

Waterfront Land Use Plan Update

Waterfront Working Group Subcommittee

Part 2 Policy Discussions

Meeting Notes

November 2, 2016 to February 8, 2017

Land Use

- **November 16, 2016** - Port-wide Land Use Context & Maritime Priority
Focus: Eco-Industrial Center
- **December 14, 2016** - Water Recreation, Maritime Berthing & Public Access
- **January 18, 2017** - Water Recreation, Maritime Berthing & Public Access;
EPS Economic Model; and Intro to Active Uses in Port Parks & Public Open
Spaces
- **February 8, 2017** - Active Uses in Port Parks & Public Open Spaces

Resilience

- **November 2, 2016** - Environmental Sustainability
- **November 30, 2016** - Emergency Preparedness & Disaster Recovery and
Collaborations Required for Successful Resilience Planning
- **February 1, 2017** - Policy Ideas and Guidance for Environmental
Sustainability

Transportation

- **November 9, 2016** - Goods Movement & Water Transportation
- **December 7, 2016** - Land Transit, Pedestrian and Bike Access
- **January 25, 2017** - Parking and Transportation Demand Management





Waterfront Plan Working Group
Land Use Subcommittee Meeting
Meeting Notes: November 16, 2016

Land Use Subcommittee Members Present: Alice Rogers (chair); Kirk Bennett; Jane Connors; Jon Golinger; Ellen Johnck; Ken Kelton; Stewart Morton, Corinne Woods

Absent: Ron Miguel; Karen Pierce; Jasper Rubin; Dee Dee Workman

Working Group & Advisory Team Present:

Chris Christensen, Working Group
Patricia Fonseca, Urban Design Advisory Team
Andrea Gaffney, BCDC
Stan Hayes, Land Use Advisory Team
Adam Mayer, Urban Design Advisory Team
Don Neuwirth, Open Space Advisory Team
Amy Patrick, Land Use Advisory Team

Port Staff: Diane Oshima; Kari Kilstrom; David Beaupre; Brad Benson; Anne Cook; Aaron Golbus; Norma Guzman; Byron Rhett; Rebecca Benassini

1. Introductions

2. Meeting Plan Overview

Alice Rogers, Land Use Subcommittee Chair

Staff support - Alice has suggested that Port staff will produce and share materials, draft criteria and policy questions for the next two meetings to guide Land Use Subcommittee discussions.

Financial feasibility model - The Port will hire an economic consultant to provide financial feasibility model to support leasing and development discussions and policy questions in the Land Use Subcommittee meetings. The Port also will hire an engineering consultant to provide cost estimates for pier repair and seismic upgrade, to be included in the financial model. Port hopes to see the first financial model analysis by the end of February, to address in Land Use Subcommittee meetings on leasing and development.

Review of Land Use Subcommittee Meeting Plan topics - Proposed dates and topics are subject to change; if the subcommittee does not conclude discussion of agenda topics in one meeting, additional meeting time will be scheduled and will affect timing of subsequent land use topics.

January 11, 2017 – Public Open Space topic will include relevant agencies from the City and BCDC, and discussion of activation of Port parks and public access areas, special event ideas and good neighbor policies

February 2017 – At a date yet to be determined in February, there will be a joint meeting of all three subcommittees to provide guidance about uses, functions and urban and historic design qualities that are publicly valued, to inform new goals and policies for the Waterfront Plan Update to guide future efforts to make the waterfront resilient, such as the Seawall Resilience project.

Subsequent meetings – Additional meeting dates to address leasing and development, and public review processes have not been set yet; the Subcommittee will take time necessary to discuss the topics, and adjust Meeting Plan accordingly.

Questions and comments

Consultant study

- While difficult to quantify, consider intangible community benefits such as historic preservation in the cost-benefit analyses, other “values” that make a project succeed.
- Staff should compare the return on investment of past projects such as the Ferry Building and Pier 39 improvements that have 10-20 years of experience with true operating costs and revenues, to compare anticipated revenues with actual rent performance. Also look at projects that have not gone forward, and why.
- Can model incorporate a ‘fudge factor’ that reflects the frequent differential between early-estimates of financial feasibility and the true residual-land-values that reflect actual engineering site work and cost estimates?

Open Space Meeting Plan

- The Port should invite active recreation specialists and approach City agencies and the State Lands Commission to clarify the demand and viability of active recreation on Port land, which is not considered a trust-consistent use. Discuss what is meant by active recreation. Consider regional models, Chelsea piers, etc
- The Port should engage with City agencies to determine whether City is relying upon Port to fulfill community recreation needs, particularly re Dogpatch Public Realm Plan
- Swimming facilities are trust consistent uses and if the Port thinks creatively, swimming facilities may have strong regional pull

Maritime Meeting Plan

- Cannot assume that the rest of Southern Waterfront will remain industrial, also sea level rise concerns. South of Pier 48 needs to be on this list.
- Speaking to Pier 50-Pier 70 area, what will surround new ferry terminal

Public review process’

- The public review process discussion should precede address of Port leasing and long-term development. Staff agreed that sequence of topics is subject to further refinement

and more specific draft meeting agendas will be developed for Subcommittee consideration.

3. [Map of Public Trust Uses and Improvements](#)

Diane Oshima presented an overview of the Port's work to improve properties for a variety of public trust uses and purposes by category: maritime; public open space; long-term development and leases. The Port has over 500 leases, many of which are leased for short interim lease terms until there is an opportunity for long-term improvements. Of the remaining piers to be improved, some may not be financially feasible due to physical, environmental or economic challenges.

Questions/Comments

- The Maritime Commerce Advisory Committee has reviewed bathymetry maps that indicate water depths. Plan maps could include dredge depths to assist with the development of policies for maritime berthing.
- Co-location, where two uses complement and enhance each other's operations, appears to be a strong pattern along waterfront, eg Pier 80-96 Maritime Eco-industrial Center, Pier 27 cruise industry and ship-repair combination. Plan should identify and support these important use-relationships.

4. [Overview of the Pier 80-96 Maritime Eco-Industrial Strategy](#)

The Piers 80-96 area is a dynamic maritime and industrial complex that incorporates Blue Greenway, and environmental habitat and sustainability. Cargo shipping is a difficult to manage, given the city's shrinking industrial land base, density of other surrounding land uses, and environmental and neighborhood needs. The Eco-Industrial Strategy addresses these needs efficiently, by co-locating maritime and industrial uses that provide source materials close to customers and reducing industrial truck traffic; enable waste products from one operator to be used as source material for other businesses; and support maritime shipping and businesses. Uses include: automobile cargo shipping at Pier 80, bulk construction material cargo shipping at Pier 94, and construction materials businesses such as concrete-batch plants; freight rail yard to serve cargo shipping and City disaster response needs; Bay sand mining operations. The Eco-industrial area includes open "laydown" space for construction and equipment businesses. The Port has worked for many years with Port maritime and industrial tenants, the Southern Waterfront Advisory Committee and Bayview Hunters Point community to improve business and environmental conditions, and generate union and local jobs, as well as advancing Blue Greenway open space, water recreation, and environmental habitat improvements. The Port intends to include amendments in the the Waterfront Plan Update to incorporate the Pier 80-96 Maritime Eco-industrial Strategy.

Questions/Comments

- A maritime freight plan called to improve freight corridors to maximize goods movements. What improvements are needed to maximize freight capacity? Response:

Port freight rail trains are coordinated with the schedule of Caltrain peninsula commuter trains.

- Acknowledge years of preparation of the Eco-Industrial strategy and improvements by the SWAC and Karen Pierce, SWAC chair; this strategy should be included in the Waterfront Plan update.
- Flexibility seems key. Maritime industry is important, it is part of economic history of the Port and City. Allow uses under this strategy to continue to evolve as needed, to maintain a strong industrial waterfront.

Endorsement

The Land Use Subcommittee unanimously endorsed the Pier 80-96 Maritime Eco-industrial Strategy and support for including in the Waterfront Plan Update.



Waterfront Plan Working Group Land Use Subcommittee Meeting Meeting Notes: December 14, 2016

Land Use Subcommittee Members Present:

Alice Rogers (Chair), Kirk Bennet, Jane Connors, Ellen Johnck, Ken Kelton, Stewart Morten, Karen Pierce, Jasper Rubin, Corinne Woods, Dee Workman

Carolyn Horgan, Working Group
Amy Patrick, Land Use Advisory Team
Cristina Rubke, Working Group
Veronica Sanchez, Maritime Advisory Team
John Tobias, Working Group
Howard Wong, Urban Design Advisory Team

Absent: Ron Miguel

Other Working Group and Advisory Team

Members Present:

Bo Barnes, Open Space Advisory Team
Chris Christensen, Working Group
Jeffrey Congdon, Working Group
Stan Hayes, Land Use Advisory Team

Port Staff: Diane Oshima, Kari Kilstrom, Aaron Golbus, Carol Bach, Anne Cook, Norma Guzman, James Hurley, Michael Nerney, Shannon Alford, Byron Rhett

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

1. Introductions and Announcements

- Port staff has proposed changes to some meeting dates in 2017. The January 11th Land Use Subcommittee meeting has been proposed to be held on January 18th. All present Land Use Subcommittee members, except Corinne Woods, indicated they could attend on January 18th. Staff will confirm this meeting date later in December, after determining that other meeting date changes are acceptable for the Working Group and other subcommittees. Please stay tuned for [schedule change](#) announcements
- Tonight's agenda will cover [Water Recreation](#) and [Maritime Berthing and Public Access](#)
- The group accepted the [November 16, 2016 Meeting Notes](#) and requested to add Stewart Morton to the list of attendees present
- Link to tonight's [PowerPoint presentation with notes](#) and background materials:
 - [Part 1 Maritime Industries Report](#)
 - [Part 1 Bay Water Trail Information](#)
 - [Port Commission Maritime Preservation Policy](#)
 - [BCDC Waterfront Special Area Plan](#)

2. [Water Recreation](#)

Kari Kilstrom presented an overview of the Port's work in creating a Port-wide open space network and, as part of the Blue Greenway open spaces south of China Basin, a Bay Water Trail system for

San Francisco's waterfront. The Port partnered with City agencies, as well as BCDC and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and public stakeholders to create the [Blue Greenway Planning and Design Guidelines](#). The Blue Greenway sets a plan for open spaces and recreational Bay access that is compatible with industrial and maritime terminal facilities. Since adoption of the original Waterfront Plan, ABAG, BCDC, California Coastal Conservancy and community developed the Bay Water Trail plan for water recreation. Kilstrom described Port objectives to incorporate new policies and guidance regarding water recreation in the Waterfront Plan Update.

Questions/Comments

Safe access and public health

- The Port has worked with human-powered water recreation community for over 10 years to establish the Bay Water Trail. Measures to build awareness and safety between deep water vessels and small water recreational craft have been improved.
- There are more water recreation support needs, including public restrooms. This process should explain timelines for water recreation improvements.
- To improve public health and safety of public fishing, the Port should distribute public health information about Bay fish consumption, and notices prohibiting public fishing during sewage overflows following storms.

Water Access Locations

- Port should broaden the definition of "water recreation" to include small motorized recreation boats and wind-powered vessels, not just human-powered vessels.
- Water recreation provides a unique form of public access, to allow water-to-shore public access to restaurants and waterfront attractions, served by transient berthing docks. The Waterfront Plan promotes this.
- Expand the water access network to include regional access points.
- Pier 52 public boat launch in Mission Bay provides the only access for power boats in San Francisco. Pier 40 provides transient berthing for small boats; the Ramp is a good location for additional transient berths.
- Regarding "Objective 2 for Discussion" in the Water Recreation handout, the Port should amend the phrase, "coordinate meetings as appropriate with *all (rather than "new")* maritime operators", to best ensure safe travel in the Bay.
- Will the language in the "Objectives for Discussion" be the actual language used in the Waterfront Plan Update? Response: The "Objectives" were developed from discussions with ABAG and water recreation stakeholders to indicate substantive points to include in the Waterfront Plan, for feedback and public comments. Staff has not started drafting any specific amendments to the Waterfront Plan, and thus the Objectives do not necessarily reflect how these points would appear in the updated Waterfront Plan.

Public Access Benefits and Amenities

- What are “public access” benefits? Can they include access to land from the water? Response: The Port and BCDC work with applicants to look for ways in which “public access” improvements can be delivered with projects per the Waterfront Plan and to meet BCDC permit requirements. Generally, public access is provided from land to the shoreline, because it serves the most people. However, facilities for transient boats can provide public access from water to land, but are more costly. BCDC and ABAG have been leaders and support the Bay Water Trail, to create a regional network for water recreation.
- The Waterfront Plan policies seem to provide high-level guidance, rather than specific improvements. Can the policies be more specific? Discussion: The Waterfront Plan is like a general plan, to provide guidance and communicate public values and objectives without being prescriptive. While not defining details about specific improvements or timelines, Waterfront Plan policy language can be revised to provide more specific programmatic guidance, to describe big ideas, performance criteria and/or public review procedures to shape future improvements.
- We should assess the provision of amenities such as bathrooms, security, and utilities along the Bay Water Trail, especially with regards to transient berthing.
- Transient berths for overnight boaters need more security, such as provided at South Beach Harbor.
- In San Diego, transient access serves as a dual type of public access for boaters and non-boaters, which should be considered in San Francisco.
- We should compare the trade-offs of providing water recreation public benefits for human- or wind- powered versus small motorized vessels, including the associated costs.
- Not everyone can use kayaks; small motorized boats and sailboats serve water recreation public access needs too.
- Water recreation uses and facilities should be low-cost to maximize public benefit, and should serve people of all physical abilities.
- Consider partnerships with YMCA or other organizations that focus on youth recreation programs, and potential new funding sources for water recreation.

Capital Prioritization, Timelines and Funding

- The kayaking community would like to see a timeline or schedule of priorities for improvements. Efforts should focus on: improving personal safety in and around the Islais Creek area; meet with PASHA to discuss in-water safety; and address recurring car and storage area break-ins. Kayaks Unlimited recently turned down an ABAG grant to construct a new bathroom because of timing, even though the existing bathroom is not in good shape.
- Are timing and funding within the scope of the Working Group’s discussions? Response: The Working Group discussions should result in a sense of available resources and may identify some priorities, but not timing or funding for specific improvement projects.
- The Port requires outside funding regardless of what project it undertakes. We must search for outside funding sources and actively solicit partnerships, or else desired improvements will not come to fruition.

- How much does it cost to provide water access sites? Response: Pier 15 cost approximately \$640,000, not including permitting and engineering. The site does not have utilities and is only used to berth excursion and small boats. The Port hopes that berthing fees will cover maintenance costs. Pier 52 public boat launch had an original grant for \$300,000; the cost of the improvements cost about \$3 million.
- Sailboat berths should be close to amenities such as restaurants, fueling facilities and onsite security. Consider models such as The Ramp in the Southern Waterfront, with transient visiting guest docks.
- ABAG shares the kayak community's concerns about timelines and funding, and acknowledged that its grant program involves an intensive application and engagement process.
- Would also like to see non-human powered sites, but not marinas because they do not pay for themselves. We should plan for "complete sites" that have amenities, destinations and connections to attractions.
- Swimming is also a form of water recreation that is human powered. In the coming years as new projects develop in southeast San Francisco, swimming access should be considered as an option for providing water recreation. Environmental and water quality issues will need consideration.

Meeting Discussion Summary

- There is broad support for the draft Water Recreation Objectives provided by staff, which should be further refined to support:
 - 1) Broadening the definition of water-recreation access to include transient berthing for free or low-cost use by small motorized boats and swimming, as well as human- and wind-powered water recreation craft that serve people of all physical abilities
 - 2) Locating transient berths and facilities for water recreation in locations where people want to be along the waterfront.
 - 3) Waterfront Plan amendments that provide direction about desired water recreation improvements, amenities, financial requirements and process to determine priorities and implementation.
 - 4) Partnership and efforts to increase water recreation funding resources

3. [Maritime Berthing and Public Access](#)

Aaron Golbus and Kari Kilstrom presented a staff briefing and powerpoint presentation on the Port's maritime berthing facilities, needs and how they are managed with public access. Both the Waterfront Land Use Plan and the Maritime Preservation Policy advance the Port's commitment to the Port's 10 maritime industries and the wide array of associated berthing needs, siting, operational and financial requirements. In general, heavy industrial, deep water vessels are berthed south of China Basin and are not compatible with public access, which is provided separately along the Blue Greenway. North of AT&T Ballpark, a mix of harbor service, cruise ships, ferries, excursion boats and water-taxies generally co-exist well the urban mix of uses along The Embarcadero, and in the Embarcadero Historic District.

Public access and maritime berthing also can share pier aprons, but certain types of maritime operations and security requirements may preclude or require occasional closures of public access. The Port is experiencing growing demand for ferry and excursion boat berths, for passenger embarkation and overnight layover berthing. The Waterfront Plan Update seeks to provide more direction about how to support maritime berthing balanced with the need to preserve and improve the waterfront public access system. Port capital limitations do not support all pier apron and fendering needs. Staff provided questions to solicit insights about the relative public access value of maritime berthing, the acceptability of limiting public access to accommodate maritime berthing that is not compatible, and comments about how maritime berth facilities and public access can share space.

Kari and Aaron presented Piers 19-23 as a case study:

- Pier 23 north is dedicated for public access only, providing views of the Bay and cruise ships that call at Pier 27
- Pier 19 south is dedicated for public access but can support transient berthing for larger vessels that maintain public access along the apron
- The aprons along Pier 19 north and Pier 23 south require repair or replacement; portions of these aprons could support layover berthing without blocking views from The Embarcadero

Questions/comments

Public Access and Security

- Public access alongside shoreside power at the Pier 27 cruise terminal does not seem logical and may present safety problems. Discussion: Port and BCDC worked to provide shared maritime and public access along Pier 27 apron, and public access around the rest of Pier 27-29 perimeter. Shoreside power equipment includes tamper-resistant measures and warning signs. Few members of the public use that area because there are few attractions, with the exception of walkers and joggers.
- Shared maritime and public access is great when it works. Red & White Ferry passenger dock at Pier 43, adjacent to Pier 43 Promenade open space is a good example.
- Harbor services (bar pilots, tug & tow) and maritime maintenance facilities used for layover berthing, support and repairs are not safe for public access, creating anxiety for maritime operators. The Subcommittee should provide guidance regarding the co-location of maintenance facilities and public access, and conditions when public access is not compatible.
- In addition to views of the Bay, public views of the maritime vessels are desirable and reflect the working waterfront. Where physical public access is not feasible on-site, off-site views of maritime vessels and operations are desirable.
- The southern waterfront is a working industrial area with construction activities, a power plant, and other activities that may not be safe for general public access. Employees must be able to carry out their jobs safely without fearing that members of the public will trespass. As part of the Working Group's tour of the southern waterfront, we visited sites in industrial zones with

heavy equipment, trucks and materials that would not be safe for members of the public to enter.

- Fisherman's Wharf area has been historically accessible even though the public cannot board fishing boats. Perhaps the Port can use access signage or other tools to continue to allow some access in a safe way.

Additional berthing needs and capital requirements

- The Pier 43 Promenade project is a public access success that also enhances views and use of Pier 41 and 43 ferry operations.
 - Would like to prioritize which piers to reserve for maintenance and also acknowledge the value of shared public access.
 - Port has done a good job of serving maritime berthing and public access and balancing numerous regulatory requirements.
 - There are few berths available throughout the Bay Area and the Port is fortunate to have rare facilities that may be saved and brought back to life as working berths. There is an especially strong demand for excursion berthing.
 - The Maritime Preservation Policy should be incorporated into the Waterfront Plan Update.
 - The Maritime Preservation Policy focuses on berthing while this discussion considers twin public trust purposes – expanding public access and berthing sites.
 - For maritime tenants, providing public access comes with capital and permitting costs as well as operational costs associated with janitorial and security services. If maritime is a high priority then we need to address these high costs to private operators. Perhaps the Port can research funding opportunities or a general obligation bond to pay for improvements.
 - The staff case study of Piers 19-23 is good and is relevant to the ferry industry because certain fendering doesn't work for Blue and Gold's 19 vessels. The facilities at the Downtown Ferry Terminal suit our vessel needs and the location is a well-known destination.
 - If the Port can't repair the aprons, it loses opportunities for maritime berthing, public access, and required fire exit capability to support pier leases. Response: Staff will support Subcommittee discussions with a consultant economic model to study financial feasibility of various land uses and ability to finance capital improvements and pier repairs.
4. The Working Group agreed to continue the discussion of maritime berthing and public access at a future meeting and the meeting was adjourned.



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 8th and will cover active use of Port Parks and Open Space.



Waterfront Plan Working Group
Land Use Subcommittee Meeting
Meeting Notes: February 8, 2017

Land Use Subcommittee Members Present: Alice Rogers (chair), Kirk Bennett, Jane Connors, Jon Golinger, Ellen Johnck, Ken Kelton, Ron Miguel, Stewart Morten, Jasper Rubin, Corinne Woods

Not Present: Karen Pierce, DeeDee Workman

Other Working Group and Advisory Team Members Present: Beau Barnes, Larry Beard, Patricia Fonseca, Melissa Litwicki, Ellen Lou, Adam Mayer, Amy Patrick, Veronica Sanchez, Howard Wong

Port Staff: Diane Oshima, Kari Kilstrom, Aaron Golbus, David Beaupre, Brad Benson, Anne Cook, Norma Guzman, Byron Rhett, Ricky Tijani, Ming Yeung

Agency Staff:

Jennifer Lucchesi, State Lands Commission
Reid Boggiano, State Lands Commission
Jamie Garrett, State Lands Commission
Ben Botkin, ABAG

1. Introduction – Meeting Notes

- Working Group chair, Alice Rogers, and other member introductions
- The Subcommittee accepted the [Draft Meeting Notes](#) (final version [here](#)) from the January 18, 2017 Land Use Subcommittee meeting with some change suggestions –
 - Page 3: regarding feasibility of hotel use in historic pier shed, notes should clarify that hotel use in pier is currently not permitted per Proposition H

2. Revised Water Recreation, Maritime Berthing and Public Access Recommendations

- The Subcommittee reviewed the [revised recommendations](#) (red-lined version [here](#)) and discussed whether the bullet under Maritime Berthing Item 3 should be revised to reflect that maritime maintenance and work areas may be compatible with public access in some instances. Discussion between Subcommittee and Advisory Team members included comments that Port should avoid adding operational or cost burdens to maritime tenants through public access requirements when these create safety or operational problems.
- Maritime and public access are both important trust uses. The Land Use Subcommittee may identify and recommend new public access opportunities, but also should be clear in

identifying limited situations where public access is not compatible with certain types of maritime activities.

- Maritime berthing and operations are authentic to the waterfront and Port history and are interesting to look at, even if physical public access may not be provided under certain conditions.
- The Subcommittee accepted the revised Policy Guidance and Recommendations for Water Recreation, Maritime Berthing and Public Access Water Access Guidance Policies ([February 3, 2017 redlined version](#)), without further revisions.

3. [Activation Uses in Port Outdoor Parks and Open Spaces](#)

- [Diane Oshima](#) provided an introduction, describing that the passive park design of Port open spaces reflects public trust principles to promote access and enjoyment by a full range of users, including residents of the Bay Area and California as well as San Francisco. Port parks are not equipped or programmed like City parks with designs for specific activation. The Port has been receiving inquiries about exercise, playgrounds and active uses in parks, and thus scheduled this topic to hear from the public about desires and ideas for waterfront open spaces. Expanded park and open space uses were also mentioned during Part One of the planning process. Port staff met with the Urban Design, Land Use /Neighborhood Planning, and Open Space/Recreation Advisory Teams prior to invite their comments and participation in this discussion. In recognition of the Port's public trust responsibilities, Port staff also reached out to BCDC and State Lands Commission staff on this subject and welcomed Jennifer Lucchesi, Reid Boggiano and Jamie Garrett from the State Lands Commission at the meeting.
- [Jennifer Lucchesi](#), the Executive Officer of the State Lands Commission, provided an overview about the public trust doctrine, an evolving body of law, where the application of trust principles focus on "what are the needs of the public?", now and in the future. San Francisco waterfront improvements realize public trust objectives and have successfully integrated the Port waterfront with the City. Development and open space projects are designed to attract and provide public enjoyment for locals, Bay Area and California residents and visitors from around the world. There is no static set of requirements for determining what is trust-consistent vs. what isn't. The context matters, where location, setting, proximity to the water and upland neighborhoods, and design all play a role ultimately in determining whether improvements are beneficial to the trust. She and her staff welcome the public discussions and engagement with the Working Group to hear about stakeholder values, needs and open space ideas; this input and exchange will inform the evolution of the public trust.
- [Kari Kilstrom](#) presented images and observations regarding four different Port parks and open spaces ranging in size and activity levels to stimulate public discussion: Pier 27 Cruise Terminal; Rincon Park; Brannan Street Wharf; and the planned Crane Cove Park. The Port's 7.5 miles have over 100 acres of public access area with substantial

improvements planned, including the Blue Greenway, which the Land Use Sub-committee has endorsed for inclusion in the Waterfront Plan update. Kari's presentation included comments from Advisory Team members, including the suggestion of a user-survey of existing park users to assess who, how, when and why parks are used.

Subcommittee and public discussion focused on active use ideas for Port parks that might attract more people of all ages with a broader range of outdoor interests, while also preserving the values of quiet, passive areas that are not heavily utilized. How should the Waterfront Plan update address the concept of open space utilization, including active uses?

Questions and Answers

- Can we clarify State Lands' interpretation of the public trust doctrine for outdoor recreational uses? The public trust evolves and is not black and white. Many factors are considered, including location, setting, design, proximity to the water and adjacent land uses. The context of each project matters. State Lands and State Attorney General often rely on case law to review projects for trust consistency. In *Mallech vs. City of Long Beach*, the court determined that surplus revenues generated from use of filled public trust lands should not have been spent on construction of public library and non-trust municipal uses. That decision provided a frame for applying trust principles to active recreation uses in parks. Filled public trust property (such as San Francisco's) is unique and should not be used for municipal recreational and sports programs and facilities.
- However, the context and setting of park amenities affect whether park uses and amenities are appropriate. For example, playgrounds do provide a fun way for children to enjoy the waterfront that can be consistent with trust principles if it designed to enhance the waterfront and not appear to be dedicated to local users or private residential development. The Oakland "Oak to 9th" mixed use project on trust lands underwent design modification to reposition a playground away from the residential buildings so that it was clearly open and inviting for non-resident use.
- How do we differentiate between a children's playground, to help them experience the waterfront, and a basketball court that appeals to 15-16 year olds? It is important to explore the needs of a full range of age groups and generations, and to develop amenities that serve a broad population. State Lands encourages these public discussions to learn what are the needs and values of public, and how they can be accommodated now and in the future.
- Are there ideas from Southern California that could be applied in San Francisco? San Francisco has been a progressive and creative trustee, and provided successful examples of trust improvements and open spaces that further public enjoyment of the waterfront. The Ports of Los Angeles and San Diego also have had some struggles creating active public open spaces.

Comments and Suggestions

- Port waterfront is a regional asset but can be “kind of boring” for regional visitors. The City is growing and also would benefit from broader variety of active uses to serve people of different ages.
- Seems there are opportunities to create great open spaces, inclusive of all age groups. Examples: 1) Skateboards are a creative uses of space and Pier 7 used to be a destination for skateboarders from all over the region; it was the only active outdoor use at the time until Port drove it off because of public safety; 2) volleyball courts on public beaches – they attract the public to use and enjoy the trust lands; 3) Balladium in Alameda attracts regional users.
- Because adjacent neighborhoods are former industrial areas, they tend to be deficient in parks. The City’s Eastern Neighborhoods are counting on the Port for parks and open space because there are no resources to acquire parkland away from waterfront. Local residents do not understand that the Port balances statewide public trust requirements and cannot focus mainly on local open space needs. In cases where trust lands are programmed or used to meet municipal park and recreational needs, this would not be consistent with the public trust doctrine. A use that serves local residents may also serve the regional public (e.g. a playground). In general, the entire Port waterfront does not feel especially ‘owned’ by the adjacent neighborhoods; a case could be made that all of the open space improvements serve regional visitors, too.
- Port open space planning efforts, such as for the Blue Greenway, were oriented to opening up the waterfront for the general public, but was not driven by City park needs.
- Some events on waterfront open spaces have successfully served locals, statewide residents and multiple generations: SF Symphony, America’s Cup, and Super Bowl events. The most successful was America’s Cup at Pier 27. Even when there were no races, people visited and gathered in the temporary open space. It was lively and benefited by adjacent food and retail concessions.
- Large special events can spin-off smaller, satellite events that could be staged in waterfront parks.
- Younger generations socialize differently, eg, Pokemon mobile phone game spurred many younger people to explore outdoors. Because we are in a tech hub, consider coordination with tech-companies for ideas about what’s next for youth use of outdoor space.
- Support active programs, such as kayaking organizations that draw many people of all ages to utilize the Bay and activate the shoreline open space areas.

- Brannan Street Wharf is increasingly inhospitable to a broad range of users due to off-leash dog use and a growing number of homeless users. Some light programming could make more people feel safe and comfortable, and broaden the user-profile.
- Consider how to better utilize open space areas on seawall lots, such as Francisco Bay office park, and proposed park in the hotel/Teatro Zinzanni project.
- It would be ideal if Pier 30-32 could be used for a region-serving open space for water recreation, swimming facilities, marina or visitor guest berths. It's a 10-acre non-historic pier in a unique and dramatic location near Bay Bridge, although acknowledged that the repair and improvement costs are very high.
- Policies should include strong encouragement for connecting kids to nature, in-line with nationwide efforts.
- Port should engage sensitive landscape design to address need for multigenerational uses and activities. Balance the needs of adults and children, youth and seniors; and all genders;.
- Incorporate features that are unique to the Bayfront location (eg a historic ship playstructure) and allow for creative, spontaneous interaction. In Vancouver/Toronto: Art sculptures are a form of activity, as climbing structure, and a focal "draw" to the space (also Rincon Park "Cupid's Span). Something could be added to, say, Cruise Terminal Park that is uniquely San Francisco.
- Keep swimming/water recreation in mind, even a large pool or aquatic center that would be healthy for all people of all ages and a senior center for senior users.
- Consider how major sports events (ballpark, Warriors) shape the ecology of adjacent neighborhoods on game-days and the use of the Port open space areas. Mission Bay Bayfront Park planning considered the impact of events at the Chase Center, and the design was modified to support views towards the water as well as towards the arena. There are features that anticipate visitors and our changing environment, such as plaza and wide sidewalks. Fans need to be managed; re-examine Good Neighbor policies.
- Design should not be all about use-program, or about how many things you can fit into a site. Rather, think about designing landscapes that tell a particular story. Focus the design on other things that make spaces special.
- Port network of open space areas is highly successful in many ways; draw lessons from the design details that are working (frequency of access areas; small-space improvements; views of ships at dock, waves hitting piers, etc.)
- The removal of the Embarcadero Freeway helped to restore the City's connection to the waterfront but The Embarcadero - one of City's largest open space areas - is primarily a highway. Redesign to de-emphasize the car and create defensible space for people, and increase connectivity across the road. Ideas: berming, landscape, depress the road-bed, so the public promenade is a separate, intimate space more dedicated to people and less to vehicles.

- It seems that the public trust would benefit from ‘programming’ to enliven and activate Port open space. Encourage pilot programs to experiment offering recreational equipment for pick-up games like volleyball or badminton. This would require opportunities for concession businesses, which should be considered to help activate Port parks.
- Partnerships are critical to help provide park stewardship because the Port does not sufficient resources. Concession businesses can rent equipment and/or provide “eyes” on the park, manage restrooms and help to keep the area secure.
- Park program needs are affected by where they are located along the waterfront. It would be useful to solicit comments from Port Citizen Advisory Committees for parks in their area of focus to include in this review.
- Yes, this is start of a conversation for direction and guidance about active uses in Port parks, to help guide updates to Waterfront Plan open space policy and build on ideas to guide future park improvements. Port CACs could discuss what might work, or not work, for their specific area of the waterfront. Each area has unique needs/potential; bring back suggestions to the Working Group.

4. Meeting conclusion

Note these meeting date changes:

- ✓ February 15 meeting cancelled.
- ✓ February 22nd will be set up as a full Working Group meeting and Subcommittee reports and recommendations to date
- ✓ March 1 Working Group as a public workshop oriented to Designing for Resilience.
- ✓ Subcommittee meetings will continue after March 1st meeting and towards end of April. Port staff is working on determining dates for each Subcommittee which will be set in the near future.

Special “thank you” to Jennifer Lucchesi and State Lands staff, for attending the meeting.



**Waterfront Plan Update
Resilience Subcommittee**
November 2, 2016 Meeting Notes

Subcommittee Members Present: Mike Buhler, Pia Hinkle, Aaron Hyland, Earl James, Peter Summerville, John Tobias, and Dilip Trivedi. **Absent:** Grant Ballard, Jacquelyn Omotalade

Other Working Group Members Present: Ellen Johnck, Linda Fadeke-Richardson, Alice Rogers

Advisory Team Members Present: Max Lowenstein, Justin Semion, Keith Primdahl

Port Staff: Diane Oshima, Carol Bach, Anne Cook, David Beaupre, Kirsten Southy, Rich Berman

Agency Staff: Diana Sokolove (SF Planning), Tim Doherty (SFMTA), Maggie Wenger (SF Planning), Mark Palmer (SF Environment)

1. Welcome & Meeting Goals:

- Chair Dilip Trivedi welcomed attendees, introductions were made, and meeting goals were discussed.

2. Discussion of Resilience Subcommittee [Draft Meeting Plan](#)

- Anne Cook provided an overview of the Draft Meeting Plan, including Guiding Principles that relate to topics that will be discussed in Resilience Subcommittee Meetings. The Meeting Plan is a living document, subject to change as the work of the Subcommittee proceeds.
- Port staff recommends a new Waterfront Plan goal and policies to reflect, elevate and improve on environmental sustainability work underway at the Port. This topic (environmental sustainability) will be the focus of tonight's meeting.
- The discussion will be informed by Carol Bach's presentation of current environmental programs and policies at the Port, which also are the subject of a background report provided for the meeting. (see below)
- The Subcommittee is invited to comment and recommend new policies or content, or staff can develop proposed policy language for further review by the Subcommittee. (The Committee both provided some early input at the meeting and asked Staff to bring back draft policy language for Subcommittee consideration at a future meeting.)

- Subsequent meetings (November 30, 2016 and January 18, 2017), will focus on a new resiliency goal and policies.
- For the 4th meeting, staff currently is considering a joint meeting with the Land Use Subcommittee to address waterfront urban design and historic resource issues that should guide the development of new resilience policies and updated land use policies. Staff is contemplating holding this joint meeting in February 2017.

Responses to Questions:

- What happens if the Subcommittee cannot get through all the topics suggested for each meeting? More meetings can be added. Committee Chair Dilip Trivedi further explained that the Subcommittee will not be required to draft specific Plan language. Rather, Staff will develop draft language based on comments and guidance received during Subcommittee meetings, and bring it back for Subcommittee comment.
- Will there only be 1 policy each for sustainability and resilience? No, consistent with the current WP goal structure, staff is envisioning a goal for sustainability, followed by several policies that address that goal, and then the same for resilience (i.e. a goal for resilience, followed by multiple policies)
- Will the Subcommittee propose specific solutions to specific resilience challenges like, for example, the seawall? Although there may be exceptions, for the most part the Subcommittee will focus on defining the public values, design criteria and/or other high-level policy guidance about priorities that should be considered for resilience projects.
- How will financial issues be addressed? The Working Group Co-chairs have directed that Subcommittees address the financial implications of their recommendations, which will be further considered when the full Working Group reconvenes to look at all financial issues collectively. [The Port Budget and Finance Overview Report](#) prepared for Part 1 of the Waterfront Plan Update process was developed to help support these discussions.
- How can Waterfront Plan goals and policies be more aspirational? There are many sustainability topics not yet addressed or given adequate attention in the Waterfront Plan. Staff will suggest proposed language to address these shortcomings, while also looking closely at where we think we can push beyond existing City and Port best practices.
- How can we avoid “siloeing” of issues? Creative and aspirational proposals likely will reflect and integrate multiple perspectives and policy objectives (e.g. environmental enhancements can be part of “gray” (hardscape) resilience projects like the Seawall).
- How does the Port communicate sustainability values to Port tenants? We will address this in a future meeting.

Additional Comments and Discussion:

- The Netherlands and other cities around the world are addressing resilience in different ways. Resilience plans vary in how they address the many interconnections between resilience, equity, environmental sustainability, and other waterfront enhancements.

- Waterfront Plan recommendations should address roles, participation/collaboration, and funding to support seawall improvements. Recommendations also can include new financial resource ideas to support new plan policies or desired improvements.
- Environmental sustainability also can be viewed in the context of cultural landscapes, which embrace historic resources and other design elements, built and natural, that are valued features of the waterfront.
- The Plan should define characteristics, features, and a new overarching vision for an improved future waterfront in light of sea level rise.
- We should also think about specific improvements that could be “ready to go” when resources are available through governmental agencies and grant programs.
- The Update should address communication and “marketing” required to convey important imperatives to the public.
- Incentives for tenant environmental improvements should be considered.

3. Discussion of Environmental Sustainability at the Port

- Carol Bach presented an overview of the Port’s existing environmental sustainability goals and polices, which can be found in this [background report](#)
- Staff also invited comments on a [Draft Outline for Environmental Sustainability Goals and Policies](#), including environmental sustainability priorities above and beyond existing regulatory and environmental requirements.

Comments and Discussion

- The new environmental sustainability goal should expressly state that the Port is seeking to limit “the Port’s” contributions to climate change.
- The goal should capture all Port activities (operations, maintenance, development, leasing, etc.)
- Policies should address funding required for environmental programs and improvements, including limited Port and non-Port resources as well as new funding sources.
- Plan should identify regional partnership opportunities
- Mark Palmer from the City’s Department of the Environment suggested that there are “frameworks” to group multiple environmental objectives together to attain broader environmental goals (e.g. triple-bottom line, 0-50-100 Roots program, or carbon reduction goals)
- Additional ideas and suggestions:
 - Consider shoreside power systems for additional maritime industries
 - Consider sustainability criteria/requirements for procurement, operations, leases and development RFPs
 - More emphasis on renewable energy sources at Port
 - Develop or improve regular collection and updates of baseline data to set sustainability improvement objectives and measure progress
 - Port should lead efforts to improve sediments to improve healthy fishing (this is an aspirational regional goal but maybe Port could take first step)

- Port should focus on improving water quality (protect against wind-blown garbage and cigarette butts, as well as stormwater management)
- Plan should address how to protect contaminated lands from inundation caused by rising seas
- Consider living shoreline approach to shoreline stabilization and SLR adaptation where feasible
- Consider how the Port can further contribute to achieving the City's biodiversity goals and objectives
- Highlight where the Port already is an environmental leader (e.g. Eco-center)

4. Next meeting

The next meeting will be on November 30th, 2016, 6-8pm at Pier 1. The focus will include a very preliminary draft outline of topics to be included in a new Resilience goal and policies for the waterfront, much like today's meeting focused on a new Environmental Sustainability goal and policies.



**Waterfront Plan Update
Resilience Subcommittee**
November 30, 2016 Meeting Notes

Subcommittee Members Present: Dilip Trivedi, Mike Buehler, Pia Hinkle, Aaron Hyland, Earl James, Peter Summerville, John Tobias, Sam Veloz (for Grant Ballard)

Absent: Jacquelyn Omotalade, Grant Ballard

Other Working Group Members Present: Alice Rogers, Jeffrey Congdon, Stewart Morton

Advisory Team Members Present: Max Lowenstein, Justin Semion, Keith Primdahl

Port Staff: Diane Oshima, Carol Bach, Anne Cook, Sidonie Sansome, Diana Bartram, Aaron Golbus, Byron Rhett

Agency Staff: Kevin Connolly (WETA), Diana Sokolove (SF Planning), Bryan Strong (SF Mayor's Office), Mark Palmer (SF Environment), Andrea Gaffney (BCDC), Lindy Lowe (BCDC)

1. Welcome & Meeting Goals:

- Chair Dilip Trivedi welcomed attendees, introductions were made, and meeting goals were discussed.

2. Resilience Goal and Policies

- Anne Cook provided a brief overview of the [Draft Outline for Waterfront Plan Resilience Goal and Policies](#), and explained that the Draft Outline will evolve over the course of the next few Subcommittee meetings based on input from the Subcommittee members, Advisory Team members, and public. Tonight's meeting will focus on the first two items on the Draft Outline: 1) emergency preparedness and disaster recovery; and 2) collaborations for successful resilience planning and finance. Subsequent meetings will focus on flood protection, the Seawall Resilience Project, and resilience planning for the Southern Waterfront, among other topics.
- Port staff recommends a new Waterfront Plan Resilience goal that covers these topics, as well as others identified as priorities by the Subcommittee and the public. The new Waterfront Plan goal for Resilience also should be consistent with the Port's Strategic Plan Resilience Goal. Like for the Environmental Sustainability goal discussed at the last Subcommittee meeting, Staff can develop proposed policy language based on comments received tonight, then bring it back for

review and further discussion by the Subcommittee and the public.

- Future Resilience Subcommittee meeting(s) will focus on the Port's Seawall Resilience Project, resilience planning for the Southern Waterfront, flood protection, etc.
- Staff anticipates holding a joint meeting with the Land Use and Transportation Subcommittees to address waterfront urban design and historic resource issues that should guide the development of new resilience policies and projects.
- Anne Cook introduced excerpts from the City of San Francisco's resilience plan, "Resilient SF", to demonstrate how the City [defines resilience](#), and where elements of the City's [Resilient SF plan](#) could be reflected in new and existing Waterfront Plan goals once the update is complete.

Emergency Preparedness and Disaster Recovery

Presentations

- Sidonie Sansome (Director of Homeland Security, Port) [presented an overview](#) of the Port's existing emergency response and disaster recovery plans and capabilities.
- Kevin Connolly (Director of Planning, Water Emergency Transit Authority) discussed WETA's role and collaboration with Port of San Francisco and other agencies in emergency response and disaster recovery planning and operations. Kevin discussed WETA's plans to increase landing and vessel capacity throughout the Bay Area, which will improve its ability to evacuate the public and move first responders after an emergency. He also discussed WETA's role in regional transportation and emergency response plans. [WETA's Strategic Plan](#) was provided as a handout and [WETA's Emergency Response Plan](#) is available on line.
- Kevin and Sidonie explained that it could take 48 hours of continuous ferry operations to clear the City of commuters and visitors after a disaster that renders the bridge and/or BART tunnel inoperable.

Responses to Questions:

- Most Port property is controlled by tenants; how does the Port communicate with tenants about emergency planning and disaster recovery? The Port's Real Estate and Maritime staff communicates directly with Port tenants. In the event of a disaster, there will be a Port-wide response. The Port also works closely with the City's Department of Emergency Management and other City and State emergency agencies to plan and implement disaster recovery operations.
- What other natural disasters, besides earthquakes, are of particular concern for the Port? The Port also plans for Tsunamis.
- Where else does WETA need facilities to support its emergency response function? The Mission Bay Ferry Landing will be a key location; this project is a good example of how agencies, in this case the Port and WETA, can collaborate to increase emergency response capacity.

Discussion:

- The Port and Ocean Beach are the only two areas where City can be accessed by water for disaster recovery operations, and Ocean Beach is much less desirable due to wave action and lack of landing facilities.
- Port lands therefore are essential to disaster recovery for the entire City. FEMA plans to bring goods in by vessel, so the City and Port need to retain access for loading/unloading vessels and space to stage people and resources.
- Port open spaces such as parks, parking lots, and some maritime industrial lands also serve as possible sites for emergency response/disaster recovery operations. Although such properties aren't often needed for such operations, if their uses remain "flexible" they can play a key response and recovery role when disasters occur.
- The City/Port should not consider the Embarcadero as space for assembly or staging of emergency or evacuation operations because it will need to remain open for transportation.
- The Port should be thinking about critical access/egress locations and prioritize these for stabilization, if needed to ensure that they are functioning after an earthquake.
- Whatever is rebuilt after a disaster should be rebuilt in a sustainable way.

Additional Collaborations for Successful Resilience Planning

Presentations

Resilience Advisory Team Member Max Lowenstein [presented background information](#) about how San Francisco agencies plan for sea level rise, including estimates of sea level rise impacts used regionally and within the City for planning purposes.

Diana Sokolove from the City's Planning Department and Co-chair of the Mayor's Sea Level Rise Committee presented an update to the more detailed presentation of the City's Sea Level Rise Action Plan she gave to the full Working Group during Part 1 of the planning process; this time she emphasized regional collaborations to address sea level rise. She also pointed out that Byron Rhett, Port Deputy Director of Planning and Development, now is her Co-chair for the of the [Sea Level Rise Action Committee](#).

Comments and Discussion

- It would be helpful to know what this Subcommittee's boundaries are on the broad topic of "resilience". Anne referred back to the key elements identified in Resilient SF, with reference to how existing plans or the developing Waterfront Plan Update might address them.
- Because understanding and predictions about sea level rise are evolving, resilience should be considered an on-going process of adaptive management.
- How do we ensure that we preserve historic resources both in planning for and responding to emergencies and sea level rise? This will be the subject of a joint meeting with the Land Use and

Transportation Subcommittees in February, as well as further discussion in the Resilience Subcommittee meetings

- The Port should focus first on what it and the public, City, and other stakeholders value, and then consider how to preserve those functions and values when planning for emergency response and sea level rise.
- The Port should also consider that different resilience goals (or policies within an over-arching resilience goal) might be appropriate for different sub-areas of the Port.

4. Next meeting

The next Resilience Subcommittee meeting will be on February 1, 2017, 6-8pm at Pier 1 (changed post meeting from January 18th). The agenda will be sent the week before the February 1st meeting.



**Waterfront Plan Update
Resilience Subcommittee**

February 1, 2017 Meeting Notes (Draft)

Subcommittee Members Present: Pia Hinckle, Grant Ballard, Aaron Hyland, Earl James, Peter Summerville, Dilip Trivedi

Absent: Jacquelyn Omotalade, John Tobias

Other Working Group Members Present: Linda Fadeke-Richardson, Ellen Johnck, Stewart Morton

Advisory Team Members Present: Max Lowenstein, Justin Semion, Keith Primdahl, Bill Tremayne, Nathan Nayman, Veronica Sanchez, Howard Wong

Port Staff: Carol Bach, Keven Brough, Anne Cook, Byron Rhett

Agency Staff: Mark Palmer (SF Environment), Tim Doherty (SFMTA), Lisa Starliper (DEM)

1. Welcome & Meeting Goals

Chair Pia Hinckle welcomed attendees, introductions were made, the [draft November 30, 2016 meeting notes](#) were approved, and meeting goals were discussed.

2. Update re: Subcommittee Meeting Plan and February Working Group Meeting Schedule

Staff explained changes to the Working Group Meeting schedule as follows:

- February 8, 2017 - Land Use Subcommittee Meeting
- February 15, 2017 – No meeting
- February 22, 2017 – Full Working Group Meeting - Subcommittee Reports
- March 1, 2017 – Full Working Group Meeting – Designing for Resilience

The next Resilience Subcommittee meeting will be in late March; at least 2 meetings will be needed to complete Subcommittee Work. Specific meeting dates will be provided as soon as possible. In the meantime, please hold Wednesday evenings in March and April.

3. Review and Discussion of Environmental Sustainability Policy Ideas and Guidance

Staff explained that they were bringing Environmental Sustainability policy ideas to the Resilience Subcommittee at this meeting to ensure discussion occurred before memories of the November 2nd meeting faded. Future Resilience Subcommittee meetings will address the Seawall Resilience Project, planning for sea level rise, interim and ongoing flood protection strategies, and leasing and development policies to promote resilience. These future Resilience Subcommittee discussions

will benefit from the ideas and input received from all Working Group members and the public during the Working Group's February 22nd Joint Subcommittee Meeting and March 1st Designing for Resilience Workshop. Staff also intends to bring back policy and discussion ideas that reflect comments received during the November 30th discussion of emergency preparedness and disaster recovery at the Port.

4. Environmental Sustainability Policy Discussion Context

Staff explained that the 1997 Waterfront Land Use Plan included goals, policies and development standards throughout the Plan that addressed environmental concerns, but with a relatively light touch, as summarized in [1997 Waterfront Plan Goals, Policies and Development Standards that Address Environmental Sustainability](#). As discussed further in the [Summary of Policy Discussions to Date – Environmental Sustainability](#), some have been accomplished and others continue to apply and may be incorporated into the Waterfront Land Use Plan Update (WP Update), including the following:

- Provide “areas for nature, habitat, and environmental restoration” and “places that restore the environment and support wildlife habitat.”
- Provide “places to learn about waterfront activities and the Bay environments.”
- “Comply with all applicable environmental and water quality laws and regulations, and any related policies adopted by the Port Commission ... including storm water drainage policies for new construction and facility improvements.”
- “Protect the environment and ensure compatibility with adjacent uses when authorizing interim uses.”

Since 1997, however, the City and the Port have developed many more environmental policies and programs that apply to the Port's maintenance, leasing and redevelopment activities, shoreline habitat and public access projects, and ongoing efforts to remediate environmental contamination and protect water quality.

Port Staff has recommended developing a new environmental sustainability goal and related policies for the WP Update to:

- Elevate environmental stewardship as a key “value” and goal of the Waterfront Plan;
- Incorporate existing City and Port environmental sustainability requirements that affect waterfront land use, planning, development and construction;
- Align with the Port's new [2016-2021 Strategic Plan](#) objectives that address environmental sustainability; and
- Ensure that the Port's land use and planning decision-making processes continue to reflect environmental priorities.

Ultimately, the Waterfront Plan's new environmental sustainability goal and policies should reflect and be consistent with the significant planning and policy work in place and underway in the City and Bay Area, and also reflect best practices elsewhere. For this reason, in addition to information and discussions shared in the Working Group and Subcommittee meetings thus far, Port Staff reviewed plans from many City, regional, and waterfront agencies as it developed policy ideas and guidance for Subcommittee discussion.

Prior to the meeting, Port staff provided [Policy Context and Discussion ideas for 4 Topics](#) discussed below. **Staff reminded attendees that Subcommittee policy discussions will provide guidance to Port Staff as they draft proposed updates to the [1997 Waterfront Land Use Plan](#). The discussions are on-going and iterative, and will require further revision and reconciliation with ideas generated in the Land Use and Transportation Subcommittee meetings, full Working Group meetings, and other public forums, before ultimately being considered by the Port Commission.** The policy ideas provided are in regular text below, followed by comments in italics that were received during the February 1 meeting.

5. Environmental Sustainability Policy Topic #1 - Climate Change and Air Quality

Policy and Discussion Ideas:

1. Continue to minimize carbon emissions and maximize carbon capture by Port tenants and development partners.

Comments - What does "carbon capture" mean in this context? Carbon is "captured" through many activities that are or could be further implemented at the Port, including sustainable design, urban forestry, capturing carbon in soil and vegetation, composting, etc... Should include all types of greenhouse gas emissions, not just carbon (e.g. could say "minimize greenhouse gases, especially carbon,..."). Also should address emissions from cars and boats (see 4, below).

2. Evaluate "carbon neutrality" as a goal for Port operations; continue to measure progress toward that goal through the Port's Climate Action Plan.

Comments – Climate change is a common theme throughout all 4 topics; it doesn't relate only to emissions and air quality. For example, there also is an operational and building design aspect. Should clarify what we mean by climate change (e.g. "human influenced accelerated climate change"). Consider going beyond carbon neutrality; may require off-site/offset or carbon credits (like at the airport) or a mitigation pool (e.g. plant trees elsewhere) to get to carbon neutral. Could also consider climate change efforts in procurement processes when selecting providers.

3. Explore new opportunities to improve energy efficiency; generate and use solar, wind or other renewable power; and facilitate use of alternative fuels, consistent with the City's 0-50-100-Roots policy.

Comments – Energy goals are changing in SF and at the State level (e.g. the City is focusing on how to eliminate natural gas use in SF by using electricity instead, and the State goal is 0 net energy by 2030, and 50% of all existing buildings retrofitted by 2030.

4. Continue and expand efforts to reduce emissions and promote the use of clean technology for water transportation and maritime operations (e.g. shoreside power, alternative fuels, etc.).
5. Consider incentives for carbon emissions reduction measures (e.g. energy efficiency and use of cleaner fuels and technologies), above those already mandated by existing regulations, in Port leasing and development activities.
6. Enhance data collection and sharing to establish baselines and better measure impacts of climate action policies and projects.

Comments – Port needs to "expand" data collection, not just enhance.

7. Collaborate with City and regional agencies to share information, pursue joint projects and jointly seek state and federal funding to meet Climate Action goals.

6. Environmental Sustainability Policy Topic #2 - Water Quality and Conservation

Policy and Discussion Ideas:

1. Continue to implement the City's existing Stormwater Management Requirements and promote additional implementation of "green infrastructure" to reduce the volume and improve the quality of stormwater runoff.
Comments - Consider applying the SMRs to smaller sites than required by existing regulations.
2. Continue the Port's ongoing program of inspection and repair of under-pier utilities to reduce discharges of wastewater and potable water to the Bay; seek opportunities in renovation or new construction to relocate utilities above-board.
3. Continue to remove deleterious fill from the Bay and shoreline, particularly where such fill degrades habitat or water quality (e.g. un-engineered shoreline debris, creosote-treated wood).
4. Prioritize beneficial reuse of dredged materials at approved facilities over in-Bay, ocean, or upland disposal.
5. Develop design, maintenance, and operational tools (e.g. solar-powered Big Bellies) to reduce the spread of garbage into the Bay.
Comments – Need more receptacles and/or fences/enclosures to prevent cigarette butts and trash from blowing into the Bay, particularly in high traffic/windy areas, and areas where there is food service or boating. Interpretive signage and other educational efforts should address the impact of trash on water quality and wildlife. Maybe could collaborate with boaters to make sure they have receptacles needed.
6. Promote remediation, redevelopment, and reuse of contaminated sites, particularly where such redevelopment can protect such sites from erosion or inundation.
Comments – Consider identifying contaminated sites at the Port and developing a long term plan to improve their condition and control leaching into the Bay. Initiate collaborative regional program to identify hot spots around the Bay and come up with solutions. Advocate to get known contaminated sites on list of sites to benefit from mitigation or fines (e.g. perhaps funding through RWQCB?)
7. Implement State and local water conservation and water reuse requirements and policies for new construction, renovation, parks and open spaces, and operations and maintenance.
Comments– it would be helpful to provide examples here. Consider establishing an overall Port target for water use reduction, and then hold tenants accountable for meeting their "share" of that reduction goal. Consider an "Educate – Encourage – Reward" approach.
8. Implement City requirements for new and redevelopment projects to design and construct infrastructure to use recycled water from off-site and reuse stormwater and wastewater on-site.
Comments - Consider also applying this to renovations and lease extensions.

7. Environmental Sustainability Policy Topic #3 - Natural Resources

Policy and Discussion Ideas:

1. Protect and maintain existing natural shorelines and habitat areas, including managing impacts of invasive species, predators, and public access.
Comments – Should also support adaptation of existing natural shorelines; consider impacts "on" (not just "of") invasive species and predators; address impacts of sea level rise.
2. Incorporate dual-purpose green infrastructure in stormwater management, flood control, and public realm improvements to promote biodiversity and provide ecological value.

3. Seek opportunities to build natural infrastructure (e.g. wetlands, horizontal levees, and “living shorelines”) and habitat into shoreline stabilization or improvement projects; build a “soft” waterfront edge where feasible and appropriate.

Comments – Soft edges should be a priority, not the default. Port should consider whether it can develop baselines and targets for wildlife and habitat so it can then measure progress against those targets. Consider Waterfront Plan policies that call for future Port-specific plans for topics that are too specific for the Waterfront Plan, like a water quality plan, habitat plan, etc. This would be similar to the more detailed Waterfront Plan Design Guidelines that followed the 1997 Waterfront Plan.

4. Seek opportunities to protect and create a mosaic of different kinds of in-water and shoreline habitat; consider opportunities to integrate habitat into design and construction of in-water structures such as oyster baskets, or textured vertical surfaces.
5. Work with partners to remediate contaminated sediment and support Bay-wide efforts to improve sediment quality and healthy fishing in the Bay.

Comments – Role of tidal marshes; need to reduce/eliminate contaminated food chain.

6. Seek partnerships and funding to support research and implementation of innovative habitat restoration methods that will improve biodiversity and ecological function around the Port and the Bay.

Comments – Should add targets around biodiversity so Port can aim at them. Can the Port lead the way on slowing down ships outside the Bay to protect whales?

7. Continue to work with partners to offer environmental education and community activities at Heron Head’s Park and Pier 94.
8. Seek locations and opportunities for new and expanded programs and signage along the waterfront to engage and educate local communities and visitors.

Comment – Consider opportunities that will arise as the Bay Water Trail unfolds. Also there could be educational opportunities at marinas and other facilities.

9. Encourage and collaborate with local stakeholders (tenants, community groups, schools, non-profits and other institutions) to broaden the volunteer and stewardship base, further engage the public in improving the health of the waterfront, and instill a conservation ethic.

Comments: Could educate public about feral cats, discourage cat-feeding, encourage native landscaping, discourage butterfly releases. Consider tenant and public education and outreach goals for all sustainability “topics”, not just natural resources.

General Comments: Financial considerations may not be accurately accounting for the true benefit of habitat services. How is Port going to pay for all this? Consider the financial impact of imposing more environmental obligations than are currently required on leases or lease renewals for small business, “legacy” businesses, and maritime tenants/businesses.

8. Environmental Sustainability Policy Topic #4 - Green Building, Leasing and Development Policy and Discussion Ideas:

1. Continue to implement the Port’s Green Building Standards and applicable provisions of the City’s Environment Code in new construction and renovation to meet LEED standards, conserve water, and improve energy, and use healthier or environmentally preferred building materials.

Comments – Policy should somehow reflect the principle that preservation is the greenest approach to building. Also should reference the National Park Services sustainability guidelines for historic resources.

2. Work toward Zero Waste by implementing Port and City requirements and policies that promote reuse, recycling, and composting in construction and operations.

Comments - Provide more specific examples of how to get to zero waste, especially in tenant's operations. For example, make sure there is space reserved for recycling bins and pick-up operations. Include educating and partnering with tenants; encourage reuse of existing buildings.

3. Implement the City's Better Roofs Ordinance, which requires new commercial and residential buildings to install rooftop solar for heat or electricity.
4. Seek opportunities to plan land uses and lease Port property to promote "district level" sustainability measures, such as those occurring within the Port's Maritime Eco-Industrial Center, to promote reuse and recycling of materials, and reduce transportation and related air emissions from construction activities on and off Port lands.

Comments – Seems this reflects two distinct policy ideas: 1) encouraging sustainable districts like SF's "2030 District" concept; and 2) co-locating synergistic land uses like those at the Port's Maritime Eco-Industrial Center to share resources and minimize impacts. They should be separately addressed.

5. Implement integrated pest management practices in Port and tenants' facilities and operations to reduce use of toxic materials in indoor and outdoor environments.
6. Monitor evolving best practices and explore new technologies to achieve progressively higher levels of resource efficiency and sustainability in leasing and development projects over time.

Comments – Also should assess opportunities to update environmental requirements and goals in existing "older" leases, lease extensions and operations (e.g. build in more opportunities to improve the environment over time. See above re: how this might affect small, legacy, and maritime businesses.

7. Market and message a green SF Port in Port development and leasing activities.

Comments – Consider, for example, "seek opportunities to identify, promote and grow the number of businesses at the Port that meet the City's Green Business Standards." Consider how to incentivize tenants to be greener, save water, etc. (e.g. rent credits or other tenant assistance). Needs to be a reasonable expectation that environmental goals can be achieved over time, especially for maritime tenants. Expensive capital improvements will require tenant assistance to accomplish.

9. Next meetings

- February 15, 2017 – No meeting
- February 22, 2017, 6-8pm at Pier 1 – Full Working Group Meeting - Subcommittee Reports
- March 1, 2017, 6-8pm at Pier - Full Working Group Meeting – Designing for Resilience
- Late March/April – To be determined



Waterfront Plan Working Group
Transportation Subcommittee Meeting 1
Meeting: November 9, 2016
Meeting Notes

Transportation Subcommittee Members

Present:

Linda Fadeke Richardson (chair), TIDA
Troy Campbell, Fisherman's Wharf CBD
Kevin Carroll, Hotel Council of SF
Jeffrey Congdon, Kidder Mathews
Chris Christensen, ILWU
Carolyn Horgan, Blue and Gold Fleet
Tom Radulovich, BART/Livable City
Cristina Rubke, SFMTA Board of Directors
Anne Turner, SF Towers

Working Group & Advisory Team Present:

Mike Gougherty, Transportation Advisory Team
Kyle Lamson, Transportation Advisory Team
Nathan Nayman, Transportation Advisory Team
Alice Rogers, Working Group
Veronica Sanchez, Maritime Advisory Team
Howard Wong, Urban Design Advisory Team

Participating Agencies and Operators:

Golden Gate Bridge and Transportation District
Hanson Aggregates
PropSF
SF Bay Conservation and Development
SF Bay Railroad

SF Municipal Transportation Agency
SF Water Taxi
Tideline Marine
Water Emergency Transportation Authority

Attendees:

Mary Betlach, Golden Gate Audubon
Mike Bishop, Hanson Aggregates
Kevin Connolly, WETA
David Gavrich, SF Bay Railroad
Danylo Hawks, SF Bay Railroad
Nick Kendall, SF Bay Railroad
Frazer Thompson, P.E., Pier 39
Barbara Vincent, Golden Gate Bridge District

Port Staff:

David Beaupre, Senior Waterfront Planner
Brad Benson, Director of Special Projects
Anne Cook, Waterfront Planner
Peter Dailey, Maritime Deputy Director
Norma Guzman, Waterfront Planner
Brendan O'Meara, Maritime Marketing Manager
Diane Oshima, Planning Asst. Deputy Director
Byron Rhett, Planning Deputy Director

1. Introductions – Transportation Subcommittee Members & Audience

2. Water Transportation Suggestions

Consider loop ferry service: Alcatraz, Angel Island, and Lucas Museum

UCSF, Warriors, other adjacent land users contribute to 16th Street Ferry project

The Port could encourage developers to contribute to transportation facility capital/operating costs

The Port should support gap funding for ferry expansion for WETA and Golden Gate

The Port (City) should pursue cost/benefit analysis and greatest return on investment for transit capital investment

Transit modes can be complimentary: 55 could be rerouted to serve 16th Street Ferry landing

The Port should consider door-to-door trips and multi-modal access policy to make it seamless for the user and provide access for everybody

The subcommittee should highlight Port water transportation priorities for policymakers (Mayor, Board of Supervisors)

The Port should pursue bike amenities (lockers, parking), bikeshare, scootershare

Is Port at the table for Southern Bayfront discussions?

The Port should develop an accessibility policy

Water transportation should include different sized vessels that meet the needs of commuters

It is important to serve 1st mile and last mile connections related to water transportation; consider electric bikes and other modes

Engage with SFMTA to discuss Muni boarding efficiency along the waterfront

How to grow ferry capacity with multiple modes of access to and from ferries?

Consider role of water transportation in post-disaster recovery

Avoid commuter parking at transit terminals in the City

Clipper on water taxi?

Public-private partnership for water taxi landings: Mission Rock, Forest City, India Basin; consider barges as intermediary landings; more coordination with yacht clubs – task force to develop network of landings – policy should be ADA accessible, vessels should enable wheelchair access

3. Goods Movement Suggestions

The City should not differentiate between the Port and DPW streets for available capital funding; DPW should manage streets.

Staff should provide an inventory of streets, capital costs; seek a conversation with Public Works regarding process for DPW to accept Port streets.

How to organize truck delivery/pickups using software apps? Copenhagen has a potential model.

What is the Port's involvement in the I-280 offramp discussion?

Consider other means besides trucks; are there options by water? Is there a water transportation option to distribute fish and crab, perhaps to Pier 80? Maybe cost/double-handling considerations would be difficult.

Crab season to open safely!

What tools can the Port use to manage traffic congestion and protect general access?

Goods movement is a strategy, a policy and a set of conflicts that needs to be managed.

High-speed rail and freight are in conflict; may be a regional decision.

The Port should protect freight access – how many freight rail trips occur to/from the Port, related to Port tenants and other freight uses? Are trucks an option?

Freight rail offsets 100,000 truck trips annually, or 6 million miles of truck trips, and reduces CO2 emissions and congestion on roads. In Europe, high-speed rail and freight rail are compatible. At CPUC, Caltrain and freight rail users agree regarding compatibility. Does the Port want to be one of the only U.S. ports without freight access? Currently, the Port is served by 3 freight trains/week.

A large part of freight is contaminated soil from downtown construction. This market may last 10-15 years. Freight rail can help with post-disaster debris handling.

Freight rail transports construction materials and rail for MUNI.

The Port just signed terminal operator agreement with Pasha – new tunnels could provide enhanced freight rail access to the Pier, including caterpillar, machine parts and wind mills.

Rail could enhance bulk export at Pier 96 as well. Port received Freight Rail Administration \$3 million grant for Quint Street.

Freight is vital to Port maritime terminal viability.

How many more Port piers could be converted to freight handling? PDR is happening in a few piers that require Goods Movement support. How do we limit conflicts between truck loading and bike lanes; how to manage curb space?

Consider time of delivery or nodes for delivery.

Auto (a self-driving truck company) was acquired by UBER; automated trucks are being tested in Amsterdam in partnership with MIT. How will this technology benefit the Port?

Sand and gravel terminals move 1.3 million tons of material over Port berths which used to be trucked in to San Francisco; bulk terminals directly serve concrete batching tenants. Sand is now travelling to San Jose by truck from the Port. Is rail for bulk transport to the Peninsula an option?

Concern about maintaining Port voice in the discussion about how streets serving the Port managed.

What are the added maintenance costs of maintaining freight and who pays?

SF Bay Railroad maintains the freight line within the Port; handoff of trains to Union Pacific; route is owned by Caltrain; maintenance costs are shared between Caltrain and Union Pacific.

How to manage truck and bicycle access and improved access for both in the Southern Waterfront?

Staff to reach out to SFMTA to discuss improved truck and bike access in the Southern Waterfront – consider impacts to parking.

Curb loading priorities: pedestrian safety, MUNI, short-term dropoff, resident parking, then commuters. Maximize use of limited road space.

Examine large volume movement for passengers and goods, successful at low cost in other locations because of economies of scale. How does this work from a labor perspective?

Land Use Committee urged to examine transportation policies related to new development.

The Land Use Subcommittee encouraged staff to develop draft policy proposals from the discussion and to develop draft policy proposals for future transportation topic discussions in order to facilitate the public discussion.



Waterfront Plan Working Group
Transportation Subcommittee Meeting 2
Meeting: December 7, 2016
Meeting Notes

Transportation Subcommittee Members Present:

Linda Fadeke Richardson (chair), TIDA
Troy Campbell, Fisherman's Wharf CBD
Kevin Carroll, Hotel Council of SF
Chris Christensen, ILWU
Carolyn Horgan, Blue and Gold Fleet
Tom Radulovich, Livable City
Cristina Rubke, SFMTA Board of Directors

Not Present: Jeffrey Congdon, Anne Turner

Working Group & Advisory Team Present:

Kyle Lamson, Transportation Advisory Team
Nathan Nayman, Transportation Advisory Team
Howard Wong, Urban Design Advisory Team

Participating Agencies and Operators:

Enviroissues
Fisherman's Wharf Restaurant Association
Golden Gate Bridge and Transportation District
SF Bay Conservation and Development
SF Environment
SF Municipal Transportation Agency

SF Railyard Alternatives and I-280 Boulevard
Feasibility Study (RAB) Citizen Working Group
Tideline Marine

Attendees:

Katie DeLeuw, Enviroissues
Jessica Garcia, SFMTA
Patrick Golier, SFMTA
Danielle J. Harris, SFMTA
Richard Knee, Hoodline
Allyn McAuley, SF Environment
Ted Olsson, RAB Citizen Working Group
Carli Paine, SFMTA
Barbara Vincent, Golden Gate Bridge District
Jeremy Wallenberg, Fisherman's Wharf RA

Port Staff:

David Beaupre, Senior Waterfront Planner
Brad Benson, Director of Special Projects
Anne Cook, Waterfront Planner
Norma Guzman, Waterfront Planner
Tyrone Navarro, Real Estate Property Manager
Diane Oshima, Planning Asst. Deputy Director
Byron Rhett, Planning Deputy Director

1. [November 9, 2016 Meeting Notes](#) accepted.

2. Overview of [Draft Policy Proposals and Implementation Steps](#):

- Goods Movement and Industrial Access
- Transportation in the City's 10 Year Capital Plan and Improvements to the Water Transportation Network
- Land Transit
- Pedestrian and Bicycle Access
- Curb Use Policy

3. Introductions

4. Waterfront Transit Service – Julie Kirschenbaum

SFMTA presentation regarding current and planned waterfront transit along the Port.

See [attached presentation](#), including proposed policy guidance.

Summary of Policy Guidance for consideration:

- Adopt SF Planning Department's Transit-Supportive Development Design Guidelines
- Support Transit Through Land Use Policy
 - Locate high density and activity centers within shortest walk to transit stops
- Promote Public Transit As Primary Mode
 - Design streets and transit facilities that support reliability, resiliency, and flexibility
- Encourage Transit Use Through Travel Demand Management

Question and Answer

- MTA stated Independent terminals for E and F lines may be a land use need.
- Owl service to Fisherman's Wharf could help with employee commutes

Public Discussion

How best to promote access to the Port, including infrastructure, capital improvements?

What are unique attributes of the waterfront that should inform transportation planning?

Answer: AM demand on F-Line is low; in the afternoon, there are both commuters and tourists. Need to work to make it easier for tourists to pay to avoid delays. Recently launched Muni Mobile (10% of ticket sales online). Just installed better wayfinding on the E-Line. The interesting thing about 3rd Street (T-Line) is one of Muni's more balanced services, from Chinatown, Sunnydale, Dogpatch, etc.

Provide types of policies that would be helpful to the Committee, e.g., wayfinding.

Goal of 50% multi-modal trips overall in Climate Action Plan; no goal set for the Port.

What could a mode-split goal be for the Port, maybe consider by sub-area.

Julie mentioned a need for turnaround for F- and E-Line. Port also mentioned potential transfer of maintenance responsibilities to SFPW. Is there a synergy?

Answer: Major land use constraints are 4th & King and Muni Metro East.

Please provide list of unfunded capital improvements along the waterfront.

A benefit of the Embarcadero is the dedicated Muni track area, but it disappears near Fisherman's Wharf. Are there any plans to create more dedicated right-of-way?

Answer: not currently.

Transportation planning varies by neighborhood; some areas have no road capacity. Need to think about available road space as an absolute limit. How do we understand that limit along the waterfront with planned development, and how do we manage to the capacity limits of Port roads?

Want to take road space to make areas more walkable and bikeable.

Answer: Will take that back to Muni colleagues. Focused as an agency on TDM, but cannot answer question regarding managing to road capacity.

Is there a need for changes to signals?

Answer: Sometimes SFMTA removes left turn signals to speed transit, but primarily focused on transit signals.

Consider stop consolidation along the waterfront for F or E Lines?

Answer: Willing to examine that strategy. Also examining a new stop near Howard.

Walgreen's is closing in the wharf, making it harder to load clipper cards. Will at the least work on a new Muni Mobile sign. Changes are coming to the program that will make it easier for vendors.

What about vending machines?

Answer: Don't want to overpromise on vending machines. (You need a land line, Tom!)

First and last mile. Chariot, Lyft, Uber. Do you (Muni) include those in your service planning? How does that weave into SFMTA thinking?

Answer: In Warriors project, examined how public transit can be buffered from the impacts of these services.

Increasing E + F-Line, 2 car trains, greater frequency, what is the highest capacity?

Answer: Heaviest demand from Pier 39 to Market Street. 2 car F-Lines are not possible.

Interest in sea level and seismic vulnerability. Examining new routes for Caltrain; opportunity for Port, given existing Port vulnerabilities. A new tunnel could provide a strengthened waterfront; density increasing in SOMA. Is now the time for the 3 agencies to work together to encircle the City with a subway?

Answer: SFMTA has included SLR and seismic risk in all capital planning. Port supported a recent grant to examine SFMTA facilities on Port property, Better Market Street, etc.

Glad you raised this point about the tunnel. Overarching goal should be to link transportation, seawall, historic preservation. Consider tunnel under the Embarcadero for vehicles, which is a fix for the Seawall. Pedestrians, bikes and Muni above.

Largest development is happening in the Southern Waterfront – Mission Bay, Pier 70, the Shipyard. Do we have a transportation master plan for that area? This way we can understand how the agencies will be working together and what the capital needs will be.

Answer: From a transit, pedestrian and biking perspective, we have a strong plan in the Shipyard, and would be happy to provide that plan.

Want to encourage the Committee to think about waterfront-wide, higher-level policies, rather than about specific development projects.

Great to get your policy recommendations beyond shuttles, including innovative transportation options

Establish targets. Embarcadero cannot handle more cars. Need to develop more specificity – what are you managing to?

Also need to manage transit trips. Consider establishing specific goals for a TDM based on capacity for different modes.

Make it easier to buy transit.

Legibility or use ability for all users, including tourists.

Response: Port staff will review internally, and return with staff suggestions.

Curb space for transit consistent with curb use policy.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Access – Patrick Golier

SFMTA presentation regarding current and planned complete street planning along the Port, including the Embarcadero Enhancement project.

See [attached presentation](#).

Summary of Policy Guidance for Consideration

- *Ensure that consideration of transportation safety is paramount when evaluating transportation improvements along the waterfront*
- *Reduce conflicts between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists by actively reducing the numbers of vehicle crossings of the Promenade and bicycle lane*
- *Determine an approval process at the Port for proposed transportation improvements along roadways under Port jurisdiction*
- *Consider a modal hierarchy for travel along the waterfront to help determine future priorities and evaluate proposed waterfront transportation improvements*
- *Create a dedicated funding stream to help cost-share transportation improvements*
- *Consider time of day requirements for deliveries to Port tenants*

Question and Answer

When you looked at bike lanes options, did you consider two on the land side?

Answer: It is not technically feasible, there is not enough room, given Muni right-of-way and number of right-hand turns.

Can you elaborate on SFMTA policy considerations with respect to The Embarcadero. If this were a street under SFMTA jurisdiction, we would ask the SFMTA Board for policy direction.

On modal hierarchy, what does that mean?

Question: Priority modes would receive priority treatment.

Looking at Vancouver, they have an incredible walking/cycling path. They reached their 50% walking/cycling goal 5 years early. A big portion of their walking and biking is protected, separated. Bike/pedestrian safety should be priority, consistent with Vision Zero.

The Bay Trail is not mentioned in here. Bay Trail policies could be integrated. Continuous bike and pedestrian path along the entire waterfront (as close as possible in all locations).

Improving connections between the waterfront and adjacent neighborhoods.

In Vancouver, traffic is several blocks inland.

Southern Waterfront affords more opportunities to get bikes/pedestrians closer to the water.

Consider joining Embarcadero Enhancement Project with Seawall Project ("dig once"). Provides an opportunity for more funding.

Consider separated modes.

Answer: SFMTA has a bike comfort index; assess future facilities with that index.

Safety is paramount for all modes.

All modes of transportation along the eastern and northern edge are high priority. Examine safety for the perpendicular pedestrian pathways.

Watch out for internal inconsistencies among policies.

Emphasize that the approach presented by staff of establishing policies and clear implementation steps will help the public and policymakers understand the roadmap, including capital needs that will lead to funding requests.

Homework Assignments

[Read curb use policies](#) and [Seattle curb use presentation](#).

Observation – curb use policies should change by street type.

Read freight and water transportation policies from November 9 meeting.

Reconvene in January to discuss.



Waterfront Plan Working Group
Transportation Subcommittee Meeting 3
Meeting: January 25, 2017
Meeting Notes

Transportation Subcommittee Members Present:

Linda Fadeke Richardson (chair), TIDA
Jeffrey Congdon, Kidder Mathews
Carolyn Horgan, Blue and Gold Fleet
Tom Radulovich, Livable City
Cristina Rubke, SFMTA Board of Directors
Anne Turner, SF Towers

Not present:

Troy Campbell, Fisherman's Wharf CBD
Kevin Carroll, Hotel Council of SF
Chris Christensen, ILWU

Working Group & Advisory Team Present:

Ellen Johnck, Working Group
Kyle Lamson, Transportation Advisory Team
Stewart Morton, Working Group
Alice Rogers, Working Group
Corinne Woods, Working Group
Howard Wong, Urban Design Advisory Team

Participating Agencies and Operators:

Golden Gate Bridge District
San Francisco Environment
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

Attendees:

Lelyn Castelo
John Davey, Retired SF Port staff
Carie Montero, Parsons
Steph Nelson, SFMTA
Carli Paine, SFMTA
Stephen Scheck, SF resident
Zac Thompson, San Francisco Environment
Johny Trujillo
Barbara Vincent, Golden Gate Bridge District

Port Staff:

David Beaupre, Brad Benson, Demetri Amaro, John Davey (retired), Ananda Hirsch, Tyrone Navarro, Byron Rhett

1. **December 7, 2017 Waterfront Plan Transportation Subcommittee [Meeting minutes](#) [accepted](#)**, with minor edits.
2. **Welcoming remarks, Linda Fadeke Richardson, Subcommittee Chair.**
3. **Carli Paine – SFMTA, [Presentation on Transportation Demand Management Presentation](#) (slides 1-6)**

Policy Considerations

Auto Trip Cap –

- Related to City Climate Action Strategy (80% of trips by non-driving modes by 2030) –
 - Consider Port-wide and by sub-area – Design TDM program(s) to meet these • Establish Port-wide TDM Program designed to support tenant and visitor trips
- Parking supply & management – Link approach to TDM goals

Question & Answer

Under new TDM program, developers can cherry-pick. Seek coordination among developers.

Carli suggested that shared shuttles – where they exist – are an opportunity for coordination.

Area plan approach is a sound approach – manage Mission Bay as one parking resource. Shuttles and other programs work better on area wide basis. Strange that TDM is done building by building, but transit planning and impact is done on a larger scale.

Shift from auto to sustainable modes. TDM strategy around time of day. Manage when deliveries occur; similar issue with transit trips (flex work hours). Provides a benefit in terms of congestion relief, including peak transit times. Port has lease tool to promote TDM strategies.

Carli – Big opportunity with Port lease, opportunity to raise funds for TMA. Emergency ride home, etc.

I work in the city and drive every day. During business hours, I travel to different locations: Palo Alto, Marin, etc.

Carli – TDM does not work for everyone, but it benefits everyone by reducing congestion. TDM allows people who have choice to make them more easily. Big mode shift away from driving over last 10-15 years.

Agree that there are not uniform TDM standards in the City; example: Treasure Island. Cherry-picking will create problems over time, support area plan approach for TDM. Millions of visitors come to the Port; Port has limited parking right now. We need to keep some parking spaces, over a 50 year plan. Port should be cognizant in its land use plan to retain spaces; parking is disappearing in other areas (South of Market).

Piers are for maritime use, not for parking. Maybe have some spots designated for maritime recreational use.

Please clarify if the presentation is saying that the legislation exempts projects with development agreements. Southern Bayfront is coordinating transportation among large projects on the eastern side of the City.

Carli – Yes, development agreements are not covered by the ordinance, but those projects are developing TDM strategies. Ordinance is aimed at smaller projects. Port has an opportunity along the waterfront to think strategically beyond individual projects. How can the Port serve all tenants through services and programs, but not tied specifically to new development.

David – TDM ordinance is pending approval. Port has two large projects (Mission Rock at SWL 337 and Pier 70 Waterfront Site) where the Port is requiring TDM programs and establishment of a Transportation Management Association (“TMA”). Port has option to work with tenants to provide TDM tools (example: emergency ride home) Portwide. Port could also develop a waterfront-wide TDM program, which could be implemented through a TMA.

Carli – Southern Bayfront is coordinating large project transportation review, affordable housing, parks, sustainability and resiliency. City developing one negotiating strategy on these topics. Port is participating as a partner agency.

David – Effort focuses on developing benefits for new and existing residents and workers.

Question – Portwide versus subarea TDM program: does this mean geographic areas (answer: yes). Also consider different types of tenants, with unique customer bases. TDM could apply to employees but maybe not customers.

Carli – focus on trips that can be effective; tailor program to population needs.

David – Encourage TDM efforts for populations like those visiting Alcatraz, or master, mates and pilots getting to the Port.

Maritime workers work at very odd hours; often people can't get home (Vallejo, Oakland).

Focus first on drivers during the commute hours. City pending ordinance is focused only on building new, for instance developing a mall in a pier would not increase space and trigger TDM requirements. City also exempts non-accessory parking from TDM; Port has a lot of parking. Port can implement policies to more efficiently manage/use parking. Port provides an opportunity to *teach the City how to do this.*

BART has no capacity.

Carli – I am a BART user; it is congested, but better than driving. TDM is part of the solution but transit expansion is also needed (hard to address through Waterfront Plan).

Port should examine parking (ADA parking). Roads are not getting larger; Port should establish parking policies not only based on price.

Introduction of TDM allows us to look at regional needs, and future needs. Working Group should address regional plan. In the meantime, Port parking spaces are crucial for the benefit of everyone. What will things be like in 10, 20, 30 years from now. We should think big.

4. Steph Nelson, SFMTA, [Presentation on City Parking Policies](#) (slides 7-11)

Question & Answer

What is the pilot area for SF Park?

Steph: SOMA, Downtown, Civic Center, Fillmore, Marina, Fisherman's Wharf, Port

5. Demetri Amaro & Tyrone Navarro, Port, [Presentation on Port Parking](#) (slides 12-22)

(See attached presentation.)

Question & Answer

Can the City come up with one meter?

Steph – City has one single space and one multi-space meter (for ten spaces in a row).

David – Color coding for different uses (grey – general use, yellow – commercial, green – short-term).

Seem to be raising a lot of money through fines. Who is getting charged – tourists?

Tyrone -- PCOs enforce against everyone.

Good trend is that revenues increase from fees and fine revenues go down. Always unbundle parking from commercial uses. Manage parking intelligently – avoid intelligently.

Tyrone – We typically unbundle. Brad – except for development.

Unbundling is smart strategy – frees land and parking resources for other uses.

Great that you get so much revenue from parking. Does the Port participate in commuter shuttle program?

Demetri & Tyrone – no commuter shuttle parking spaces.

Develop other revenue sources to replace parking revenues.

Byron – all Port off-street parking sites are development sites. Examples: Broadway affordable housing project proposal and Teatro Zinzanni will replace parking. Neither development includes parking.

Develop option for employees, such as in Fisherman's Wharf.

Recommend we leave parking to the Port and its staff, in partnership with SFMTA. Port lots are an important resource. Please provide links to presentations.

Janice Li (Working Group Co-Chair) introduction.

Ananda Hirsch, Port, [Transportation Scope of Services](#) (slides 23-26)

(See attached presentation.)

Question & Answer

Who is the consultant?

Siefel, with Nelson Nygaard as a subconsultant.

What about Puglia Ship Repair and Pasha – study should look at off-peak employers, including maritime industrial.

How will study inform this process?

Will study look at areas of the Port such as Fisherman's Wharf?

Study will look at different lots, time of days?

How many parking spaces are used by different activities or uses?

Ananda, Brad and David: \$100,000 study will examine Port parking lot utilization, existing waterfront transportation data including the prior Port waterfront studies (including those produced by SFMTA). Study will recommend TDM and parking policies for the Port.

Scope of problem (increased car demand over time) requires look at MTA data to address problems such as congestion on the Embarcadero. Americans rely (too much) on autos – look at large parking lots for major retailers. How the Port manages parking cannot address the scale of the problem.

Embarcadero Enhancement Project and Seawall Project will significantly impact transportation and parking at the Port. What are the next steps in our transportation policy discussion?

How can the Port address the larger problem the prior speaker discussed?

David – City agencies, SFMTA and SF Countywide Transportation Authority are studying the broader issues affecting area-wide transportation.

Brad Benson, Port, [Review of Next Steps](#) (slide 27)

(See attached presentation.)