



## Waterfront Plan Working Group Land Use Subcommittee Meeting Meeting Notes: January 18, 2017

### Land Use Subcommittee Members Present:

Alice Rogers (Chair), Kirk Bennet, Jane Connors, Ellen Johnck, Ken Kelton, Stewart Morton, Jasper Rubin, Ron Miguel, Corinne Woods, Dee Dee Workman.

**Port Staff:** Diane Oshima, Kari Kilstrom, Carol Bach, David Beaupre, Rebecca Benassini, Anne Cook, Aaron Golbus, Norma Guzman, Ming Yeung

**Agency Staff:** Ben Botkin (ABAG) Andrea Gaffney (BCDC), Brad McCrea (BCDC)

**Absent:** Jon Golinger, Karen Pierce.

### Other Working Group and Advisory Team Members Present:

Bo Barnes, Open Space Advisory Team  
Chris Christensen, Working Group  
Max Lowenstein, Resilience Advisory Team  
Veronica Sanchez, Maritime Advisory Team

Nathan Nayman, Transportation Advisory Team  
Amy Patrick, Land Use Advisory Team  
Howard Wong, Urban Design Advisory Team

### 1. Introductions and Announcements

- The group discussed and considered endorsement of the [Draft Policy Guidance and Recommendations for Water Recreation, Maritime Berthing and Public Access](#)
- The group accepted the December 14, 2016 [Draft Meeting Notes](#) (final version [here](#))
- Link to the evening's [PowerPoint presentation with notes](#)
- [January 13, 2017 Port memo to Subcommittee](#)

### 2. Discussion and Endorsement of the [Draft Policy Guidance and Recommendations for Water Recreation, Maritime Berthing and Public Access](#)

Land Use Subcommittee Chair Alice Rogers led the Subcommittee members and meeting attendees through a review of the Draft Policy Guidance and Recommendations document to determine Subcommittee agreement and further comments. Since the Working Group is not a voting group, any endorsement of recommendations were determined by group consensus.

#### Water Recreation Recommendations

Item 1 focused on human powered water recreation, and the Subcommittee discussed how water recreation should be expanded to include small motorized boats and wind-powered craft (sailboats).

The discussion included comments about the need to increase water access from and to the Port waterfront, and to provide more transient berths for mariners to access restaurants and waterfront attractions. If available at no or low cost, such waterside access should be recognized as a public benefit. One proposed universal change to the Draft Recommendations was requested to add the word “Area” to “Bay Area Water Trail”.

Item 2 was accepted.

Item 3 was accepted, with two comments to recognize: water taxi landing sites are also a form of transient berthing; reference to guest docks should include Pier 38 and Mission Rock/China Basin among examples.

Item 4 was accepted, but with a comment to include “commercial” operators along community/non-profits as possible partners for promoting water recreation use.

Item 5 regarding the promotion of the understanding of maritime operations was deemed accepted.

Item 6 was accepted.

### **Maritime Berthing and Public Access Recommendations**

Item 1 accepted, but add:

- a) Acknowledge that Burton Act as well as Proposition H which recognize Port maritime mission;
- b) Highlight the significant value of northern waterfront pier aprons as a maritime resource, and portions of adjacent pier sheds as needed to support maritime storage and industrial work areas that often require use of pier aprons. The Waterfront Plan correctly predicted that cargo terminal uses in the northern waterfront would shift to the southern waterfront, but there is still a need to recognize demand for other maritime businesses and the importance of pier aprons for berthing of maritime vessels in northern waterfront.

Item 2 accepted, but add references to other deep water berths north of Piers 80-96, including the drydock at Pier 70.

Items 3-5 These three items generally concern harbor services operations, growing demand for ferry and excursions, and related berthing needs in for piers within the Embarcadero Historic district. Several comments were suggested to augment these recommendations:

- a) emphasize the value of the pier aprons (see Item 1, above)
- b) state clearly that maritime maintenance and work areas are incompatible with public access. In some areas, transportation security laws apply and worker id cards are required for access.
- c) Waterfront Plan amendments should describe the industrial functions associated with Harbor Services, Ferry and Excursion operations that are incompatible with public access due to operational, safety and security reasons. Comment suggesting the addition of the policy language for water taxis to this Item.

General comments pointed out that safety and operational conflicts between maritime operations and public access extend beyond berthing and pier apron use. Specifically, in the southern waterfront, conflicts arise with the close proximity of bike trails, pedestrian trails, and water recreation users, and the Port's Maritime Eco-industrial operations. Illinois Street, as both an industrial truck route and bike route, was cited as another example. This conflict issue should be presented to the full Working Group to solicit crossover comments and recommendations, particularly Transportation Subcommittee members, to discuss what is realistically compatible and what is not.

BCDC staff members present acknowledged the need to collaborate to address conflict areas and compatibility with public access requirements. There was a suggestion to not refer to specific sites, but rather list specific uses.

Item 6 accepted, with a suggestion that shared public access should only occur if it's economic feasible for the Port or tenant to fund public access improvements and maintenance.

Item 7 accepted, and emphasized that trade-offs need to be considered to determine what improvements are funded.

Item 8 accepted, with strong support for positive value of views to maritime activity and operations, as well as vessels at berth; these maritime activities are authentic waterfront functions. Where public access within the maritime area is not compatible, nearby public access should be sought to view the operations, and could be improved with amenities such as benches, lighting, and bike parking. BCDC staff present shared that BCDC's own "parallel" plan, the Special Area Plan, may undergo revision and that staff will collaborate with the Port and Working Group to address points of divergence with the Waterfront Plan.

Item 9 accepted, but change to "Port should work jointly with BCDC..." Also comment that Port and BCDC plans must be aligned, and the Special Area Plan may need to be updated along with the Waterfront Plan to emphasize the Port's maritime-industrial use of historic piers and aprons.

### **3. Presentation on the Land Use Consultant economic modeling by Rebecca Benassini**

In response to prior Working Group discussions, the Port is working with EPS (Economic & Planning Systems) economic and financial consultants to study the feasibility of a variety of land use and repair scenarios and investments under short-term, mid-term and long-term leases. The analysis will compare and contrast the feasibility of these land use scenarios on two types of bulkhead and pier facilities: one that is relatively good structural condition, and one that is in deteriorated condition. The Port has contracted with an engineering consultant to provide structural condition assessments to support the analysis. The purpose of this effort is to better understand the economic tradeoffs of different types of improvements, use combinations, and public benefits that can be achieved from piers in varying structural condition. Public benefits include public access, basic repair/maintenance, historic rehabilitation, and seismic-superstructure rehabilitation. The analysis will test a range of low- to high-revenue uses. Port also has asked the consultant team to assess whether it is physically feasible to adapt an historic pier shed for hotel use and meet

Secretary Standards. Port staff sought to include this task because hotels are a public trust use and can generate significant revenue, although Proposition H prohibits hotels on piers.

**Comments and Responses to questions:**

- Can you clarify what “levels of intensity” of pier improvement mean? The intensity of improvement refers to the need for seismic upgrades depending on the occupancy load of the assumed uses. The engineering portion of this study will address seismic needs.
- Can we put recreational uses in low intensity (lower cost) categories? Recreational uses are usually high-occupancy activities that trigger costly seismic improvements to pier sheds.
- How does this economic study and the Port’s Capital Plan coordinate with each other? Are they competing processes? The original Waterfront Plan did not have the benefit of the Capital Plan and the Strategic Plan. We now know understand the extent of Port capital needs, and this economic analysis and Waterfront Plan update process will help educate about the financial requirements and trade-off opportunities of different land use and public benefit choices. We can include aspirational goals in the Waterfront Plan, but with an understanding of the resources needed to achieve them.
- Can we mix and match use intensities in the economic model? Yes.
- Could the preservation of maritime uses be considered a public benefit? Maritime uses count towards the overall public trust consistency of a project.
- We are talking about historic piers, not seawall lots. Some information can be transplanted, but yes, this analysis is focused upon Embarcadero Historic District piers.
- Does the Port consider the total number of public members who might benefit from a project? Public benefits considered here are broad – include passageways through a historic pier. We can consider whether to take into account the scale of people expected to benefit from certain improvements.
- On one of your slides, are we assuming that the first two columns are interim uses? The important similarity in the first two columns is that the tenant program does not require seismic upgrades.
- At what point in these scenarios do we include sea level rise improvements? We can add an asterisk to the financial model to recognize additional costs such as sea level rise improvements.
- Is there an existing mixed-used site that has experienced feasibility challenges? Pier 38 is a key case study of this.
- Regarding level of improvements, suggestion to explain the study as a study that considers basic repairs and maintenance as public benefits which are uses that “unlock” additional revenue.

4. **Meeting adjourned.**

- The next Land Use Subcommittee meeting will take place on February 8<sup>th</sup> and will cover active use of Port Parks and Open Space.