



Potrero Yard Neighborhood Working Group Meeting 17 Minutes

Tuesday, September 8, 2020, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Zoom Webinar, Webinar ID: 895 5965 2938

(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:

Magda Freitas
Alexander Hirji
Claudia Delarios Moran
Roberto Hernandez
Mary Haywood Sheeter
Benjamin Bidwell
Kamilah Taylor
Scott Feeney
J.R. Eppler

Members Not Present:

Alexandra Harker
Thor Kaslofsky

SFMTA Staff:

Rafe Rabalais
Adrienne Heim
Licina Iberri
Pamela Owen Adams
Kerstin Magary

Other Attendees:

Rosie Dilger (consultant)
Abraham Vallin (consultant)
Jenny Zhou (consultant)
Frank Baltz
Tristan Robinson
Arnoldo Ulloa
Roberto Jenkins



Purpose of the Meeting

To discuss general project updates, review the Request for Qualifications (RFQ), discuss draft Public Benefit Principles, and brainstorm ideas for virtual engagement for public events.

Item 1. Welcome & Rules for Virtual Engagement

Rosie Dilger welcomed everyone to the meeting and reminded participants of virtual etiquette.

Item 2. Wellness Check-In & Member Announcements

Adrienne Heim then transitioned to the Wellness Check-In and invited Working Group members to share what they are looking forward to this month.

Rosie Dilger: I'm looking forward to camping at Dillon Beach later this month. I'm going to pass this onto Magda.

Magda Freitas: Hi, just looking forward to Fall weather. It's too hot over the hills.

Rosie: Does anyone else want to share?

Rosie Dilger transitioned to Working Group Member Announcements

Rosie Dilger: We do have some changes to our Working Group membership, Adrienne and Licinia, if you wanted to speak to it; Brian is no longer a part of the Working Group and we do have two vacancies.

Adrienne Heim: We have spots open for a Transportation Advocate, a Housing Advocate, and a member At-Large which would be replacing Brian. We also have a spot open for a Small Business within 0.5 miles. We've talked to a number of folks, including District Supervisors Ronen and Walton's aides Amy and Percy. We're looking to you to cast a wider net. We're looking for applicants who are emerging advocates that have some time to dedicate to our monthly meetings and one-off meetings to support the Request for Proposals (RFP) document and other pieces of this project. Your help would be great – this is an ongoing process to get more people interested about being a part of this.

Rosie Dilger then transitioned the discussion to the SFMTA COVID-19 service updates.

Item 3. COVID-19 Update

Adrienne Heim: We have many updates to share. Back on August 22nd, we rolled out our metro Muni service back on board – unfortunately, we had an employee test positive for COVID-19 and a piece of the overhead system malfunctioned so we had to revert back to bus service. Because of this, we will be utilizing bus service until we get the equipment fixed and ensure that everyone is safe and healthy in the Transportation Management Center .

We will be enforcing residential permit parking (RPP) again starting September 14. Those that live in RPP zones, please be aware and share that information. You can get updates on COVID-related information at [SFMTA.com/COVID-19](https://www.sfmta.com/COVID-19).



Rosie Dilger then transitioned into discussion around the RFQ.

Item 4. RFQ Walkthrough

Rosie Dilger introduced Licia Iberri to walk through the RFQ.

Licia Iberri: Hi everyone, I wanted to make sure that you all had the chance to get familiar with the RFQ. Unless you want to go through the hoops of going through SFBid it can be tricky to get a hold of the document. It was linked in the email that went out today. For anyone who may be on the phone for this meeting: the correct path for submitting questions is now through San Francisco Public Works, through the bid website. We've linked the document here in case anyone wants to see the document for themselves: sfpublicworks.org/biddocs.

We could not share much about this towards the tail-end of the process to respect the integrity of the procurement process. I wanted to walk through this with the Working Group now so that you know what is happening in the RFQ.

First, part one in a two-part process: we are trying to find people who are qualified, the teams of people who have done this work. We're looking for what we're calling, the "core team," of this project and the disciplines are listed on screen.

Licia listed and explained the following roles:

- *Lead Master Developer*
- *Affordable Housing Developer*
- *Housing Developer*
- *Design Consultant*
- *Construction Management Consultant*
- *Infrastructure Facility Maintenance Consultant*

Licia Iberri: This suite of people makes up what we imagine are the major players of this project. There are going to be way more roles, but we are asking for them to identify these specific roles at this stage.

While there are six roles, they can meet the qualifications by submitting a consortium of other firms or people for any of these roles. For example, the Design Consultant - if the qualifications say they need 15 years of experience and three projects in San Francisco, they can bring on a Design Consultant that has 15 years of experience and another firm with three years of projects in San Francisco.

As a result of this, we hope to determine three qualified teams. The three qualified teams must be independent of each other. You can't have the same Master Developer applying on multiple teams; any members of the core team can only come in on one team. We will then short-list the three qualified teams.

We had a pre-Statement-of-Qualifications (SOQ) meeting to introduce the project on August 31; the highest number of attendees at any time was 219. We are now in a phase where we are accepting questions, and that ends Friday, September 11. We, the City team - Public Works and



the SFMTA, will respond to the questions on Friday, September 18. We will collect all the Statements of Qualifications (SOQs) on October 16 at 3:00 PM. We think we'll get to the RFP in January.

The RFQ was presented on the screen.

Licinia Iberri: We'll now do a high-level summary of the RFQ. If you have any questions for us, we're available to answer those for you.

Licinia walked through the RFQ section by section.

Roberto Hernandez: I have a few questions about the RFQ – by the way good job. Were there any inspections on the land?

Licinia Iberri: Yes, we did a preliminary geological survey as well as a HAZMAT survey – it's been about three years now, it was one of the first things we did – and we did it because:

1. We wanted to get a sense of the foundation, and
2. Similar to what you are saying, to answer questions like, "What are we getting into?", "Is this possible?", "Is there something so bad that would preclude pausing this project?".

Since SFMTA has owned the property for so long, we know what's been there. The developer will do a survey in greater depth to get a better sense of what's there.

We did find some contamination in the Northwest corner. It is not close to the water table, it is not likely to spread around the site - it is localized and can probably be dug up and removed.

Roberto Hernandez: My other question is: Does this RFQ also include the art or does the art come later?

Licinia Iberri: Art will come later. It is indicated that there is a public art requirement; there is no design direction or specifications on how to incorporate it. There is a mention of it in the Draft Design Guidelines, if you would like to take a look in that section, we can highlight that part for you. One question we've left open to this group is: Do you all have design ideas or proposals of how art should be incorporated on this site? Perhaps in the architecture, the building materials, or through standalone art on site?

Rafe Rabalais: One thing we've worked in through this process is that community engagement continues. We need to make it explicit that as we go into more detail, as we delve into these hyper-specific details, that they are not closed conversations. These may be later-stage conversations.

Roberto Hernandez: In terms of outreach to Latino and African American contractors, what has been done? I know that that's constantly a challenge for the City departments, it's a criticism that Latino and African American contractors are not hired. I also hear that these contractors don't know about the project opportunities.

Licinia Iberri: For now, we have put in the strongest equity and inclusion language into this document that the City Attorney would allow us to include. We put in what we thought was more



inclusive language and the City Attorney said it was “too much”. I would also like to include that, the overall structure of labor with this project can be talked about with folks interested in talking about it. Roberto, if this is a conversation that you would like to have about how we incorporate labor into this project, we welcome that and anyone else who would like that.

Roberto Hernandez: I definitely want to talk about that. There’s a lot of opportunity to bring in subs. For the size of this project, you don’t have a lot of wiggle room, but you have an opportunity to bring on Black and Brown-owned firms. Part of the problem in San Francisco particularly, with so much construction, are going to places like Arizona and not pay them fair wages with the protections of unions. Let’s work with our local unions to make that happen.

Licinia Iberri: We should be striving for diversity in the core development team. We sent something out in an Addendum.

Rosie Dilger: Yes, Licinia, these things are posted on SFBid.

Licinia Iberri: Let’s send it out to the Working Group.

Rosie Dilger transitioned to the next agenda item.

Item 5. Housing Subcommittee Report & Discussion

Rosie Dilger asked Rafe Rabalais to begin summarizing conversations on the Housing Subcommittee.

Rafe Rabalais: We had a Housing Subcommittee meeting with Scott and Thor and then looped Claudia in afterwards to get her input. In terms of the highlights of the discussion, Claudia or Scott, would you like to go over them?

Scott Feeney: Yes, I can talk about them. We wanted to make sure that the design of the building created a sense of community. Since it’s going to be a pretty big building, how will you create smaller subdivisions so that people end up knowing their neighbors? We didn’t come up with anything specific in terms of a solution, we just want it to be considered in the design.

There was also discussion around how to phrase the affordability target; even though we’re saying the target is 50% affordable, more than that would be amazing. Also, looking into potentially getting outside funds to add affordable units. Additionally, we discussed if the land value of the site increased in the future, would the SFMTA be able to capture that increase?

Rafe Rabalais: To add onto that, we don’t want this to feel like a hotel. There are a lot of units there and we don’t want people to just scurry up to their apartment and then scurry down to go about their day – that there truly is a sense of community. This should feel like a neighborhood on top of a bus yard and not just a series of apartments we’re building.

We also talked about building management. It shouldn’t just be like, “Here’s your key and welcome to the building,” but there should be events, community cookouts, trick-or-treating, and



community events like Dia De los Muertos. We should incorporate that into the language for the building management to include for services.

In terms of the affordability language, I shared what we had in the RFQ, and I think there was some excitement about that. What we heard from the Supervisor's office wanted to emphasize that 50% affordability is the minimum and we want to challenge the development community to competitively go after external funds to go up to 100% affordable. Roberto articulated a year ago that there are disproportionate rents (among Mission residents) due to tech engines, so this could be the pivot to a tech "ask." Claudia, was there anything else you wanted to add to that?

Claudia Delarios Moran: I just wanted to acknowledge that it was exciting to hear such a dramatic change in the language around the affordability target. We've gone from 50% as the aspiration/goal to 50% being the floor. That's the conversation we need to have front-and-center. You've all heard about the development on 16th and Mission that went from 0% affordable to 100% affordable due to community pressure and years of organizing. I feel really grateful and glad that our Working Group has moved so dramatically towards that direction.

Rafe Rabalais: And Claudia, this predated your membership on the Working Group, but the very first conversation we had around affordability was around January or February 2019 – and credit to Roberto – we started this project without any funding source to get to a higher affordability than the code requirement of 25%. Through the input of the Working Group, we've pushed it to go as high as we can. Any other comments?

Roberto Hernandez: I recommend that we position this project as a philanthropy opportunity for "Old Money" San Franciscans. We should also have a conversation with Fred Blackwell, the CEO of the San Francisco Foundation. Fred serves on a housing fund in the Bay Area. The San Francisco Foundation manages a lot of funds for wealthy San Franciscans. We should get the San Francisco Chronicle; we need to think about marketing this project.

Rosie Dilger then transitioned to the Public Benefit Principles.

Item 6: Public Benefit Principles Workshopping

Adrienne Heim introduced the Public Benefit Principles.

Adrienne Heim: In July, we had two subcommittee meetings. We talked through the positives, negatives, and questions to discuss what should be included in our Public Benefit Principles. We also discussed what we would like to see as an art component of the project. We developed a Public Benefit Principles outline draft. We'd like the Working Group to review, examine, and refine it so that we can incorporate it into the final RFP. This will also be reviewed by the project team and the Board of Supervisors. Say aloud or type in the Chat your comments, Rosie and Jenny will take it down.



Adrienne Heim walked the Working Group through the Public Benefit Principles outline draft and Rosie Dilger and Jenny Zhou recorded their comments onto a project collaboration tool called Jamboard. This was shared live on-screen. PDF of Jamboard notes are located [here](#).

Item 7: Virtual Engagement Public Event Brainstorm

Rosie Dilger discussed the need for ideas on how to engage stakeholders virtually. She started off by listing things the project has already done and ideas that the project team has considered.

Rosie Dilger: We'd like to vet with you what has been working, and we'd also like to ask if you have ideas from other events you've attended. We'd love to open it up for comments, brainstorming, and to share any ideas you have.

Rafe Rabalais: We are tight on time, so we'll put two minutes on the clock for everyone to jump in or put comments in the chat.

Roberto Hernandez: One thing that we did was connect with arts groups and socially distant events. Let me give it some thought and I can help.

Adrienne Heim: Roberto, are you asking us to move into a PPE-protected physical space more so than virtual?

Roberto Hernandez: I would say both. Around the virtual side, we've done a lot of events around music and art. We're doing a video around wearing a mask, we're doing an event around wearing a mask, and all of the masks will be one-of-a-kind art masks. With virtual meetings, people will come, but it's about engaging the masses. Right now, since everyone is on lockdown, people are looking for something to do.

Rosie Dilger: I do want to point out that in the chat, Scott had said that he liked the virtual sticky notes that we just used in the last activity and asked if we could incorporate more people in the future.

With no other input Rosie concluded that item and announced Item 8 would be continued. She then transitioned to Public Comment.

Item 9: Public Comment

Rosie Dilger: Before handing it off to Abraham, I'd like to remind everyone that since we're in the middle of an open bid and an open procurement, we cannot address any questions or comments around the procurement process or the RFQ at this time. Please address your questions or comments to San Francisco Public Works and online at SFBid.

Public comment was prompted by Abraham; no members of the public provided additional comments. Rosie thanked all for participating and announced that Item 10 was cancelled due to time constraints, and concluded the meeting.