



RAILYARDS WORKING GROUP – MEETING NOTES

MEETING DATE: March 19, 2024

Staff Contact: Allison Albericci – 628-652-7327
allison.albericci@sfgov.org

RWG Members (Present / Absent/ Vacant):

Bruce Agid	P	J.R. Eppler	-	Jessica Perla	-
Angelica Arhror	-	Vanessa Gonzalez	-	Krute Singa	A
Cliff Bargar	-	Rob Jaques	-	Michael Walker	P
Don Cecil	P	Liz Kirby	A	Erica Waltemade	P
Tammy Chan	P	Christian Martin	-	Dylan Fabris	-
Desi Danganan	-	Chris Paik	-	Bayview Representative	V

Project Partners:

- CCSF** Jeremy Shaw, Principal Planner, CPC; Allison Albericci, Senior Architect / Urban Designer, CPC; Amnon Ben-Pazi, Senior Planner, CPC; Hugo Errazuriz Icaza, AECOM; Wenzheng Fan, AECOM; Erika Uribe, incommon; Jesse Koehler, Rail Program Manager, CTA; Ahmed Thleiji, Rail Program Principal Engineer, CTA; Gigi Chen-Kou
- Caltrain** Navdeep Dhaliwal, Government & Community Affairs; Nadine Fogarty; DJ Baxter from Kimley Horn; Dylan Clayton from Kimley Horn.
- Prologis** Genevieve Cadwalader, VP Investment; Xavier Lema; Kristen Hall, KHCD;
- TJPA** Lily Madjus Wu, Communications and Legislative Affairs Director
- Other** N/A

Public Attendees: Dan Bell,

Meeting Purpose

1. Provide updates on **Neighborhood urban design efforts** (informational, 5 min)
2. Provide updates on **DTX (Portal) and PAX efforts** (informational, 15 min)
3. Discuss **Caltrain's Preliminary Business Case** alternatives (explorative, 25 min)

Agenda

Opening	Welcome and settling-in Check-in: agenda and updates <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community updates• Neighborhood projects/ efforts
Content	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Provide updates on neighborhood urban design efforts (5 min)<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Informational item. Clarifying questions from the group are welcome.2. Provide updates on DTX and PAX efforts (15 min)<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Informational item. Clarifying questions from the group are welcome.3. Discuss Caltrain Preliminary Business Case alternatives (25 min)<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Presentation of alternatives (5-7 min)• Clarifying questions to understand alternatives (20 min)
Closing	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Next steps (10min) Group action items and activities Project team next steps

Check-in and Community Updates

- There were no comments on this section

Neighborhood Project Updates

- Bluxome Street Linear Park (Bluxome between 4th and 5th Streets)
 - Public Realm improvement entitled as part of 88 Bluxome mixed-use development (2019)
 - Developer proceeding with obtaining necessary permits.
 - Process takes several years - “Major Encroachment” into City, street requires meeting City standards, BOS approval of agreement.
- SF PORT released the Draft Waterfront Floor Study
 - Draft Plan published with 60-comment period underway.
 - SF Port has been conducting outreach and walking tours in several sub-areas, including Mission Creek.
 - Note: Report is now included in the dashboard in the google drive for reference.
 - For more information: <https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/2d7ae4e84f244acca0f433ba1abfac7c>

Neighborhood Urban Design Update: Public Realm and Streetscape Opportunities

Hugo Errazuriz from AECOM presented an update of the Neighborhood Public Realm and Streetscape Design work.

- There were no comments on this section

The Portal (DTX) and PAX Update

Lily Madjus Wu from TJPA presented an update on The Portal project.

Jesse Koehler from CTA presented an update on the Pennsylvania Avenue Extension (PAX) project.

Questions:

- What does progressive design-build mean? Jesse Kohler: “progressive” design phase with both City and contractor, before build agreement finalized. <https://learn.aiacontracts.com/articles/6508632-whats-so-progressive-about-progressive-design-build/>
- Dan Bell: If DTX is built first, what would the interface look like for surface tracks to the DTX underground tunnel? New underground station at 4th and Townsend, rising to the surface along the curve at 7th and Townsend.
- Don Cecil: What happens to the at grade ROW if PAX is completed? With PAX built, some surface rail stays as long as railyards has above ground operations.
- Dan Bell: Can mixed use development occur at Railyard if PAX is not built? Mixed-use development can begin before PAX is complete, we are studying how this would happen

Preliminary Business Case Update

DJ Baxter from Caltrain presented an update regarding the Preliminary Business Case.

Comments and Questions

RWG members provided comments and questions regarding the Preliminary Business Case to the City prior to the meeting. Erika Uribe facilitated a conversation to respond to those questions.

General comments:

- The presentation does not address the surrounding area or community.
- This is the first introduction of the concept of off-site storage.
- The potential Phase 1 development area is underwhelming.

DTX/PAX clarifying questions:

- Dan Bell: Please discuss where off-site storage of trains is feasible with these alternatives? (Additional similar questions addressed comprehensively by Navi) Caltrain is early in their analysis and does not have all of the answers, will keep us all engaged. Caltrain is not pursuing a joint facility with HSR. Caltrain is analyzing options, cognizant of outreach to local communities, cost, timing. More details later this summer on location.
- What is the probability the Portal stays on schedule? Lily Madjus: Depends on funding - \$2B gap but

advancing legislative and technical components.

- Jesse Kohler: PAX studying how to support development of the site relative to PBC alternatives.

Offsite storage clarifying questions

- Navi Dhaliwal: Offsite storage is a precursor to any form of development on site. Caltrain will be making these decisions in the short-term April-May this year.

Resilience: question on slide. Lily Madjus was unavailable to respond, team will respond off-line.

Development clarifying questions

- Bullets 1, 2 - Genevieve: Factors influencing how development happens: continuous rail operation; structural (seismic) and soil considerations; space constraint (building foundations going through rail platforms) – leads to Phase one not building over rail.
- Bullet 3 – Navi Dhaliwal: aiming to accommodate High Growth scenario in Phase 2. Phase 1 allows this until HSR is operational.
- Dan Bell: How did Prologis become owner of the site? Prologis merged with Catullus in 2005, gaining ownership of the site.
- Bullet 4 – Genevieve: importance of the transit on site justifies height and density, as does cost of the infrastructure. Currently studying the right height density program.
- Don Cecil: Thanks for the efforts and coordination. Will take me a while to find the excitement again (describes letdown). RWG should have started work at this point [once the constraints of the site were ready to be shared]. Sobering reality – difficult to imagine MR 2.0, connecting the grid, density I imagined.
- Don Cecil: Perhaps a small building footprint creates an opportunity for a “Salesforce-like park” over the rail areas.
- Genevieve: stay tuned, we will focus on more exciting aspects as we get into design.
- Jeremy Shaw: Acknowledging group efforts and feedback.

Phase 1 clarifying questions

- Genevieve Cadwalader: we looked at 100s of options, selected a Phase 1 that could advance independent of the uncertainties around the other projects. Goal is to have Phase 1 work as stand-alone and incorporate connectivity, flexibility. Will see that as Prologis starts sharing design ideas.
- Navi Dhaliwal: All alternatives would allow for Caltrain high level of service.

Reaction slide:

- Navi Dhaliwal: Don’s comments resonated. Directors wanted to understand the realities for development. There is an appetite for delivering something wonderful here, preservation of options for future growth, delivering experience to match new electric trains.

Next Steps

RWG Members:

- Open question related to resilience to be answered asynchronously.
- Asynchronous input and regular updates to align with PBC process, is this working? Erica Waltemade: hard to keep up, maybe more regular meetings instead? Suggested having a regular frequency would help.
- In person meeting Erica Waltemade: hard to meet in person (schedule), happy to have more meetings but not in person.

- Don Cecil: Concerned about underwhelming participation of more RWG members.
- Erika Uribe: Organizing team will look at this feedback and propose options to better support the group. We are aware that some group members are moving on and/ or going through life changes.
- Allison Albericci: The original commitment for RWG members was 18 months and the group is now in meeting #7, and has exceeded this request, now meeting for 21 months.

City Family:

Addressing RWG questions/ comments related to PBC/PAX/DTX.

Continue to develop Public Realm and Streetscape Design.

Coordination with The Portal (DTX), PAX and the PW/PUC Stormwater Management Studies.

Next Meeting:

2nd Quarter 2024 – Tuesday, June 18th from 5:30pm to 6:45pm

Questions submitted by RWG members in advance:

Portal/ DTX/ PAX

- When will the group know more about planning and timelines for Portal/ DTX, high-speed rail? [to be addressed earlier in the meeting see item 1]
- What is the likelihood the Portal will remain on schedule?
- How are the alternatives related to PAX? Which alternatives help advance or constrain PAX?

Off-site storage

- Should the RWG assume that off-site storage is confirmed?
- Will offsite storage require dedicated land and facilities owned by JPB?
- Who will pay for offsite storage?
- How does current litigation between CA High-Speed Rail and City of Brisbane over train storage impact the approach/viability of Caltrain finding storage space?
- Prologis owns commercial buildings in Brisbane, are they viable storage locations?
- Is train storage along the ROW in southern San Francisco a viable storage option if space above storage were activated for community uses?

Development

- Other cities build over rail; is the assumption that later phases of development will have to be “unencumbered” by rail?
- Even if Caltrain and/or Portal rail is below-grade, what are the limitations of building over the tracks?
- The presentation makes reference to high/ medium/ low growth ridership scenarios. Does this materially affect the railyards development itself? (i.e. amenities, greenspace, housing...)
- What types of height and density will be required to make any phase/alternative viable?

Resilience

- With the Port’s recent release of the Waterfront Coastal Flood Study, how does the findings in the report impact the current thinking around the above grade vs. below grade infrastructure in the PBC Alternatives? Are there additional considerations given the likelihood of sea level change and impacts to rail infrastructure?

Reactions & feedback from AMP Committee

- How would you describe the Caltrain’s AMP Committee members' reaction to this presentation?

Phase 1

- Did the team consider different Phase 1 scenarios/ approaches?
- How will Phase 1 support/advance the goals identified through community efforts and working group discussions? (connectivity, safety, ground floor activation, affordable housing...)

Announcements / Community News / Events

N/A