

Potrero Yard Neighborhood Working Group Meeting #39 Minutes
 Tuesday December 5th, 2023, 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.
In person Virtual & Hybrid Meeting via Microsoft Teams

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

Members Present:	PNC Staff:	SFMTA Staff:
Alexander Hirji	Chris Jauregui	Bonnie Jean von Krogh
Amy Beinart	Clem Howard	John Angelico
Claudia DeLarios Morán	Jackson Smith	Kerstin Margary
Christian Vega	Jennifer Trotter	Sean O’Brien (DPW)
Erick Arguello	Kalia Price	Tim Kempf
Heather Dunbar	Kelsey Frost	Alison Heath (Planning Commission)
Jolene Yee	Michelle Feng	Debra Dwyer (Planning Commission)
Magda Freitas	Monica Almendral	Other Attendees:
Manuel (Dino) Santamaria	Myrna Ortiz	Aleena Gallow (SFMTA Labor Union Rep)
Mary Travis-Allen	Seth Furman	Alejandro Abogado
Peter Belden	Jackie Von Treskow (SFAC)	Gabriela Pantoja (CPC)
Roberto Hernandez	Members Not Present:	Jennifer McKellar
Scott Feeney	Jorge Elias, Jr.	415-638-1811
Shellena Eskridge	J.R. Eppler	415-310-8381
	Raven McCroey	Dan Katzenberg 774-239-1367

Purpose of the meeting

The purpose of the meeting is to discuss scheduling and inform the Working Group about the Public Art, the EIR, and Entitlements.

Item 1. Welcome

John Angelico: (Slides 1-3) Introduced agenda and opened meeting.

Item 2. Member and SFMTA Announcements

John Angelico: (Slide 4) Announced MuniMobile App launch updates and details. The current app will expire on January 15th.

John Angelico: (Slide 5): Introduced announcements from Working Group.

- Franklin Square has a new pit stop toilet that is fully staffed and operates 10am-10pm 7 days a week. (Jolene Yee)
- Thank you for the bathroom, but it recently got knocked over. (Heather Dunbar)
- It got fixed as of 2 hours ago. (Alejandro Abogado)

Item 3. Schedule Updates

Jennifer Trotter: (Slide 7) Introduced Working Group calendar dates for 2024. Meetings will continue to be hybrid at KQED and online on the 2nd Tuesday of the month from 5:30-7:30pm.

- Jolene and Claudia cannot make the April meeting.

Comment: I enjoy going to these meetings in person and think the conversations that happen before and after are invaluable. (Peter Belden)

Comment: The hybrid option is helpful and we could send out a poll with different days to see the popularity of each option. (Jolene Yee)

Q: I'm not confident in what is required for attendance in person vs. online. Is there a minimum for either? (Shellena Eskridge)

- A: The requirement is for each Working Group member to attend at least half of the monthly meetings in either form and two major events per calendar year. (examples: community open house, neighborhood festival, etc.) (John Angelico)

Jennifer Trotter, Chris Jauregui and John Angelico: (Slide 8) Presented November Project updates. PNC met with Walk SF, Senior & Disability Action, and SF Transit Riders Union. Requested recommendations for additional stakeholders or individuals for Project outreach. Presented a Building Progress update to SF Transportation Authority and SF Public Utilities Commission.

Chris Jauregui: (Slide 9) Shared updated environmental testing locations for drilling bore holes. Official dates to be determined by the SFMTA.

Item 4. Public Art Update

John Angelico: (Slide 10) Introduced Jackie von Treskow to share Public Art updates.

Jackie von Treskow: (Slide 11) SFAC extended the RFQ deadline to January 22, 2024. Recent artist informational workshops were well attended.

Jackie von Treskow: (Slide 12) The Review panel is planned for the week of February 26 and the artist(s) is anticipated to be under contract August 2024.

Jackie von Treskow: (Slide 13) Summarized qualification process with panelists and artists. Shared composition of panels and introduced arts policies and guidelines.

Jackie von Treskow: (Slide 14) Gave detailed overview of each qualification panelist who will also serve on expanded review panel for continuity

Jackie von Treskow: (Slide 15) Provided background on three arts specialists participating in the Artise Review Panels: Rhiannon Eans MacFadyen, Trisha Lagaso Goldberg, and Fatima Ramirez.

Item 5. Environmental Studies

John Angelico: (Slide 16) Introduced environmental studies section.

Sean O'Brien: (Slide 17) Gave an overview of the CEQA process and engagement with City and County groups. The Project was presented to the SF Board of Supervisors, where Supervisor Ronan introduced Special Use District (SUD) legislation.

Sean O'Brien: (Slide 18) Recapped the CEQA Process, which is coordinated by the SF Planning Department.

- Draft EIR was published June 2021 with public comment through August 2021.
- Final EIR certification hearing scheduled take place on January 11th, 2024.

Sean O'Brien: (Slide 19) Final EIR will include the draft report, written responses to comments, and supplemental technical analysis. To account for the refined project and paratransit variant, additional research was conducted on wind and shadow, water quality assessment, transportation and circulation, and air quality.

Q: Could you speak more about the Special Use District? What does it do and what are the parameters for it? (Erick Arguello)

- A: We will go into more detail in later slides. (Chris Jauregui)

Sean O'Brien: (Slide 20) Provided context on shadow study and analysis. Because the shadow impact is less than significant, no mitigation measures will be necessary. The shadow study considered where shadows occur on Franklin Square to determine any substantial or adverse effects. The Project would result in net new shadow by 1.66% for a total of 3.02%. The new shadows will cast during Fall and Winter months only.

Sean O'Brien: (Slide 21) The Refined Project will cast a bigger shadow by 1.77% from current levels, which results in a new annual shadow of 3.13%

Sean O'Brien: (Slide 22) Discussed the schedule of shadow on annual calendar, which occurs annually from Sept 21 – March 21 at various times in areas within the southern half of Franklin Square between 8 - 11am.

Sean O'Brien: (Slide 23) Identified that the Refined Project Variant (paratransit option) design has bus ramps with a canopy to prevent rain from getting into the Bus Yard below. These ramps would be located near Franklin Square.

Sean O'Brien: (Slide 24) Net shadow for the Refined Project Variant with maximum shadow times and square details.

Q: When does the refined shadow study become available? Is this something that people can look at in more detail? (Jolene Yee)

- A: Yes, the draft EIR included in the [initial study](#) in Appendix 1 was published June 2021 and is currently available on the Planning Department website. The full study (evaluating the Refined Project and Project Variant) is around 130 pages and will be available on Dec 13, 2023. Currently only the draft is publicly available. (Sean O'Brien)

Q: Is the refined study still within the shadow limits? (Shellena Eskridge)

- A: Yes, when the draft EIR concept design was published, the Planning Department found the shadow did not have a substantial impact on Franklin Square. (Sean O'Brien)
- A: The report combines two studies—one addressing Section 295 of the planning code regarding recreational park properties in the downtown area and the other examining the adoption timeline of this section. Certain parks have shadow budgets and there is a specified limit on shadows. The only scenario where the shadow limit can be exceeded is if the Recreation Park Commission takes action to modify it, which is contingent upon demonstrating public benefits associated with the Project. Recommendations will be presented to the commission for consideration. (Debra Dwyer)

Follow up: Does this mean there are two studies on shadow impacts? (Shellena Eskridge)

- Response: Yes, one is a draft version and another one is a final version. (Sean O'Brien)

Q: Debra mentioned shadow budgets – I wanted to clarify that Franklin Square is not one of those parks that has limits (Shellena Eskridge)

- A: Franklin Square is not one of the projects that has a shadow budget to be met. (Jennifer McKellar)

Q: Does the shadow study come with research around reflections of the building? (Christian Vega)

- A: The planning code does address glare in some instances, but to answer your question, it is not a part of the study. (Jennifer McKellar)

Q: Two questions: 1) When concerns are expressed about the amount of shadow, what are the potential solutions? Because the improvement of the Bus Yard and additional housing is our priority, we wouldn't want to reduce housing or size of the Yard to reduce the shadow. 2) In these discussions about shadow, it would be helpful to specify the difference between shadow caused by the building versus increased shadow from trees in the park. (Peter Belden)

- A: Since there is no significant shadow impact here, we have no need to modify it. We are not taking the park's vegetation into account in these studies. (Debra Dwyer)

Q: What is being decided at the two meetings in December and January? Will they be the last meetings about shadow study and impacts? (Jolene Yee)

- A: December 21st is a decision for Recreation and Parks Commission where SF Planning will present findings around any adverse impacts from the Project. January 11th is for certification of the EIR and sharing CEQA findings as a step to receive Entitlements. This is one of the last steps in the approval process before the Project construction begins. (Debra Dwyer)

Q: Is there any flexibility with the meeting dates? I'd like to engage in a longer discussion with our community to present the study results and hear their thoughts. Would we be able to postpone the meeting by a month? Given the significant shadow impact on Franklin Square, particularly on the children's playground and adult workout area, I want to communicate the Project's benefits to the community. (Jolene Yee)

- Response: The current dates are set and you can provide comments at both Commission meetings. Since we already collected public comments, staff is not seeking additional requests at this time and the analysis aligns with the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). We appreciate your understanding, and while we are open to addressing any questions, the schedule has been finalized. (Debra Dwyer)
- Response: The final review will be published in mid-December. (Sean O'Brien)

Q: It is crucial to ensure sufficient community outreach to those who use the park. I firmly believe that those directly affected by these changes should be engaged. In light of this, I'd like to pose the question: What outreach efforts have been undertaken so far? (Roberto Hernandez)

- A: We started the original public comment period in July 2021 for the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). Updates were put on the website and through email about what was available to comment on. A Notice of Preparation for the EIR was issued in 2021, along with a presentation on public comment opportunities. The draft EIR's availability was widely distributed, with coordination with SFMTA for maximum outreach. A separate EIR team discussed shadow studies at a working group meeting in early 2021. Those wishing to stay informed can join the Project's continued contact list to ensure ongoing updates with SFMTA & the working group. (John Angelico and Debra Dwyer)

Q: I was more so asking whether the shadow study, now that it has been presented, has been shared with the community? (Roberto Hernandez)

- A: These studies are supplementary to the initial draft EIR that was released in 2021, evaluating differences between the conceptual and refined Projects. If substantial impacts were found, a new comment period would have been initiated. However, the supplemental studies indicate no substantial differences, eliminating the need for an additional comment period. These findings build upon the original results. (Jennifer McKellar)

Comment: It's crucial to engage the future residents of the building and ensure their input is considered. (Peter Belden)

Comment: As a Friends of Franklin Square board member, I recommend a one-month postponement of all scheduled Commission hearings to enhance outreach, particularly with playground and workout area users. While overall outreach has been commendable, a focus on shadows is needed. This is my first time seeing the shadow diagram, and I propose an extra 30 days for in-depth discussion on the shadow impact. (Jolene Yee)

Comment: The outreach has already been done. The benefits of the Project far outweigh any impacts on shadow. Another 30-day delay would mean getting further behind schedule. I'd like to keep it moving. (Heather Dunbar)

Comment: I second what Heather said in keeping the process moving. Though I recognize the importance of outreach, these studies have taken place over the course of several years and this new report isn't very different. It is about a .11 percent difference from other studies. I think we should maintain perspective as we are talking about building something that will house 500 working class families. (Scott Feeney)

- A: To give context for the timeline of the schedule, we need the December recommendation in order to meet the January 11th date and receive Entitlements by the Board of Supervisors. These are essential to getting the Bus Yard built on schedule. (Seth Furman)

Item 6. Special Use District

Chris Jauregui: (Slide 26) Special Use District allows development of the facility for maintenance and sets development controls for the overall Project. This legislative amendment shows how this space can be used.

Chris Jauregui: (Slide 27) In development controls, space is addressed for residential use to ensure unit mix complies with the neighborhood's mixed-use standards. The Refined Project includes the Bus Yard and housing within the Special Use District. The 75 feet limit is the maximum height for the bus facility, with potential paratransit or housing above the bus facility and housing along Bryant Street.

Chris Jauregui: (Slide 28) Discussed design guidelines and Special Use District building standards. These are formal documents that illustrate setbacks, building massing, height, and bulk. Maximum width, height, and planning codes are to be finalized.

Chris Jauregui: (Slide 29) Reshared calendar for upcoming January meeting, encouraged public comment, support for the Project, and general feedback.

Q: How about the other topics of the EIR? Noise and air quality impact? What are the findings? (Magda Freitas)

- A: The Draft EIR and all technical work done is available on our website. We supplemented certain studies based on Project changes which will all be available after December 13, 2023. The results were similar to what was in the draft EIR. (Debra Dwyer)

Comment: While we're talking about Entitlements, I would like to give a quick update around housing. Most funding sources want to see Entitlements secured before application. There is a funding source we want to apply for in 2024, which is why this timeline is critical. (Seth Furman)

Item 7. Housing Update

Seth Furman: (Slide 31) Summarized transition from senior housing to all-family due to lack of financial resources dedicated to building senior projects and overall competitiveness.

Seth Furman: (Slide 32) Adapting the unit mix poses a complex challenge and is not as straightforward as copy-pasting due to various design considerations. The team explored the feasibility of fitting a maximum of 77 family-sized units into the original 75-foot senior housing footprint which fell short of competitiveness for state financing and tax credits.

Seth Furman: (Slide 33) The new proposal involves elevating Phase 1 of housing to a maximum of 150 feet within the existing entitlement, optimizing the building envelope. The design team has addressed challenges, including elevators extending upwards, to ensure the completion of planned retail and streetscape. This adjustment enhances the competitiveness of the unit mix for funding.

Seth Furman: (Slide 34) Showed revised family housing with facade design elevated to 150 feet compared to previous senior building at 75 feet.

Seth Furman: (Slide 35) Phase 1 of the Bryant Street Housing, consisting of a single-loaded corridor building with an anticipated 103 units, represents a more competitive mix for funding. An initial financial analysis has been conducted which suggests this approach is an ideal solution.

Seth Furman: (Slide 36) Described various design options for the construction of Phase 2. The elevators, initially perceived as a challenge, would become an asset with the existing infrastructure. The design adheres to all CEQA approvals and shadow studies. Based on the information and analysis conducted, there is unanimous agreement that this is the best option.

Seth Furman: (Slide 37) Phase 1 is considered the housing along Bryant Street and Phase 2 is considered housing above the Podium.

Q: I like this creative solution. Do you have any idea what housing will be leftover for Phase 2 and if it can still be competitive for funding? (Scott Feeney)

- A: We are focused on construction for Phase 1 of Housing and the Bus Yard. Details for Phase 2 of housing, including whether it will cater to all families or include senior units, are still undecided. Drawing from the experience on Bryant Street, a similar evolution of unit configurations may happen for Phase 2. Specifics cannot be shared now due to ongoing work on Phase 1 but will be communicated once a clearer vision emerges. (Seth Furman)

Q: I'm with Potrero Boosters and we feel very good about family housing, but there is a concern around the amenities. What can you say about open space that will be available? (Alison Heath)

- A: Affordable housing projects must meet open space requirements for recreational purposes outside the units. One option is considering rooftop spaces, either temporarily or permanently. Another possibility involves leveraging the proximity to Franklin Square, potentially improving and utilizing that space for recreational purposes as well. (Seth Furman)

Q: What is the minimum and maximum time between Phases 1 and 2? (Alison Heath)

- Response: Pending funding availability, construction of Phase 1 Housing will commence immediately after the Bus Yard is built. The timeline for Phase 2 Housing is uncertain and contingent on future state approval for local funding. (Seth Furman)

Q: Does this change the total number of units from the original estimate of 500? (Roberto Hernandez)

- A: Entitlement allows a maximum of 513 units; we cannot exceed this limit. (Seth Furman)

Q: Will the workforce development phase remain the same or change? (Roberto Hernandez)

- A: Phase 2 is on the same timeline as workforce development. We can't start building workforce housing until we have the roof on the Yard. Is that your question? (Chris Jauregui)

Q: When will the family housing be shovel-ready? (Roberto Hernandez)

- A: For the initial phase for family housing to begin, demolition of the existing Bus Yard and the construction of utilities and the basement are the initial steps. Once completed, we are considered shovel-ready for vertical construction. (Seth Furman)

Q: Are tax credits the only funding sources you are pursuing? I know how competitive those are. Is the state putting out more funding than that? (Roberto Hernandez)

- A: Funding is sought from various sources, including significant tax credits, the Affordable Housing Sustainable Community (AHSC) funding source, and the Infill Infrastructure Grant (IIG). These, in combination with tax credits, represent major funding avenues, alongside support from the Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development. (Seth Furman)

Skipped transportation and parking section to keep time. Will include in the agenda for next month's monthly meeting.

Item 8. Next Steps

Chris Jauregui: (Slide 47 - 48) Shared planned outreach activities, upcoming meetings, and next steps.

Item 9. Public Comment

- No additional comments from the public.

Comments from Chat

- Scott Feeney he/him (Guest) 5:36 PM Hello working group colleagues and project team! I'm remote because I'm a little sick today, and will keep my video off so you don't see me being sniffly. Thanks for putting this on as a hybrid meeting. That's great news, thank you Jolene!
- Jolene (Guest) 5:42 PM Hi this is Jolene. I would say I would not be able to make April 9th also due to spring break
- Peter Belden (Guest) 5:46 PM Nice idea. The poll could ask can you attend this date and would you be in person or virtual. So for each date there could be 3 possible replies.
- [6:31 PM] Myrna Ortiz: DEIR -- [Shadow study is Appendix I: Environmental Review Documents | SF Planning](#). This DEIR was published on 06/30/2021.
- Heather Dunbar 6:51 PM Excellent Points
- Alison Heath (Potrero Boosters) (Guest) 6:53 PM It's my understanding that the opportunity for substantive comments related to the CEQA review should have been made during the Public Comment period for the Draft EIR.
- McKellar, Jennifer (CPC) 6:55 PM Yes, that is correct.
- Magda (Guest) 6:59 PM Hi Jennifer, how about the other topics of the EIR? Noise and air quality impact? What are the findings?
- Shellena Eskridge (she/her) (Guest) 7:04 PM What funding source will we be going after for the housing?
- Myrna Ortiz 7:04 PM [DEIR from 06/30/2021](#)
- [7:27 PM] Shellena Eskridge (she/her) (Guest) Happy Holidays everyone!
- [7:27 PM] Scott Feeney he/him (Guest) thanks everyone, happy holidays!