect, meaning it seems to appear that the yard cannot be built without a housing component to finance it.

Licia Iberri referred to the SFMTA's charter, which states that the SFMTA should diligently pursue alternative revenue sources to leverage assets, and that is why joint development to fund a portion of the project is being considered. She went on to say there is a funding gap and every bit of the budget helps. Yet, the narrative isn't that SFMTA must build housing to build the yard, but that we have to turn over every rock to find alternative funds.

Thor Kaslofsky asked staff will there be a point in time when you talk about financing the project so that it's digestible to the public? He said he was confused about the financing as well and potentially



having a workshop with the Working Group and public to talk about financing the project would be ideal.

Peter Lauterborn replied they could potentially create a visual rather than organize a meeting around it.

Magda Freitas asked about the online tour and Virtual Reality communication options.

Adrienne Heim explained that based on the funding available this could be a creative outreach tool to showcase the current and future look of the site.

Scott Feeney asked about Brochure Takeaway Layout - Slide 1 and whether the gray dash out represents the housing component.

Rafe Rabalais explained that represents the housing concept, but not a specific proposal.

Magda Freitas stated that the top doesn't show the mass and height.

Rafe Rabalais replied it's intended to be grayed to show a possible future concept and that the specific parameters and design of housing are still under discussion.

Magda Freitas asked staff if there will be a footnote that housing is being considered and not a done deal?

Peter Lauterborn replied we'll clarify on the board that it's still to be determined.

Magda Freitas asked staff if the visual is to scale and the structure should clearly show the relationship through a pedestrian's view.

J.R. Eppler explained that the housing component should include text that says "under study" or "potential" to make it clear that it's not set.

Thor Kaslofsky echoed that statement and said there could potentially be no housing included. He also wanted to know how much more the Working Group could be involved in the technical aspects of the design of the transit facility.

Rafe Rabalais replied the SFMTA will inform stakeholders about technical aspects needed for transit operations. Further, they will involve the public about other aspects and potential outside the box input like how to improve staff's experience while working in the building.

Magda Freitas asked to present the broken-out floors in a more digestible way with more depth - 3D.

Licinia Iberri replied this isn't a real view of the floors, but our consultant SiteLab will create a true visual for the next outreach event.



Thor Kaslofsky said to be careful to not show anything more than massing, especially when it's included in a handout. That could live beyond its intention and create mixed messages.

Rafe Rabalais replied they can include a notation on the visual that states "for visual purposes only".

J.R. Eppler felt that it would be ideal to include a visual of a current building(s) with similar height/mass to provide context.

Ryan Scott Feeney agreed with a comparison and he had concerns about Brochure Takeaway Layout - Slide 2. The visual makes the building look very big and confusing without the housing on top. He also felt that it would be a better perspective from 17th Street.

Magda Freitas asked staff if 75 feet is the limit for the building, exclusive of housing?

Licinia Iberri replied 75 feet is the limit as part of the design criteria.

Kamilah Taylor asked staff what is the conversation of design and height with housing on top.

Thor Kaslofsky said it would be good to incorporate LEED Gold and standard performance (risk category 3) in the boards to call out public benefits and structural resistance.

Scott Feeney referred to the Potrero Yard Pedestrian Experience Board and stated there's a lot to unpack on this board.

Licinia Iberri replied massing and shadow are considered based on conversations with city staff.

Rafe Rabalais stated that we will explain that we're having ongoing conversations rather than provide a commitment.

Scott Feeney replied what is the commitment?

Rafe Rabalais explained that conversations with the City Family where 900-units were evaluated and that was considered too big. But that's not the same as a commitment, so the language will be adjusted. The community can continue to express an opinion for a larger or smaller project.

## **Item 5. Project Updates**

Claudia DeLarios Moran stated that she needed a clear understanding of the decision-making process not just for this Working Group but for the public.



Rafe Rabalais replied we are coming back to the community to show what we've heard and then have that manifest into a project description for the Request for Qualifications (RFQ) and Request for Proposal (RFP). There are two big milestones, first bring this to the community and second send this to SF Planning. Then, structure on going community feedback to keep the conversation and information pipeline going.

Scott Feeney asked if staff will have those numbers in August or September of this year?

Rafe Rabalais replied that by September, we should have something that looks and feels like a draft project.

Licinia Ibarra explained the Board of Supervisors have been briefed and are familiar with the project. She hasn't received a recommendation for a specific unit count or project type from the Supervisors. So, if the Working Group would like to advocate for higher density that's an option.

Thor Kaslofsky asked staff when doing the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) with alternatives, will one alternative show the maximum capacity of the site?

Rafe Rabalais explained that that could be considered.

Licinia replied there will be some new shadow from the bus yard.

#### **Item 6. A Look Ahead**

Scott Feeney and Thor Kaslofsky agreed that future Working Group meetings should be scheduled.

Magda Freitas liked the Doodle invite approach.

Staff would send the Working Group a survey in order to schedule future meetings.