



**Potrero Yard Neighborhood Working Group Meeting 21 Minutes**

Monday, February 1, 2021, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Zoom Webinar, Webinar ID: 846 3350 5939

(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:**

Thor Kaslofsky  
Mary Sheeter  
J.R. Eppler  
Scott Feeney  
Magda Freitas  
Peter Belden  
Alexander Hirji  
Roberto Hernandez

**Members Not Present:**

Alexandra Harker  
Kamilah Taylor  
Benjamin Bidwell  
Ryan Parker  
Claudia Delarios Moran

**SFMTA Staff:**

Rafe Rabalais  
Adrienne Heim  
Licina Iberri  
Bonnie Jean von Krogh  
Jesse Schofield  
Kerstin Magary

**Other Attendees:**

Rosie Dilger (consultant)  
Abraham Vallin (consultant)  
Jenny Zhou (consultant)  
Ronald Mitchell  
Hayden Miller  
Arnoldo Ulloa  
Mat Snyder



## **Purpose of the Meeting**

*To provide updates to the Working Group and review revise and discuss Request for Proposal (RFP) potential panel questions and key categories.*

### **Item 1. Welcome**

*Rosie Dilger welcomed everyone to the February meeting. She reminded the audience that the RFP is still being developed at this moment and all related questions from proposers should be directed to San Francisco Public Works. She then went over the meeting's virtual etiquette.*

### **Item 2. Wellness Check-in**

*Rosie introduced Adrienne Heim to lead the Wellness Check-in.*

Adrienne: Thank you, Rosie! Working Group, what is your favorite Muni line? Mine is the 43 Masonic!

J.R. Eppler: My favorite is the one I have not been able to ride yet, and that is the 55 Dogpatch.

Rosie: I'll jump in. In college, I took the 22 Fillmore for the entire route while I worked at Sports Basement on 16<sup>th</sup> and all the way to the Marina. That was very special to me.

Peter Belden: I will have to go with the 55 Dogpatch! The 55 just seemed to go faster!

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: I will have to go with the 27 Bryant. It's near and dear to me because I worked about 2 years on the project to improve its service. Its route has been modified due to COVID-19.

Scott Feeney: My favorite Muni bus line is the 29 Sunset. It goes to McLaren Park. I love to take it up to the park to do some hikes. It's been a way for me to enjoy nature without having to drive.

Alexander Hirji: My favorite line is currently suspended: the 76X Marin Headlands Express. It's different. I remember seeing the bus all the way out in Marin!

*With no additional input, Rosie transitioned to the Staff Announcements, inviting Adrienne to lead.*

### **Item 3. Staff Announcements**

Adrienne: Hello all, I am leaving the Potrero Yard Modernization Project. I've learned so much on the project. I am becoming a Planner for [Livable Streets](#) starting February 22<sup>nd</sup>. I will be working on quick-build projects. Additionally, I'd like to welcome Jesse Schofield, who will be supporting Licinia Iberri, Rafe Rabalais, and Bonnie Jean von Krogh with communications on this project. I will be helping Jesse in the transition and he has a wealth of information! Please welcome him with open arms.



Jesse Schofield: Thanks Adrienne! Good evening, everyone. I have a background in transportation planning. I have a strong passion for outreach and communication. This project is very exciting, and I'm interested in this Working Group and how this process moves forward. I am very excited to help progress this project in a meaningful way.

Bonnie Jean: We are so thankful for Adrienne's incredible hard work on this project! Jesse and I will both stay on the project. Good luck, Adrienne!

Rosie: Thank you for all that you've done, Adrienne. Jesse, I hope you know that you have got big shoes to fill.

*Rosie then transitioned Adrienne to Item 4.*

#### **Item 4: Project & Schedule Updates**

Adrienne: J.R. mentioned a line that is open, and I got to ride it during its rollout. The 55 Dogpatch is out and running. The 15 Bayview-Hunter's Point Express, the T Third, the 8AX and 8BX Bayshore Express, the 33 Ashbury, and 37 Corbett have resumed their full routes. Go to [SFMTA.com/COVID-19](https://www.sfmta.com/COVID-19) for the latest developments.

*Rosie then introduced Rafe Rabalais for discussion on federal and local legislation and general project updates.*

#### **Item 5. Legislative Communications & Prop K Update**

Rafe: Funding of about \$100 million dollars will be making its way to the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) through the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) regionally. That's a real lifeline for the SFMTA. Another update on the federal scene is that we have a new Secretary of Transportation – former Mayor Peter Buttigieg – who was approved by the Senate. There's a potential \$1.9 trillion stimulus that is believed to include some transit relief at the state and local level. That's the update on the federal level.

Closer to the project, I have a quick update on the RFP process. We had hoped to get the RFP out at the end of January, but that schedule is looking more like a month and a half delay or so (in the Spring, around March).

This is because of two reasons:

1. We have a lot of loose ends to tie up on the RFP, including some things we will talk about tonight.
2. The funding request through the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) is also something we will talk about tonight, as well as the project legislation coming before the Board of Supervisors.

After a lot of internal discussion, we determined that we need both of these legislative processes well underway by the time that we release the RFP.



The last quick update is on the Racial Equity Assessment. It is still a high priority. We've run into a hurdle, and the San Francisco Contract Monitoring Division (CMD) sees this activity as intrinsic to the work that we do. Our hope is to still have the Equity Assessment out by the time the RFP is released. And those are the updates for those three topics.

*Rosie then prompted Rafe to discuss, in more detail, the legislative communications and Prop K updates.*

Rafe: We had very good dialogue with the Board of Supervisors. We had some very positive meetings, getting everyone on the same page. We spoke with Supervisors Rafael Mandelman and Hillary Ronen's offices. Our hope is to schedule meetings with members of the Budget and Finance Committee. The three members of the Committee are Sup. Matt Haney, Sup. Ahsha Safai, and Sup. Gordon Mar. And that's a look-back and a quick look-ahead to meetings with the Supervisors.

Related to that, the Prop K Funding Request is some essential funding to keep the project moving. It's a really important funding request. I think that the meeting with Supervisor and Board President Shamann Walton was very positive – we got the thumbs up to get the project back on the agenda for the Transportation Authority Board (TA Board). This is good because we've been on hold since December now.

Bonnie Jean: We'd appreciate it if you could join us at meetings before the TA Board.

Rafe: The project legislation is very narrowly tailored for projects of similar size that the City and County have undertaken. There just isn't a chapter in the Administrative Code that perfectly fits this project. Bonnie Jean, can you speak on the timing and what's been discussed with Board President Walton's office?

Bonnie Jean: Yes. In conversations that we've had with President Walton's office, they are getting the project legislation moving at the Board of Supervisors level. We're looking at mid-February to go back before the Budget and Finance Committee. We'll keep the Working Group updated once things are set in stone.

Rafe: I don't anticipate that either action will be very controversial, but it never hurts to have public comment. We'd love to get your perspective.

Bonnie Jean: I can definitely see community comments being helpful to the Supervisors.

Rosie: Are there any Working Group members that would like to comment?

Roberto Hernandez: I'd like to make a comment. I would like to ask that we send a letter congratulating President Walton for his victory on his election on behalf of this Working Group.

Rosie: That's an awesome idea. Moving along, I will pass this over to Adrienne and Bonnie Jean.



## **Item 6. Working Group Evaluation Questions to Proposers**

*Adrienne and Bonnie Jean led a Jamboard discussion on potential question topics to be included in the RFP from the Working Group. Adrienne and Bonnie Jean began the discussion with a review of previous conversations and then explained the internal SFMTA process for how they organized previous Working Group feedback into question categories. Categories included: Transportation; Communications and Community Engagement; Open Space/Neighborhood; and Housing Affordability and Housing Inclusivity of the Design. After some comments and revisions to the questions, Working Group members all agreed to increase the number of questions they have input on from three to four. Overall, Working Group members all agreed that after some wordsmithing, the questions all capture sufficient details.*

*Rosie then moved the meeting forward to Item 7.*

## **Item 7. Housing Discussion**

Rafe: We circulated documents for the Working Group to review for the Housing element. These are two housing appendices that will be included in the RFP. The first appendix will establish a framework for our vision and priorities for the housing element and then secondly, establish guidelines for the housing component. For the first component, there is a real emphasis on striving on getting as much affordable housing as possible, up to 100% affordable housing. What flows from that are topic-by-topic goals, which are intentionally a little bit vague. The goals were distilled from the input we've received from the community, Working Group, and the Housing Subcommittee who are members of the Working Group. That's Volume I.

Volume II are the technical guidelines. A challenge with building an RFP is not being overly specific and not being overly general. There's a lot that's changing at federal levels for affordable housing, so we don't want to lock ourselves into something overly cautious, and we also don't want to be unrealistic in our assumptions.

*Rafe went over the Technical Guidelines.*

Rafe: For the first component, there is an emphasis on striving to get as much affordable housing as possible. The second component should target low- and moderate-income households, including Muni staff. Third component is the market-rate component, we specifically say that we want this component as small as possible. We'd like it to be as affordable as possible.

This next component is about building community. We want this project to be as socio-economically mixed as possible.

*Rafe scrolled down to the Location and Design Characteristics.*

Rafe: We want the community businesses to be as affordable and accessible as possible. This should be marketed to a broad range of individuals. The businesses should cater to communities across the socio-economic spectrum. And that's a quick tour!



This document has been shared with the Working Group via email and we will happily reshare it.

Most of the comments from the Working Group that we received for this appendix were wordsmithing comments and asking if we should be more prescriptive and more technical in certain areas. We are also looking for guidance from the [Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development](#) for a standard for low-income or moderate-income. We are looking to be very specific about affordable housing.

To put Magda Freitas on the spot, you had a comment about artist housing as well. We talked about not just making the housing affordable, but also marketing to folks as well. There are different ways to get folks to pursue the housing. For the sought-after affordable units, there is a lottery system with weight that is given to certain groups. We will work with the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development to refine that. And then there's also general marketing, which, Magda, your community fits into the latter?

Magda: Artists need space to make their art.

Rafe: The Administrative Code establishes neighborhood preference. We'll see if they have a tie to the neighborhood. We'll see if this could fall into a population of risk of displacement concern. The feedback we've received from the Subcommittee was that the neighborhood families that bore the brunt of housing displacement are a high priority and the second priority are SFMTA employees. We hope that folks have an opportunity to review this.

Roberto: If we are going to get into artist housing, then we should also identify seniors. There's a large retiring population that makes minimum wage. On the affordability aspect, what is now considered affordable housing is somebody that makes \$150,000 a year. I'm talking about minimum wage workers. Affordability has been redefined in the last seven years due to housing cost in San Francisco. What kind of affordable units are we talking about?

I did a whole breakdown for a developer of a teacher's salary. It starts about \$58,000 a year. After five, 10, and 20 years, the cap is around \$80k. It's important that we look at affordability and define affordability. With a developer, they may need to make the project financially feasible. We should look at salary range and the number of units per that population. For example, seniors, maybe we set aside fifty units for seniors.

Scott: I think the document looks pretty good. What mechanisms do you have to protect the City if the developer ends up not being able to go through with 100% affordable?

Rafe: There's no foolproof method. It's not necessarily just a bright-shiny object, it's about evaluating the financing ability. We would identify secure financing sources versus speculative sources. We will be looking at the most realistic path for financing the project. We will make sure to recirculate this document one more time for those that haven't had a chance to read it. We'll talk internally about timeline.



*Rosie gave a last call for comments. With no additional comments, Rosie moved the meeting to Public Comment.*

**Item 8. Public Comment**

*Rosie prompted Public Comment.*

*Abraham asked for public comments. There were no call-in audience members. With no public comments, Rosie and Abraham concluded the meeting.*