RAILYARDS WORKING GROUP — MEETING NOTES

MEETING DATE: June 20, 2023

Staff Contact: Jeremy Shaw – 628.652.7449
jeremy.shaw@sfgov.org

RWG Members (Present / Absent / Vacant):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Agid</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelica Arhor</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff Bargar</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Cecil</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy Chan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desi Danganan</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.R. Eppler</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanessa Gonzalez</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Jaques</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Kirby</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Martin</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Paik</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Perla</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krute Singa</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Walker</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Waltemade</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFTR Representative</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayview Representative</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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; DJ Baxter, Kimley Horn

Prologis
Banke Abioye, Entitlements & Community Engagement; Genevieve Cadwalader, VP Investment; Mark Hansen, Managing Director

Other

Public Attendees: Xavier Lema

Agenda

1. Opening/ check-in (Allison, 5min)
2. Updates:
   - Community Feedback since last meeting (All, 10 min)
   - Growing the Project Team (Navi, Banke, Allison, 5 minutes)
3. Preliminary Business Case Update (Navi and DJ, 5 minutes)
4. Visioning at Scale (Peter, 15 minutes)
5. Neighborhood Urban Design (Hugo, 5 minutes)
6. Public Participation Plan and RWG support (Erika, 5 minutes)
7. Open Discussion and Next Steps (All, 10 minutes)
8. Close (All)

Community Feedback

Some of the themes we’re seeing arise through these Railyards Working Group (RWG) Meetings, and our ongoing community conversations include.

- Affordability and Vitality
  - General affordability
  - What type of housing can this project provide? Will there be affordable housing?
  - Which factors help ground floors and businesses thrive?
  - What are the services and facilities missing in nearby neighborhoods (Showplace, Western SoMa, Mission Bay)?
- Resilience, Sea Level Rise, Stormwater Management and Flooding
  - What are the existing risks and how can they be addressed/mitigated by this project?
  - What would it mean for the Railyards project to be resilient and sustainable?
- The Economic Context
  - Questions about Downtown Revitalization and the future demand
  - Questions about transit funding
- Community Input and the RWG Process
  - How can the RWG efforts be most effective and meaningful in terms of community input, when proposals are not currently available for review?
  - How should the RWG be organized?

Feedback from Railyards Working Group and from other Community Members since last RWG Meeting.

- DC: This summary hits on points that I have brought up earlier. I do not believe in the doom loop. Tenuous situation right now, hopes and dreams can strangle projects. How do we squeeze the most of this dirt while meeting needs of key stakeholders, feedback that results in a viable project vs having a project that is unviable or can’t be implemented?
- MW: concerned that I see multiple dirt lots around, if we are having trouble now, how viable is this project going forward? Worried we are not able to use the land today, what we will do with it in the future?
  - AA: Planning is countercyclical, still essential work for the long run
- BA: Lots of uncertainty about future feasibility and what the future looks like, makes it hard to have this conversation. We see other projects nearby that have not moved forward (i.e., tennis courts)
  - MH: Understand the cycles, here for the long run
- JR: Optimistic perspective. EN (neighborhood planning) was finalized in 2008, during real estate meltdown. And now look at that positive growth once economy righted itself.

Growing the Project Team

Intros by AA (SF Planning), BA (Prologis), and ND (Caltrain)—no comments.
Preliminary Business Case Update

Update from Caltrain—no comments.

Visioning at Scale

- PS: Once in a generation opportunity to do something, different than many of the open lots nearby, opportunity to knit together neighborhoods and have a long-term plan.
  - 3-block long barrier between neighborhoods
  - Infrastructure project can bridge divides and create whole new destination
  - Foster & Partners have worked on many projects around the world – none are exactly the same, but all have something to learn from (including Diridon in SJ).
  - 3 rail TOD examples have been transformative and present common themes
    - **Contextual** to its place in the world
    - **Transit** modes overlap, easy and seamless multimodal connections
    - Quality of interstitial spaces, unique and communities unto themselves
  - Kings Cross St Pancras, London
    - Circulation and different scales of development offer lessons
    - Former industrial lands
    - Not just one station. But a collection of destinations and access points for diverse transit: Eurostar + Regional rail + local modes and pedestrian circulation.
    - **Activation of the ground plane**, through creative design, creation of a collection of destinations that can be reached through diverse transit modes including biking, walking, bus.
    - Its more than a station – public spaces, finding opportunities for activities along circulation routes
  - Canary Wharf, East London
    - Different types of transit that create chances for new activities in between
    - Former docklands, industrial history
    - From late 1980s, transformed from disconnected area to one of the most connected parts of the City
    - Even though originally commercial, mixed use and residential have been layered in the intervening years
    - Park/Garden space right on top of rail
    - Again – not just singular station, but community connected through diverse transit and activities
    - Important to create a **variety of spaces and activities**
  - Stockholm Central Station
    - Current station is blocked from other neighborhoods
    - Plan would reconfigure station, add development above to fit in historic grid
    - Create permeable site that would restitch urban fabric together
    - 6.5 minute walk from end to end, perfect scale for new vision of site
    - Lessons
      - Good lines of sight to transit access points
• Working with the city’s historic fabric
• Smaller plazas to connect different public spaces, pedestrian friendly
• Views into station and to city beyond from new public spaces
• Active streets into and through the site
• DC: Good to see representative examples. Need to balance vision with feasibility and community benefits. Balancing vision/ economics/ community benefits/ operational Caltrain needs.

Neighborhood Urban Design
Introduction of efforts by Hugo Errazuriz.

Public Participation Plan and RWG Support
Introduction of role and public participation plan by Erika Uribe

Open Discussion
• Group consents to proposal to set up asynchronous workflow in between quarterly meetings.
• BA: Make sure when you ask for feedback that you knit everything together --- how does that connect to the existing plans around the site and other neighborhoods.
  ▪ We’ve had 11 years of conversations with Central SoMa, and another 11 years with Mission Rock, and 22 with Mission Bay; how does it all fit together?
  ▪ Include commercial corridors (i.e., Brannan St), Central SoMa Plan.
• Group requests digests of the executive summaries and existing plans of all previous efforts and other sources of community driven efforts (i.e., UCSF Long Range Development Plan).
• Group coordinators until next Quarterly meetings will be DC and KS. Coordinating efforts will include testing tools/ set up for asynchronous review and agenda-setting for next quarterly.

Additional Written Comments / Questions in Chat
• MW: Does that much office make sense going forward?
• CP: Check out Takanawa Gateway in Tokyo
• JR: Commercial that can flex with market?
• KS: To add, does the ground floor need to have retail? Can there be design requirements for the ground floor activation/visibility if the building does not have retail?
• PS: We believe the relevance is in the phased development over time and multiple modes of transit.

Announcements / Community News / Events
• N/A
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 Q3 Meeting is scheduled for September 19th from 5:30pm to 6:30pm
- Set up location to share Materials for RWG Feedback
- City Family Consultants to begin work.
- Get update from MTA on the Active Communities Plan

Next Meeting:
3rd Quarter 2023, September 19th from 5:30pm to 6:30pm

Attachments:
N/A