



Potrero Yard Neighborhood Working Group Meeting 14 Minutes

Monday, June 8, 2020, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Zoom Webinar, Webinar ID: 821 3576 8377

(Virtual)

Note – The meeting minutes capture the overall tone of the group’s discussion and is not meant to be an exact transcription.

Members Present:

Alexander Hirji
Claudia DeLarios Moran
Alexandra Harker
Brian Renehan
Magda Freitas
Mary Sheeter
Scott Feeney
Thor Kaslofsky
J.R Eppler

Members Not Present:

Roberto Hernandez
Benjamin Bidwell
Kamilah Taylor
Erick Arguello

SFMTA Staff:

Rafe Rabalais
Adrienne Heim
Licina Iberri
Pamela Owen Adams
Kerstin Magary

Other Attendees:

Rosie Dilger (consultant)
Abraham Vallin (consultant)
Jenny Zhou (consultant)
Amy Eliot
Christian Figueroa
Daniel Jimenez
Diane Fischer
Jeffrey F
Jonathan Stern
Kieran Kelly-Sneed
Linda Crouse
Lisbet Sunshine
Mark Kelly
Miyamoto San Francisco
Roberto Jenkins
Ryan Marcelo
Simin Naseh



Purpose of the Meeting

To discuss project general updates, recent events, takeaways from June 6 events, and solicit feedback on RFP Subcommittees - with an emphasis on housing.

Item 1. Welcome

Rosie Dilger welcomed everyone to the meeting, highlighted the webinar features of Zoom including the "Raise Your Hand" function for participation, and reminded the participants of virtual etiquette. Adrienne Heim then transitioned to discussing recent events and their impact, and invited members to share their thoughts and feelings as part of the Wellness Check-In.

Adrienne Heim: There's been some horrific, gut-wrenching events that have been taking place over the last week. Not only with George Floyd, but other incidents of racial inequities and injustices, that we cannot just sweep as we go through this meeting today. So I want to do a wellness check-in with everyone. You can speak if you would like to do so, and share a quote or feeling for all of us to address the things that are happening. One of the quotes that resonated with me comes from an Australian aboriginal elder named Lilla Watson; she states "If you have come to help me, you are wasting your time, but if you have come because your liberation is bound with me then let us do the work together."

Adrienne then opened the space for other SFMTA staff and Working Group members to share.

Licinia Iberri: Hi all. Everyone here knows me, but I've been gone for awhile and now I'm back. One thing that I'm learning, through observing all that is happening on the streets of our city and online, is that I should be more proactive in teaching my daughter and my son about inequities and racism. Moreover, the history of racist structures and culture in the United States. I didn't do this because I have a privileged perspective. I didn't want my daughter to see that others were treated differently, and I wanted her to think that all of the kids in her preschool class were the same. Now I'm learning that, that's not what black children are taught. I now have a curriculum to undertake with my kids. Which is new for me.

Alex Harker: Welcome back Licinia. I actually had a few thoughts recently about things that we could do for this project. Specifically to rise to the moment. I don't know if this is the time for that because this is specifically just a wellness check-in. I can come back to that later on. When we're not doing wellness check-ins.

Thor Kaslofsky: Just want to say that it is a pleasure to see all of your faces.

Rosie moved forward along the agenda and transitioned Working Group members to the Working Group Member Announcements section



Item 2. Working Group Member Announcements

Thor Kaslofsky: I just wanted the Advisory Board to know that I'm president of the board of the San Francisco Housing Corporation. They are an affordable housing developer in Bayview/Hunters Point and they are looking at applying for this project as part of the larger team and so I've spoken with SFMTA staff about what the parameters are of my participation on this group, and I've checked in with the City Attorney's office on any guidance that they might have. The City Attorney suggested that it was okay for me to be a part of this larger group despite being on the advisory board. So there was no conflict of interest. Also, I am not paid for being on the board of an affordable housing developer, I am a volunteer. So, I wanted the board to know that, and SFMTA staff to know that, if you wanted to see those emails.

Rosie Dilger: Thanks for sharing Thor. By nature of the work that we all do and the reason that we're here, it's very lucky that some of us will be on boards or involved in other things. But if you are ever concerned just ask and we'll make sure that everything is good to go.

Rosie transitioned Licinia to provide Project Updates

Item 3. General Project & Schedule Updates

Licinia Iberri: We submitted the project application back in September of last year. Since then, thanks to Pamela, we have been working diligently towards a fully fleshed out project description and notice of preparation. In light of the COVID-19 shelter in place, we have pushed the public scoping meeting to fall of this year, as that is what the Planning Department decided. Mostly because there is no real guidance from the state who administers the CEQA legislation, on how to have a public scoping meeting that one cannot attend in person. We may have to get there depending on the limits on public gatherings moving forward, but for now they have found a way to move it to fall without it impacting our critical path. We're still anticipating that the draft EIR will come out in early 2021, that would most likely be the culmination of the initial studies for those of you who are technical wonks.

Thor Kaslofsky: Is an initial study even needed, because we know we need a full EIR?

Licinia Iberri: Yes, we need it but we already know what it's going to say. The initial study is basically the checklist that you start with for all of the subjects that one has to study. In other words, the initial study consists of multiple questions asking "will this project do this? Does this project do that?" and for projects where one says "I don't know" a technical report must be done entailing the transportation, air quality, and noise studies. The technical report will detail if the project will have a specific impact or not. We do have to do an initial study but it is more of a formality as we know we already have to do an EIR.



Licinia continued with additional updates

Licinia Ibarra: Moving forward, we are pretty much at the point of stable project description, as you can see this is when the Planning Department really starts counting the 22 months for CEQA. This description is what will be used in advance of the developer concept.

The RFQ will be coming out soon. Most likely at the end of this week or at the beginning of next week. Then we will follow up with project-specific legislation with Supervisors. This is enabling legislation that will allow us to close the procurement. Chronologically it is not necessary to do this right now, but considering we've been trying to approach this project as transparently as possible, we are trying to do this with the Board of Supervisors. The purpose also being to have any preliminary conversations the Board wants to have now, in advance of coming to them with a full project agreement and a development partner. We will be sure to include you all on the public notice for that and you are welcome to come to the Board of Supervisors meeting then. We can discuss this more via email before the opportunity approaches.

The RFP will most likely be released in the fall. The RFQ will help determine the three competing teams for the RFP. It will be a very busy next nine months for us as we are nearing the development partner selection process. As you can see, we are still moving forward with the goal of breaking ground by 2023. Anyone have questions on those slides before we keep going?

Alex Harker: I know we already went through the comment process for the RFQ, but I was thinking that we might want to broaden the qualifications just because I feel like it's generally the same large players that are eligible for this project because they've done them before and that's not necessarily based on meritocracy. I think that we might be able to broaden our scope if we say we would accept qualifications from groups that have had similar or comparable or similar experience rather than being so specific. In tandem with that I was thinking that we should really think about paying people for the RFP's because that is needing to put so much money up front, and again that is going to be the same players who have the funds to do that. We have an opportunity to bring more people in with this.

Licinia Ibarra: Let's be sure to write that down. There are some things that the City has currently in legislation that can help, and in the enabling legislation there is a provision for potentially paying those teams to prepare these proposals. That payment would likely include payments to the LBE (local Business Enterprise) members of the respondent team. Thank you for the comment, I agree that there is more that we could do. We will look at the language.

Without the further comments or questions, Rosie introduced Adrienne for the next item of the agenda.



Item 4. COVID 19 Update

Adrienne Heim: I'll just give a brief overview of the SFMTA currently in relation to COVID-19. Since we last met, we've increased frequencies on a number of routes by two to four minutes. Routes such as the 8 Bayshore, 12R Mission, 22 Fillmore, 33 Rapid, 49 Van Ness-Mission, the M bus, and the T bus. We've also improved the 14 Owl routes by ten minutes, and that's operating weekdays and weekends. We've also added more frequent service for the 9 and 9R. As of Monday June 15, street sweeping will be enforced and we will start ticketing, please give that information to friends and colleagues who own a vehicle.

We've had a number of overviews with the SFMTA Board about our restart and recovery plan. We've seen a lot of traffic flowing through the City as things are starting to open. We're now going into Phase 2 of reopening, and we want to get ahead of how we're going to address the traffic congestion while ensuring that transit is also safe. By taking the measures as recommended by the CDC, while keeping certain quarters open on safe streets. Our recovery plan is in sequence and we are looking at other potential measures, such as implementing transit only lanes, and ensuring that small businesses are able to operate on the curb. Be on the lookout as all of this information will be up on our SFMTA Blog SF portal, and you can look for updates at [SFMTA.com/COVID-19](https://www.sfmta.com/COVID-19).

Thor Kaslofsky: I'd like to plug the safe streets initiative. It's working really well in the Richmond district on Lake street. It's good, keep it up thank you.

Rosie Dilger prompted the Working Group to ask any questions if they had any. Then moved on.

Item 5. Spring Outreach & Event Promotion

Rosie Dilger: As you know, we've been doing a lot of outreach and promotion for the events that we held just this last Saturday on June 6. As you know it's been difficult to not do person to person outreach that we love doing. Even though we weren't able to do what we've done before, we are proud of our outreach during this COVID-19 era. We mailed the brochure to over 1,000 people within the project site radius, and we also had a Spanish-language version that was distributed to CBO's and service providers throughout the Mission, and 750 brochures were delivered to our workers at Potrero, Presidio and Islais Creek. Rafe actually got on the radio and did a short interview on The Game 95.7 that aired on the 29th of May. We also advertised the events on June 6 in our community newspapers - the Potrero View, the Bay View, and El Tecolote. As always we had the event on Facebook and on the project website.



We also engaged in social and digital advertising, and we were extremely lucky to do that this time. We worked with KCBS as well as Univision, and we did targeted ads. I would love to know if anybody saw them. As they were geo-targeted for people in the Potrero and Mission. As we move forward we'd love to tell you how the events went. Rafe would you like to give us an overview?

Rafe Rabalais: Sure! The first event we had on Saturday June 6 was the English Telephone Event. We used a conference line system called Broadnet. It worked very well, it allowed us to systematically go through callers and field calls almost like a radio show. It was very organized, and we were able to chat with all of the callers who had questions or comments. We had 49 participants overall, a significant number of new participants, and approximately four participants who asked questions. We also asked a question about whether or not this was their first Potrero event, and discovered that 68 percent of folks who participated had previously attended events. Overall it went very well despite being restricted to a phone call without visuals for maximum accessibility. And we accomplished our goal, which was to get the information out there.

Rosie Dilger: We were able to conduct a survey during the English Telephone Event. We asked participants, "what community benefits are most welcome?" and a good number of people mentioned retail and open space, over childcare and community space. Given the city's stance on reopening, a similar format will most likely take place for our next big outreach event. Working Group members who joined, how well did the format work? What would you change? Is this the specific kind of virtual format that you think we should use in the future?

Mary Sheeter: I called in and I thought the format worked really well. It was nice to hear different perspectives and it just seemed very organized and their response to the questions was very good. The only thing that I would comment is that it seemed like there might have been people who wanted to make more comments or have more dialogue. It almost seemed too short if that's possible. As a person joining the call I wasn't sure if there were many other comments or questions that weren't addressed.

Rosie Dilger: This is the first time we've done an event like this so we weren't sure what we were going to get. We did take live calls and for those of you who were on anytime during the call you could dial *3 and you were routed to a member of our team to share your question and put it into the system. We didn't have a huge influx of questions, and one of our callers actually asked twice. It's important to notify participants of how many questions we are receiving. We may consider extending the length if we have increased participation resembling our in person events.



Rosie transitioned Abraham to give an overview of the Spanish Telephone event

Abraham Vallin: The Spanish Telephone Event occurred from 1 PM to 2 PM, and we used Zoom instead of the Broadnet service. Given that it was our first Spanish-only event, and it was digital, we believe it went rather well. We had about 8 participants total and although they did not have many questions or comments, a lot of key information was provided on the RFQ and the RFP stages. Some key takeaways from the event were that we should begin to look at activities for engagement to use during future events, while preserving the accessibility factor, as we're not sure everyone has access to a computer. We are considering having polls or a set of questions to prompt callers. With that, here are a few questions for the Working Group: Did anyone join during the Spanish event? Do you think the format worked? Should we consider using Boradnet for future events? And are there concerns about equity?

Adrienne Heim: I want to add that we did do a preliminary contract with Univision prior to the June 6th events. So we might do some more with them throughout the year, and that could include short interviews.

Thor Kaslofsky: With regard to Juneteenth I presume you might do something? I'll start by explaining a bit of what it is. It is a day to celebrate the end of slavery with the Emancipation Proclamation.

Adrienne Heim: What are you envisioning connecting the project to Juneteenth?

Thor Kaslofsky: There's a nexus of many things going on, with the George Floyd and other unjust murder protests. The Potrero Yard is huge enough that with the right messaging, outreach in line and in support of Juneteenth could be useful for attracting the right attention to the project.

Adrienne Heim: We will discuss this internally and speak with supervisor Walton as well. We'd have to structure the messaging so as to not hop on the bandwagon of all that is happening, while being very honest and sincere about the benefits of the project to all of the communities surrounding the yard.

Thor Kaslofsky: It could probably be something very simple. You must have some statements about what has been going on lately, something a little subdued. Something that says the SFMTA cares about the black community and please click on the Potrero Yard to learn more about what we are doing in the Mission. Something simple like that would capture some valuable eyeballs.

Rosie thanked Thor and moved on to RFP Subcommittees



Item 6. RFP Subcommittees

Rafe Rabalais: I want to reiterate the important role of the Subcommittees. Thank you to all on the RFQ subcommittee for providing some very meaningful feedback that has been incorporated. We envision a similar role for RFP subcommittees, really doing a deeper dive into topics that we will have to go into greater detail on. As I've said in the past we've reached a certain point in the definition of the project. By the time the RFP is released project details will not be fully fleshed out but the RFP provides some other opportunities to get to an additional level of detail beyond the EIR with any number of topics. For housing we wanted to review a couple of the statements that we've put out there so far.

We've established this goal, that 50% of the units will be affordable. We have had a good ongoing dialogue with the Mayor's Office of Housing about the project, and heard that COVID-19 could have major implications. We don't know how long we will be in the situation that we're in, which will have an impact on funding sources. So there is a question as to the funding we will receive for affordable housing. The discussion that we've had is to persevere towards this goal in spite of these challenges. We know that in addition to city funding, there haven't been large commitments that have been made that's something that will challenge our development partner to secure funds for the project.

The new director of the Mayor's Office of Housing understands the importance of this project. He understands that it aligns with a number of city priorities, notwithstanding all of the challenges to the city budget. There is a sense that this is a priority project, as it provides a lot of affordable housing. To kick off the conversation on housing, we have multiple questions in terms of the kinds of housing that you might like to see. We have heard from a variety of stakeholders that SFMTA employee housing is desirable and we've also heard a real concern about the population in the Mission who has been a victim of the run up in prices. How do we achieve both aims optimally?

Rosie Dilger: With that, we'd like to conduct a quick poll for the first housing issue. Our first question for you is: Should the SFMTA be prioritizing family units? Members of the public you are welcome to vote on all polls as well.

Results of the poll: 3 people or 20% said "Not Sure" and 12 people or 80% said "Yes"

Rosie Dilger: It's looking like we have a lot of yes answers, some not sure and zero no's. This is a great way to start off this conversation. What does saying yes mean in terms of the other



housing options? Our next poll is: Is SFMTA employee housing the most important (Muni

operators, mechanics, etc.)?

Results of the poll: 5 people or 33.3% said "No", 4 people or 27% said "Not Sure" and 6 people or 40% said "Yes"

Rosie Dilger: Here it is looking like we have more of a spread. This is a great temperature measure, from here. Rafe, how about we move into where you were heading next?

Rafe Rabalais: These polls so far beg the question, how do we balance these two priorities? How much should we set aside for each population? With that, what are your comments?

J.R Eppler: Do we have any actual measure of what demand would look like for SFMTA workforce housing? People already have living situations, so what does the demand look like?

Rafe Rabalais: We've started to look at income data but there has not been an explicit demand yet. There could always be some prioritization in terms of marketing.

Adrienne Heim: Furthermore, we are going to continue in-reach events where we will gauge how receptive staff is to this idea.

Rafe Rabalais: We hope to do another round of inreach in advance of the RFP release. Any other thoughts?

Thor Kaslofsky: None of these housing options are simply yes or no, the way the City often does these is often based on priorities. I would definitely consider the SFMTA staff priority folks for housing.

Rosie Dilger: Thank you Thor. I think we want to do another poll question that speaks to marketability: Should we be prioritizing single units or one bedrooms?

Results of the poll: 6 people or 46% said "No" and 7 people or 54% said "Yes"

Rosie Dilger: It looks like this is something which should not be prioritized. Single units/1 bedrooms are seen in the market quite often, this is very helpful feedback. Licinia, let's discuss priority and allocation of these units.

Licinia Iberri: Thank you for the comment, Thor, that you'd prefer priority over allocation of these units. Do other Working Group members want to weigh in?

Claudia DeLarios Moran: I agree with that approach.

Rosie Dilger: Licinia, what do you see as the difference between priority and allocation? Will the priority be developed through the RFP or perhaps a marketing effort?



Licinia: Priority would be like, here's the list of populations that we would like to see in the development. For example, say our top priority is local families from 94110. If you go through that whole list and a group of those people are hardly interested or qualified, then it can go to anybody else in the other criterias there would be. Allocation would be dependent on income share for the units, one would have to meet the minimum AMI.

Rosie Dilger: That is helpful, does anyone else have questions? Thor brought up this great question, should we look at market rate units for a specific population?

Thor Kaslofsky: I did a study a year ago for a foundation in San Francisco, and I looked up demolition data for the year of 2017 going back to 2012. Single family homes in 2 or 4-unit buildings have the most number of large unit types. Most affordable housing produces few 3-bedroom and above types of units. There is always a balance of units and cost. Larger buildings tend to exclude family units. I'll plug this information here knowing that more family units also reduces the total amount of units overall. However feasible I think it is a big priority, especially for the Mission community.

Claudia DeLarios Moran: It makes me nervous to see 50% goal as the language being used, it feels like we're walking back a little. Using this language is setting up the project with an out to our commitment because of the economy. Also, is the 50% affordability in terms of units or overall cost?

Rafe Rabalais: The 50% affordability relates to units. Something that we are conscious of in terms of language is that it is a balancing act. Especially with the COVID-19 world that we are in, we don't want to undersell and we don't want to be unrealistic. We've tried to be prudent yet ambitious.

We just began the draft process for the RFP, we can convey to the developer community that we would recognize proposals that achieve a percentage of affordability higher than 50%. Through securing additional funds that are not apparent for now, we can aim for a percentage higher than 50.

Rosie Dilger: Any additional questions? In addition to what Rafe has said, we don't want to scare away any developers by setting unrealistic marks, and at the same time we want to ensure that the established affordability goal of 50% is prioritized. Licinia or Rafe, what can we do in the RFP to encourage the affordability ratio? How can our group help support in terms of a subcommittee?

Rafe Rabalais: The first step is putting it out there. That creates a certain level of ambition that's not seen as unrealistic but that challenges the development community to do well. We haven't drafted language just yet, so we are looking for innovative ideas from proposers during the RFQ



stage. How do we close that circle between impact from corporate investment in affordable housing?

Rosie Dilger: We've talked about this before, as we proceed outside of this meeting and into subcommittees - how do we figure out the affordability ratio itself, but also what are the desirable options in terms of housing? We know that we don't want to prioritize one bedrooms or studios over SFMTA employee housing. Let's do one more poll: Is a local preference most important (i.e. Mission residents)?

Results of the poll: 8 people or 42% said "Not Sure" and 11 people or 58% said "Yes"

Rosie Dilger: It looks like slightly more people favored yes over not sure. This result makes sense given the competing priorities, with operator housing, and family units also in consideration.

Licinia Iberri: I want to see if anyone who said not sure during any of the polls would like to flesh out their ideas?

Scott Feeney: What are the different priorities when we consider one aspect of affordable housing against another?

Rafe Rabalais: In terms of process, because these are difficult issues to navigate, the purpose of the RFP is to take a stab at how we can kind of thread that needle among all these different priorities, and then have the housing subcommittee give their say on if we are hitting the mark with our draft RFP language.

Rosie Dilger: Thank you Rafe. We are talking about something that will end up in the language & narrative of the RFP. We did a great job of gathering opinions today and making a difference in the qualifications that came out of the RFQ. We'd like to do something similar with the RFP. Rafe could you speak to the other issues that will be in the RFP?

Rafe Rabalais: The format is homework. Again, the initial interface for Working Group members will be in review capacity, looking at draft documents and draft design guidelines. In terms of schedule, our team will work on the solicitation effort, consulting with Public Works and Arup. June 19th is our internal deadline for our internal first draft of the RFP. That will be our first opportunity to have something that starts to look & feel like a document. Around that point is when folks can start to review some of the language and let us know if we're on or off target.

Rosie Dilger: We'd like to ask the Working Group members if the spreadsheet worked well for you, we'd like to know if there are other things you'd like to do so we're wondering what we could do to be as supportive of you in this capacity, in providing feedback while you get through the crux of questions & drafts.



Rafe Rabalais: I should say that the need for further discussion among Working Group members might emerge in the context of the responses that we get to these draft documents. If

consensus is difficult to reach we may have to have conversations. Or if they're minor tweaks, we could keep to the usual Google Doc format that we used for the RFQ.

Licinia Iberri: I just want people to be aware that we've sent an email detailing how to be part of a particular subcommittee, Adrienne sent out a Google form. We can send that out again after this meeting if you haven't been able to sign up for a subcommittee, or if you'd like to sign up for another one. I wanted to plug the housing one in particular if you'd like to be a part of the discussion around preference, ranking, priority, and tradeoffs. We do want to get more in depth into these conversations as we explore these areas, but not necessarily give you all of the homework. It might be too much for this one month period.

Rosie Dilger: We tried to combine subcommittees to consolidate the amount of groups and conversations, and so being on multiple subcommittees isn't so overwhelming. I categorized one as Design, another as Open Space/Franklin Square with Ground Floor/Activation, another as Neighborhood Engagement with Community Benefits, and the last as Housing. I'd love to hear from Working Group members if combining them into these buckets makes sense for you.

Thor Kaslofsky: I feel like if you're in the Open Space/Franklin Square with Ground Floor/Activation subcommittee, then I feel like you will be constantly pulling in Design. I could see them being integrated.

Rosie Dilger: In terms of how we look at things outside of this group, and recognize folks who want to get on a call or into a shared spreadsheet and share precedence from other designs or things that they're really hoping to see in the neighborhood. What I'm hoping is that by segmenting these subcommittees some groups that are really focused on the technical aspects of design can come back to the larger group, discuss the things that have been talked about in the subcommittee, and consult the larger group. I want to know, what is not encompassed by these four subcommittees? Let's aim to get in on our agenda for future Working Group meetings. For example the LBE engagement is not represented by these four subcommittees, or construction mitigation which will eventually happen.

Licinia Iberri: Let's combine Design and Ground Floor Use. We can talk about Open Space in connection to Franklin Park Square.



Adrienne Heim: Brian Renehan and Benjamin Bidwell we're interested in the Electrical Grid

subcommittee.

Rosie Dilger: Yes, I forgot to include those but I figured they were a part of the Design subcommittee.

Licinia Iberri: Adrienne, we can connect about this subcommittee after the meeting. We are treating Electrical Grid conversations as a separate piece from subcommittees.

Brian Renehan: I'm happy to work in whatever capacity is easiest for you.

Claudia DeLarios Moran: In terms of the Housing Subcommittee I think it'd be important to understand how we're considering and weighing the input of the community, what did the neighborhood say when we went out and conducted outreach? They said that they were heavily in support of affordability. How do we bring their voice into the conversations around priorities and who gets priority. That voice should be in the room.

Rosie Dilger: We agree with you, which is why housing is a subcommittee that we are taking the time to discuss today to have a conversation with the full Working Group and with the public.

Licinia Iberri: Given that we can't have public gatherings, Claudia can you or other folks think of other ways that we could potentially pose questions with a short turnaround time to the broader neighborhood? The issue right now is having enough time to obtain usable input.

Claudia DeLarios Moran: I think that the Working Group can help determine a few ways. We have existing data that we may be able to refer to. How do we weigh that? How do we take that into consideration before we arrive at decisions?

Rafe Rabalais: Our hope is to have a big public event for the neighborhood well before the release of the RFP, which will deal with these topics in much greater detail for surrounding neighbors to provide an open forum to address these topics. We are taking iterative stabs at fleshing these ideas out with the public.

Rosie Dilger: From the Telephone Events we had last Saturday, we did have very good participation in lieu of being able to do this in public. The potential to engage the public through polls on the phone and surveys is something to consider.

Rosie transitioned to Meeting Logistics & Next Steps



Item 7. Meeting Logistics & Next Steps

Rosie Dilger: In terms of subcommittees, it appeared that the shared Google doc format is working well for collaboration. Can the housing subcommittee speak to whether or not they'd like additional support? Be it through setting up Zoom call, or conference call number for the group, we'd really like to know what works best for each subcommittee.

In terms of Homework, Licia, what do we have?

Licia Iberri: We are working on Urban Design guidelines, and the Design subcommittee would most likely be the best suited one to review this. If other folks want to see it, please sign up for that subcommittee. The Planning Department Urban Design guidelines deviate slightly from our project's.

Rosie Dilger: How about we send the Urban Design guidelines to everyone, and if you're interested in jumping in then you are a part of the Design subcommittee. If you want to do a few things without being a part of the subcommittee then that is fine too.

Licia Iberri: Great!

Rosie Dilger: Because these meetings are held during dinner time, we are going to provide a stipend depending on participation. This lump sum will be given via gift card soon. If anyone has any fun or interesting ideas for a meeting topic or presenter, we are all ears. Any requests?

Alex Harker: It might be interesting to have someone from the Planning Department come to the next Working Group meeting to discuss parameters for the Urban Design guidelines and should the group have questions.

Rosie Dilger: That is a great idea, we will try to make that happen.

Thor Kaslofsky: Can we invite someone from the KQED project, or from Franklin Square Park? They are both significant neighbors and it would be interesting to see what their participation could look like.

Scott Feeney: Great point.

Adrienne Heim: Kristen thank you for providing this info, all SFMTA busses will stop operating for 8 minutes and 46 seconds at noon tomorrow, to observe what happened with George Floyd. Staff will observe this as well.



Alex Harker: I noticed that Santa Cruz is doing a project that runs parallel to ours. I just wanted to put this on people's radar. They're looking at doing a public library with housing above it, and parking. I recommend that people track that along with me.

Licinia Iberri: Rosie I just sent you a link to the rendering of KQED for folks to observe it really quick.

Rosie Dilger opened the webpage, displaying the renderings of KQED's future building on Mariposa Street. With that, Rosie opened the conversation to members of the public.

Item 8. Public Comment

Roberto Jenkins: Quick question, I was at the English telephone event this past Saturday. I wanted to know if the 150 foot height restriction came from a discussion with the Planning Department. Why not push that height limit to further benefit the proposed density of the site?

Licinia Iberri: We have had a two year community process, along with conversations with the Planning Department during that time. There are two answers to your question. We have had significant input from both directions, vying for or pushing against a taller building. Although greater housing density would positively impact the supply of the City, we must ensure that our neighbors remain happy. The other answer is that the Planning Department is truly the urban design and planning body of the city, and we are a city department. Our role as stewards of this particular property and a city department is to work within the policy that our sister department has created. The Mission Action Plan 2020 was a very long and inclusive strategy setting document, that sets 150 feet as the ceiling for height on the Potrero Center Site as a potential "opportunity site." They were firm on that number, and we're even unsure that this limit would be feasible. We are moving with these guidelines to ensure a project that is approvable and endorsable.

Further public comment was not provided. Rosie thanked all for participating and concluded the meeting.