RAILYARDS WORKING GROUP — MEETING NOTES

MEETING DATE: September 19, 2023

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

RWG Members (Present / Absent/Vacant):

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

Project Partners:

CCSF
Leigh Lutenski, Deputy Director of Joint Development OEWD; Jeremy Shaw, Principal Planner, CPC;
Allison Albericci, Senior Architect / Urban Designer, CPC; Hugo Errazuriz Icaza, AECOM; Beibei Chen,
AECOM; Erika Uribe, Incommon

Caltrain
Navdeep Dhaliwal, Government & Community Affairs; Nadine Fogarty;

Prologis
Banke Abioye, Entitlements & Community Engagement; Genevieve Cadwalader, VP Investment; Mark
Hansen, Managing Director ; Xavier Lema, Prologis; Peter Sokoloff, Foster and Partners; James Abrams, J
Abrams Law

Other

Public Attendees: Ash, Kristen Hall, Vivian

Meeting Purpose

1. Public Participation Framework (available for asynchronous review) - provide overview, gather input,
   and confirm group consent to move forward.
2. Existing plans “dashboard” - gather input & confirm consent to develop further.
3. Neighborhood mapping - gather input & interest in site tour to confirm mapping.
## Agenda

### Opening
- Welcome and settling-in (5 min)
- Check-in: agenda and updates (5 min)

### Content
1. Public Participation Framework (10-15 min)
   - Provide overview to complement asynchronous review
   - Guiding questions:
     - Are there any critical gaps or stakeholder groups missing?
     - Is the purpose of the Railyards Working Group well-defined? Any suggestions?
     - Is there group agreement to move forward with this guiding framework?

2. Context dashboard (policy and plans) (10 min)
   - Overview & open discussion
   - Guiding questions:
     - Is there potential for this to be a helpful tool?
     - Could this be a good way to approach the groups’ request to develop an “executive summary of executive summaries”?
     - What can be done to make it better? Is there group agreement to develop further?

3. Neighborhood Mapping (20 min)
   - Presentation and open discussion
   - Guiding questions:
     - What is missing? What has changed on the ground?
     - Would the group be interested in joining a site tour to confirm mapping?

### Closing
- Next steps (10min)
- Site tour coordination
- Community Brief & dashboard (to be developed for asynchronous review)
- Visioning: Case Study Takanawa Gateway Station (10-15 min)

## Check-in

There are no updates from our core teams partners Caltrain and Prologis, today. They continue the work on the Preliminary Business Case and, Technical Constraints, and implications for phasing.

We have heard some desire to incorporate more Team Building opportunities into our interactions. One possibility that we’ll talk about further is a Neighborhood Walk. We’d also like to create space in the agenda to highlight people, places, and events in the neighborhood, to help us ground the conversation. We invite you all to make nominations for future meetings.

Are there any community updates, or suggestions for ice breakers or other team building activities?
• Michael Walker – calling attention to fatality at 4th and King
• Erica Waltemade – SFMTA Folsom project needs community help on outreach
• ND [Caltrain] – invited everyone to Caltrain electrification event 9/23

As always, thoughts, reactions and ideas are welcome in the chat!

Public Participation Framework Draft

Reactions/ comments:
• Don Cecil – document is not referencing economic needs of landowner or realities of financing.
• EU [meeting support] - We will discuss this with the City team. Perhaps this document is not the best place for the landowner’s economic needs, but it could certainly include an economic/funding approach from the City’s perspective.
• Liz Kirby – Clarify role/expectations for members between meetings (day to day) – works actively with SOMA families who will have input and can help reach out/ engage. Is it too early to engage them?
• EU – We will keep this in mind as we move forward once there is information to be shared and when it is a good time to have community input. EU - Group may provide more asynchronous feedback in the coming days.

Outcome/ Way forward:
• Krute Singa [via email]: No additional groups to add to PPF, purpose of working group is well defined, recommends moving forward with the framework. Comments available in the document.
• Group agrees to move forward with the framework.

Context Dashboard

• Erica Waltemade – appreciates the effort [to create the dashboard]. Add SoMa Pilipinas and Leather District CHESS
• Bruce Agid – likes leveraging off past work, appreciates effort. How comprehensive will it be?
  ▪ RAB
  ▪ Central Soma
  ▪ Showplace
  ▪ Mission Bay CAC / Redevelopment Plan
  ▪ 900 7th Street / Recology site – community input
  ▪ Mission Rock
  ▪ Western SoMa Plan
• Don C: likes this 1) important to recognize the people who worked on this in the past (and so it doesn’t need to be a fight) 2) we don’t have a blank canvas
• Important to make sure that previous Equity work is respected, will provide confidence to what exists and communicate this work is not preceding or superseding [prior efforts]. Let people know we hear.
• EU- may need to prioritize certain plans as we add them to the dashboard.

Outcome/ Way forward
• Group agrees that work of refining dashboard should continue.
Neighborhood Mapping

- Tammy Chan:
  - we receive many close call reports from our UCSF bikers for the 16th/7th Street crossing.
  - The new MB school site under construction should be considered and acknowledged in any new connection
- Michael Walker: Dodging cars is an art around here
- Bruce Agid– yes to walking tour. Many things have been talked about for many years, need to be incorporated into plan. Mention of 5th street extension.
- Liz Kirby: Excited about potential 5th street connection as well, to connect families in Mission Bay to services in SOMA (and vice versa)
- Erica Waltemade– when does Caltrans get involved?
- AA [Planning]– Planning is doing work in this area Streets and Freeways Study and Transportation Element Update.

Outcome/ Way forward
- Group will coordinate dates for a site walk to confirm neighborhood mapping.

Open Discussion

- Erica and Don volunteered to be coordinators; Krute will also be asked to join again.
- Erica; Seeing this is very helpful and I'd love to see more case studies!

Next Steps

RWG Members:
- Review and comment on Public Participation Plan
- Continue conversation and provide input on emerging themes
- Attend and invite staff to community meetings

City Family:
- 2023 Q4 Meeting is scheduled for December 19th from 5:30pm to 6:45pm
- Planning Department to coordinate Site Tour for RWG members.
- City Family Consultants to continue work. Completing Existing Conditions Analysis and moving into Public Realm Opportunities.
- We will also begin setting up the first rounds of Stakeholder Interviews and Focus Groups

Case Study: Takanawa Gateway, Tokyo

- MH [Prologis] – this is a good example, we have others in mind, also engaging with Foster and with planners of this project, can present their analysis of desired. Have been looking at several studies of recently built stations, important mix of retail, office and housing, and how you help move people through. Phasing approach very important as well. Offer to bring case studies to the group if interested.
Next Meeting:

4th Quarter 2023, December 19th from 5:30pm to 6:45pm

Attachments:

N/A

Announcements / Community News / Events

N/A