



Potrero Yard Neighborhood Working Group Meeting Minutes

Monday, March 11, 2019, 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Potrero Yard (1800 Bryant 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:

Alexandra Harker
Kamilah Taylor
Magda Freitas
Thor Kaslofsky
Erick Arguello
Mary Haywood

Not Present:

Alexander Hirji
J.R. Eppler
Roberto Hernández
Ryan MacPhee
Scott Feeney
Claudia DeLarios Moran

SFMTA Staff:

Licinia Iberri
Rafe Rabalais

Other Attendees:

Peter Lauterborn
(consultant)
Rosie Dilger (consultant)

Purpose of the meeting

To discuss process, where we are right now, and next steps for the project and the role of the Working Group.

- Peter Lauterborn opened by explaining that the meeting's purpose was to discuss where are we in the process right now, and what we will do with all the information we have gathered.
- Licinia Iberri updated the group, stating that:
 - There are many new applicants to the Working Group,
 - Mayor's Office of Housing (MOHCD), SFMTA, Office of Economic and Workforce Development (OEWD) are all informed and participated in last workshop,
 - We are in the process of involving Supervisors Walton and Ronen in long term conversations about future development,
 - We've had some conversations with Supervisors Ronen and Walton's staff, and
 - City family conversations are ongoing, mainly talking about two things: larger framework for housing and doing feasibility analysis on City properties, and honing in on the actual property and working with Planning to begin conversations about design.
- Thor Kaslofsky asked what are the Supervisors' perspectives on what we should do?
 - Licinia Iberri - We are actively talking with Supervisor Ronen about several parcels in the Mission. Her office remained really interested in potential for housing and affordable housing. There was an article in the SF Chronicle in which she supported housing at the site.



- We have also presented the whole capital plan to Supervisors and generally they are all supportive of housing. In District 10, we didn't get to talk to Supervisor Walton directly, but Supervisor Malia Cohen was supportive prior to leaving. Staff had a lot of questions about size, scope, and project specifics but were generally favorable. They are waiting for project details.
- Alexandra Harker asked how would the citywide search for housing locations impact this development?
 - Rafe Rabalais - There's a general interest in a lot of different sites. This site wouldn't take another off the table. We've had good conversations about potential housing on other SFMTA sites so far.
- Licinia Iberri - We are looking into the EIR timeline with Planning. The Planning Department requires a pre-application to determine EIR requirements - air quality, environmental, size, etc. They need the application to initiate the process. Our team is going to have meetings with the City family to discuss the application - most were not comfortable having conversations about a specific application, but we will continue to work on design ideas and work with developer in terms of the EIR process.
- Magda Freitas - How do we get access to the documents?
 - Licinia Iberri - They are all available to the public - we have a report, outreach survey, and probably in 6 months or so we will have a draft. We are trying to have a negotiation with Planning to sit down and hammer out a scope. Technical designers will be hired to work with environmental consultants.
- Thor Kaslofsky - What's in the design so far?
 - Licinia Iberri - We didn't do a fully scoped report - just 3 massing studies, starting with no housing, max housing, and then some with mid-level units, which SITELAB turned into an image. Additionally, they did a shadow fan with geodata from Franklin Square. They turned those findings into a layperson's understanding with graphics on the boards and online.
- Magda Freitas - We can go on the website to get all these studies?
 - Licinia Iberri - I can send them to you, but yes you can find the boards online.
- Mary Haywood - I'm representing Friends of Franklin Park. Our people are most concerned with shadows but are also pro-housing and interested in something in between.
- Thor Kaslofsky - My group was really worried about shadow. Having done development and as a former city employee, you should put out as much information as possible. Whether they use it or not, all of the studies should be available - just a suggestion.
- Magda Freitas - What's the study?
 - Licinia Iberri - The focus is just the shadow on Franklin Square.
 - Magda Freitas - It looked like a huge impact, it's hard to understand from the image.
- Licinia Iberri (to Magda Freitas and group) - None of the options you saw at the workshop are actual options at this point. We also think some of it is a massive shadow, but we wanted to put it out and get feedback.



- Mary Haywood - Yeah and certain times of the year it will be practically unnoticeable.
- Magda Freitas - It's not going to be tall? Not a high rise?
 - Licinia Ibarra - We don't know yet.
 - Peter Lauterborn - We showed the maximum massing.
- Thor Kaslofsky - It must be transparent more than anything. As staff you must disclose all options so people can't say they didn't know.

Workshop Reviews and Feedback

- Peter Lauterborn moved the conversation to public outreach and what we heard at the workshops and asked for any initial feedback.
- Erick Arguello - Most people I heard from felt that the meeting was being led in a certain direction and that it was a done-deal based on the information provided, that there is already a plan and that this is just the process.
- Thor Kaslofsky - In the group I was with, Oscar said he thought it was too early in the process to talk about housing. She (the presenter) took it in stride but was surprised by that reaction. But if someone sees a massing strategy, they will think there is already a project planned. A 3-story versus a 5-story building is still a building.
- Erick Arguello - Talking about the affordable percentages was important to my table.
 - Rafe Rabalais - When we did some light outreach to the Latino Democratic Club. They also heard question about affordability percentages.
- Magda Freitas - My group said that too and that based on the Bryant project they were worried about other massive projects and construction impacts - and the Monster in the Mission. There is a lot of worry about regarding all the development in the area and especially height.
- Erick Arguello - I think these are important concerns and that fear is there and a lot of us have been involved in these issues and big projects.

Outreach Update and Numbers

- Peter Lauterborn shared that on-street flyering was a recommendation of the Working Group. We distributed 375 flyers and counted 545 interactions in both English and Spanish. The group didn't share any feedback other than acknowledge that the outreach was thorough. It's what we anticipated but we got almost everyone to sign in, many opted for project updates and turned in comment cards.
- Rafe Rabalais added there is a sense too of a couple gaps - something Kamilah Taylor has mentioned - to continue to reach out to operators to get them involved. We've started to brainstorm what other meetings we can go to rather than just host meetings to take these workshops on the road, and in-language.



- Licia Iberri thanked everyone for supporting outreach to their communities and noted that getting MEDA and others at the meeting is amazing and that this was some individual's first community meeting.
 - Thor Kaslofsky - I would be interested in doing outreach to General Hospital or gauging how their construction process is going.
- Peter Lauterborn - Getting back to what we heard at the workshops, is there anything else you heard at your tables?
 - Mary Haywood - My table got really focused on the housing and forgot about the bus yard -and they tried to bring it back to the conversation, but it got a little glossed over.
 - Kamilah Taylor concurred - They asked a few questions about where the busses enter and exit, but most people were excited about housing.
- Peter Lauterborn - Did you get the sense that they already accepted the concept of upgrading the bus yard?
 - Mary Haywood - I got the feeling it was because the housing would pay for the project.
 - Kamilah Taylor - I think it's because they were happy about the housing.
- Erick Arguello - People cared about the relationship between it but mostly about affordable housing.
- Thor Kaslofsky - My table didn't talk about the bus yard at all. The facilitators didn't really guide the conversation there. It's been such a thing in the area - the intensity of development in the area versus affordability percentages.
- Magda Freitas - Some people are worried about what will happen if the yard needs to be expanded in the future if there is housing there. Even the schematic with the least shadow highlighted concerns about where the kids play.
- Magda Freitas – There are some concerns about parking. Muni drivers rest in their cars so it would be nice for them not to come in cars - how is it going to work? They need a place to rest and take a break.
 - Rafe Rabalais - People think maybe having an incentive will help?
 - Thor Kaslofsky - Are they concerned about parking in the neighborhood?
 - Magda Freitas - We think drivers shouldn't park there, but they should possibly take shuttles from BART or wherever's convenient.
- Alexandra Harker - Because of the way it was structured about housing, we didn't talk about wrap around retail and other options for the space aside from housing.
- Thor Kaslofsky - In terms of the RFP (Request for Proposals), I urge the group to think about getting a developer on ASAP to determine feasibility. Building above a platform is difficult and expensive. It's super political and most of the feedback we need to know it can work would come from a developer and not from city staff.
 - Licia Iberri - We have a development consultant, Hatch, to help us do some of that but yes you are totally right. Having said that, we will continue to say that housing is not a forgone conclusion and we realize there are many constraints and concerns and outside market changes that may completely change the project by the time we get there.



- Erick Arguello - Politically I would be careful to get a developer too early. This is how these things go wrong in the community. A consultant is a better idea if they can give you a cost.
 - Licinia Iberri - We know the cost of the yard and we have been using lots of other projects and market data and a reasonable set of assumptions to model. Then we will check those projections within city family, but the market is very volatile. If it still feels like we aren't sure we may go out and get another consultant or firm to do more research. We have an opportunity to set our prerogatives in the RFP in terms of percentages, height, unit, public art, etc., so we only get a developer that could do that.
- Mary Haywood - Can we do some kind of workforce housing for Muni operators? Like the LGBT senior housing in the Castro?
 - Licinia Iberri - Realistically we can't. Fair housing laws technically consider it discrimination. It's not impossible but would require statewide legislation and it would probably not end up being specific to Muni operators.
 - Rafe Rabalais - But we could do specific marketing to operators to make it easier to apply.
 - Erick Arguello - What info do we have about operator demographics?
 - Licinia Iberri - It's something to think about, but we can put a pin in it for now.
- Peter Lauterborn refocused the group back to affordability, stating that comment cards show there is a strong preference for 55% AMI.
- Erick Arguello - My table wanted 2 or 3 family housing/mixed and 100% affordable.
 - Mary Haywood - Mine said a mix of units and 100% affordable.
- Magda Freitas - Our table wondered if 100% affordable would attract developers - one person was not in favor of in lieu fees.
- Thor Kaslofsky - My table didn't talk about affordability at all. But there were lots of concerns about displacement. Maybe we can use Ellis Act Evictions as a priority for residents in this housing.
- Kamilah Taylor - I don't think we discussed affordability.
- Thor Kaslofsky - We should think about how to mix single units and families because they use spaces different ways.
- Alexandra Harker - We all want affordability, but we want to as much as we can that makes it a project.
 - Rafe Rabalais - We really don't know the answer to that yet, but we appreciate your feedback while we figure it out. A lot of people would like more than 25% affordable, but the higher it is the harder it is to get, and the city does not anticipate having money to subsidize this project.
- Thor Kaslofsky - We should be concerned with the working poor and affordability, but there is no work going towards the middle class who are making above the amount to qualify for affordable, but not enough to compete for market rate housing.
- Erick Arguello - But you are (all) saying 55% AMI is \$40-45K for one single person, but many Latino families are making \$43k for a family of 4. We should look at different populations like families and



LGBT. We know it must pencil out but maybe we can finance the groups. Maybe not allow an opt out or in lieu fee.

- Kamilah Taylor - What does the Mayor's Office of Housing usually do? How do they set those percentages?
 - Rafe Rabalais - They can set percentages on different income levels, but not preferences from different groups. They base it on need, financing and community preference.
- Thor Kaslofsky - For 2019 the AMI for a family of 4 is \$65k.
 - Erick Arguello - It's much lower in the Mission for Latino populations. The Mission area AMI seems higher because of all the wealth that has come in. It's closer to 30-55% AMI.
- Mary Haywood - Teacher housing would be good.
- Kamilah Taylor - What's the inclusionary requirement?
 - Licia Iberri - It was 12% and now it's on an uptick to about 15 to 20% and will plateau to 22%. In the Mission it's 25% at different income levels. Public land is handled somewhat differently.

TRANSIT IMPACTS

- Peter Lauterborn - Now let's discuss strategies for transit impacts. We heard the most feedback about bike access. Do you have thoughts about other types of data points we should ask about? Like rent versus own? Or what else went into the conversation?
- Erick Arguello - It goes back to figuring out what types of families and what sized units to design the amenities that serve that population. If you have a building of all studios, don't have a childcare center. If it's drivers, they may need different services.
- Erick Arguello - I also have concerns about Production, Distribution, and Repair (PDR) and loss of jobs - laundromats, painters, gardeners - who can't park anywhere so we are losing workers. A lot of working-class folks depend on cars for their jobs. Studies show that poor people drive. How do we balance environmental issues with the needs of the working poor? If they can't park, they can't work, but we have the best paying jobs in San Francisco.
- Rafe Rabalais (to Licia Iberri) - What's the time table for the residential parking study? The SFMTA is trying to figure out what types of parking are best for a mixed neighborhood.
 - Licia Iberri - The study and residential permit parking implementation is not strictly in regard to this project.
 - Erick Arguello - A lot of restaurants are suffering because low paying positions like dishwashers and bussers can't drive in and they can't afford to live here.
 - Kamilah Taylor - 23rd and 3rd streets have a shuttle for workers, but 70% of bus drivers drive into work.
- Kamilah Taylor - The operators who are coming into work are still going to drive to their jobs, wherever they can walk from. I stop to pick them up on Iowa Street because there are free spaces around Division rather than meters.



- Thor Kaslofsky - The idea of no parking is premature. Parking that can be converted is useful. Having conversations about no parking isn't considering large families or people who are not able-bodied.
 - Licia Iberri - We want to be very transparent about this and we have been told by Department of Transportation that there will be no parking on this site.

ONE-ON-ONE MEETINGS

- Licia Iberri - About having one-on-one meetings - this is the last time we will ask, you don't have to - does anyone else want one?
 - Erick Arguello - I have concerns about one-on-one meetings.
 - Licia Iberri - They have been much like these meetings and we ask for feedback as well as an optional question of "If you were to build this project today, what would you build?" We aren't trying to be less transparent, we just want to give people the opportunity to share in smaller environments since some voices are louder than others and not everyone gets to say everything they want to say.
 - Thor Kaslofsky - This project is so complex anyone of us could sit down and ask 2 hours of questions.
 - Rafe Rabalais - We have an open-door policy.

NEXT STEPS

- Peter Lauterborn stated that the agency is planning a project roadshow. Any ideas of who we should be talking to is welcomed and encouraged. Licia Iberri added - We heard you in the last meeting and want to do more to reach the Mission community. We want to do an in-language Spanish meeting next.
- Peter Lauterborn asked whether the group would prefer to meet next month for consistency or set a meeting when we have a lot of info to bring back to you? April or May?
 - Working Group agreed to set meeting date when there is substantial information to share.