We acknowledge that we are on the unceded ancestral homeland of the Ramaytush Ohlone who are the original inhabitants of the San Francisco Peninsula.
Meeting purpose

1. Public Participation Framework Draft (available for asynchronous review) - provide overview, gather input, and seek group agreement to move forward.

2. Context “dashboard” - gather input & seek group agreement to develop further.

3. Neighborhood mapping - gather input & interest in a 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 Draft (10-15 min)
Overview to complement asynchronous review

2 Context Dashboard (prior plans and policies) (10 min)
Overview & open discussion

3 Neighborhood Mapping (20 min)
Presentation and open discussion

Closing
Next steps (10min)
Visioning (optional)
Case Study Takanawa Gateway Station (10-15 min)
Community Feedback

• What have you heard since we last met?
Public Participation Framework (draft)
(Erika Uribe, incommon)
Public participation process goals*

1) Guide planning for the Railyards Area Design and Development (development site and surrounding neighborhood)

2) Help balance transportation benefits with community priorities, and

3) Raise awareness of Railyards activities among community members and the public.

*18-month period
Public participation framework (draft)

What is it?
Alignment tool involving project stewards and partners in the development of participation strategies.

What is for? The framework supports a process to:
(1) identify priority communities for engagement,
(2) establish intentional strategies and feedback loops,
(3) coordinate participation efforts with Core Team, and
(4) map civic partnerships to support the project (long-term).

The Public Participation Framework can be periodically updated within an 18-month period to integrate new information.
PPF Overview

Document contents:
1 Introduction
2 Project Background
3 Equity and Policy Context Updates
4 Approach to Public Participation
5 Strategies

Appendix 1 Community Brief (in development)
Appendix 2 Frequently Asked Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Participation goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Railyards Working Group</td>
<td>Collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Small group conversations</td>
<td>Involve &gt;&gt; Collaborate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Public events*</td>
<td>Inform &gt;&gt; Consult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Railyards Network</td>
<td>Inform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Digital platforms</td>
<td>Inform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Timeline and content to be coordinated with other engagement by Core Team Partners (Prologis & Caltrain)
Railyards Working Group

Guiding Questions

Railyards working group

Is the purpose of the RWG well-defined (for now)?
Any suggestions or questions?

Public participation framework (draft)

Are there any critical gaps or stakeholder groups missing?
Is there group agreement to move forward with this guiding framework (for now)?

(Additional feedback welcome after this meeting)

The RWG will work to:

- Inform and shape public participation strategies.
- Review and provide feedback on project materials.
- Identify potential synergies and opportunities for public benefit.
- Share and solicit feedback from their networks and support their participation.
- Inform an assessment framework for the proposed alternatives.
- Verify RWG input summaries prepared by Railyards Project partners.
Context Dashboard

(Erika Uribe, incommon)
Context "dashboard"

What is it?

- Interpreting RWG request to develop an “executive summary of executive summaries” of previous neighborhood planning efforts.

- A tool to review previous planning policy documents and community input in relation to/ in the context of new City policy (i.e., EJ Framework/ Housing Element), and RWG emerging themes.
Context dashboard

RWG emerging themes
- Balance economic viability, operational needs, and community benefits
- Urban vitality
- Housing and equity
- Resilience, sea level rise, stormwater management & flooding
- Learning from related efforts and community input

Neighborhood Plan
Plan goals or recommendations
Showplace Square Open Space Plan 2021 update
Maximize access to open space and waterfront by planning connections to the waterfront and new parks where rail infrastructure may be undergrounded in the future.

EJ Framework priorities
- Healthy and Resilient Environments
- Physical Activity and Healthy Public Facilities
- Healthy Food Access
- Safe, Healthy, and Affordable Homes
- Equitable and Green Jobs
- Empowered Neighborhoods
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RWG emerging themes</th>
<th>Plan goals or recommendations</th>
<th>Neighborhood Plan</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>EJ priority - category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance economic viability, operational n</td>
<td>Plan goals or recommendations</td>
<td>Showplace Square Open Space Plan 2021 upd 2020 policy updates (p18)</td>
<td>8.5 design large developments to maximize public benefit</td>
<td>Healthy and Resilient Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance economic viability, operational n</td>
<td>Plan goals or recommendations</td>
<td>Central SoMa Plan 2018</td>
<td>8.5 design large developments to maximize public benefit</td>
<td>Physical Activity and Healthy Public Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance economic viability, operational n</td>
<td>Plan goals or recommendations</td>
<td>Central SoMa Plan 2018</td>
<td>8.7 establish clear rules for development</td>
<td>Safe, Healthy, and Affordable Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and equity</td>
<td>Address systemic racial and social inequities and environmental justice</td>
<td>Showplace Square Open Space Plan 2021 upd 2020 policy updates (p18)</td>
<td>2.3 - 33% of housing in affordable...</td>
<td>Safe, Healthy, and Affordable Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and equity</td>
<td>Expand public participation of communities of color in the planning, designing, programming, and stewardship of the public realm to ensure</td>
<td>Showplace Square Open Space Plan 2021 upd 2020 policy updates (p18)</td>
<td>2.4 - address shortage of 'gap' housing</td>
<td>Safe, Healthy, and Affordable Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and equity</td>
<td>Goal 2: Maintain the Diversity of Residents</td>
<td>Central SoMa Plan 2018</td>
<td>2.5 - housing for diversity of household sizes and tenures</td>
<td>Safe, Healthy, and Affordable Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and equity</td>
<td>Goal 2: Maintain the Diversity of Residents</td>
<td>Central SoMa Plan 2018</td>
<td>3.1.3 support living wage jobs...</td>
<td>Equitable and Green Jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and equity</td>
<td>Goal 3: Facilitate an Economically Diversified and Lively Jobs Center</td>
<td>Central SoMa Plan 2018</td>
<td>3.3 does not result in loss of PDR...</td>
<td>Equitable and Green Jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and equity</td>
<td>Goal 6: Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood</td>
<td>Central SoMa Plan 2018</td>
<td>6.1 strategy for sustainable and resilient nhhood</td>
<td>Empowered Neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience, sea level rise, stormwater ma</td>
<td>Goal 6: Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood</td>
<td>Central SoMa Plan 2018</td>
<td>6.2 minimize greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>Healthy and Resilient Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience, sea level rise, stormwater ma</td>
<td>Goal 6: Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood</td>
<td>Central SoMa Plan 2018</td>
<td>6.3 minimize water waste</td>
<td>Healthy and Resilient Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience, sea level rise, stormwater ma</td>
<td>Goal 6: Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood</td>
<td>Central SoMa Plan 2018</td>
<td>6.6 flood-resiliency</td>
<td>Healthy and Resilient Environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience, sea level rise, stormwater ma</td>
<td>Goal 6: Create an Environmentally Sustainable and Resilient Neighborhood</td>
<td>Central SoMa Plan 2018</td>
<td>6.7 earthquake resilience</td>
<td>Healthy and Resilient Environments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Context dashboard

Guiding questions

• *Is there potential for this to be a helpful tool?*

• *Is this a good approach to 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 this tool further?*
Neighborhood Mapping
(Hugo Errazuriz, AECOM)
Existing Conditions Analysis

Purpose

• Summarize existing conditions within and around the study area, including previously planned and proposed activities
• Help identify what is working and what should be improved
• Guide the direction of potential urban design solutions that can help improve what isn’t working

What is missing? What has changed on the ground?
Would the group be interested in joining a site tour to confirm mapping?
## Railyards Neighborhood Study Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY PRIORITIES</th>
<th>STUDY QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide open space, housing and other essential community benefits</td>
<td>What types of open spaces, housing and community services? Where? How much?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate with and improve connections between neighborhoods</td>
<td>Which connections? Serving which transportation modes? How can this project complete the Public Realm network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address resilience and sea-level rise at this site</td>
<td>How will resilience planning integrate with and benefit the surrounding neighborhood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complement San Francisco’s skyline</td>
<td>What is the composition and scale of buildings, heights, roof lines?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility with the Downtown Extension and Pennsylvania Avenue Extension (and existing Caltrain operations/service)</td>
<td>Phasing considerations? Intermediate conditions? Synergies?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Railyards Neighborhood Study Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY PRIORITIES</th>
<th>STUDY QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide open space, housing and other essential community benefits</td>
<td>What types of open spaces, housing and community services? Where? How much?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrate with and improve connections between neighborhoods</td>
<td>Which connections? Serving which transportation modes? How can this project complete the Public Realm network?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address resilience and sea-level rise at this site</td>
<td>How will resilience planning integrate with and benefit the surrounding neighborhood?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complement San Francisco’s skyline</td>
<td>What is the composition and scale of buildings, heights, roof lines?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility with the Downtown Extension and Pennsylvania Avenue Extension (and existing Caltrain operations/service)</td>
<td>Phasing considerations and constraints? Intermediate conditions? Synergies?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Active, accessible and meaningful public realm**

**Walkable, safe and pleasant connections**

**People-oriented and contextual places and urban form**
Public Realm
Open Space Network

Observations:

• Existing and planned open space concentrates mostly in Mission Bay
• Lack of open space within the study area, but key areas of open space adjacent to it
• Lack of clear connections to/from adjacent open spaces
Public Realm
Open Space Network

1. North side of King St. under-utilized space between industrial buildings
2. 5th St. main corridor disconnected by the railyards
3. 6th St. main corridor disconnected by the railyards
4. Programmed public open space under Hwy 280
Observations:

- Limited active ground floor frontage in the study area, except areas between 3rd and 4th St.
- Even Mission Bay development along King St has very limited active ground floor use.
- Potential to connect/strengthen isolated pockets of activity within the study area.
Public Realm
Housing

Observations:

• A lot of residential and residential mixed use land use within the study area
• Limited non-residential uses in the study area
• What is the appropriate land use mix for the study area?
Connections
Road Network

Observations:

-Disconnected roads caused by current railyards and Hwy 280
-Confusing intersections at King and 5th, Mission Bay Blvd and 7th
Connections
Pedestrian Network

Observations:

• Disconnected pedestrian path caused by the railyards and Hwy 280
• Disconnected pedestrian path at Mission Creek
• Poor sidewalk conditions along Townsend St, 7th St and 6th St
• Lack of midblock crossing between Bluxome and Townsend St

Scale: 1 inch = 500 feet

Poor Ped. Condition
No Ped. Crossing/ Connection
Long Block with no Midblock Crossing

Semin. walking radius

Mission Creek

3rd St Corridor
Connections
Pedestrian & Bike Network

1. N side of Townsend raised sidewalk
2. Pedestrian connection along 6th St between Bluxome and Brannan
3. S side of Townsend sidewalk shared with bike lane
4. Narrow sidewalk along 6th St between Townsend and Bluxome
Existing Conditions

5th St: Major public open space & gateway towers

4th St: Urban corridor supported by Caltrain 4th St station

7th St: Lower context buildings

5th St: Major public open space & gateway towers

I-280: Runs over the site, ramps land on King St

I-280: Runs over the site, ramps land on King St
Planned Activities

- Opportunity sites between Bluxome & Townsend
- Bluxome St linear park and midblock connections
- Completed Mission Bay open space network
- 5th St: Green connector across Mission Creek for cyclists & pedestrians
+ Potential Area Opportunities

- Programmed open space underneath 280 & along 7th St, allowing pedestrian connection across 280
- Midblock connections & active edge along Townsend
- Density opportunity sites along Townsend
- 7th St: South Gateway
- 6th St: Connect Central SOMA and Mission Bay
- 5th St: Potential gateway & public realm connection
- 4th St: Landmark Tower & Transit Plaza
- Road and open space connections
- 3rd St.
Potential Site Opportunities

Open Space Opportunities:
• Linear open space connections to Mission Creek across the railyards (5th & 6th St)
• Public parks/plazas within the study area, and connections between them
• Programmed open space under Hwy280, and along 7th St
• Open space with recreational programs

Connection Opportunities:
• New King St, Berry St, 6th St connections
• 5th St connection?
• New bike path along 5th St, Mission Creek N bank, and Mission Bay Blvd
• Pedestrian connections along Hooper, Irwin, Hubbell, and Daggett

Active Ground Floor Opportunities:
• Both sides along Townsend, north sides of King
• Both sides along 4th and 5th St

Landmark Tower Opportunities:
• Along 4th and 5th St
Open Discussion

• Would the group be interested in joining a site tour to confirm mapping?

• *Are these the right topics that can help inform a comprehensive neighborhood plan?*

• *What is missing? What has changed on the ground?*

• *What else is working well or not working well in the neighborhood?*

• *Are there any cases or benchmarks from which to draw lessons learned to be applied here?*
Next Steps

(All)
Next Steps

• Planning Department to coordinate Site Tour for RWG members
• RWG Coordinators support.
• RWG should review the Community Brief and Context Dashboard
  • Documents will be posted to the collaboration space
  • Please review and Comment
• Q4 RWG Meeting scheduled for Tuesday, December 19th 2023
Case Study: Takanawa Gateway  
(Planning Department)
Takanawa Gateway City, Tokyo
Takanawa Gateway
- ~32 Acres
- ~5,000 ft long
- Adjacent to railyard

SF Railyards
- ~20 Acres
- ~3,000 ft long
- Co-located with Railyard
Considerations

- Density of development
- Hyper-diverse program and vertical mixed-use
- Layered circulation in a long narrow site
- Interconnected public realm
East and west-facing tower facades should be subdivided into at least two or more vertical expressions to break down the building scale and enhance visual interest.

The massing and composition of buildings should include a major orientation towards the corners of each block.

The Promenade plays an important role in the integration of programs, activities, and uses.

The shaping of the tower skylines should reflect the dynamic movement of the Master Plan and create a dialogue between buildings.

The Promenade is the organising framework of the plan, creating a diversity of public realm spaces.

Billard Chilton strives to create built environments that fully satisfy our clients’ ambitions while exceeding the expectations of those who will live, visit and work in and around our projects. Each project tries to create within the greater urban context community-oriented public spaces that are human-scaled and teem with new vitality. We believe that buildings are not static and that they exist in dynamic environments inhabited by people.

To create a continuous green network within master plan of the Kiyosumi Archipelago, buildings should embody a strategy for landscape integration within podium design that is apparent from a distant view.

One of the lessons of building such projects is that the innovative ideas that emerge from the community can often give a building a flexible or defining feature that makes it both respond to and influence development -- resulting in a project that truly belongs to its community and city.
The major contents of lower composition are oriented toward Eikachi Square and reflects the flow of the Promenade below to the site façade, visible from a distance.

The podium design of Block 4, with ‘green interface’ terraces on the northeast and southeast corners of the site, is providing rooftop outdoor space for users, connected with nature, and a counterpoint to the vertical expression of the prominent tower mass.

Sweeping beneath the volumes of the New Station as well as the podium massing at the north and south ends of Block 4, the Promenade is the organizing framework connecting the Shinagawa Archipelago master plan concept.
Next Steps

• RWG Members:
  • Check access to Collaboration Space
  • Review and comment on Community Brief and Context Dashboard
  • 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 6:30pm
  • City Family Consultants complete Existing Conditions Analysis, being Public Realm

• Review materials and sign up for updates at sfplanning.org/railyards
Thank You

sfplanning.org/railyards