

APPENDIX A BACKGROUND ANALYSIS FOR WATER- DEPENDENT ACTIVITIES	191
APPENDIX B TEXT OF PROPOSITION H ORDINANCE	202
APPENDIX C GLOSSARY OF TERMS	207
APPENDIX D SEAWALL LOT/ASSESSORS BLOCK CORRELATION CHART	212
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	213



Background Analysis for Water-Dependent Activities

A key priority of the waterfront planning process was to ensure that ample property was reserved for the existing and future land use needs of the Port's water-dependent activities. Water-dependent activities – those which require access to water in order to function – include cargo shipping, ship repair, passenger cruise, excursion boats and ferries, recreational boating and water activities, historic ships, fishing, and temporary and ceremonial berthing. The land use needs of these industries were determined following intensive, industry-by-industry evaluations and public workshops which were completed in October 1992. Approximately two-thirds of the Port's properties were then reserved to meet the future needs of water-dependent activities. Below are brief summaries of those industries, taken from more detailed profiles prepared by Port staff, and from statements of facts and issues based on the profile reports and workshops with industry representatives. These additional documents are available from the Port of San Francisco upon request. Following the summaries of the industries is a brief summary of dredging and its impacts on maritime operations at the Port of San Francisco.

Cargo Shipping Industry

The “containerization” of cargo, whereby freight is pre-loaded into standard size boxes (as compared to “break-bulk” cargo which is freight that is made up of similar sized pieces loaded loosely or on pallets), began a revolution in shipping that has had dramatic impacts on most older waterfront cities, including San Francisco. Deregulation of transportation industries in the U.S. then paved the way for water, rail and motor carriers to work together in creating total transportation packages. The container provided an easily exchangeable conveyance between the different transportation modes. As a result of deregulation and containerization, intermodal movement of international shipments has flourished during the last two decades. In San Francisco, these historical trends led to the shift away from the break-bulk facilities on finger piers in the northern waterfront to the modern container facilities in the southern waterfront.

In the future, containerized cargos are projected to further dominate San Francisco Bay Area maritime trade. The 1996 Seaport Plan predicts over a four-fold increase in containerized cargo between 1990 and 2020, which accounts for approximately 80% of the total growth in dry cargo. At the same time, break-bulk cargo is projected to have little or now growth. These forecasts assume that the Bay Area will continue to compete successfully with other West Coast ports, especially Long Beach and Los Angeles. This assumption may prove optimistic in light of massive capital projects now underway in Southern California which the Port

of San Francisco is ill equipped to match. For example, the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach are spending over \$1 billion each on intermodal cargo improvements. The Port of San Francisco's surplus revenue in 1994/95 which could be applied to such improvements was \$3 million.

San Francisco's share of the regional growth forecast in container cargo trade is dependent upon a number of variables, including shipping line operations, actions by regulatory agencies, availability of capital to meet infrastructure requirements, and ability to increase productivity at marine terminals. Although all of these variables can be influenced by the Port of San Francisco, few are completely within the Port's control. In addition, a number of economic, demographic, and geographic factors outside the Port's control have severely limited San Francisco's ability to compete for intermodal container cargo shipping business. Some of the factors that will determine the future of container shipping in San Francisco include:

Competitive Access

By virtue of its geographic location, San Francisco does not have the same access to inland and eastern markets as the Port of Oakland or other East Bay ports. Cargo moving by truck to or from East Bay locations must travel on the Bay Bridge, adding time and expense as well as load limitations. Rail service is provided by only one line, Southern Pacific, and it takes on average 2 days for cargo entering San Francisco to reach Oakland where it is consolidated onto eastbound trains. Furthermore, shipping companies have expressed a strong desire to locate where two or more railroads compete for business. San Francisco, with its one rail carrier, is therefore less attractive than Oakland, with three rail carriers. San Francisco also faces a competitive disadvantage with respect to cargo exports. Whereas 25 years ago most cargo exports were generated on the San Francisco side of the Bay, today most are generated from the east side and, for the same reasons discussed above, are most likely to be shipped out from Oakland.

Rail Line Access and Congestion

The Southern Pacific rail line is located on the Peninsula Commute Service (PCS) corridor which is owned by the Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB). This double track rail line currently handles 60 commuter trains per week day traveling between San Francisco and San Jose. Freight rail operations are permitted, except during morning and afternoon peak commute hours. However, if both container cargo operations and commuter rail usage are projected to grow, conflicts will occur.

Double-stacked Intermodal Rail Service

The economics of intermodal service favor ports that have the capability to allow containers to be double stacked on rail cars directly off the ship, which increases the capacity of a train without adding to its length. Although the Port is the only Northern California port with on-dock rail facilities and on-dock rail yard, commonly known as the ICTF (intermodal container transfer facility), trains from the Port must go through two tunnels that lack sufficient vertical clearance to accommodate double-stack rail cars when loaded with the tallest containers in use today. Double-stacked rail cars will not alleviate the competitive access and

access and congestion issues discussed above. However, if these access issues are alleviated, then it may be beneficial for the Port to move forward with improvements to the rail tunnels to allow double stacks.

Consolidation of Shipping Lines

Changes in the relationship between carriers (either by contract or through merger and acquisitions) to improve the frequency and efficiency of service have resulted in large losses for the Port of San Francisco. For example, the Port recently lost three small carriers which entered into a joint venture arrangement. Since the Port of Richmond is more conveniently located for one of the shipping lines, the other two followed. While trends toward increased volumes of cargo are positive, not all Ports will share equally in capturing new business.

Preferential Assignment of Terminals to Carriers

There is a developing trend among large carriers to own or control their own marine terminal. Historically, no one carrier has controlled either of the Port's two container terminals. Rather, stevedore companies have competed for the right to operate the terminals as public facilities for a combination of ocean carriers. Until recently, the Port of San Francisco was the only Bay Area port with the capacity to offer long-term preferential assignments of its container terminal to selected ocean carriers. The federal government's recent transfer of over 400 acres of the Oakland Navy Supply Center to the Port of Oakland for cargo expansion allows Oakland to consider offering preferential assignment for Oakland facilities.

Container Terminal Facilities

The Port has two major container terminals located at Piers 80 and 94/96. Both terminals primarily handle container cargo, but have the capability for break-bulk, container freight station operations (stuffing and unstuffing of containers) and transloading (transfer of cargo from one mode to another, e.g. between box-car and container). Between 1992 and 1994, the Port lost 10 container shipping lines. Among the more significant, was the discontinuation of Nedlloyd's hub service between Central and South America through San Francisco to the Far East because Nedlloyd was not able to provide competitive transit times to its customers. The joint container service of Columbus and Blue Star Line moved to Oakland to have all of West Coast terminal services provided by a single company which is located in Oakland. The largest of these losses, COSCO, intended to carry a much larger portion of intermodal cargo and found Oakland's rail access better suited to its needs. For similar reasons, in 1995, the Port's largest remaining cargo line, Evergreen, relocated to Oakland.

Container operations depend heavily on economies of scale and, for a number of years, terminal operators at both the North and South Terminals have had difficulty maintaining profitability. More recently, there has not been enough cargo shipped through the Port for the terminal operations to break even. In fact, Metropolitan California Stevedore Company recently was forced to cease container operations in Northern California, effectively closing the North Container terminal at Pier 80.

With only a few shipping companies remaining at the Port of San Francisco, the terminal facilities are operating at a fraction of their capacity. Operating revenues generated from cargo shipping have fallen from \$10 million in 1990 to an expected \$1.8 million in 1995/96. The Port is making changes that it hopes will attract new business. For example, the Port is actively pursuing several niche markets for new shipping businesses that are less rail dependent. The Port has recently made inroads in the “project cargo” market which involves the lucrative, albeit cyclical, shipping of major equipment for construction projects throughout the world. The Port’s existing terminals have more than enough capacity to accommodate growth in the foreseeable future.

Ship Repair

The ship repair industry has long been an important source of blue collar employment in the San Francisco Bay Area, providing high paying jobs and historic ties to the San Francisco waterfront and maritime industries. Over the last decade, however, the ship repair industry has steadily declined, reflective of industry trends nationwide.

In the 1960’s, the ship repair industry employed some 20,000 workers at over 15 different companies in San Francisco. The employment base of the industry now stands at approximately 450 full time positions with a maximum of another 1000 “seasonal workers” serving the industry in San Francisco. Most of these workers are employed by the remaining full-service ship repair company: San Francisco Drydock at Pier 70.

Two reasons are most often cited for the industry decline: foreign competition and the decreasing number of active military ships.

Foreign Competition

During the 1960’s the U.S. ship repair industry grew dramatically as the result of repairs necessary on both military and commercial vessels. After the Vietnam War, in order to keep a level of combat readiness to build and repair ships, the U.S. government provided subsidies to ship repair companies in the United States. These subsidies were reduced and eventually eliminated in 1981. Most foreign countries have not followed suit, and continue to maintain a level of subsidy to their ship building and ship repair industries. The elimination of subsidies by the U.S. government has put U.S. ship building and repair operations at a considerable disadvantage in the commercial market.

Military Spending

With the decline of the commercial ship repair industry in the U.S., ship yards were forced to rely on military contracts. The downsizing of the military over the past twenty years, however, has led to a dramatic reduction in expenditures for ship repair work. In addition, major U.S. Naval facilities at Alameda and at Mare Island in Vallejo have recently been slated for closure, further reducing the demand for ship repair work.

The ship repair industry in San Francisco will have to be able to attract additional commercial business in order to survive. For example, San Francisco Drydock began transitioning its business from the governmental market to the commercial market in 1987. In the last 7 years, it increased its percentage of commercial business from 10% to 70%.

The ability to continue to attract ship repair business will depend in part upon factors outside the control of individual companies or the Port, such as the discontinuation of subsidies provided for the industry in other countries.

In response to the decline of the ship repair industry, the Board of Supervisors approved a seven point program in 1991 to help San Francisco ship repair companies become more competitive in the commercial sector. The program recommends that the Port waive most dockage fees and provide rent credits to ship repair companies to fund much-needed improvements to their facilities. In response, the Port has reduced rents and established an employee training facility at Pier 70. Although the seven point survival plan represents a creative attempt by local policy-makers to revitalize the ship repair industry, it could have significant costs for the Port that may or may not be offset by higher revenues generated by the industry.

Passenger Cruise Industry

San Francisco's reputation as a world class tourist destination makes it a desirable port of call for cruise lines. Nevertheless, two important obstacles have precluded San Francisco's rise to preeminence in the cruise market. First, San Francisco's central location on the west coast places it 1-2 sailing days further away from major cruise destinations, such as Alaska and Mexico, in comparison to Southern California and Vancouver. Second, the U.S. Passenger Services Act prohibits foreign flagged vessels from carrying passengers between U.S. ports. Since the vast majority of deep sea cruise vessels are foreign flagged (only two are U.S. flagged) this law prevents most cruise lines from offering itineraries that would carry passengers one way between San Francisco and other U.S. cities along the coast. Attempts are underway to amend this Act to improve the competitive position of U.S. ports in this industry. Without it, San Francisco's potential for growth in the traditional cruise market is limited.

On the other hand, there are other cruise industry trends which could potentially increase the amount of cruise ship activity in San Francisco. A wide variety of new types of cruises are being considered, including "cruises to nowhere" or gambling cruises (currently prohibited by California, but not federal law), coastal cruises between U.S. cities, and auto/ferry cruises. In 1995, the Port hosted 13 passenger lines that made 50 ship calls. The Port anticipates notable growth in revenues from cruise ship operations in the next few years because of the addition of 2 passenger lines offering round trip cruises between San Francisco and Alaska, and new carriers introducing Pacific cruises.

San Francisco's existing cruise terminal at Pier 35 provides two berths which could accommodate more than 200 ship calls per year. Recently, ship calls have averaged about 44 calls per year. However, cruise ship forecasts from 1995 to 1999 indicate an increase of 50 (1995) to 66 (1999) calls per year.

Although San Francisco has excess berthing capacity, Pier 35 has several major shortcomings as a cruise passenger terminal. Physical constraints due to the narrow width of the pier prevent efficient ship servicing and negatively affect passenger flow when more than 1500 passengers pass through the terminal. These constraints are particularly problematic when two ships are in port. Furthermore, there is no clearly delineated passenger drop off and pickup area, and many cruise passengers and officials consider the terminal to drab, unattractive and uninviting. Finally, Pier 35 needs frequent dredging to maintain water depth sufficient to accommodate deep draft cruise vessels. As discussed more below, the cost of dredging is becoming prohibitive. In sum, cruise industry experts consider San Francisco's terminal to be inferior to most others in the United States. And, from the perspective of San Franciscans, the Pier 35 terminal lacks any public access or viewing areas from which residents can safely observe the fascinating cruise operations.

The trend in new cruise terminal developments has been to integrate ancillary commercial activities to help offset the costs of constructing and operating new terminal facilities, and to provide year-round public enjoyment despite the seasonal nature of cruises. New cruise terminals in North America have included commercial facilities such as hotels, convention and conference space, retail shops, restaurants, and parking garages.

Excursion Boat Industry

Due to the size and strength of its visitor industry, San Francisco is the center of the Bay Area excursion boat industry. This industry is divided into four basic types of operations: dining cruises, sight-seeing or tourist cruises, recreational riders on commuter ferries, and small charters. There are approximately five large excursion boat companies operating in San Francisco, along with approximately 50 small charter boats. The large excursion boat companies command a total of approximately 17 vessels. The total number of excursion boat passengers in San Francisco last year exceeded 1.5 million.

Overall, the financial condition of the excursion boat industry is fairly good. The existing large operators at the Port have seen modest increases in sales volumes over the past five years. On the other hand, smaller operator's revenues have remained fairly flat. Most of the current operators appear to have additional capacity on their existing vessels, with the exception of popular recreational tours such as trips to Alcatraz and Angel Island during the summer.

However, existing excursion boat operators need additional facilities to meet current requirements. Locational requirements depend upon the market segment being served. Generally, visitor-oriented excur-

sions should be located in Fisherman's Wharf and excursions oriented to convention or business groups should be near Downtown. In addition, excursion operations need parking, particularly for dinner cruise patrons who often return from cruises late at night, truck catering and loading access, and ancillary space for food preparation, storage and vessel repair.

Fishing Industry

Fisherman's Wharf is the home of the Bay Area's fishing fleet and fish handling industry, which includes wholesale buying and selling of fish, fish filleting, and sorting and distribution for local and regional consumption. About 20 million pounds of fish – crab, salmon, herring, shrimp, squid, abalone, mackerel, halibut and sole – come through the Port annually, although the majority of fish handled at the Wharf is transported in and out by truck. A significant amount of fish trading occurs on Jefferson Street in the very early morning hours, before tourist activities take over the area.

Although always a fairly cyclical industry, recent environmental conditions have greatly reduced the available fisheries resources, which in turn has greatly reduced the economic health of the industry. At the same time, more stringent federal sanitation and safety regulations for fish handling have required costly infrastructure improvements.

The growth potential in the fishing industry varies depending on the particular activity. Fish handling and distribution activities of the type which occur at the Wharf have the greatest growth potential, especially now that modernized facilities on Pier 45 are available to the industry to help them meet new sanitation standards. The growth potential of the sport fishing industry is less clear, primarily because of the decrease in the salmon fisheries and the lack of inexpensive parking at the Wharf for patrons. New fishing and environmental regulations adopted with the goal of improving fisheries, and better marketing and parking arrangements, could help the industry considerably.

In general, except for the newly modernized Pier 45 facilities, the fishing industry facilities at the Wharf are in poor condition. The berthing system was designed to serve out-dated fishing vessels and is inadequate by today's standards, particularly in terms of accessibility, security, protection from surge and availability of parking, storage and support services. The fish handling facilities in historic Fish Alley were designed many years ago to meet the needs of fish handling businesses that operated on a much smaller scale.

The Port, with the active support of the fishing industry and the Fisherman's Wharf community, initiated the "Seafood Center Project" to meet the physical infrastructure needs of the fishing industry, including new berthing and modernized fish handling space. New fish handling facilities on Pier 45 are now available, and the construction of 62 new berths in Hyde Street Harbor for fishing boats is scheduled to begin in 1999. In the meantime, the Port has been working closely with the fishing industry to meet their most immediate needs. The Port has provided the industry with affordable ice, more readily available and affordable fuel, dredging around the fuel dock to allow fueling at high and low tide, a permanent Port office with a view of the harbor and a satellite police station. The Port is working on a public hoist and new lighting throughout the Wharf.

Commuter Ferry Operations

In the 1920's and 30's, the Ferry Building was said to be the world's second busiest terminal, behind London's Charing Cross Station. More than 170 ferries arrived and departed each day from eight berths, with approximately 50 million riders per year passing through its gates. The completion of the Golden Gate and Bay Bridges in the late 1930's caused a dramatic reduction in the once thriving passenger and cargo ferry industry, rendering many of the Port's finger piers obsolete. The Ferry Building ceased to function as a ferry terminal in 1958.

Today ferries dock at Pier ½ just north of the Ferry Building and at Ferry Plaza, behind the building. Although in recent years there has been a resurgent interest in ferries, ridership remains modest compared to historic levels. Nevertheless, commuter and recreational riders made approximately 2.8 million ferry trips in 1991, and this number is expected to grow to over 4.4 million over the next decade according to the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC). Interest in non-commuter waterborne modes of transit, such as water taxis and an airport hovercraft, also has been rising as local roads and highways become more congested.

Two critical factors will determine the ultimate growth of commuter ferry ridership: 1) changes in the technology of ferry boats, and 2) the continuation of operating subsidies. If breakthroughs in ferry technology lead to a reduction in commute times, and if the price of a ride is competitive with other forms of transportation, then demand will continue to grow for new facilities. The entire Bay Area regional ferry system is centered at the Ferry Building, where all existing and proposed commuter routes terminate. But, as Mission Bay and other new waterfront neighborhoods emerge, smaller ferries or water-taxis could become a popular means of traveling along other parts of the waterfront.

The Port has received over \$10 million in state and federal grants to upgrade and expand ferry facilities at the Ferry Building. The Ferry Terminal upgrade project currently underway involves an additional landing barge, reconfiguration of deck areas, construction of a breakwater to allow safe installation of the additional barge, covered waiting areas, signage, and passenger drop off and pick up areas. All of this work is being closely coordinated with plans for renovation of the Ferry Building. Renovation of the Ferry Building as a regional transportation complex emphasizing waterborne transportation may require a significant public subsidy.

Historic Ships

In San Francisco, historic ships are concentrated at the San Francisco Maritime National Historic Park on the Hyde Street Pier at Fisherman's Wharf. This floating national park attracts 150,000 visitors each year. On the east side of Pier 45, the USS Pampanito also attracts 200,000 visitors each year. And approximately 450,000 visitors each year go to the Maritime Museum in nearby Aquatic Park. Like the excursions industry,

the market for historic vessels is significantly enhanced and dependent on the presence of the City's large number of visitors. As a result, historic ship berths at Fisherman's Wharf, with its higher level of foot traffic, are currently more desirable than berths located elsewhere along the waterfront. Berths with direct visibility from The Embarcadero are most attractive of all. An exception to this general rule is the historic ferry Santa Rosa at Pier 3, which is used for maritime offices and special events not requiring a highly visible location.

Much like the excursion boat market, growth in the visitor industry should generally result in growth in the number of potential customers touring historic vessels. Operators of the historic vessels have identified a need for additional facilities to accommodate anticipated growth in the number of visitors, and to address deficiencies in existing facilities. In particular, the National Park Service has three ships temporarily berthed in Sausalito and one at Fort Mason because there is no room for them at the Hyde Street Pier. At Fisherman's Wharf, the parking shortage is a disadvantage for the Maritime Park. Bus tours visiting the Park have difficulty loading and unloading and finding layover parking. Exhibition display space, storage and support facilities, such as a space for boat repair shops and restrooms for visitors, are also in short supply. Also, historic ships used for offices and special events need parking for visitors.

The Port's revenue stream from historic ships is not sufficient to cover the capital improvement costs necessary for placement of additional historic vessels. On the other hand, historic ship berths could be funded as a component in a mixed-use, maritime-oriented commercial development. For example, the Ferry Building area would be ideal for such an amenity because of the area's large numbers of pedestrians and outstanding public transit service.

Recreational Boating and Water Use

San Francisco Bay is one of the most exhilarating places in the world for recreational boating and water activities, including cruising, racing, kayaking, swimming, windsurfing, rowing and sailing.

During the early 1980's, two marinas were built on Port property, at Pier 39 and South Beach Harbor. Today, high capital costs and uncertain revenue streams make marina development risky without supporting commercial uses. As evidence by the South Beach Harbor marina, revenues raised from berthing rentals alone may be insufficient to support the costs of new marinas. Commercial development in conjunction with marina development provides additional revenue to help the financial feasibility of the overall project. Marinas, in turn, attract visitors and customers for adjacent commercial development.

The demand for new berths has slowed in recent years, and the number of registered pleasure boats in San Francisco actually declined from 1975 to 1991. Nevertheless, the market for recreational boating has remained fairly stable, and there are opportunities for expansion due to the aging "baby-boomer" generation

with increased disposable income and leisure time. In the meantime, there is an acute shortage of slips for boats less than 26 feet in length. The waiting list for smaller slips at the South Beach Marina is over 100 years long. As a result, small boat owners often “overpay” for larger berths than they actually need.

In recent years, San Francisco has become increasingly popular as a sailing destination for short term visits and excursions, raising demand for short-term berthing particularly during holidays and weekends. There is a consensus among the boating community that San Francisco should offer more opportunities for free or inexpensive buoys and floating docks for temporary berthing or mooring. Such facilities are most desirable near waterfront restaurants and public attractions. New commercial establishments could provide such facilities, enticing new patrons while also providing waterfront projects with a maritime ambience. However, the potentially high cost to comply with the Americans With Disabilities Act and protect property owners from general liability exposure may impede provisions of these berthing and mooring facilities at a low cost.

Currently, the City only has one public launch facility for trailerable boats and non-motorized small craft, and it is in poor condition. On busy days in the summer months, there can be as many as thirty boats on trailers waiting to gain access to this one facility. In addition, there is insufficient off-street parking for boat trailers near the launch, and there is insufficient dry storage for small boats. Additional facilities also are required to meet the boat repair and haul-out needs for recreational boaters. Public funding for these improvements is difficult to obtain. However, small boat facilities such as a public launch could conceivably be funded as a condition of other waterfront projects. For example, facilities for launching small boats could be developed in tandem with business supplying food, equipment, bait and/or sailing lessons.

Temporary and Ceremonial Berthing

The Port receives requests for temporary and ceremonial berthing facilities from ships, commercial fishing boats, yachts and pleasure boats, as well as from the U.S. Coast Guard and Navy, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association and foreign navies. These ships berth for time periods ranging from a few hours to a few weeks, depending on whether they are calling at the Port to load and unload materials, make minor repairs, provide shore visits for crew members or ship visits for the public, or lay over between assignments. While the number of temporary berthings has been relatively stable in the past few years (130 in 1990, 137 in 1991, 139 in 1992, and 134 in 1993) the rate at which they will occur in future years is difficult to predict.

The Port also provides berthing for ceremonial ships. Despite the Port’s favorable location on San Francisco’s reputation as an international cultural and tourist center, demand for this use has been erratic because promotional and special events are not routine. In recent years, the demand for ceremonial berthing varied from 45 visits in 1990, to 78 in 1991.

In order to accommodate the full range of temporary and ceremonial vessel needs, berthing facilities ideally should include truck access and turnaround areas, utilities, strong pier substructures and fender systems, parking, and security. Because of the irregularity of demand for these facilities, and the limited revenues to support improvements and maintenance, these activities are best accommodated through facilities shared with other users. Although revenues from this activity may not be sufficient to fund improvements, this use would be an ideal attraction and complement to mixed-use projects on the waterfront.

Dredging

Although the Port is a naturally deep harbor, annual dredging is required to maintain berth and channel depths. Regulations governing dredging have recently become more and more complex and costly. Because of the decreased capacity at existing in-bay disposal sites and growing concerns about the potential environment impacts of dredging, the entire Bay Area faces limitations on the ability to dredge in the near – and long-term future. A \$16 million regional “Long-Term Management Strategy for Dredging Material Disposal” (“LTMS”) is underway to establish a 50 year strategy and alternatives for disposing of dredged materials in the most economical and environmental and sensitive way. The conclusions so far indicate that while ocean and upland disposal alternatives may provide new capacity, future testing and disposal costs will be far more expensive than in the past. For example, the 1991/92 dredging costs for newsprint cargo shipping operation at Piers 27-29 went from 6% of total revenues for in-bay disposal to about 85% of total revenues for upland disposal.

In the meantime, the Port of San Francisco has reduced its annual dredging to serve only those facilities with urgent and immediate needs. As a result, the Port has had to relocate cargo shipping tenants from the Port’s China Basin break-bulk terminal to other marine terminals, and the China Basin terminal will most likely be re-leased for uses that do not require deep water access.

These recent examples indicate the potentially devastating land use and financial impacts the Port faces with respect to dredging. In addition, the Port is now required to fund water quality regional monitoring programs and new permit fees. New opportunities to generate revenues must be found to help offset the increasing dredging costs associated with maritime operations.

Appendix B

Text of Proposition H Ordinance

Passed by the San Francisco voters in November 1990

(Note: In November 1994, San Francisco voters approved Proposition P, which exempted the Ferry Building restoration and Pier 52 public boat launch and café from the Proposition H moratorium on non-maritime development, as described below in Section 5.)

Be it ordained by the people of the City and County of San Francisco that the Administrative Code is hereby amended by adding a new Chapter as follows:

Section 1 – Findings and Declaration of Policy

The people of the City and County of San Francisco find and declare:

- a. Whereas, the waterfront of San Francisco is an irreplaceable public resource of the highest value;
- b. Whereas, the most beneficial and appropriate use of the waterfront is for purposes related to and dependent on their proximity to San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Ocean, such as maritime uses, public access to, and restoration of, San Francisco Bay;
- c. Whereas, San Francisco holds the waterfront in Trust for the People of California;
- d. Whereas, maritime uses, public access to, and restoration of San Francisco Bay serve San Francisco residents, and provide significant economic, social and environmental benefits to San Francisco and its residents, including a diversity of employment opportunities and better access to a healthier San Francisco Bay;
- e. Whereas, the waterfront contains structures of historical and architectural importance;
- f. Whereas, it is poor planning to approve waterfront land uses on an ad hoc basis, rather than as part of a comprehensive waterfront land use plan;
- g. Whereas, it is in the interest of San Francisco to develop a strong and economically vital waterfront with adequate public access to and restoration of San Francisco Bay; and
- h. Whereas, changing conditions in the maritime industry such as deeper draft vessels and increased awareness of the negative environmental impacts of dredging and dredge-spoil dumping indicate that cargo handling at the Port of San Francisco could increase dramatically;

Therefore the people of San Francisco declare that it is the policy of the City and County of San Francisco that:

- a. the waterfront be reserved for maritime uses, public access, and projects which aid in the preservation and restoration of the environment;
- b. where such land uses are infeasible or impossible, only acceptable non-maritime land uses as set forth in this ordinance shall be allowed;

- c. a waterfront land use plan shall be prepared (as set forth in Section 2 of this ordinance) to further define acceptable and unacceptable non-maritime land uses and to assign land uses for specific waterfront parcels.

Section 2 – Land Use Planning Process

- a. Upon adoption of this initiative, the Board of Supervisors shall within 30 days request the Port Commission to prepare a “Waterfront Land Use Plan” which is consistent with the terms of this initiative for waterfront lands as defined by this ordinance. Should the Port Commission not agree to this request within 30 days of the Board of Supervisors request, the Board of Supervisors shall have 30 days to designate a different City agency or department to prepare the “Waterfront Land Use Plan.”
- b. The agency drafting the “Waterfront Land Use Plan” shall consult the City Planning Commission to ensure development of a plan consistent with the City’s *General Plan*. The final plan and any subsequent amendments thereto shall be subject to a public hearing conducted by the City Planning Commission to ensure consistency between that plan and the City’s *General Plan*.
- c. The “Waterfront Land Use Plan” shall define land uses in terms of the following categories:
 - 1. Maritime land uses;
 - 2. Acceptable non-maritime land uses; and
 - 3. Unacceptable non-maritime land uses.Land uses included in these categories which are not part of the initial ordinance shall be added to Sections 3 through 5 of this ordinance as appropriate. No deletions from Sections 3 through 5 shall be allowed unless approved by the voters of San Francisco.
- d. No City agency or officer may take, or permit to be taken, any action to permit the new development of any non-maritime land use (except those land uses set forth in Section 4 below) on the waterfront until the “Waterfront Land Use Plan” has been completed. Non-maritime land uses existing, or which have all their necessary permits, as of January 1, 1990 shall be exempt from this limitation.
- e. The “Waterfront Land Use Plan” shall be reviewed by the agency which prepared it or by such other agency designated by the Board of Supervisors at a minimum of every five years, with a view toward making any necessary amendments consistent with this initiative.
- f. The “Waterfront Land Use Plan” shall be prepared with the maximum feasible public input.

Section 3 – Maritime Land Uses

Maritime Land Uses include but are not limited to:

- a. Maritime cargo handling and storage facilities; b. Ship repair facilities; c. Fish processing facilities; d. Marinas and boat launch ramps; e. Ferry boat terminals; f. Cruise ship terminals; g. Excursion and charter boat facilities and terminals; h. Ship berthing facilities; i. Maritime construction and maritime supply facilities; j. Marine equipment and supply facilities; k. A list of additional maritime land uses developed as part of the Waterfront Land Use Planning process shall be included in the “Waterfront Land Use Plan” and added to this section.

Section 4 – Acceptable Non-maritime Land Uses

Acceptable non-maritime land uses include but are not limited to:

a. Parks; b. Esplanades; c. Wildlife habitat; d. Recreational fishing piers; e. Restoration of the ecology of San Francisco Bay and its shoreline; f. Transit and traffic facilities; and g. A list of additional acceptable non-maritime land uses developed as part of the Waterfront Land Use Planning process shall be included in the “Waterfront Land Use Plan” and added to this section.

Section 5 – Unacceptable Non-Maritime Land Uses

a. Criteria for Consideration in Determining Unacceptable Non-maritime Land Uses

Criteria to be considered in making findings regarding the acceptability of any specific land use on the waterfront shall include but are not limited to:

1. Does the land use need to be located on the waterfront in order to serve its basic function?
2. Is the land use compatible with existing or planned maritime operations on surrounding parcels if any?
3. Does the land use provide the maximum feasible public access?
4. Does the land use improve the ecological balance of San Francisco Bay?
5. Does the land use protect the waterfront’s architectural heritage?
6. Does the land use represent the best interest of the people of the City and County of San Francisco and/or State of California?

b. Prohibition of Unacceptable Non-maritime Land Uses

No city agency or officer may take, or permit to be taken, any action to permit the development of any unacceptable non-maritime land use (as set forth below) on the waterfront.

c. Listing of Unacceptable Non-maritime Land Uses

The following land uses are found to be unacceptable non-maritime land uses;

1. Hotels

The City finds that hotels do not need to be located on the waterfront, and permitting their development on the waterfront will displace or preclude maritime uses;
The City finds that waterfront hotels do not provide the economic benefits provided by maritime employment;
The City finds that waterfront hotels do not provide high quality public access to, or permit restoration of, San Francisco Bay;
The City finds that waterfront hotels do not serve the needs of San Francisco or its residents;
The City therefore finds that hotels are an unacceptable non-maritime land use and shall not be permitted on the waterfront.

2. A list of additional unacceptable non-maritime land uses developed as part of the Waterfront Land Use Planning process shall be included in the “Waterfront Land Use Plan” and added to this section.

d. Grandfathering of Existing Unacceptable Non-maritime Land Uses

This initiative shall not permit any unacceptable non-maritime land uses existing as of January 1, 1990 from

continuing in operation or expanding on its existing site in a manner consistent with all other applicable laws and regulations. At such time as a new land use plan is proposed for the site of a business existing as of January 1, 1990 that new land use must meet the conditions set forth in this ordinance.

Section 6 – Definitions

- a. "City agency or officer" means the Board of Supervisors, and all other city commissions, boards, officers, employees, departments or entities whose exercise of powers can be affected by initiative.
- b. "Action" includes, but is not limited to:
 1. amendments to the Planning Code, and *General Plan*; 2. Issuance of permits or entitlement for use by any City agency or officers; 3. Approval, modification or reversal of decisions or actions by subordinate City agencies or officers; 4. Approval of sales or leases pursuant to Section 7.402 and 7.402-1 of the Charter of the City and County of San Francisco; 5. Approval of or amendments to Redevelopment Plans; and 6. Any other actions, including but not limited to projects as defined in Public Resources Code Section 21065.
- c. "Waterfront" means land transferred to the City and County of San Francisco pursuant to Chapter 1333 of the Statutes of 1968, as well as any other property which is owned by or under the control of the Port Commission of San Francisco, and which is also in any of the following areas:
 1. piers;
 2. the shoreline band as defined in Government Code Section 66610(b), between the Golden Gate National Recreation Area and the intersection of The Embarcadero and Berry Street, except for the area south of Jefferson Street between Hyde Street and Powell Street.
 3. the shoreline band as defined in Government Code Section 66610(b), in the area bounded by San Francisco Bay, Berry, Third, and Evans Street, Hunter's Point Boulevard, and a straight line from the intersection of Hunter's Point Boulevard and Innis Avenue to the intersection of Carroll Avenue and Fitch Street; and
 4. the area south of Pier 98 in which all new development is subject to the Shoreline Guidelines, as show on Map 8 (Eastern Shoreline Plan) of the Recreation and Open Space Element of the San Francisco *General Plan*, in effect as of January 1, 1990.
- d. "San Francisco Bay" means the area defined in Government Code Section 66610(a) which is in the City and County of San Francisco, except for areas west of Third Street.
- e. All references to public roads are to their alignments as of January 1, 1990.
- f. "Hotel" means any use falling within the definition in Section 314.1(g) of the San Francisco Planning Code in effect as of January 1, 1990; any waterside hotel having docks to accommodate persons traveling by boat; or any facilities for providing temporary or transient occupancy. This shall not include boat berths which are provided for temporary moorage of boats.

Section 7 – Implementation

Within 180 days of the effective date of this ordinance, the City and County shall:

- a. amend its General Plan, Planning Code, and other relevant plans and codes in a manner consistent with this ordinance;
- b. request and apply for conforming amendments to all applicable state and regional plans and regulations; and
- c. begin preparation of the “Waterfront Land Use Plan” required under Section 2 of this ordinance.

Section 8 – Severability

If any portion of this ordinance, or the application thereof, is hereafter determined to be invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, all remaining portions of this ordinance, or application thereof, shall remain in full force and effect. Each section, subsection, sentence, phrase, part, or portion of this ordinance would have been adopted and passed irrespective of the fact that any one or more sections, subsections, sentences, phrases, parts or portions be declared invalid or unconstitutional.

Section 9 – Amendment and Repeal

No part of this ordinance or the amendments made pursuant to Section 7 hereof may be amended or repealed except by a vote of the electors of the City and County of San Francisco, except for those additional listings provided herein in Sections 3, 4, and 5.

Section 10 – Chaptering of this Ordinance

After the adoption of this ordinance the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors shall assign a Chapter number to this ordinance and shall renumber the sections of this ordinance in an appropriate manner.

Appendix C

Glossary of Terms

Academic Institutions - Institutions or classrooms for educational purposes, including but not limited to: academic, professional, cultural, business, technical, industrial arts, fine arts or other types of education.

Accessory Parking - Parking which is associated with existing Port activities or which is provided as a requirement for new development.

Artist/Designer Studios and Galleries - Facilities for artisans and designers (e.g. artists, designers, craftpersons, graphic artists, sculptors, wood workers, etc.) including but not limited to: space for manufacturing/creating, exhibiting and/or selling of products (e.g. studios, galleries, workshops, ware houses), which shall not be used for residences unless all applicable local and state authorizations are obtained.

Assembly and Entertainment – Facilities for entertainment and attractions including but not limited to: band shells, auditoriums, theaters (cinemas and live performances), night clubs, amusement parks, conference, convention and event facilities, exhibition halls, public markets and children’s entertainment.

Bay Oriented Commercial Recreation and Public Assembly Uses – Facilities specifically designed to attract large numbers of people to enjoy the Bay and its shoreline, such as restaurants, specialty shops and hotels. (*San Francisco Bay Plan, p. 36*)

Break-bulk – Freight which generally is made up of similar size pieces which is loaded into or unloaded

loosely, on a pallet or in a cargo net. Break-bulk was the traditional method of cargo handling along the Port’s finger piers before innovations in container cargo shipping.

Bulkhead Buildings – Structures, generally built on top of the seawall and spanning the width of the pier, which are the entrances to piers.

Burton Act – State legislation which sets the terms and conditions for the transfer of Port property to the jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco, subject to control and management by a local Port Commission. (California Statutes, Chapter 1333, 1968.)

California State Lands Commission – A State agency with jurisdiction over the lands granted in trust to the Port of San Francisco. Commission staff monitors Port activities and projects to ensure compliance with the Burton Act (legislation that transferred Port lands to the City) and the Public Trust Doctrine.

Cargo Shipping – Primary, support and ancillary facilities for waterborne transport of cargo shipped in container boxes or in bulk (dry bulk, liquid bulk, break-bulk, neo-bulk) including but not limited to: shipping terminals and berths, cargo handling, storage and warehousing, equipment storage and repair facilities, cargo sourcing, container freight stations, freight rail and truck access, ship servicing, administrative functions, and employee support services, (e.g. training facilities, parking).

Community Facilities – Public safety and community service facilities, including but not limited to: fire and police stations, postal services, day care, health care, libraries, community meeting rooms, and medical emergency helipad.

Connector Buildings – Structures, generally built on top of the seawall north of China Basin Channel, most of which extend between bulkhead buildings.

Container Cargo – Cargo which is transported in standard sized boxes.

Dry Bulk – Dry loose freight, such as grain and various ores, which is loaded or unloaded via conveyor belts, spouts or scoops.

Ferry & Excursion Boats and Water

Taxis – Primary, support and ancillary facilities for waterborne transportation (e.g. commuter ferries, waterborne taxis hovercrafts) or short-term excursions (e.g. charter boats, mini-cruises, sightseeing, gaming, dining and entertainment on the water) including but not limited to: passenger terminals and berthing areas, storage, employee or passenger parking, administrative functions, ship servicing areas, layover berths, fueling stations and other boat or passenger services.

Fill – As defined in the *McAteer-Petris Act* which created the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, fill means “earth or any other substance or material including pilings or structures placed on pilings, and

structures floating at some or all times and moored for extended periods, such as house boats and floating docks.”

Fill Credit – A proposed concept whereby existing fill could be removed and relocated to another site.

Fishing Industry – Primary, support and ancillary facilities for commercial or sport fishing operations including but not limited to: fishing boat berths and harbors, fish processing, handling (e.g. cleaning and packing) and distribution facilities, support services (e.g. fuel docks, Fisherman’s Wharf Chapel, fishing research and education facilities), storage, maintenance and administrative functions, and employee services (e.g. training facilities and parking).

General Industry – Facilities for enclosed and open air industrial activities, including but not limited to: recycling operations, automobile repair and related services, bio-remediation, sand and gravel operations, transmission facilities, and manufacturing operations.

General Office – Includes but is not limited to: administrative, management, executive, business service, research and development, and professional services for small and large companies.

Historic Ships – Primary, support and ancillary facilities for display of historic vessels including but not limited to: berthing

areas, museum/exhibit and administrative space, storage maintenance and workshop space and employee and visitor parking.

Hotel – Facilities for overnight lodging, including hotels, boatels, bed and breakfast [except for overnight lodging on ships which is consistent with a primary water-dependent use (e.g. temporary or ceremonial berthing, recreational berthing, historic ships, etc.)]

Liquid Bulk – Liquid freight, such as petroleum or vegetable oil, which is shipped in tankers rather than in drums or other small, individual units.

Maritime – A general term used to describe industrial, commercial or recreation activities related to waterborne commerce, navigation and recreation, including but not limited to: cargo shipping, ship repair, ferries and excursion boats, cruises, recreational boating, historic ships, fishing industry, berthing.

Maritime Office – Administrative and business functions for any maritime industry including, but not limited to: import/export businesses, legal and professional services.

Maritime Support Service – Ancillary functions needed to support maritime activities including but not limited to: tug and tow operations, bar pilots, ship chandlers, associated parking and maintenance, equipment storage, repair and warehouse facilities, environmental services, Foreign Trade Zone and Port maintenance.

McAteer-Petris Act – An Act passed by the State Legislature in 1969 which created the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC).

Museums – Includes but is not limited to: facilities for exhibits on San Francisco history, maritime history, ongoing exhibitions, cultural and exhibit space, etc.

Neo-bulk – Freight such as autos, steel products and newsprint paper rolls which is shipped in large bulk quantities.

Non-Accessory Parking – Parking open to general public use which is not specifically to serve existing Port activities or required for new development.

Non-Water Dependent Activities – Activities and land uses which do not require access to the water in order to function.

Open Space – Includes but is not limited to: parks, wildlife habitat, wetlands, large plazas, tot lots, fishing piers and related public amenities.

Parking – Includes but is not limited to: surface parking lots or above or below grade garages. (See also Accessory Parking and Non-Accessory Parking.)

Passenger Cruise Ships – Primary, support and ancillary facilities for large, generally international passenger cruise vessels with sleeping accommodations typically for over 250

passengers (e.g. ships providing long-distance vacations and recreation voyages which may include gaming, dining and entertainment on board), including but not limited to: passenger terminals and berthing areas, waiting and customs areas, publicly accessible bon voyage and greeting areas, and passenger-serving retail, entertainment and commercial services, ship servicing areas, bus, taxi and visitor pick-up/drop-off and parking areas.

Piers – Pile-supported structures over water, which generally have more regulatory restrictions imposed on their use than other Port facilities. The fact that a Port facility is, or is not, commonly referred to as a “pier” does not necessarily mean it is in fact a Pier. The actual construction characteristics, as opposed to the common names of facilities, is the determining factor.

Port-Priority Use and Port-Priority Use Areas – The BCDC/MTC Seaport Plan designates areas that should be reserved for port priority uses, including marine terminals and directly-related ancillary activities such as container freight stations, transit sheds and other temporary storage, ship repair, and support transportation uses including trucking and railroad yards, freight forwarders, government offices related to the port activity, chandlers and marine services. Uses that are permitted within port-priority use areas may also include public access and public and commercial recreational development, provided they do not significantly impair the efficient utilization of the port area.

PortWalk – New public access walkways and amenities extending onto piers, where feasible, as major new mixed use pier developments occur that, together with public side walks and rights-of-way and pedestrian improvements under construction along The Embarcadero, will provide continuous pedestrian access through waterfront activity areas. PortWalk improvements will primarily be located north of China Basin, but also could be established south of China Basin where possible.

Power Plants – Facilities and utility installations to generate power including, but not limited to, cogeneration power plants.

Proposition H – A ballot measure adopted by San Francisco voters in November 1990 which imposed a moratorium on new “non-maritime” development pending completion of a land use plan for a portion of the waterfront property under the jurisdiction of the Port of San Francisco, and prohibited hotel developments or boatels on that property.

Public Access – Areas or features which are open to the public, often provided as part of new development, including but not limited to: esplanades, boardwalks, pedestrian access to piers, small plazas, visual or informational displays, kiosks, signage, public fishing and viewing areas and related public amenities.

Public Trust – Under the Public Trust Doctrine, title to tidelands and lands under navigable waters (as existed when California became a state) is held in trust by the State for

the benefit of the people of California and must be used for purposes of commerce, navigation and fishing as well as for environmental and recreational purposes. The Port of San Francisco is the trustee for Public Trust lands granted to the City by State legislation in 1968 (i.e. the *Burton Act*).

Recreational Boating and Water Use –

Primary, support and ancillary facilities for recreational boating and other water sport enthusiasts (e.g. swimmers, kayakers and windsurfers) including but not limited to: sailing center for yachting events, swimming, rowing and boating clubs, marinas, visiting boat docks and moorings, boat rental facilities, boat launches, fueling stations, repair and dry storage facilities, administrative functions, visitor, boat trailer and employee parking, public restrooms, and other public facilities.

Recreational Enterprises – Facilities for non-maritime recreation-oriented activities including but not limited to: athletic fitness facilities, indoor and outdoor sports courts, jogging tracks, health and fitness centers and other non-maritime recreation amenities.

Residential – Includes but is not limited to: multifamily unit developments, and, in the southern waterfront, an RV park.

Retail – Retail sales of goods and services, including but not limited to: restaurants and other eating and drinking establishments, shops, personal services, dry goods, public and other markets, retail outlets, gas stations and carwashes.

San Francisco Bay Conservation & Development Commission (BCDC) –

A state-created agency with authority to permit or deny any project in or over the San Francisco or within 100 feet of the shoreline, after reviewing the project in light of specified criteria. BCDC's responsibilities include protecting San Francisco Bay from excessive fill and preserving the Bay waterfront for Bay-oriented or water-department uses.

Seawall Lots (or "SWL") –

Parcels of land owned by the Port which generally lie inland of the seawall which separates land from the Bay. North of China Basin, seawall lots usually are located across The Embarcadero from the water (or along Jefferson Street in Fisherman's Wharf or near King Street in South Beach). South of China Basin, seawall lots more often abut the water, but they are not pile-supported structures like piers.

Ship Repair – Primary, support and ancillary facilities for repair, restoration, and maintenance of large and small vessels, including but not limited to: drydock and berthing areas, warehouses, workshop and storage areas, administrative functions, and employee support services, (e.g. training facilities, parking).

Sports Facilities – Facilities which accommodate professional sports events such as basketball, baseball, hockey and tennis, which also may be used for non-sport related performances and events, including but not limited to arenas and ballparks, with support and accessory activities such as food

services, automobile, bus and taxi parking, pick-up and drop-off zones.

Temporary & Ceremonial Berthing –

Primary, support and ancillary facilities for berthing of historic, military or other visiting vessels on temporary basis including but not limited to: berthing and passenger greeting, bon voyage and waiting areas, bus, taxi and visitor pick-up/drop-off and parking areas.

Transportation Services – Facilities for land-based, water-borne or intermodal (e.g. connections between water and land transportation services) transportation operations, including but not limited to: transit and traffic facilities, areas for ticket sales, passenger information and waiting, bus, automobile, taxi, pedicab and horsedrawn carriages staging areas and pick-up and drop-off zones, and related administrative functions.

Visitor Services – Facilities and information services oriented to visitors, including but not limited to: programs providing education and information to acquaint visitors with current and historical activities of the Port, the City, maritime operations or similar programs.

Warehousing/Storage – Includes but is not limited to: facilities for storage generally in enclosed buildings, and related transport and distribution of general (non-maritime cargo) goods. Mini-storage warehouses are prohibited on piers or within 100 feet of the shoreline.

Water-dependent Activities – Activities, businesses or industries which depend on a waterfront location to function, such as cargo-related activities, berthing of historic, ceremonial or other ships, ferry and excursion boat operations, fishing industry uses, maritime support uses, recreational boating and water use, ship repair, and water taxi docking.

Water-Oriented Uses – Under the *McAteer-Pertis Act*, BCDC can permit Bay fill only for certain “water-oriented” uses specified in the law or “minor fill for improving shoreline appearance or public access to the Bay.” The water-oriented uses the law permits include water-related industry, bridges, wildlife refuges, and water-oriented commercial recreation and public assembly. Housing and offices are not considered water-oriented uses.

Wholesale Trade/Promotion Center – Facilities for wholesale storage, promotion, sales and distribution of products, including but not limited to: exhibition and conference spaces, ancillary space for promotional displays and demonstrations, and marketing services, particularly those which enhance international trade.

Appendix D

Seawall Lot / Assessors Block Correlation Chart

Most planning maps of the City and county of San Francisco label sites according to their Assessor Block number. However, Port maps and documents (including this Waterfront Land Use Plan) commonly refer to non-pier properties as seawall lots, which have different numbers. This Chart shows the correlation between the two numbering systems (assessors block and seawall lots).

FISHERMAN'S WHARF WATERFRONT

Seawall Lot #	Assessors Block #
300/301	4
302	6
303	7
311	15
312	16
313	17

FERRY BUILDING WATERFRONT

Seawall Lot #	Assessors Block #
327*	3743
348*	3742 (portion)
347-N	3715 (portion)
347-S	3742 (portion)
351*	201 (portion)

SOUTHEAST / CHINA BASIN WATERFRONT

Seawall Lot #	Assessors Block #
328	3769 (portion)
329	--
330	3770/3771
331/332	3790/3791
333	3792
334*	3801
335*	3802 (portion)
336*	46C (portion)
337*	3880 (portion)
338/339*	3838/3839/3852 (portion)/ 3940/3880 (portion)
340*	3892
343*	--
345*	3941 (portion)

NORTHEAST WATERFRONT

Seawall Lot #	Assessors Block #
314	35
315	37 (portion)
316	36
317	57
318	58
319	82
320	109
321	110
322	137
322-1	140 (portion)
323	138
324	139

SOUTHERN WATERFRONT

Seawall Lot #	Assessors Block #
344/344.1/ 352*	4502A (portion)
354/354.1*	4379/4380
349*	4046/4052/4110 (portion) 4111/4120

*Correlations are approximate

Acknowledgments*

MAYOR

Willie L. Brown, Jr.

FORMER MAYORS

Frank M. Jordan
Art Agnos

THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Tom Ammiano
Sue Bierman
Amos Brown
Leslie R. Katz
Barbara Kaufman
Susan Leal
Jose Medina
Gavin Newson
Mabel Teng
Michael Yaki
Leland Y. Yee

Former Members

Roberta Achtenberg
Angela Alioto
Harry Britt
Annemarie Conroy
Jim Gonzalez
Terence Hallinan
Tom Hsieh
Willie B. Kennedy
Bill Maher
Carole Migden
Kevin F. Shelley
Doris Ward

THE PORT COMMISSION

Michael E. Hardeman, *President*
Denise McCarthy, *Vice President*
Preston Cook
James R. Herman
Frankie Lee

Douglas Wong, *Executive Director*

Former Port Commissioners

James Bouskos
Ming Chang-O'Brien
Arthur Coleman
Anne Halsted
Francis J. O'Neill
Douglas Wong

* We have made every effort to acknowledge all individuals and their stated affiliations, and all community and governmental organizations that participated in the development of this Waterfront Land Use Plan. If we have inadvertently omitted or misstated your name or organization, or if you would like to update your affiliations, please call Port Planning and Development staff at (415)274-0526 with requested changes. The Waterfront Land Use Plan will be updated periodically.

Thank you to the members of the Waterfront Plan Advisory Board for their extraordinary dedication and commitment to this public planning effort.*

Robert R. Tufts

*Advisory Board Chair
Business Attorney, Jackson, Tufts, Cole & Black
Chair, Bay Conservation and Development
Commission (BCDC)
Executive Committee and Board of Governors,
San Francisco Symphony*

Kermit H. Boston

*Director of Education, Computer Curriculum
Corp.
Board of Directors, Black Executive Exchange
National Urban League*

Arthur A. Bruzzone

*President, Sorel Group
Commissioner, Bay Conservation
and Development Commission (BCDC)
Board of Directors, San Francisco Urban
Planning and Research Association (SPUR)*

Anne Marie Cervantes

*Architect, Cervantes Design Associates
President, San Francisco Hispanic
Chamber of Commerce
Board of Directors, San Francisco Urban
Planning and Research Association (SPUR)*

Denise E. Conley

*Principal, Keyser Marston Associates, Inc,
Board of Directors, California Association
for Local Economic Development
Member, Lambda Alpha,
San Francisco Chapter*

James C. Eschen

*Former President, California Stevedore
and Ballast Company (retired)
Board of Directors, Metropolitan Stevedore
Company, Wilmington*

Patrick J. Flanagan

*President, Standard Fisheries Corporation
Secretary and Treasurer, Fisherman's Wharf
Merchants Association*

Michael Gallette

*Executive Director, Fisherman's Wharf
Port Tenants Association
Producer, Festo Italiano and SF Chronicle
Fourth of July Waterfront Festival
Fisherman's Wharf Citizens Advisory Committee*

Lester W. Gee

*Architect, Raymond, Boulton & Gee
Active in Chinatown housing and
community issues*

Robert B. Hagedorn

*Attorney, California Department of Insurance
Former Acting Director, Earth Island Law
Center
Bar Association of San Francisco*

D. Carl Hanson

*Executive Vice President, Managing Director,
Southwest Marine Inc.
President, Marine Exchange, San Francisco
Bay Region
Society of Port Engineers, San Francisco Bay*

Toby Levine

*Former Member, San Francisco Planning
Commission
Vice President, Mission Economic
Development Association
Member, Treasure Island Reuse Committee*

Denise Hinckle McCarthy

*Executive Director, Telegraph Hill
Neighborhood Center
National Neighborhood Coalition
Fisherman's Wharf Citizens Advisory Committee*

Richard C. Millet

*President, Potrero Boosters & Merchants
Association
Potrero League of Active Neighbors
Coalition of San Francisco Neighborhoods*

George Mix, Jr.

*Executive Director, South Bayshore Community
Development Corporation
NAACP, San Francisco office
Board of Directors, Jelani House*

Jane Morrison

*Vice President, San Francisco Social
Services Commission
Board of Directors, San Francisco Tomorrow
Former Community Affairs Manager,
KNBR-NBC Radio*

Stan Moy

*Finger & Moy Architects
San Francisco State Building Authority
Former Commissioner, San Francisco
Rent Board*

Peter Moylan

*San Francisco Historical Society
Member, San Francisco Convention
and Visitors Bureau
Steering Committee, San Francisco
Urban Institute*

George Romero

*International Longshoremen and
Warehousemen's Union, Local 10
Bay Area Longshoremen Memorial Association
Board of Governors, Fisherman's Wharf
Merchants Association*

Nan G. Roth

*Fisherman's Wharf Citizens Advisory Com-
mittee
Mid-Embarcadero Open Space Subcommittee
Telegraph Hill Dwellers*

Marina v. Secchitano

*Ticket Agent, Golden Gate Ferries
Former Regional Director, Inland Boatmen's
Union of the Pacific
Maritime Trades Department, AFL-CIO*

Paul H. Sedway

*Sedway Consulting
Board of Directors, Foundation for San
Francisco's Architectural Heritage
Board of Directors, American Planning
Association*

Bob Tibbits

*Waterfront Chairman, Telegraph Hill Dwellers
Chairman, Mid-Embarcadero
Open Space Committee
Fisherman's Wharf Citizens Advisory Committee*

Julia Viera

*Volunteer Executive Director,
Friends of Islais Creek
Board of Directors, San Francisco Beautiful
Recreation and Parks Open Space
Advisory Board*

Tom Walker

*Manager, Nedlloyd Lines, San Francisco
Member, Golden Gate National Park Association
Member, National Trust for Historic Preservation*

Jay S. Wallace

*Attorney
San Francisco Bar Association
Former Board Director, Mission YMCA*

Esther "b" Woeste

*Independent Insurance Broker
President, Golden Gateway
Tenants Association
Member, The Housing Committee
(San Francisco)*

Former Members

Sue Bierman

Robin Chiang

Dennis J. Herrera

Brian T. McWilliams

Jack Morrison

Curt A. Rodby

Emily G. Rodriguez

Jack Scott

*For additional affiliations of the Advisory Board members please call Port Planning and Development staff at (415)274-0526

PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO

Plan Authors

Anne Cook
Kari Kilstrom
Diane Oshima

Legal Advisor (Office of the City Attorney)

Noreen Ambrose

Production and Technical Assistance

Dan Hodapp
Pat Jackson
Floristine Johnson
Keri Lung
David Mercado
Paul Osmundson
Sharon Lee Polledri
Gerry Roybal
Gail Tang
Joe Wyman

WATERFRONT LAND USE PLAN CONSULTANTS

Economic Planning Systems (EPS)
Simon Martin-Vegue Winkelstein Morris
Tenazas Design
Vickerman Zachary Miller
Illustrations by Canon Tolon

OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES

City and County of San Francisco:

Mayor's Office
Department of Parking and Traffic
Department of Public Works
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, Waterfront

Transportation Projects

Planning Department
Public Transportation Department
Public Utilities Commission
Recreation and Parks Department
Redevelopment Agency
San Francisco County Transportation Authority

San Francisco Bay Conservation & Development Commission State of California Coastal Conservancy

MARITIME INDUSTRY PANELISTS

Passenger Cruises

Michael Herney, Williams Diamond & Co.
 Stan Horn, Cruise Letter
 Stein Kruse, Seven Seas Cruise Lines
 Susan Lethbridge, Seven Seas Cruise Lines
 Carol McDonald, Royal Cruise Lines
 Bruce Setloft, Royal Cruise Lines

Container Shipping

Walter Abernathy, Edgewater Consultants
 Former Director, Port of Oakland
 Ray Holbrook, Stevedore Service of America
 William Jetter, Chilean Line
 George Watson-Jones, Columbia Lines
 Robert Kleist, Evergreen line
 Fergus Moran, Metropolitan Stevedore

Break-Bulk and Bulk Cargo Shipping and Handling

Susanne Cauthen, World Wide
 Shipping Magazine
 Werner Lewald, Transpacific Transportation Co.
 Fergus Moran, Metropolitan Calif.
 Stevedoring Co.
 Fred Noonan, Fred F. Noonan & Co.
 Douglas A. Tilden, newsprint terminal operator

Commuter Passenger Ferries

Paul Bishop, Harbor Bay Maritime
 Mike Fajans, SF Bay Area Ferry Plan
 Caroline Horgan, Red & White Fleet
 Rob McMillan, Metropolitan
 Transp. Commission
 Roger Murphy, Blue & Gold Fleet
 Eric Robinson, Golden Gate Transit
 Ferry Division
 Ernest Sanchez, Oakland/Alameda
 Ferry Service
 Cheri Sheets, City of Alameda

Fishing

Sal Balestreri, Fisherman's Wharf Seafood
 Phil Bentivegna, sportfishing vessel
 "Butchie B"
 Carol Brown, Fisheries Consultant
 Tom Creedon, Scoma's Restaurant
 Pat Davis, North End Fish Co. and commercial
 fishing vessel "Deborah Ann"
 Zeke Grader, Pacific Coast Federation Fisher-
 man's Association
 Bob Miller, commercial fishing vessel "Orca"
 Mike Mitchell, commercial fishing vessel
 Engineering Company "Linda Noelle"
 Ron Roque, sportfishing vessel "Lucky Lady"
 Leo Vu, Seawin Fish Company
 Russel Wilson, S.F. Bay
 Fisherman's Association

Excursion Boats

Drew Harper, Rendezvous Charters
 Carolyn Horgan, Red & White Fleet
 Marty McMahon, Pacific Marine Yacht Charters
 Terry McRae, Hornblower Dining Yachts
 Roger Murphy, Blue & Gold Fleet
 Eric Robinson, Golden Gate Transit
 Ferry Service

Small Boat Marinas, Boat Clubs, Historic Ships and Ceremonial Berthing

Martha Bell, Mariposa-Hunters Point Yacht Club
 Michael Bell, S.F. Maritime National Historic Park
 Sheila Best, Pier 35 Marina
 Betty Boatright, Mission Creek Harbor
 Association, Bay View Boat Club
 Jim Haussener, Past President of
 California Association of Harbor Master
 and Port Captains
 Larry Hitchcock, boat builder
 Joseph Houghtelling, National Maritime
 Museum Association
 Carter Stauch, South Beach Harbor

Ship Repair

Peter Blake, General Engineering Company
 Ed Conne, Service Engineering Company
 Dick Harden, Metal Trades Council
 Carl Hanson, Southwest Marine (S.F. Drydock)
 John Stoker, Ship Builders Council of America

Support Services for Industrial Water-Dependent Industries

Tony Bosque, Zim Container Services
 Mark Egan, Nautilus Leasing Services,
 Container and Chassis Leasing Services
 Tom Fianzie, Foreign Trade Services
 Joe Muzzin, Cal Cargo
 Ed Osgood, Foreign Trade Services
 Chuck Podesta, Coast Marine Services
 Capt. Larry Teague, San Francisco Bar Pilots

Support Services for Commercial and Recreational Water-Dependent Activities

Phil Arnold, San Francisco Recreation & Park
 Department
 Mike Berline, South End Rowing Club
 Ken Coren, Dolphin Club
 Arthur Feinstein, Golden Gate Audobon Society
 Karen Glatzel, Port of San Francisco
 Ruth Gravanis, Save San Francisco Bay As-
 sociation
 Kerstin Magary, Catellus Development Corpora-
 tion

Dredging

Tom Gandesberg, S.F. Regional Water Quality
 Board (RWQCB)
 Karen Glatzel, Port of San Francisco
 Steve Goldbeck, Bay Conservation
 and Development Commission (BCDC)
 Jim McGrath, Port of Oakland
 Barry Nelson, Save San Francisco Bay
 Association
 Veronica Sanchez, Port of San Francisco
 Tom Wakeman, US Army Corp of Engineers

WATERFRONT BOAT TOUR

Special thanks to the Red and White Fleet and volunteers from the Inland Boatmen's Union of the Pacific for their help with the Waterfront Plan Advisory Board boat tour.

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Commercial Development Workshop

Paula Collins, Western Development Corp.
Jeffrey Heller, Heller & Leake, Architects
Mandy Joslin, Former Port Fisherman's Wharf Manager
Tom Leary, Western Capital
Todd Waterman, Tishman Speyer Properties
Walter Wright, Terranomics Retail Services
Visions For The Waterfront

Visions For The Waterfront

The Port of San Francisco expresses its deep appreciation to N. Teresa Rea, PBR Planning Consultant for facilitation of visioning workshops held by the Waterfront Plan Advisory Board, November and December 1992.

Open Space and Public Access Workshop

Karen Alschuler, Simon Martin-Vegue Winkelstein Morris
Marc Beyeler, California State Coastal Conservancy
Jeffrey Blanchfield, BCDC
Boris Dramov, ROMA Design Group
David Hayes, California State Coastal Conservancy
Steve Shotland, City Planning Department
Kent Watson, Landscape Architect

Presentations on Urban Design

Philip Henry, AIA – Urban Design Committee
Bruce Race, SPUR

Presentation on Transportation/Circulation

Carmen Clark, Transportation Authority
Emilio Cruz, Waterfront Transportation Projects
Jack Fleck, Department of Parking and Traffic
Flint Nelson, MUNI
Roger Peters, Port of San Francisco
Bill Wycko, City Planning Department
Joe Wyman, Port of San Francisco

Presentation on Historic Preservation

Vincent Marsh, Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board
Mark Ryser, Foundation for San Francisco Architectural Heritage

Workshop on Public Framework for the Waterfront

Coordinator: Dan Hodapp, Port of San Francisco

Design Team

Jim Adams, ROMA Design Group
Karen Alschuler, Simon Martin-Vegue Winkelstein Morris
Anne Cervantes, Cervantes Design
Joe Esherick, Esherick, Homsey & Bodge
Peter Hasselman, Peter M. Hasselman, FAIA
John Kriken, Skidmore, Owings & Merrill
Barbara Maloney, EDAW
Bruce Race, ELS/Elbasani & Logan Architects
N. Teresa Rea, PBR Planning Consultants
Peter Richards, Exploratorium
Dr. Jack Sidener, Ph.D., Bechtel Corporation

Overview Panel

Carolyn Abst, Greenbelt Alliance
Noreen Ambrose, City Attorney's Office
Jeff Blanchfield, BCDC
Tom Conrad, Redevelopment Agency
Emilio Cruz, Chief Administrator's Office
Paul Lord, City Planning Department
Jill Manton, San Francisco Arts Commission
Beverly Mills, Friends of the Port
Peter Moylan, Waterfront Plan Advisory Board
Paul Osmundson, Port of San Francisco
Nan Roth, Waterfront Plan Advisory Board
Jim Stevens, San Francisco Tomorrow
Bob Tibbits, Friends of the Port
Robert Tufts, Waterfront Plan Advisory Board
Julia Viera, Waterfront Plan Advisory Board

Waterfront Development Workshop

Coordinator: Dan Hodapp, Port of San Francisco
Kathy Blake, Peter Walker, William Johnson & Partners
Sheila Brady, Brady & Associates
Denise Conley, Keyser Marston Associates
Claude Gruen, Gruen Gruen & Associates
Tony Guzzardo, Anthony M. Guzzardo & Associates
John Healy, Hanford/Healy Companies
Jeffery Heller, Heller & Leake, Inc.
Glenn Isaacson, Glenn Isaacson Associates
Ron Kaufman, The Ron Kaufman Companies
William Lee, Economic Research Associates
Donn Logan, ELS/Elbasani & Logan Architects
David Martin, The Martin Group
Jim Musbach, Economic & Planning Systems
Jon Reynolds, Reynolds & Brown
Guillermo Rosello, Guillermo Rosello
Lynn Sedway, Sedway & Associates
Don Turner, Bridge Housing Corporation
William Turnbull, William Turnbull Associates

City Staff Workshop on

Options for Change

PLANNING DEPARTMENT STAFF
Dave Feltham
Amit Ghosh
Inge Horton
Eva Lieberman
Paul Lord
Lulu Mabelitini-Hwang
Lilia Medina
Barry Polley

PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO STAFF

Noreen Ambrose (City Attorney)
Anne Cook
Kari Kilstrom
Diane Oshima
Paul Osmundson

Thank you to those members of the community who took the time to come and speak at meetings of the Port Commission or Waterfront Plan Advisory Board

Mr. Acker
 Nunzio Alioto, Alioto Fish Corp.
 Ben Andrews, marine architect
 Cliff Anfinson, sportfishing vessel "Bass Tub"
 Jack Bair, San Francisco Giants
 David Bahlman, San Francisco Heritage
 John Bardis
 Mike Berline, South End Rowing Club,
 Fisherman's Wharf Citizens Advisory Committee
 Louise Bea
 William Blackwell, Architect
 Miriam Blaustein
 Anne Bloomfield, Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board
 Joe Boss
 Peter Brand, California Coastal Conservancy, Dolphin Club
 Peter Brown, Anchorage Shopping Center
 Jeffrey Brown, Mission Rock Boat Owners Association,
 Bay View Boat Club
 Wendy Brummer-Kochner, Innes Avenue Coalition
 Anthony Bryant, Bayview-Hunters Point resident
 Francine Carter, Morgan Heights Homeowners Association
 Man Cheung, San Francisco resident
 Larry Chew, Oceanview, Merced, Ingleside Community
 Association
 Charlene Clark, San Francisco Tomorrow
 Jennifer Clary, San Francisco Tomorrow
 Dr. Francis Clauss, Potrero Hill resident
 Virginia Conway
 Ken Coren, Dolphin Club
 Michael Cossett
 Tom Creedon, Scoma's Restaurant
 Dorothy Dana, One Hills Plaza Homeowners Association
 Rev. Dr. George Davis, Hunters Point Multipurpose
 Senior Center
 Jean DavisVernon DeMars, Architect
 Nancy Douglas, San Francisco resident
 Babette Drevke
 Derek Durst
 Neils Erich, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce,
 Waterfront Committee
 Arthur Feinstein, Golden Gate Audobon Society

Dan Finnane, The Warriors
 Jim Firth, Potrero League of Active Neighbors
 David Goldstein
 Andrew Gordon
 Philip Graf, Concerned Boaters
 Bill Graff, recreational boater
 Ruth Gravanis, Golden Gate Audobon Society, Sierra Club
 Jim Haas, Rincon Point-South Beach Citizens Advisory
 Committee
 Jeffrey Heller, San Francisco Planning and Urban Research
 Association
 Sue Hestor, Attorney
 John Hines, Aboriginal Blackmen Unlimited
 Charles Higgins, Bicycle Commuter Coalition
 Joe Houghtelling, National Maritime Museum Association
 Imogene Hubbard, Innes Avenue Coalition
 Bob Isaacson, Mission Creek Housing Association
 Maria Jacinto, South San Francisco resident
 Espanola Jackson, District 7 Democratic Club
 Shirley Jones, Young Community Developer
 Redmond Kernan, Consultant
 Gary Kitiyata, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency
 A. R. Langley, LL Management Company
 Tom LaVell, Matthew Turner Foundation
 Howard Lazar, San Francisco Arts Commission,
 Street Artist Program
 Michael Levin, Embarcadero Citizens Advisory Committee
 Frank Levy
 Joni Levy, North Beach Neighbors
 Jerry Liberatore, Bay View Boat Club
 Bruce Livingston, Clean Water Action
 Kendall Luce
 Tom Luciani, nightclub and restaurant owner
 Patrick Lynch
 Rick Mariano, Rincon Point-South Beach Citizens
 Advisory Committee
 Christopher Martin, The Cannery
 Nan McGuire, San Francisco Beautiful
 Rob Michaan, China Shipping Line
 Bob Miller, Crab Boat Owners Association
 Bruce Miller, Laventhal & Horwath
 Bob Muir, AES Corporation
 Andrew Nash

Ted Nelson
 Al Norman, Bayview Hunters Point businessman
 Bill Owens, LG & E Power Systems, Darling Delaware
 Joe O'Donahue
 Jason Pearl
 David Polatnick
 Barney Popkin
 Steve Price, Commodore Seaplanes
 Dehnert Queen, Small Business Development Corporation
 Eddy Redka
 Meg Reilly, Dolphin Club
 James Richards, Aboriginal Blackmen Unlimited
 Bob Rose
 John Sanger
 Greg Sempadian, San Francisco resident
 Dorothy Siedel, San Francisco resident
 David Spencer
 Dave Spero
 John Stein
 Jim Stevens, San Francisco Tomorrow
 Stephanie Thornton, Coastal Resources Center
 Bob Tibbits, Telegraph Hill Dwellers
 Mark Topture
 Harold Treskenoll
 Joel Ventresca, San Francisco Tomorrow
 Margaret Verges, District 4 Democratic Club,
 Presidio Avenue Association of Concerned Neighbors
 Stephen Vettel, San Francisco Planning and Urban Research
 Association
 Charlie Walker, Bayview Hunters Point Building Exchange
 Sue Walker
 Malcolm Ward
 Eula Waters, Golden Gateway resident
 Vivan Wiley
 Alfred Williams, Co-Chair, Hunters Point Citizens Advisory
 Committee
 Kevin Williams, New Bayview Committee
 Claude Wilson, Morgan Heights Homeowners Association
 Don Wyler, San Francisco resident
 Reggie Younger

**Thank you to those community organizations which hosted or sent representatives
to special presentations on the Waterfront Land Use Plan**

American Institute of Architecture, San Francisco Chapter
Audobon Society, Golden Gate Chapter
Bay Area Association of Disabled Sailors
Bay Planning Coalition
California Native Plant Society
Chamber of Commerce, Waterfront Committee
Chinatown Resource Center
Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods
Coalition for Economic Equity
Fisherman's Wharf Citizen's Advisory Committee
Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association
Fisherman's Wharf Port Tenants Association
Hunters Point Citizens Advisory Committee
North Beach Chamber of Commerce
North Beach Neighbors
Planning Association for the Richmond
Potrero Hill Boosters and Merchants
Potrero Hill League of Active Neighbors
Rincon Point-South Beach Citizens Advisory Committee
Russian Hill Improvement Association
Russian Hill Neighbors
San Francisco Tomorrow
San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association
Save San Francisco Bay Association
Sierra Club
Telegraph Hill Dwellers Association