



COMMUNITY MEETING #6 OVERVIEW

Event Details

PORT



Timing:

- Thursday, September 24, 2020, 5:30 to 7 PM &
- Friday, September 25, 2020, 12:30 to 2 PM
- Location:
 - Zoom meeting link provided

COMMUNITY MEETING #6 OVERVIEW

Agenda



- Key findings from the Multi-Hazard Risk Assessment (MHRA)
- Introduction to "measures" or strategies for addressing risk along the Embarcadero waterfront
- Key priorities from community and stakeholder engagement
- Describe next steps to develop Proposition A projects



MEETING ATTENDANCE

Combined for the two meetings, approximately 100 people logged in

MEETING MATERIALS

Click the links to the right to view meeting materials



- <u>MHRA Key Findings +</u> <u>Measures Introduction</u>
- <u>Measures Engagement Online</u> <u>Activity Boards</u>

5

ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITY

Overview



- After the presentations, attendees joined Port staff in breakout rooms for smallgroup discussions:
 - What are the most important considerations for evaluating measures?
 - What concerns do you have about any of the measures?
 - Where would you like to see measures placed on the waterfront?



SAMPLE MEASURES ACTIVITY FOR BREAKOUT ROOM DISCUSSION



OVERVIEW: WHAT WE HEARD

What are the most important considerations for evaluating measures? We heard the following general comments and feedback from the two meetings.

Design Life

• Willing to trade off higher cost for longer design life

Cost

- Willing to pay higher costs to protect iconic and cultural buildings
- Potential cost savings of building new vs. retrofitting for non-historic buildings

Impact on the Waterfront

- Limit impact on the waterfront by thinking longer-term with projects that wouldn't need to be updated or replaced
- "Do it once, do it right"



WHAT WE HEARD

What concerns do you have about any of the measures? We heard the following general comments and feedback from the two meetings.

- Are there measures that in addressing the risks of one area of the waterfront that would negatively impact others?
- What opportunities are there for federal funding?
- What opportunities are there to balance potentially lower-cost measures that could help address risks (like current flooding) with the higher costs of larger projects to address risk with uncertain timing (like an earthquake)?
- Consider total cost (societal and environmental) and not just the financial cost as part of calculations
- Maintain public access and aesthetics of the waterfront



WHAT WE HEARD

Where would you like to see measures placed on the waterfront? We heard the following general comments and feedback from the two meetings.

- Consider more expensive measures or measures requiring more intervention for historic, iconic, or culturally important areas
- Consider the effects of bay fill as part of the Nearshore Buttress measure

While the breakout rooms included discussion of where people might place certain measures, the purpose of the activity was not to determine yet which measures would be adopted and where they would be placed. That decision-making will be part of future community engagement.

Share your feedback with the online Measures Explorer.



Notes for Aquatic Park-Fisherman's Wharf | Thursday, September 24

| MEASURES EVALUATION | COMMUNITY FEEDBACK |
|---|--|
| What are the most important considerations for evaluating measures? (Design Life, Adaptability, Impact on the Waterfront, Cost, Compatible Measures) | Adaptability Cost-Effective Design Life – able to be replaced Ecological Features combined with structural Long-term solution needed to |
| What concerns do you have about any of the measures? | In area of high seismic risk: willing to start over and rebuild Different challenge than sea level rise – needs different pace of action Minimizing disruption to identified species |
| Map Measure Annotations | Raised Marine Structure at Pier 39 Bulkhead Wharf Retrofit at Pier 45 (last vestige of working waterfront) Seawalls at Pier 43 Drilled Shafts inland |
| Other Discussion Notes | Older buildings (non-historic) lower priority than shoreline stabilization; focusing on keep landmarks Could these areas be parkland instead? |



PORT

Measures Activity for Aquatic Park-Fisherman's Wharf | Thursday, September 24





Notes for Aquatic Park-Fisherman's Wharf Group #1| Friday, September 25

| MEASURES EVALUATION | COMMUNITY FEEDBACK |
|---|---|
| What are the most important considerations for evaluating measures? (Design Life, Adaptability, Impact on the Waterfront, Cost, Compatible Measures) | Adaptability Cost Impact on the Waterfront Protect wildlife Maritime component of Fisherman's Wharf |
| What concerns do you have about any of the measures? | Cost - can we use federal funds? Port and maritime operations Can Drilled Shafts be used without high cost and large program interruption |
| Map Measure Annotations | Raised Roadways to minimize traffic Ecological interventions at Hyde Street Pier Potential to use Breakwaters Expand Embarcadero Promenade |
| Other Discussion Notes | De-emphasizing vehicular traffic Prioritize people and program |



Measures Activity for Aquatic Park-Fisherman's Wharf Group #1| Friday, September 25





Notes for Aquatic Park-Fisherman's Wharf Group #2| Friday, September 25

| MEASURES EVALUATION | COMMUNITY PRIORITIZATION |
|---|---|
| What are the most important considerations for evaluating measures? (Design Life, Adaptability, Impact on the Waterfront, Cost, Compatible Measures) | Design Life Adaptability Cost |
| What concerns do you have about any of the measures? | Best way to apply measures in this tight area |
| Map Measure Annotations | Raised Marine Structure at Pier 45 (historic value), Pier 47, and Hyde Street Pier Ecological Features at Hyde Street Pier and for rowing clubs and swimming area to keep area attractive Drilled Shafts along Embarcadero Roadway between Pier 39 and 45 as more cost effective Drilled Shafts along Embarcadero Roadway at Pier 47 |
| Other Discussion Notes | Consider rebuilding Ecological Features: low cost is a benefit |



PORT

Measures Activity Aquatic Park-Fisherman's Wharf Group #2| Friday, September 25





Notes for Pier 31-35 + Northeast Waterfront | Thursday, September 24

| MEASURES EVALUATION | COMMUNITY PRIORITIZATION |
|---|--|
| What are the most important considerations for evaluating measures? (Design Life, Adaptability, Impact on the Waterfront, Cost, Compatible Measures) | Define our priority uses Get the most lifespan for the cost Dual function: ecological/educational Cost is worth it if highly adaptable |
| What concerns do you have about any of the measures? | Nearshore buttress requires filling the bay Tradeoffs of impacts and adaptability Aesthetic value of historic buildings Is short-term consequence worth it for long-term value It is already a constructed edge, so fill may not change that |
| Map Measure Annotations | Potential Nearshore Buttress between Piers 31 and 35 Ecological Shorelines near the cruise terminal Raised Marine Structures for Piers 9 to 23 Drilled Shafts along the Embarcadero between Piers 9 and 23 |
| Other Discussion Notes | N/A |

Measures Activity for Pier 31-35 + Northeast Waterfront | Thursday, September 24



PORT

Notes for Pier 31-35 + Northeast Waterfront | Friday, September 25

| MEASURES EVALUATION | COMMUNITY FEEDBACK |
|---|--|
| What are the most important considerations for evaluating measures? (Design Life, Adaptability, Impact on the Waterfront, Cost, Compatible Measures) | Design Life: 30-50-yearr Design Life doesn't make sense (investment should be longer) Cost – importance since it will be so huge Impact to the Waterfront – visual, physical, and system-wide impacts |
| What concerns do you have about any of the measures? | Try to avoid filling as much as possible Regulatory hurdles Visual impact Grade change/different elevations Will one action make it worse elsewhere? Little disturbance as possible to buildings/structures |
| Map Measure Annotations | Combine: Raised Marine Structures + Ecological Features > Raised Marine Structures Piers 9-23; Raised Marine Structures + Ecological Features Piers 17-23 Potential for floating structures for Piers 31 to 35? |
| Other Discussion Notes | Teaching about the effort – Exploratorium could education Impact on the Waterfront – Exploratorium, Cruise Ship Terminal, Tunnel need to be protected; "The city by the bay" (keep the story); Experience of the waterfront (the flow of people from city to water) |

Measures Activity for Pier 31-35 + Northeast Waterfront | Friday, September 25





PC

Notes for Ferry Building | Thursday, September 24

| MEASURES EVALUATION | COMMUNITY FEEDBACK |
|---|--|
| What are the most important considerations for evaluating measures? (Design Life, Adaptability, Impact on the Waterfront, Cost, Compatible Measures) | Cost-effectiveness – how do we distribute resources for everyone? Construction and social impacts Design Life (sea level rise projections uncertainty after 2060 – unpredictability of ice melt; target near-term solutions) Impact on the Waterfront – to businesses and mobility |
| What concerns do you have about any of the measures? | Uncertainty of projections – better to bet on nearer-term solutions |
| Map Measure Annotations | Bulkhead Wharf Retrofit between Piers 1 and 3 Drilled Shafts at the Ferry Building; not as effective in other areas due to bay mud Nearshore Buttress good for Ferry Building but expensive |
| Other Discussion Notes | Explore retreat to focus on higher-use areas? Ferry Building: protection of iconic structures vs. expense and social costs Deep soil mixing at Ferry Building (adaptable but costly) Do more short-term, but more certain, flood measures now for lower costs Potentially migrate Rincon Park How do we integrate planning for the greater Bay Area? How is transit preserved during construction? |

21

Measures Activity for Ferry Building | Thursday, September 24





Notes for Ferry Building | Friday, September 25

PC

| MEASURES EVALUATION | COMMUNITY FEEDBACK |
|---|--|
| What are the most important considerations for evaluating measures? (Design Life, Adaptability, Impact on the Waterfront, Cost, Compatible Measures) | Design Life: Critical area for the city – measures with longer design life and effectiveness are worth impacts and cost Adaptability: Nature-based adaptation is important What needs to happen now vs. long-term effects? Ecological co-benefits – opportunity for demonstration |
| What concerns do you have about any of the measures? | Levees can be unrealistic; Floodwalls not effective here Can this be improved design and built in time? Could compartmentalize flooding with raised structures for complete system Demonstration projects – possible in some areas of the waterfront, especially near Exploratorium? Nearshore Buttress as more effective than Bulkhead Wharf Retrofit |
| Map Measure Annotations | Raised Marine Structures at Ferry Building and Piers 1 and 3 Seawall and Ecological Features at Ferry Building and Piers 1 and 3 Ecological Shorelines at Rincon Park |
| Other Discussion Notes | • Effectiveness of measures is not listed as one of the criteria in the activity; Restraints from existing construction on which measures could be implemented |

PORT

Measures Activity for Ferry Building | Friday, September 25



Notes for South Beach | Thursday, September 24

| MEASURES EVALUATION | COMMUNITY PRIORITIZATION |
|---|---|
| What are the most important considerations for evaluating measures? (Design Life, Adaptability, Impact on the Waterfront, Cost, Compatible Measures) | Cost Design Life – long-term thinking and longevity of projects |
| What concerns do you have about any of the measures? | Disruption from construction Disruptions from construction will have to be minimal and slow |
| Map Measure Annotations | Nearshore Buttress at Brannan Street Wharf Bulkhead Wharf Retrofit + Drilled Shafts at Piers 38 and 40 |
| Other Discussion Notes | • Focus on area with greatest seismic risk as priority |



PORT

Measures Activity for South Beach | Thursday, September 24



Notes for South Beach | Friday, September 25

| MEASURES EVALUATION | COMMUNITY FEEDBACK |
|---|--|
| What are the most important considerations for evaluating measures? (Design Life, Adaptability, Impact on the Waterfront, Cost, Compatible Measures) | Design Life Consider that measures with a shorter design life may cost less money, but if they need to be replaced sooner it may ultimately be more cost-effective to choose the measures with a longer design life 30 years is too short of a design life Cost – paying more for longer design life "Do the project once" Impact on the Waterfront – keep visual and public access |
| What concerns do you have about any of the measures? | There is public perception about levees as being less effective based on their performance in Hurricane Katrina Maintenance of a levee system |
| Map Measure Annotations | Combine Seawalls with Raised Marine Structures |
| Other Discussion Notes | • Include societal and environmental costs as well as financial costs as part overall cost evaluation |



PORT

Measures Activity for South Beach | Friday, September 25





WE HOPE TO SEE YOU AT A FUTURE COMMUNITY MEETING!



PORT

