Potrero Yard Neighborhood Working Group Meeting 28 Minutes

Tuesday, January 10, 2022, 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Virtual Meeting

Microsoft Teams Webinar, Meeting ID: 281 020 521 483

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

Members Present:  
Alexandra Harker  
Claudia DeLarios Morán  
Jolene Yee  
J.R. Eppler  
Magda Freitas  
Peter Belden  
Roberto Hernandez  
Scott Feeney

Members Not Present:  
Benjamin Bidwell  
Kamilah Taylor  
Ryan Parker

SFMTA Staff:  
Bonnie Jean von Krogh  
John Angelico  
Kerstin Magary  
Tim Kempf (DPW)

PNC Staff:  
Chris Jauregui  
Jennifer Trotter  
Johnny Jaramillo  
Karoleen Feng  
Monica Almendral  
Robert Abbott  
Yancy Clayton

Other Attendees:  
Jorge Elias (public)  
Aleena Galloway (public)  
Fernando Marti (public)  
Matt Snyder (Planning)

Purpose of the Meeting

Potrero Neighborhood Collective (PNC) to provide a Project update, discuss feedback received from the Working Group and during the Pre-Application meeting on PNC’s early stage (5%) design of Potrero Yard, and invite Working Group members to provide additional feedback on the Project’s “Look and Feel.”

Item 1. Welcome

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: (Slides 1 – 3) Welcomed everyone to the January 2023 meeting. Reminding Working Group members, members of the public, and thanking attendees for attending virtually due to inclement weather. Provide brief overview of agenda.
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Chris Jauregui: (Slide 4) Provided an overview of the PNC team structure and team members. PNC includes Plenary Americas (lead developer), MEDA (affordable housing), YCD (affordable housing), TCDC (affordable housing), Presidio Development Partners (workforce housing), IBI (design), YA (design), Plant (construction management), The Allen Group (construction management), WT (advisory)

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: (Slide 5) Asked each attendee shared their role on the Potrero Yard Modernization project and something they never get tired of talking about. The following themes were discussed: transit, housing, community organizing and development, architecture, food, and family.

Jennifer Trotter and Monica Almendral: (Slides 6 – 8) Confirmed that PNC holds the same values as SFMTA in regards to public participation and will adhere to the established Charter for the Working Group and other Group Agreements.

Item 2. Proposed 2023 Working Group Calendar

Bonnie Jean von Krogh: (Slide 9) Led a discussion on Working Group member availability to attend proposed Working Group meetings throughout 2023. A general preference to maintain meeting times in the late afternoon or early evening was discussed.

Consensus was reached on establishing a monthly meeting on the first Tuesday of the month at 5:30 p.m., with the exception of January, July, August, and September due to holidays and other schedule conflicts.

- January 10
- February 7
- March 7
- April 4
- May 2
- June 6
- July 11
- August 8
- September 12
- October 3
- November 7
- December 5

PNC to send out a calendar appointment to all Working Group members for each of the meeting dates in 2023.

Item 3. Member and SFMTA Announcements

John Angelico: (Slide 10 – 11) Announced the new T Third Service. New service includes Subway from Chinatown-Rose Pak to Sunnydale, Bus service along 3rd and 4th Streets, and Chase Center Event Service shuttle. Details of T Third and adjacent lines provided.

No Working Group member announcements provided.
Item 4. Project Updates

Chris Jauregui: (Slide 12 - 13) Provided an overview of Project timeline. We are currently in Design & Permitting phase (yellow) through end of 2023. During this phase PNC will be progressing toward: Entitlements (Q3 2023), Design Development (Q4 2023), Design-Build Partner selected (Q4 2023), Commercial Close (Q2 2024), and MME Completed (Q2 2024).

Discussed more detailed plan for Project Schedule during the first quarter of 2023 (January – March 2023), including:

- January – Working Group meeting to focus on obtaining feedback on the Project’s Look and Feel and sharing feedback received in December.
- February – Working Group meeting to focus on obtaining feedback on the streetscape of 17th Street and LBE plan; submit final project management plans [to SFMTA]; initiate Listening Sessions with nearby stakeholders; potentially hold a community meeting
- March - Working Group meeting to focus on obtaining feedback on public art, sidewalk, and trees; submit LBE plan and 50% Schematic Design [to SFMTA]

Jennifer Trotter and Karoleen Feng: (Slide 14) PNC will meet with nearby community stakeholders to introduce PNC, provide an update on the Project, and gain feedback and input on proposed design. PNC has plans to offer to present to stakeholder groups such as Calle 24 and KQED. Additionally, PNC offers to present to Working Group members’ organizations and request Working Group suggestions on other community stakeholders:

- Neighborhood Associations (Peter Belden)
- Sierra Club (Peter Belden)
- Jorge Elias (bus operator)
- Friends of Franklin Square (Jolene Yee)
- Rowan Homeowners Association at 338 Potrero Ave (Alexandra Harker)
- SF Transit Riders Union (Peter Belden)
- Transport Workers Union Local 250 (Aleena Galloway)
- Potrero Boosters (J.R. Eppler)

Karoleen Feng: (Slide 15) Provided an overview of housing plan presented in December 2022 and anticipated housing units provided by housing type. Confirmed that housing plan is subject to market feasibility and funding availability.
Early design changes including eliminating a long corridor and the need to adapt design to regulatory framework for financing and ongoing market assessment. Updated housing plan anticipates 501 housing units that includes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Unit Types</th>
<th>Studio</th>
<th>1 Bedroom</th>
<th>2 Bedroom</th>
<th>3 Bedroom</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions presented by Working Group:

- Q: The baseline for multi-bedroom units in the area is 40%. Your proposal is currently at 42%, given the emphasis on workforce and family housing, can the housing program increase the number of multi-bedroom units? (J.R. Eppler)
  - A: The Senior building includes 96 units and senior units are typically studios or one-bedrooms. Supporting senior housing skews the percent of multi-bedroom units proposed. (Karoleen Feng)

- Q: Does the January 2023 housing plan show how the different types of housing will be distributed or will it be more mixed? (Claudia DeLarios Morán)
  - A: The affordable housing and workforce housing layout is due to regulations tied to financing. The housing design includes an open concept in the interior courtyard to encourage interactions among all residents in communal space. (Karoleen Feng)

- Q: What is the justification, why can’t the housing be integrated? (Claudia DeLarios Morán)
  - A: Financing for affordable housing and workforce housing have different requirements. Specifically, affordable housing finance cannot fund costs related to market rate (including Workforce) housing. (Karoleen Feng)

- Q: Can you integrate the housing types as much as possible? The housing plan currently reads as very segregated. (Claudia DeLarios Morán) Alexandra Harker stated in the Chat function that she had the same question and agrees with Claudia.
As affordable housing developers, we tried to integrate with different income levels by placing an overall cap on income (120% Area Median Income or AMI) and prevent the housing from becoming market-rate. (Karoleen Feng)

- Q: I am distressed with the proposed housing reduction from 575. (Scott Feeney)
  - A: It’s challenging to maximize unit count and also have family size bedrooms. Another way to look at this is by overall bedroom count (as opposed to units) since bedroom count prioritizes families. (Karoleen Feng)
  - Looks like we have gone from 820 bedrooms to 776 bedrooms (Scott Feeney)
  - We will confirm total proposed bedroom count and other details (Karoleen Feng)

- Q: Stated agreement with Claudia’s comment and want to integrate housing as much as possible. Is it possible to provide better drawings or modeling to show how tall the buildings are going to be? (Jolene Yee)
  - A: The housing has a maximum height of 150 feet (within Design Guidelines). For comparison, the building across the street (where Starbucks is located) has the same height as the Bus Yard (unsure of address, potentially 1850 Bryant Street). (Karoleen Feng)

- Q: Concerned that since there is no housing on 17th Street that the area will look and feel dead with no people walking through and may lead to blight. (Jolene Yee)
  - A: There is no housing planned near 17th Street to remain compliant with shadow impact requirements. Although there is not housing planned on 17th Street, we are activating the streetscape. (Karoleen Feng)

- Q: Segregation is problematic even understanding the constraints. What are the affordability ranges for housing types? (Peter Belden)
  - A: All of the affordable housing is up to 80% AMI. We target 30 – 60% for family housing and 55% for senior housing. Workforce housing may go up as high as 120% AMI. (Karoleen Feng)

- Q: I’m trying to understand the differences between family units versus bedroom count. Previously 820 bedrooms proposed and now 776 bedrooms are proposed. To maximize housing, can we revisit the [building] heights? (Scott Freeney)
  - A: The heights area Planning and SFMTA requirement that we can discuss with them. Changing the heights would also likely impact CEQA. (Karoleen Feng)

- Q: It is possible that some of our group would be willing to trade some minimal shadow in exchange for more activation on 17th Street (examples: residential, commercial spaces, or entry/exit of buses). Is there common space to support integrating residents of affordable and workforce housing? Reference to another nearby project with a playground and recreation room. (Jolene Yee)
Item 5. Open Decision Point

Chris Jauregui: (Slide 17) provide overview of Open Decision Points presented to Working Group and during a Pre-Application meeting in December 2022.

Chris Jauregui: (Slide 18 - 19) shared public input provided on streetscape of 17th Street. Clarified that the proposed commercial components are at the corner of 17th Street and Hampshire Street as well as along Bryant Street. In total commercial component is approximately 10,000 square feet. PNC understands that the following broad topics are of interest to the Working Group: public safety and mobility, activation, public restroom access and maintenance, and bus movements.

- Peter Belden: clarified that concern around mobility is related to creating protected intersections to avoid vehicular conflict with pedestrians.
- Jolene Yee: stated that while visibility of bus ramps is cool, they could create dead space, even with kiosks. Requested clarification if the input provided in question-format would be provided.
- Karoleen Feng: confirmed that PNC is sharing the questions that PNC continue to consider and use input to refine project design.

Chris Jauregui: (Slide 20 - 21) shared public input provided on commercial and retail component. A large variety of both retail and community spaces have been suggested and are under consideration.

- Claudia DeLarios Morán (chat function): suggest considering a neighborhood center or clubhouse for youth and seniors that could be staffed by City Park & Rec, connecting directly with Franklin Square.
- Scott Feeney (chat function): supports idea of neighborhood center.
- Jolene Yee (chat function): likes idea of neighborhood center but also recognizes that this use may not be feasible. Suggest a ground level open art studio that generates rental income and activation.
- Roberto Hernandez (chat function): suggest including a multi-purpose community service Hub that include resources for workforce, Head Start (early education), childcare, tutoring, technology, and art.

Chris Jauregui: (Slide 22 - 23) focus is currently on location of trees and anticipate having a plant palette in the future.

- Sean O’Brien (chat function): identify the City’s Street Design Advisory Team (SDAT) includes multiple City agencies including Planning Department, SFMTA, Public Works Department, Fire Department, and Public Utilities Commission.
- Roberto Hernandez (chat function): recommend growing fruit (planting fruit trees).
- Jolene Yee (chat function): suggest tiered green space around Project to create a more welcoming façade and less like a big wall.
- Scott Feeney (chat function): emphasize importance of connectedness.
- Jorge Elias: as a bus operator suggested that Cypress trees have impacted bus operation because it interferes with overhead lines. Also recommends to prioritize tree maintenance.
- Roberto Hernandez: provided a number of comments that address multiple slides previously presented including:
  - Housing – agrees with previous comments about housing appearing segregated and want to encourage team to push back on funding restrictions that require separate funding for each building type.
  - Retail / Commercial – suggest that a Hub providing multiple community resources.
  - Community Connection – the Project should connect to and benefit the rest of the community (not just the park). For example residents of Mission Housing building (kitty corner) could use services provided at hub.
  - Trees / Sidewalks – prioritizes urban farming and referenced new Indigenous focused urban farming program at Golden Gate Park. Additionally encourages maximizing plantings to mitigate impacts of climate change.

Chris Jauregui: stated agreement that the commercial and retail components of the Project are intended to serve and integrate with the community as a whole. Additionally clarified that PNC is seeking Gold LEED certification for the whole building.

- Claudia DeLarios Morán (chat function): agrees with greening and growing food. Asked if gardens can be on the roof. J.R. Eppler and Roberto Hernandez agreed with Claudia’s comments.
- Scott Feeney (chat function): supportive of gardens and emphasize the biggest impact that Project can have on climate change is to maximize housing so working-class people do not have to commute into San Francisco from far away.

Chris Jauregui: (Slide 24 – 25) provide overview of SF Arts Commission process including application, qualification, and review periods. Note that Arts Commission will create a panel to support this process.

- Alexandra Harker (chat function): suggest a specific muralist and children’s book illustrator (Ana Aranda)

Chris Jauregui: (Slide 26 – 27) provided overview of feedback provided on the Look and Feel of the building including a discussion on how to soften the building design. Responding to a question presented during December 2022 meeting, clarified that operational sound issues on Hampshire Street is planned to be minimized since majority of maintenance work is on ground level only. The 2nd and 3rd floors are dedicated mostly for bus parking.

- Magda Freitas: stated that much of the discussion around Look and Feel has already been identified in the Design Guidelines.
• Jorge Elias (chat function, bus operator): a slide showed easy access to parking. How many parking spots available at Project?
• J.R. Eppler (chat function): notes that the Project proposes a tremendous (good) amount of housing. Emphasize importance of creating livable environment so that people remain in housing for longer terms.

Chris Jauregui: (Slide 28) describe Look and Feel as building materials (glass, metal screening, material colors, artistic aspects of building materials), massing/size (within established project envelop), functionality, and neighborhood integration.

Chris Jauregui: (Slide 29) ask Working Group to discuss which types of materials they would like to see highlighted in the Project design.

• Magda Freitas: stated preference for use of raw materials and for images #3 and #4 as identified in Slide 29. Emphasized both metal screening and lighting in these images.
• Jolene Yee (chat function): reiterate concern about 17th Street façade creating a sense of dead space and potentially resulting in blight. Current buildings in neighborhood that are not activated (with driveways, pedestrian activity, or businesses) end up having encampments [of unhoused persons]. J.R. Eppler agrees with Jolene.
• Alexandra Harker (chat function): likes metal screens and glass. Suggest metal and glass be muted color with pop of colors found in murals.
• Magda Freitas (chat function): agrees with Alexandra Harker, emphasize material use from Mission Industrial neighborhood (glass, metal, brick, concrete). Suggest that art can bring in color.
• Alexandra Harker (chat function): will the landscape architect be attending future meetings to review 17th Street and sidewalks?

Chris Jauregui: (Slide 30) ask Working Group to discuss how important is color variation.

• Scott Feeney: color variation and modulating facades is an overrated technique. It ends up looking like a big building [unsuccessfully] trying to be many small buildings. What’s most important is to activate ground floor with a variety of activities (examples: café, kiosks). In chat function, Alexandra Harker agrees with Scott.

Chris Jauregui: (Slide 31) ask Working Group to discuss how streetscape integrates with housing program.

• Jolene Yee: stated a dislike for design on 17th Street and Mariposa Street because both look like a big dead wall. Request to increase activation on ground levels.
• Claudia DeLarios Morán (chat function): emphasize importance of making this massive building human-scale so as not to alienate community. Stated that no parking for approximately 500 housing units is problematic.

Item 6. Public Comments

The following public comments were provided:

• Jorge Elias: enjoyed conversation (from color to landscaping). However, there was not a conversation on parking.
  o Chris Jauregui: clarified that there are no public parking spaces planned for Project.
• Jorge Elias: Parking for bus operations staff is important and lacking in design although it has been brought up previously.
  o Claudia DeLarios Morán: agrees with Jorge’s comment.
  o Jorge Elias: reference different SFMTA project that had parking issue for SFMTA staff. Expressed importance to have safe parking locations for transit operators to better serve the public.
  o Aleena Galloway (chat function): agrees with Jorge Elias.
• Jolene Yee (chat function): request access to review the design plans from other unsuccessful developers to get ideas from their design.
• Roberto Hernandez (chat function): the building needs to be artistic and green. Don’t want a boring building that looks like a prison.
• Claudia DeLarios Morán (chat function): reiterate that no parking for housing is problematic.
• Jolene Yee (chat function): agrees with Jorge Elias’ comments. Understands that the City wants the Project site to be a transit-oriented location and doesn’t need parking, however transit is not always reliable especially at the time that many operators start their shifts (5 a.m.).