

# **SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION**

## **MINUTES OF THE MEETING**

**APRIL 9, 2019**

### **1. CALL TO ORDER / ROLL CALL**

Port Commission President Kimberly Brandon called the meeting to order at 3:15 p.m. The following Commissioners were present: Kimberly Brandon, Gail Gilman, Victor Makras and Doreen Woo Ho. Commissioner Adams was not present.

### **2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – March 26, 2019**

ACTON: Commissioner Woo Ho moved approval; Commissioner Gilman seconded the motion. All of the Commissioners were in favor. The minutes of the meeting were adopted.

### **3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

### **4. ANNOUNCEMENTS – The Port Commission Affairs Manager announced the following:**

- A. Please be advised that the ringing of and use of cell phones, pagers and similar sound-producing electronic devices are prohibited at this meeting. Please be advised that the Chair may order the removal from the meeting room of any person(s) responsible for the ringing of or use of a cell phone, pager, or other similar sound-producing electronic device.
- B. Please be advised that a member of the public has up to three minutes to make pertinent public comments on each agenda item unless the Port Commission adopts a shorter period on any item.

### **5. PUBLIC COMMENT ON ITEMS NOT LISTED ON THE AGENDA**

Janet Lawson - I'm going to talk about the elephant in the room, and it's not going to be comfortable. At the last Port Commission meeting, I recall very distinctly that Commissioner Makras came out, took a seat and made a point of telling us that he was strongly in favor of this project and recommended that we accept our moral imperative to help those less fortunate. Well, after I picked my jaw up off the floor, I decided to find out who is this gentleman. The very first hit I got was a spread in Haute Living magazine talking about how Mr. and Mrs. Makras are a political power couple who have hosted fundraisers in their "spectacular Marina Boulevard mansion" and support of the mayor. It was also in Haute Living that I first came across the name of a political super PAC called Progress San Francisco, which led to an article describing a group of super elite billionaires and millionaires, many of whom who live in Districts 1 and 2 who can bundle their funds, their political contributions through the super PAC, that would normally be illegal, and send thousands and millions of dollars into other campaigns. I can't help but see the irony

in that the Progress San Francisco is funding groups that are yelling at us and paying for some of their things and would probably have them arrested if any of them showed up at their home for the fundraiser. After noticing that an unelected, politically appointed official, who is also a contributor to Progress San Francisco, who has publicly stated his support both politically and financially for the mayor and her upcoming election, the light went off. Because I was always wondering, what made this piece of property so different than anything else in the city? And that is because it's something that no one can touch, and a politically connected ally is in a position to persuade the Port to fulfill his request. There's nothing any of us can do about that. So while I'm here and because there's so much surrounding this, I don't think it's inappropriate to ask Mr. Makras to recuse himself from voting on this lease because I'm sure he understands that this transparency in this project as well as in the mayor's office are critical to this process. There should be no question of political cronyism or personal relationships, casting even more shade over this thing because, in the word of Franklin Roosevelt, "In politics, there are no coincidences." And if this isn't politics, I ask you what is?

Diana Drue - I live on Brannan Street. I have a solution to this problem. I believe that the Navigation Center should be built across the street from City Hall. I believe that's where a Navigation Center used to be. It'll better serve the homeless there because there's a higher density of homeless people there than there is here. Also, it would be right across the street from Mayor Breed, so she can view and observe what progress they are making. She can make it as big as she wants. You will get a lot of support from people from this area. I'm not saying that we shouldn't build one. I'm saying it needs to be more thoughtful as to where it is. Also with the good-neighbor contract, I believe there needs to be an independent third party with metrics. There needs to be fiscal penalties for recourse. There also needs to be a clause for eviction of that center if it doesn't hold up its end of the deal. There was mention about San Francisco Police Department that patrol four times a day. I calculated that to be every six hours. How many officers will that be? The fact that they're starting to talk about patrols, etc. basically says they understand that this will be a problem. The fact that a Navigation Center at City Hall should be able to serve the mayor's purpose as far as accounting for the number of beds she wants to do. It will be central to a lot of facilities in that area. She will have a capability of keeping a good eye on it because I don't know how convenient it will be for her to come to Sea Lot 330. I think we have better uses for that property to help assist in tourism, which is important for San Francisco. To put something inappropriately in the middle of sports fans, highly dense residence areas with vulnerable people such as children and seniors, we've got all sorts of foot traffic up and down the streets. I'm very concerned about what kind of message we're sending if we're not thoughtful about where we're placing the Navigation Center. I would hope that the Port will think about better uses for using it. Also, if we're a democracy, I firmly believe that there should be a vote of the residents who actually live there who would be impacted because we have to abide by what is in our environment. For people to come be bussed from other neighborhoods to be supportive of it is a bit of a hypocrisy because, if they want it there in their backyard, great. Right now, I believe we have at least two Navigation Centers in District 6. If we're going to talk about equitable

distribution, it's not even math. It's simple arithmetic. I think they need to start looking at other places.

Alan Dundas - In 1968, the Burton Act authorized that all the land that was created from our seawall was transferred from the state to the city of San Francisco. The state, however, wanted to make sure their interests were insured. One of the first concerns they had was that the current or any future mayor would take the land and use it in ways detrimental to maintaining the Port. So to protect against this, this commission was created. The SF Port Commission became the caretakers of all the land that was formerly owned by the state. The commission is being placed in the responsibility where they must take the interests of the state and put them above the interests of the city. As a second check and balance, there was an amendment process to the Burton Act that was allowed that's been actually used 20 times, and something that has been done regularly. During that amendment process, the State Land Use Commission got involved if any amendment gets to be approved. So the Port has actually been doing a great job here with Seawall Lot 330. They had an open meeting on February 26th. They had a plan. It's on the website. Media and public can go look at that. Once that recommendation to consider an RFP process became public, the mayor decided that she was going to use that property for her own purposes. The mayor also took a page out of the president's playbook and passed fast-track legislation to remove neighborhood input and feedback by declaring an emergency. In my opinion, the mayor's use case will have a serious detrimental effect on the commerce and maritime use in this area. Those are the focus points of the Burton Act for which this commission has been created to uphold. Having our overflow cruise ship customers have their first impression of San Francisco when getting off their boat, walking over needles and 200 homeless laying about will only be one example to the impact of commerce from tourism. All we need is one incident from the tens of thousands of Giants fans passing the property on a game night for the impact of this decision to be felt. We have already had conferences cancel from Moscone Center because of concerns of safety in that area. The Port Commission is creating a real possibility of the future cancellations of cruise ships making Port stops in San Francisco by placing so many drug-addicted homeless people in this location. I have three alternative recommendations to the Port for their upcoming April 23rd meeting. One, please consider not approving the memorandum of understanding at all. Two, please tell the mayor that the RFP process must be completed. You've already started it. You'll find out the fair market value of what is your most valuable piece of undeveloped property. Three, tell the mayor she's got to go through the amendment process. At least the state's interest will then be listed too.

Garrett Law - I live at the Brannan. I've been looking at this talking to residents, trying to be open and see what's going on. If they put this thing there with 225 beds, Jeff Kositsky says that's going to be about 750 to 1,000 people transiting through our neighborhood per year. We're a small neighborhood. When I moved there 15 years ago, it was a bunch of warehouses and a few condominiums. Today, you've got the Giants stadium, the marina. On the floor I live, over half the residents have children under three. This is becoming a real neighborhood. It was a bunch of old folks like me 15 years ago. Today, there are young families there. This doesn't fit

with young families. They've got to find another place for this very large Navigation Center.

Dr. Bergen James - I'm a pediatric dentist in San Francisco for 28 years. My biggest concern is about the children and the families. We have the highest concentration of children, schools and daycare centers in District 6. I think this is not the appropriate place to put it. We already have two Navigation Centers in District 6. Until every district gets a Navigation Center, I don't believe that we should be taking on a third one. I also think it's inappropriate that the proper permitting isn't having to go through that they pass where they can just build this center. If any of us wanted to build a kitchen or add on to our home, it would take a heck of a lot longer than three or four months. I think the fact that it's right near all the Giants fans, the Warriors fans -- it's just not the place to have it. Crissy Field has a huge parking lot. We could easily put one at the Crissy Field parking lot. We could probably put one in Golden Gate Park. There are a lot of places to put one but the Embarcadero with all the children and the schools and the daycare centers is not the appropriate place.

Frank Chen - I've been living in South Beach since 2001. I have four concerns about this navigation system. One is the safety of the general public. Another one is safety of the homeless and safety of the nearby residents and also the effectiveness of the Navigation Center model and safety of the general public. The proposed Navigation Center is 30 feet from current muni rail and also diagonally from the open waiting platform for muni. There is no barrier for anyone to get onto the rail or the platform. People high on drugs don't behave predictably or rationally. What if a person high on drugs decided to push a passenger down to the track from an incoming muni train or jumped in front of an incoming muni train? Also, what if the belonging of a homeless person got stuck on the track of muni train, and the train can derail? This could potentially be a public safety hazard. I put pictures on the second page. My second concern is the safety of the homeless. The city block along Bryant Street between Beale and Embarcadero is one of the busiest blocks in the city. You have a four-way intersection between Bryant and Beale. You have a three-way intersection half the block between Bryant and Main and a four-way intersection between Bryant and Embarcadero. In addition to that, there's two more muni tracks so that makes a six-way intersection. We've all seen homeless people cross streets with no regard to traffic lights. Imagine after Giants game, a drunk Giants fan driving from the game and rushing to get onto the Bay Bridge and meets a homeless person who does not follow traffic lights. It's an accident waiting to happen. My third concern is the safety of the residents next door. According to Mr. Jeff Kositsky, only one third of the homeless people are drug addicts. Let's use his number and put yourself in our shoes. How would you feel if I say Ms. Commissioner, I will put 200 homeless people next to your house and 70 of them are drug addicts? They are free to roam around the neighborhood 24 hours a day. They are allowed to sit by and do drugs outside your door, again 70 drug addicts allowed to do drugs outside your door. By the way, don't worry. We have police to patrol the area four times a day. Also the effectiveness of Navigation Center model -- we are not haters. None of these are haters. We are just concerned residents. We embrace Delancey Street Foundation. They are good neighbors. They contribute to the neighborhood. We feel safe. We

use their movers. I go to their café. I buy Christmas trees from them every year. They install good habits in people.

Connie Clark - I'm a very long-term resident of South Beach. I moved in in 1996 into the Oriental Warehouse when it really was more of a commercial neighborhood. I, with a group of women parents, took our toddlers before the board of supervisors in 2000 to argue for the Tot Lot that the Giants helped put in. Then, we argued that South Beach was in the transition of becoming a multigenerational neighborhood. So it started a long time ago. It's not a fly-by-night neighborhood. We're an established group of residents. I question the model of the Navigation Center. Homelessness, drug addiction, mental illness -- these are problems that many of us have in our own families. People with means can send their family members to Mountain Vista or to some other retreat so that they can get the support that they need. These are smaller groups of people. San Francisco General has a very small bed. I guess it would be a center. It's only 15 beds for people who are mentally ill and those who are substance abusers. When you scale it to that small of a model it's much more effective. I just don't understand how it would work with a 200-bed facility with the kinds of intensive services that mentally ill and substance abusers need.

T.J. Hsiang - I'd like to start by saying that I supported the Navigation Centers at Fifth and Bryant. I supported the Navigation Center on Van Ness. But there are lots of homeless there. There aren't many homeless here. All the city statistics citing the fact that crime didn't go up in those neighborhoods that's because you're not transporting a large group of homeless from one area to another. It defies reason to me to believe that crime will not go up if they build this Navigation Center here. My second point is, the city has stated numerous times they used only three criteria when choosing this site. The criteria were the size of the location, availability of electricity and plumbing and whether it's owned by the city, nothing else. They didn't consider the number of families. They didn't consider the actual number of homeless. I bike every day from Brannan to work just across the street. I count on average two homeless people a day. They didn't consider that the police response times in our neighborhood are dreadful. I mentioned that last time I spoke. They don't think about any of these things. They only considered those three criteria. If those are the only three criteria you look at, yeah, this is a good site. But there are other criteria in the world. At this point, if they looked at some other criteria, there's no way they would pick this site. It doesn't make sense. I think now they're essentially committed. They can't back down because it'll look bad to certain voters. They're trying to ram this through. It's going to be stuck in court for a year or two years, three years. If your goal is to help homeless people as soon as possible, this isn't going to do that. This site really just doesn't make sense. We can stop it here, save the city a lot of time and money. We can all come together, find a better site. I think that would be much more positive for everybody.

Deborah Baumer - Thank you for allowing so many of the neighborhood to speak. Much of what I wanted to say has already been said. An overwhelming number of the community has voiced my concerns. I do have a few more. The city's plan to relocate up to 225 homeless people into an area where there are currently less than

approximately 50 people is both reckless and unfair. District 6 has supported Navigation Centers. We have two already in our district, which is far more than any other district. We also are good neighbors to the Delancey Street project and also the homeless center of St. Vincent de Paul. Now it's time for all districts in San Francisco to do as the mayor said and step up and serve the homeless in this crisis. This past Friday, the Giants celebrated their home opener. I watched as hundreds and perhaps thousands of tourists, fans, families with strollers and residents hurried along the Embarcadero where the Navigation Center is proposed to be located. They were walking along one of the most beautiful, open and green spaces in all of San Francisco. This area is not only an important tourist destination and business destination but is the main area where we as neighbors gather to exercise, walk our pets, hurry to work in the Financial District and to take our children to the playgrounds. It's difficult for me to overstate the negative and costly impact such a large Navigation Center would have for the hundreds of tourists who visit daily and the approximately 10,000 residents who live within a three-block area of this Navigation Center in the south Bay Area, which we call home. This dense residential and tourist location is simply the wrong site for a Navigation Center.

Sam Wagner - Since the last Port meeting I attended and spoke at, I found out that one of my family members has recently relapsed. He was last seen stealing packages off of front porches. If I could get him into a Navigation Center, our family would. My college roommate and soccer teammate of many years is also homeless because of her own mental health issues. Again, if I could get her into a Navigation Center, I would. But I'm also here because I live next to Seawall Lot 330. Yes, there is a homeless crisis. It requires attention but not every plan proposed to address a crisis is a good idea. That's the important part that we have to remember. This is a crisis if not legitimate response for community concerns regarding public safety. A crisis does not legitimize pretend hearings where the HSH pretends to listen to us but instead tell us about modular toilets instead of answering questions about needle disposal. It also failed us to ask them about the good-neighbor policy that we're also curious about. A crisis does also not entitle the mayor, the Port or Matt Haney to make irresponsible decisions regarding our public safety. This is a densely populated neighborhood. Every one of us have covered that. Less than half a mile from the proposed site, there are five preschools, daycare centers, two playgrounds and two parks. Within one mile, there's significantly more. Please keep this in mind as you consider a Navigation Center that will house addicts but will require them to use their needles on our sidewalks and in the surrounding park facilities. We are a neighborhood that walks everywhere. You are turning our Embarcadero pedestrian highway into their injection sites. This is an insanely irresponsible decision making when you consider the concentration of schools, daycares and children within walking distance of the Navigation Center. You may offer statistics that say that crime does not increase in your Navigation Centers. We've seen data that says otherwise. Speaking of credibility, what is undeniable is that the norm in the immediate vicinity of Nav Centers is a sidewalk littered with tents, passed-out individuals, needles, feces and all matter of abandoned suitcases, bags and bike parts. I have never driven past a Navigation Center and not found that to be the case. If you want to see my photos, I'll share them with you. But I don't think anyone needs to see them because everyone knows that's the case. For the city and for the

HSH to continue to cite a good-neighbor clause in any capacity completely undermines their credibility. They fail to meet these commitments daily. Worse yet, they continue to cite the good-neighbor clause knowing it is an empty promise. If they're willing to deceive us on this simple failed commitment, how do we believe anything they say? I believe everyone in this room wants to help the homeless. But not every idea proposed is an idea worth implementing. A crisis can be made worse if it isn't addressed thoughtfully. A new crisis can be created if irresponsible decision making is employed. If I could get my own friends and family into Navigation Centers, I would. But I still would not put them at the place you're talking about because of the demons they battle. I have seen it firsthand. I know what I'm talking about. That doesn't make me heartless. That makes me responsible. I ask for the same responsible decision making out of you guys and out of the mayor.

Barbara Raymond - I'd like to thank the commissioners for being here to listen to our concerns regarding the proposed 225-bed homeless center. I live at 301 Bryant Street and have been there for 17 years. I'm a San Franciscan, born and raised. My question to you today is, what's in it for the Port of San Francisco? An overwhelming outcry from homeowners and business leaders have already spotlighted the inappropriate size, hasty planning and lack of public information from the mayor's office, lack of budget specifics over the projects four-year plan. If you build it, many more homeless will find a home along the Embarcadero with the expected and documented problems that accompany living on the streets: filth, tents, disease, crime and more drugs. I've been around long enough to remember the outcry of the 1959 revolt that stopped the Broadway Street extension of the Embarcadero freeway. That outcry and the united public voice of over 30,000 San Franciscans paved the way for the Port to develop the Embarcadero as a world-class destination, the walkable and well-integrated community for young and old alike. Why would you go back to the dark days of skid row as the Embarcadero was and will be again if you let this happen. Instead of suggesting other San Francisco neighborhoods that will have the same objections, I ask you to consider an alternate, a bit crazy plan that only a Port city could offer -- refurbish a ship. You would have beds, cafeteria, sanitary facilities and even medical options. Think of the Mercy Ships, the ships of hope that service people in need around the world with world-class treatment and results. Encourage charitable and corporate support. Welcome medical and social services. If you have the vision for a plan like this, they will come. Be a visionary leader into a brighter future instead of supporting a short-sighted and retrograde plan that forces San Francisco back into a darker time. Engage in something that could solve the homeless problem instead of relocating it from one place to another. Right now, you're thinking of putting it in an area that has a stunning and commercial rich vista in San Francisco. You have that power and act beyond the politics.

Christy Scrivano - Port Commissioners, I spoke to you last month in opposition to the Nav Center on Seawall 330, 20 yards from my three-year-old son's bedroom. I heard Vice President Adams, who is not here today, state in our last meeting a few weeks ago, "With politicians, you have to be relentless. Knock on their doors. Beat them down." So I'm here again today to persistently voice my concern over the impact that this center will have on the safety of children and to report to you that

the city's politicians are not listening to our concerns. My fear is not of the homeless themselves but of the type of people the area will attract - drug dealers and those with substance-abuse problems, which will pose risks to the safety of hundreds of small children who not only live in the area but regularly spend time in our neighborhood. Over the last month, residents from the area have repeatedly expressed our concerns and posed questions to our civic leaders about the size, safety and drug-use policies, yet our questions remain unanswered. You probably heard about the community meeting last Wednesday at Delancey Street in which we were not allowed to speak. Our queries were censored. In fact, I know this because my own question about police patrols wasn't even discussed. Over the last month, I've attended eight public meetings on this topic. It's clear to me that the city is not engaging in good faith with the community. Their safety plan continues to lack any detail. Instead, they've over-weighted their time to discussing things like the color of the walls. The mayor has recognized that our community is very divided on this issue. It's a difficult situation. The Port is being put right in the middle of it. But it is not your responsibility to address the concerns of residents. That is the responsibility of the mayor. However, it is within your power to halt this fast-paced progress and ask the city to pause and conduct the necessary due diligence to determine the lasting effects that this center would have on Port property, which you oversee. Port commissioners, I ask you today to please extend your decision on this proposal to a later date. Once the city has had more time to properly engage with the community, with more time I believe that we can work together to find a location that will not jeopardize the safety of children.

Elenor Mak - My husband and I moved into The Watermark two years ago to start our family. We today have a 14-year-old son and another child due at the end of this year. This proposed Navigation Center is the site where my active young son will ride his bike, take evening walks with us. So for my husband and I, as we came to this decision, we really wanted to be open-minded. So we drove past two of the existing Navigation Centers on Bryant Street and Van Ness multiple times of the day, multiple weeks of the day. Each time, we witnessed incidents that made us fear for the safety of our son and our family. We saw individuals, loiterers standing directly outside or nearby the business who were intoxicated, likely on substance abuse, mentally unstable, screaming profanities, half nude. These were individuals that my son would likely encounter as he tries to ride his bike down the block. We saw syringes around the block. We saw what looked to be human feces within the same area. We ask ourselves how can this be our child's front yard? How can we safely, as parents, let him go outside, take walks, take bike rides, meet up with his friends? In addition, in our selection of neighborhood, we've always look at the Megan's Law database just to know who our neighbors are. As I look at this Navigation Center, my question is around, how will we know who are previous offenders of Megan's Law? Who are individuals who've had histories of violence against children? We won't know that with this community coming and going. So I ask you today to also consider the voices of the young children who cannot speak up here today for their safety and for their childhood.

Marcus da Cunha – I'm a 10-year resident of Brannan Street. My wife and I remain supportive of the fight against homelessness. We also remain opposed to the



location of a shelter on Seawall Lot 330. Last time, I spoke about homeless dogs and the obvious problems. Today, I will speak about the far more serious topic, and I apologize for the feelings it will evoke. I will speak about sexual assault. Off the bat, my wife and I are strong believers that everybody deserves a second chance. We believe that nobody should be defined for life on their worst day. The best data I have is for 2008. Back then, there were about 6,500 homeless in San Francisco of which 3 percent were sex offenders. Seawall Lot 330 census track has seven sex offenders today within that same area and easily 10,000 residents within three blocks from Seawall Lot 330. At a rate of 60-some days per client per bed times 225 beds times a four-year lease, it means over 5,200 clients will pass through our neighborhood. Using the 3 percent from a moment ago, one hundred sixty will be sex offenders. You heard me. One hundred sixty will be sex offenders. Another way to put it, the shelter would bring 20 times the number of current sex offenders into the neighborhood. That's unacceptable. The DSHS says they will work with referrals, which is very nice. Perhaps, some of my numbers are off. I'm willing to stand corrected. Let's cut it in half. Say it's only 80 sex offenders within three blocks of 10,000 residents. I'd like a show of hands right now. Who here would like to live for the next four years on the same block with 80 sex offenders? How about one block away? How about two blocks away? How about three blocks away? Nobody. Now, I'm not worried about me. I'm a tall, large, fat, middle-aged ugly guy and that's no joking matter. That means that I'm not a typical prey of sexual assault. All four of you are. Many here are. This plan hasn't been fully vetted. There has been on consultation with stakeholders. I urge you to send this project and lease back to the proverbial drawing board.

John Cornwell - I'm a 25-year resident of Portside, right across the street from Seawall Lot 330. My family came to San Francisco almost 100 years ago and actually worked on the waterfront. My grandfather was a merchant marine. My mom was born here. My kids were born here so I'm invested. In fact, I participate in a lot of local groups. So right across the boundary, across Bryant Street is something called The East Cut Community Benefit District. This was established to deal with a lot of the quality-of-life issues with homelessness. We all have voted to assess ourselves additional property taxes, handle security, to try and navigate, if you will, the homeless in the area into shelter, services, the rest. The burden that you will be putting on this nascent grass-roots effort to improve the community is unfair. The city keeps mentioning that this center is meant to serve the local homeless problem. And therefore, it's a community amenity. That's ridiculous. They cite the 311 call log that they hundreds of calls for homelessness. They say, there must be hundreds of homeless there, which is completely ridiculous. The CBD every night has people that go out at 4:00 or 5:00 in the morning and do a night count. They know plus or minus one or two with those five or six square blocks on the other side of Bryant. They know exactly how many homeless are there and they know their names. The stuff about the city keeps portraying that this is a neighborhood-serving amenity is absolute garbage. We know how many homeless are there. It's 12 or 13 on the other side of Bryant and maybe that number on the other side. You're looking at like maybe 20 to 25, one-tenth of the population of this. Why would we want this in our neighborhood? We shouldn't have to bear it. We've already provided a disproportionate amount of below-market housing, transitional housing and

subsidized housing like no other district in the city does. We are already carrying our load. I should not have to feel guilty or be accused of being like shallow because I'm not doing my part, especially by people that tend to be imported and bussed in for these meetings, which are not local residents. I'm amazed that, as Port commissioners, that you would want to have this adjacency yourselves. You already have a problem with homelessness on the front in terms of the Port. Not to bring this up, the old wound, but Kate Steinle, the guy who shot her I used to see with my kids. My five and eight-year-old went to school at Hills Plaza. We'd walk on the Embarcadero. I saw this guy riding around for three months before that happened. He was homeless. You've already directly experienced a huge PR issue. This is not some abstract concept that the homeless are unsightly. They are a danger. I'm amazed that you would want to put this thing right on the doorstep of your Port property when you're creating a security issue for yourselves.

Jocelyn Thompson - I've attended several public meetings. This is the first time I've actually had an opportunity to speak because of rules last week that people weren't allowed to speak their minds. At the meeting I attended previously, they didn't get to everybody. So thank you for allowing me this opportunity. At the many proceedings I've attended, I've often heard that no one in the neighborhood supports the Navigation Center. That is not correct. I live in this neighborhood. I walk past this lot every single day when I walk my dog. Walking is my primary mode of transportation. But in addition every day, I pass folks living on our streets. I pass them as they're waking up, as they're going through their morning ablutions, as they're packing up their bedding to hold until the evening. I've learned who I can greet. I've learned who I can chat with. I have learned who is best to avoid. I support the Navigation Center. I believe we should construct it without doubt, without delay and without divisiveness. But it is this last item that I think is really important to discuss today: divisiveness. The proposal looks fine as far as it goes. But there are some really important things missing. Where are the other five to 10 facilities that the city will need to accomplish its objectives? Where is it in the plan that justifies calling this a temporary facility that will be gone within just a few years? I don't see anything on the back end that would replace this so-called temporary facility. Without a coherent, comprehensive plan that addresses these two things, the proposal has no credibility. A proposal with no credibility only feeds suspicions and divisiveness. At last week's public meeting, someone was circulating a sheet that described the percentage of the city's shelter resources that are hosted by District 6. I didn't compile that. I can't vouch for it. But if it is true, it exhibits a shockingly unequal distribution of the burdens of dealing with our city's homeless population here in District 6. I've heard that the search is still underway for sites for Navigation Centers elsewhere in the city. The city is having trouble finding perfect sites that meet all their search criteria. I get it. The city faces hard choices about other locations, and I get it. But based on more than 35 years in working on development projects, I can assure you that the city's choices will not improve in time. The city needs to make those hard choices now. It needs to complete the comprehensive plan and debut a suite of sites across the city that will proceed in the same general timeframe. Why? Because without it, few in this community will believe that the city will follow through. failure to follow through with centers and services across the city will result in intensifying and densifying the homeless population here in District 6 and, in

particular, in the vicinity of the proposed center. It's also important to see the entire package now because the city may conclude it simply can't identify other sites in other. It's important to couple this proposal with other benefits to the community that would offset the disadvantages of shouldering such a disproportionate burden.

Bruce Goldetsky - You've heard from a lot of the local residents that they're not in favor of the mega Navigation Center at Seawall 330. They're worried about safety, cleanliness, crime, open drug use, the negative impact on tourism, etc. Personally, my biggest concern is about crime and open drug use. A significant portion of the people staying there are addicts. They cannot use on premise, but they can use off premises. What's going to happen I'm worried about is a great choice for them where to get their drugs is going to be right across the street on the wharf from Delancey Street. You've heard about all this from all the neighbors. I walk up and down on the Embarcadero every day. The last few days, I decided to talk to some of the people that rent from you, the businesses. They're on the west side and the east side. You have the east side people. I talked to people on the west side. There's the South Beach Café, the hair salon, Town's End Bakery, Crossroads Café, Delancey Restaurant, RJ's Market, Cento, Palomino, Firefox and Crunch Fitness. Those are all on the west side. The South Beach Marina, Java House, Hi Dive, Waterbar and EPIC all rent from you. It's somewhat anecdotal but every single person I talked to was either the owner or the manager of these sites. I didn't get to every single one but almost all of them. Without question, every single one is against this Navigation Center. They're worried about the increase in crime and external drug use and tent cities. I don't know what you're going to do. It's going to be hard for you. You're trying to get somebody to come in to SB 38. I know it. You've painted it, and I'm sure you're negotiating with somebody about that. You want somebody to improve Hi Dive. He's not going to be happy if there's a lot of additional problems that we all think this is going to cause. If Waterbar or EPIC's business goes down 30 percent, what are you going to do? Are you going to lower their rent? There's a lot of problems. The guy who is supposed to speak next is a friend of mine. He had a place at the Navigation Center on Mission. He had to leave because they crushed his business.

Mark Dragun - I have been resident of South Beach for over 15 years. I'm a member of CWAG. I'm pretty invested in this neighborhood. I'm opposed to the Navigation Center on Seawall Lot 330. What I'd really like to ask today is that you postpone the vote for April 23rd to give a chance for the neighborhood to engage in a process that's being very quickly moved along without adequate neighborhood input. There are three principal reasons I'd like for you to postpone it. The first one has to do with your duty. The reason you are Port commissioners and you solicit neighborhood feedback is to make certain that uses of the Port don't adversely or severely adversely affect neighborhoods. This is a case where the fear in this room is palpable. You know what the neighborhood is concerned about. It's your job, in some sense, to keep them free from fear, to keep them safe. By voting next week to approve this, you circumvent their ability and your ability to ensure that your duties are fulfilled. The second reason I'd like you to consider postponing the vote next week is to consider the quality of life for the people in that neighborhood. These are the people who make the city work. They go to work every day. They pay off their

mortgage. They save for retirement. They pay their taxes. They raise their families. Yet, there isn't enough consideration of their quality of life in deciding upon this location. In fact, when the mayor chose this location, there was no consideration to the demographics of the area. It was simply a large lot that she could put 225 beds on. I ask you to postpone your vote next week so that you can consider the neighborhood's interest and they can get involved in the process and hopefully develop some mitigation measures. The last reason would be political. If the first two don't convince you, consider Mayor Breed. She's dividing the city. She's coming across as arrogant, stubborn and dictatorial. That's going to become an albatross across her neck. It will be part of her political legacy, what she did to this neighborhood. So if for no other reason than you want to support Mayor Breed, consider postponing next week to ensure that she doesn't end up having that reputation and being really out of touch with the community.

Malika Shahani - My husband and I moved here eight years ago from Marina into SoMa, bought our property in Portside. We're very excited about building our home, building our little family. We've succeeded so far with one. We also have a puppy at home. I'm going to give you a few instances of things that have happened. I have been punched at 7:00 in the evening outside the Charles Schwab building while walking with a few friends by a mentally disturbed person. A few months ago, I was walking with my child and family just a few blocks away from Portside again. I was kicked really hard with no provocation whatsoever. When you talk about a Navigation Center, that's the first thing that comes to my mind is that now I have to deal with and think of my safety, my son's safety, my dog's safety. There are many streets around our house, around Portside on Spear Street where I don't walk my dog because my friend's dog stepped on a syringe and was taken to ER and had to spend \$1,200 besides, of course, dealing with the consequences. I'm all for a Navigation Center. But this is a humble request. We don't know what we are going to do if there is one that opens up 500 feet from our house because, honestly, I'm trying to get to a school district and to get a daycare. But at this point, we also think of where we're going to move because we'll be literally house bound, can't get out of our houses if there's 100 mentally disturbed people as well as drug addicts staying right across our house. This is something that should be considered. I'm not alone in saying this. I have spoken to neighbors. I have tried to keep a very open mind. I'm all for the homeless but not for drug users that will be given free access to come in and stay with a no-questions-asked policy. If you want to put up something like this, it should be either the civic center or Dogpatch industrial area or somewhere else, not where we have 12 or 15 homeless people who are attacking us. I feel like our data has been used against us. We were told call 311 every time there is a homeless encounter. But it's that same calls that we made for those 12, 15 people. Instead of solving our problem, you're now dumping 200 more on us. There has to be a whole lot more thought that goes into this. Otherwise, with children and dogs, it's absolutely unlivable. I'm not saying this out of nowhere. I have experienced it firsthand. So I would love for this to be reconsidered.

Paul Scrivano - I live at Portside condominiums. I strongly oppose the proposed Navigation Center. I ask the commission to postpone the vote here until more diligence can be done. We're being told many things from the city that we're

expected to believe that we know are not true. We're being told there are no other appropriate sites. We know there are many other appropriate sites with already water and sewage hooked up. We are being told there will not be any crime or loitering or drug use. All you have to do is go on social media to see the various pictures all over the city outside the Navigation Center with drug use and loitering. We're being told it's temporary. As Commissioner Makras said in a prior meeting, "Temporary can mean up to 30 years in San Francisco." South Beach does not have a homeless problem at the moment. We have dramatically fewer than other districts. This Navigation Center will import hundreds into South Beach. It will bring drug abuse. It will bring drug pushers. It will bring crime. The Port needs to slow down. They need to do the appropriate diligence. What effects will this have on South Beach? How much will crime increase? Will SFPD be able to do anything? They're already overwhelmed, it seems, with the rest of their policing duties. If the Port rushes forward with this Navigation Center, it is going to gravely endanger the health and safety of the residents of South Beach, SoMa and Rincon Hill. I urge you to postpone the vote, do the appropriate diligence for the health and safety of the residents of this area.

Wallace Lee - I've been to a couple of these meetings before. I've heard several commissioners say that residents with concerns about the Navigation Center should bring those concerns to City Hall and that the Port sees itself as more of a landlord and isn't able to address the residents' concerns. I completely understand that. That's a fair thing to say. But I'm here to tell you that we have been talking to the city but have received little real engagement. Now, the mayor's advisor for homelessness, when asked at a neighborhood meeting whether the surrounding area is considered when deciding where to build a Navigation Center, she quite forthrightly said, "No, because Navigation Centers haven't been shown to have negative impacts on their surroundings." I hope we've shown in previous meetings and also today that at the very least room for reasonable debate. But you can't have a constructive engagement with someone who refuses to acknowledge even the potential that Navigation Centers are associated with ill effects. Now, you've probably heard about the community meeting the city held last Wednesday at Delancey Street. Residents there weren't allowed to speak. We were asked to submit written questions. Quite frankly, I think they mocked us by answering written questions like, "What are the benefits of having a safe place to sleep?" I think we're on the same page there. We all know that it's good to have a safe place to sleep at night. Just the fact that they brought that up as one of the questions shows that they're not concerned about the community's real concerns. It was reported on KTVU that a resident approached Mayor Breed, who showed up at the meeting, and tried to ask her a question or tried to bring up a concern. And she said, "I don't want to hear what you have to say." All this is to say that the city isn't listening and is driving a divisive narrative. Anyone who raises concerns is labeled as anti-homeless, which is not true. I think that the rather respectful comments that have been made here at the Port is a result of the Port being willing to listen. I hope that the Port will slow this process down because the city is using the speed at which this is moving to ignore the community's concerns. I hope that the Port will delay the decision that's currently scheduled for April 23rd.

Alice Rogers - I just want to second Wallace's comments about the possibility of postponing this. We realize that you didn't originate this proposal but you are hearing it. We need you to lean on the city to actually engage with us. We've been spending a lot of hours speaking past each other. We, as you know, have a smaller working group that's been organized. We keep saying the same things again and again and again. We just keep getting the same response again and again and again. There is no engagement. There is no discussion. The fear in the neighborhood would be greatly lessened if there was a dialogue that, as Wallace and others had said, hears what the fears are and gives us substantial baseline information, risk analysis, staffing to make this proposal actually a viable proposal. I'm all in for getting to yes. I don't know what yes is but we just can't throw the community under the bus. I do think that there is a solution to be had that can satisfy everyone but it can't happen by next week.

Emily - I wasn't able to come to any of the other meetings because I work, as do most of my neighbors. It's a mixed area of different incomes. You've heard it all from my neighbors and my community. I've never felt more connected to a community than I do today listening to everybody. I'll just add a comment, aside from the inappropriate location and the danger to children and our seniors. On a personal note, I have to go out and walk a little dog. I often do it in the dark. I do it in the morning, and I do it at night because that's when he needs to go out. I've learned over the last couple of years that I have to navigate around some of the dodgier folks in the neighborhood. They're volatile, at best unpredictable and that's okay. I deal with it. But as you've heard repeatedly, it's a number that's not great. The thought of having 20 times that number in our backyard terrifies me. It makes me wonder, what do I do as a single person who goes out and feels vulnerable on the street? I've been in the neighborhood nine years. I'm a home owner. I ask you to give this real consideration. You've heard a really genuine outpouring from the heart here from all my neighbors in my community.

## 6. EXECUTIVE

### A. Executive Director's Report

- In Memoriam – Corinne Woods, community leader and friend of the Port

Elaine Forbes, Port's executive director - It's with a heavy heart that I open my report in the memory of Corinne Woods, who was our dear friend. She passed away peacefully Monday, April 1st with her husband by her side. Corinne was a resident of Mission Creek in a houseboat and was a community advocate for San Francisco's eastern waterfront and Mission Bay neighborhood for four decades. She was considered the rudder and conscience of the Mission Bay Harbor Association by the chair. I think she was the rudder and conscience of our Port Commission as well. She was a constant presence here. Throughout the years, she attended literally hundreds of Port Commission meetings, advisory meetings. She voiced her point of view. She also extended a true helping hand to further our mission. She attended many board meetings to support the Port Commission and

Port staff. She was a giant in our community dialogue. We appreciated her wisdom, her knowledge, her straightforwardness, her advice. Most of all, we appreciated her as a person of integrity and for her clear love and passion for the waterfront, so much so that, in January of 2016, the Port Commission presented her with the Port Community Leader Award, the first and last so far of its kind, in recognition of her dedication and volunteer service to our community. Her civic work, as far as I can tell, began in 1983 when her and her neighbors created the Mission Bay Conservancy to clean up Mission Creek. She devoted her efforts to open space and environmental issues related to development on the eastern shoreline of San Francisco. She quite simply never stopped volunteering or attending meetings. I have a full page of bullets that outline the various efforts and organizations she was part of. If it had to do with the shoreline and development, she was there at the table. She looked at every single detail and remembered them all and was just such a fierce advocate. She was described by a friend as someone who believed that San Francisco is a city for everyone. You can't fight development and change. What you need to do is get yourself a seat at the table and guide development and she did that. Big and small changes on our waterfront are a result of Corinne, many of which we've seen, and many will go unseen. But she was there for the last four decades at that table. As another community activist was bemoaning what life would be without her, someone said, "Who exactly will replace Corinne?" They were quiet for some time. And then, the perfect response came. "No one will." She was a giant, and we'll miss her tremendously. We ask the commission to close the meeting in her honor.

Toby Levine - This is certainly a giant loss for us all. After all, who is going to take me home after these meetings? I just can't imagine life without Corinne. I'm sure that's also the case for you guys. The executive director mentioned earlier about Corinne's involvement in the Mission Creek Conservancy. That was really an important activity of hers, among the many of them. The conservancy was very involved with trying to clean up the creek and then expand people's imagination and view about the future possibilities. I do remember sitting with Corinne long before Mission Bay was actually built and Corinne saying, "Well, we have to have a nice, broad promenade for the people to walk up. And we have to have lots of trees," and going on and on. "And we must be able to see the movements of the tide, so we have to keep that a possibility," and on and on. Of course, the conservancy grew mainly with the support of the people who live in the floating homes there, as she would say. In the process of years of work and years of fundraising, the Mission Creek Conservancy developed a beautiful book. I'm sure you all may have seen it. But if you haven't seen it, I brought a copy for the commission and a copy for the staff. I hope you will enjoy reading through it and, with every word, think of Corinne because she was one of the main people responsible for the conservancy and many other good things that have become part of our life.

Catherine Riley - I'm here wearing three hats. Currently, I'm with Brookfield, formerly Forest City, working on the Pier 70 project. But also, I worked for OCII as the project manager for Mission Bay for eight years. During that time, Corinne was the chair of the Mission Bay Citizen's Advisory Committee. Then, the third hat is that I consider Corinne to be a personal friend and that's probably the most important hat for me. Corinne was one of those community advocates that never quit fighting for the community, not just for what she thought was important but, more importantly, what she thought was important for the community itself. She held government entities, staff, decision makers as well as developers to task. When she raised an issue and she called me, sometimes she'd drive me up the wall. But I also knew that, if she raised an issue, it was something that was well thought of and worth listening to and addressing. She did not shy away from change, as the executive director mentioned. She understood change happens. So she focused on directing that change to the benefit of the community. She knew her project approvals inside and out. I'm sure Peter is having to deal with all the paperwork that she's collected over the years as she got herself up to speed. She knows what was promised to the community and had a memory that didn't quit. She understood both the big picture and the day-to-day issues. She would hold us accountable. David Beaupre and I both knew that she remembered what had been committed as a big picture to how Mission Bay Association in the design and replacement of Huffaker Park. She also was focused on the small stuff. So if pile driving started one minute before 8:00 or went to one minute after 5:00, she would call me. I finally told the pile driver guy, "Please put your clock -- start two minutes after and end two minutes before just in case her clock's running fast." But also, what I appreciated about Corinne was she would work with staff, decision makers and developers as partners for the best goal. She did not simply identify problems. But she was a problem solver, and she brought to the table fixes. I always appreciated that of her. One example that we have is for Pier 70. It's further away from her house. It was not going to immediately affect her. But she was willing to spend two hours of her time to sit down with us on our draft design for development and share her lessons learned on Mission Bay down to the detail of how you do trash management. She was not a planner or a designer by trade, but she was in practice. As a staff person, I appreciated her because of her willingness to stand up and advocate for approved projects that she had supported. Not only did she hold the government, staff and developers to task, she also held the community to task. I remember when some of the affordable housing folks in our office came in, Corinne was the first one in the meeting to sit there and remind the community that the affordable housing was part of that. We'll miss her. I don't know how we'll all sit there and replace her.

Philip DeAndrade - I'm the president of the Mission Creek Harbor Association where Corinne lived. I had the honor of being partners with the Port in the stewardship of Mission Creek. I want to thank the Port for its participation and working with us to improve the quality of that creek that



Corinne lived in and started her advocacy in. I would say it was the condition of Mission Creek when she moved into it that began this program of advocacy that you all have lauded throughout her life, four decades of working. She started going to meetings to clean up the creek. She never stopped going to meetings. You all know that. She was the foremost person in the yes-in-my-community movement. She was not a NIMBY. Ironically, we're here today facing a lot of issues relating to our communities. Corinne always took the big picture. She always looked for the good of not only her immediate community but the larger community, the Mission Bay community and ultimately the city at large. We were then partners together in accessibility to the water and the use of the water and making the water available to all the people. She always believed that what's important is to have a seat at the table to have an influence on the endpoint but always to work with the city, with the staffs of the various communities. She worked with everyone, the Port Commission, UCSF, Bay View Boat Club, southeast neighborhoods, eastern neighborhoods. There isn't a group that had an influence on the waterfront or especially on the Mission Bay community that Corinne wasn't part of. We thank you for honoring her today. Let us add our honor with you. To answer to the question of who will replace her, she would say we have to replace her. I think that's her challenge to us is that we now have to do the job that she so carefully did. If you're looking for something to honor her in the long term, I will mention to you that the only public launch facility in San Francisco which she very importantly got together does not have a name.

Elizabeth Windsor - I am representing the Bay View Boat Club. A small aspect of Corinne's life, she was a lifetime volunteer of our club and a strong advocate. I believe she was instrumental in implementing that Pier 52 public launch and subsequently the parking for vehicles with trailers. It is the only public launch in the city. I want to thank you for honoring her today. She'll be greatly missed.

Sarah Davis - I moved to Mission Bay almost 40 years ago when I was very young. I want to talk about how we stand on the shoulder of Giants. The first Corinne Woods of Mission Bay was Ruth Huffaker. When we moved down there when I was seven or eight, Ruth Huffaker and her husband were living in this ragtag community of undesirables. The next Corinne Woods was Betty Boatright. My entire life, she looked like a 70-year-old Shirley Temple. She had a lock of gray curls. I learned a lot about politics from Betty Boatright. Her technique was she would find you after the meeting and put her arm around you and said, "I need a little help." Our urban legend is, at some point, somebody from the Port we describe it as a bar napkin. Like there was some agreement given to us that we would be able to live in Mission Bay and that was Betty Boatright's generation. Then, Corinne Woods and that generation came. I remember work parties, hundreds of work parties. Peter Snider, Corinne's husband, I remember dropping the first loads of soil in our community garden. I remember planting trees. It was a neighborhood that nobody wanted, and we wanted

it. I also remember millions of meetings that Corinne would go to where there was literally building blocks where we were deciding what was going to go where in Mission Bay and the constant narrative of affordable housing and this being a community for everybody. I just want to thank you guys for the work that you did with Corinne and remind you that her advocacy came from affordable housing in a sense. With that, people have the capacity to give in a way that I think it's a benefit to all of us. Corinne is a great example of that.

David Beaupre, Planning and Environment - I wanted to recognize my work with Corinne. She was a strong advocate for the Blue Greenway. I'll never forget the first time I met her. It was within the first week I started at the Port. Diane Oshima was trying to probably figure out what to do with me at the time and said, "I've got a little project you can help out on." So she parked me in a small meeting room with Corinne Woods and John Super to talk about the public boat launch project, which evidently had been struggling at the Port for a number of years. So that was my friendship with Corinne. She pushed and pushed and pushed and decided that we would build it in phases over time. Eventually, four, five or six or seven years later, we finally built it. It was a fitting project, from there then many meetings on the Blue Greenway up and down the waterfront. She was a strong advocate for open-space planning, water recreation. In my work on both Pier 70 and other projects, come to realize that she's really an advocate for smart land-use and transportation planning. Since our colleagues from MTA are here, I should also mention her advocacy for the 22 down 16th Street as a part of Mission Bay, which I'm sure they all fondly remember as well. We'll miss her and we appreciate her.

Diane Oshima, Planning and Environment - That boat launch might have to be the David and Corinne boat launch but I just want to concur with all of the accolades of what Corinne really cared about. The core of it was about community and her citizenship. That's really what I'm going to miss the most because it's a rare thing for somebody to invest so much of their heart for us, for everyone. She was so smart. She really gave it to us when we needed it. She found ways to bring us all together to do amazing things in this part of town. I started with her 20 years ago with the Port here on the waterfront. Look what has happened in that time, President Brandon. I think we all have our angels. Corinne is one of them. I'd like to also thank Peter Snider for being so generous with her time to giving her to all of us.

Alice Rogers - I, too, want to praise Corinne. Without her as a role model, certainly our neighborhood association would not have had the inspiration that we have had to go forward. She never did get her bus to her hair dresser, which she worked on, she said, for 22 years. So she's a lesson to us. I also do want to mention that Fran Weld at the Giants was here earlier and had hoped to speak but had to leave. So please know that she had sentiments that she wanted to share.

Commissioner Woo Ho - A lot has been said. Corinne is a very special and unique person. When I first came on the commission, it was such a breath of fresh air. I was sort of being very nervous about public comment and input from the community and expecting a lot of usual sort of adversarial NIMBY type of mentality and she was such a role model in engaging. Even if she disagreed with us, she would do it with a smile. She really did, as people have mentioned, she really did not look at it very narrowly. She looked at issues very broadly. She did her homework. She knew her facts. She sometimes knew them better than our staff. She came to the table prepared to discuss what she passionately believed in. She was able to always make a very cogent case and she was really a gentle giant. I think the main thing to appreciate, as everybody said, she wanted to be at the table. She always wanted to have a win-win solution. She believed being part of the solution rather than to force or push for something that was not going to be acceptable to either side, whether it was the community or the Port. She's made so many contributions. We just heard about some of them today. I was missing her the last few months and wondered why she wasn't here. Obviously, I know now why she wasn't. We will genuinely miss her because she had institutional memory. She gave us institutional conscience for the city of San Francisco, not just for the Port. As Alice said, she really set up the role model for all of our citizens advisory groups were because she was the best of the best. We sorely miss her. I don't know that anybody can replace her but I guess we all will have to replace her.

Commissioner Makras - I'd just like to acknowledge all of her contributions, and we will miss her.

Commissioner Gilman - I wanted to mention that I actually knew Corinne for over a decade in a different capacity. I didn't know her up here as the Port Commission. But I knew her for her work in Mission Bay. She definitely was, yes, in my backyard. Actually with the comments we heard today, we should remember that she was able to always drive what the community needed. Besides the affordable housing in Mission Bay, Mission Bay was one of the first communities, like Transbay, that planned for and had homeless individuals living in housing as some of the first members. I think it's really important that we remember the integrated communities was something that Corinne really accepted. She worked to make it the best of the best for everyone particularly for the folks who lived on the houseboats. She mentored so many people. I know Davi Lang and her family couldn't be here today. Futures of young activists grew up in that neighborhood off of Corinne. That was the context I know her and how warmly she welcomed me when I joined the Port Commission. I send my condolences to her family and definitely want to acknowledge all of her accomplishments.

Commissioner Brandon - Corinne will truly be missed. I have known her for over 20 years and I consider her an honorary Port commissioner. She was at every meeting. It didn't matter what the issue was or where the issue was. She was going to tell us what she thought about it, which was

wonderful because she was the conscience of the Port. She was always knowledgeable, there ready to tell us if we were doing something right or wrong but telling us from her perspective, which was from the heart, not any other reason. It was what was best for the Port, what was best for the city, what was best for the community. She is truly, truly going to be missed. She was one of my true friends. When I had my 20th anniversary last year, I asked her to speak on my behalf because she's just such a wonderful person. We are really going to miss her. Again, our sincere condolences to the family. We should look at naming something after her. I also want to know if there's anywhere that we can make a donation or anything that we can do to support the family in her memory.

Commissioner Woo Ho - I just want to add I remember when I was up for my first re-nomination to the Port Commission. I will treasure this memory. I asked Corinne to come to the board of supervisors to be one of my endorsements along with Willie Brown. She will be always very special in my mind.

Elaine Forbes – We will keep the commission posted on services for Corinne. We will certainly work on a proposal for a naming. I think we have a leading contender from today. Thank you, everyone. I have two other items. April is Earth month. Happy Earth month. Please mark your calendars for April 22nd, which is actually the annual Earth Day. Rec and Park will be hosting a celebration at Heron's Head Park that will begin at 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. It will have a speaking program, activities, a barbecue, cake cutting, etc. It sounds like a lot of fun for all. So if you would like to join Rec and Park at Heron's Head Park on Earth Day, please do so.

Finally, our April 23rd meeting is scheduled to be at Pier 1, the Port offices at the Bayside conference rooms. We've noticed the change of venue. It's posted on our website.

## **7. CONSENT**

- A. Request authorization, subject to Board of Supervisors' approval, to accept and expend \$105,000 in 2018 Port Security Grant Program (PSGP) funds from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security for security improvements at the Port of San Francisco. (Resolution No. 19-10)
- B. Request authorization to advertise for competitive bids for Construction Contract No. 2796, South Beach Marina Repairs. (Resolution No. 19-11)

ACTON: Commissioner Woo Ho moved approval; Commissioner Gilman seconded the motion. All of the Commissioners were in favor. Resolution Nos. 19-10 and 19-11 were adopted.

## **8. PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT**

A. Informational presentation on proposed amendments to the Port's Harbor Traffic Code allowing certain parking restrictions within Mission Bay east of Third Street to support the Chase Center Draft Access Plan ("Access Plan") and an update on other Port transportation related improvements to support access to the Chase Center.

David Beaupre, Planning and Environment - I'm joined here today by Peter Bryan from the Golden State Warriors and Tom Maguire from SFMTA to talk about amendments to both the harbor traffic code and an access plan for the Chase Center. This slide is a brief overview of the presentation. I'll provide an introduction and some context. We'll have Peter Bryan talk about the Chase Center planning and outreach followed by Tom Maguire to talk about the access plan. Then, I'll follow up with next steps.

The board of supervisors delegated to the Port Commission the ability to adapt a harbor code, which includes a harbor traffic code. The harbor traffic code allows the Port to restrict curb use to enhance transportation along the waterfront. The Port also has an MOU with the SFMTA to allow us to use their expertise as transportation planners to assist in the management of our curb zones. SFMTA has taken the lead to develop an access plan on how to access the area and enhance transportation to serve the Chase Center.

I'll turn it over to Peter Bryan, who will talk about the Chase Center planning and then back to Tom Maguire. Then I'll wrap it up.

Peter Bryan - Thank you, David. Thank you, commissioners. Want to give you a brief update of what is happening at Chase Center and how we are preparing for opening. There's a lot of time that we just heard people talking about Corinne. One of the things that's unfortunate is Corinne is not going to be here to see the opening of Chase Center and, as she would say, holding our feet to the fire with the promises and expectations for how the facility will operate.

With that said, there's been a lot of work and a very good collective effort among partners with the city, not just the Port, MTA who is here today, the mayor's office, through organizations in the community, UCSF, local businesses, the bio life sciences roundtable and neighboring residents and community members.

As many of you are aware, in 2015 when the project was approved, a transportation management plan was assembled. It was always envisioned that this was going to be a living, breathing document that will be amended. Our current plan is to have revision one of that document ready in August 2019 to reflect all the hard work that we have been coordinating with the stakeholders I mentioned to ensure that we are promoting a transit-first approach for patrons and employees who are going to come to Chase Center, looking at non-auto modes such as bicycle riding, bicycle share, using our own two feet in an ambulatory method and then also really with the goal of reducing the single-use-occupant automobile transportation. We are planning a rather robust

communication strategy with that that we are going to start sharing with city partners towards the end of April and early May as to what that will look like and the timing and the media that will be involved.

So what is coming? August 2019 is when the Chase Center will receive occupancy from the City and County of San Francisco. The last third of that month, we will hold what we consider to be several soft opening events. The whole purpose of that is not only to test our own interior systems but to also test the transportation infrastructure for patrons who are coming. So we'd start with some smaller events, possibly just employees, and get to the point where, hopefully we are having several thousand people come to Chase Center to burn the facility in and to, as I said, test the infrastructure.

As some of you are aware, the first ticketed event has gone on sale, symphony and Metallica too. There will be performances on September 6th and also September 8th. Prior to that, we will have a ribbon-cutting gala event on September 3rd. From there, it actually gets into a rather busy event calendar, only some of which have been announced publicly. But we have Tuesday, September 10th, Dave Matthews Band, which happens to be our first dual event with a home game at Oracle Park.

Obviously, that has all sorts of different requirements and strategies for how we deal with transportation not just at Chase Center but also at Oracle Park and in the neighborhood. Our first Warriors home game has been announced, Saturday, October 5th versus the Lakers. The monthly schedule of events will be pushed out to various groups, both through the Ballpark Mission Bay Transportation Coordination Committee, then Mission Bay CAC, through other media outlets. In addition, people are able to sign up at ChaseCenter.com to receive a newsletter of upcoming events.

Finally, as many of you are probably aware, when the project was approved, MTA and the board of supervisors did approve a Mission Bay transportation improvement fund. The purpose of this fund was to ensure that revenue that's generated from the event center stays within Mission Bay to address transportation issues that could arise as we become operational. It is a group that is chaired by SFMTA with representatives from the Warriors, UCSF, local businesses and local residents. That committee has commenced their meetings and are currently meeting on a monthly schedule.

In addition to this advisory information today here, we are presenting to the Dogpatch Neighborhood Association this evening, the Mission Bay CAC Thursday. We met with the Mission Bay life sciences roundtable earlier this afternoon. We have very frequent interaction with UCSF and are planning meetings with the local neighborhood homeowner's associations along with the Potrero Boosters.

Now, I will turn it over to Tom Maguire with MTA who is going to talk about a lot of the measures they've been working on.

Tom Maguire - I'm the sustainable streets director at the MTA. I oversee all of the MTA's parking and traffic functions. To build on the previous speakers, our approach to making transportation work at the new arena is an approach based in collaboration. We are building, first of all, on our own track record, our experience. Many of our staff remember the launching of Pac Bell Park back in 2000 and how that ballpark has one of the highest shares of people getting to games without driving of any place in the country. We want to build on that track record. Of course, working closely with both the Warriors and the Port staff and all the other public agencies who are committed to collaboration and to making the arena work. The first key message that we're pushing out to everyone we talk to about getting this arena is that the best way to get there is going to be to take mass transit.

There are major investments through that lockbox that was just referred to, major investments in improving the transit experience, getting people there in ways that they can be confident they don't need to rely on their cars. They can be confident that muni will get them there safely. The transit service plan at its core is built around muni service. We are planning to increase rail service along the T Third line between the T Third and the Embarcadero and the Embarcadero BART station.

We'll be adding express shuttle buses to both the 16th Street BART station in the Mission as well as the northern and central parts of the city. I'll show maps showing that in much more detail in subsequent slides. But the key principle is that the arena should be within convenient reach of anywhere in the city by muni. We're adding muni service so that transit travelers from elsewhere in the region can make very easy, convenient connections via BART, Caltrain, Golden Gate Transit and the ferry system.

If you've been out near the arena site recently, you'll see our initial construction work. We actually shut the T Third line down for a few weeks this winter. The reason for doing that was to build what you can see in the rendering in the slide here, which is a wider, larger platform in front of the arena that will allow us to load four two-car trains at the same time.

Again, this is very similar to the way we operate in front of the Giants ball park right now. In that post-game experience when thousands of people are streaming out of the stadium, we want them to be able to get on that platform and always see a train with the doors open and capacity to get them to their destination. The T Third is back up and running again providing the rail service again. The platform construction -- there's a bunch of those items. So we'll have full completion of that station in May. Again, that'll give us an opportunity to run the same kind of exit operations that we have at the Giants ballpark.

Also next week, we'll be bringing that into our board to rename that station as the UCSF Chase Center 16th Street Station. Looking at a little more detail about what the transit service will look like -- the first piece, of course, is the T

Third. But we're also going to be running, until the central subway opens, some direct shuttlebuses as well including the express shuttlebus that'll take about 10 minutes to get to the 16th and Mission station. That's actually the closest BART station to the arena so that folks coming from anywhere along the BART line in the city or in the region can hop on the connecting bus at 16th and Mission.

The T Third going around the hole in the Embarcadero, 20 minutes to get to the Powell Street station. We'll also be running some dedicated bus services along Van Ness Avenue that will be able to get from just north of the Civic Center in 15 to 30 minutes. when I said making sure that the arena is accessible to every part of the city by transit, it's not just rail. It's also this new bus service, which is being funded from the lock box.

Once the central subway opens, the story gets even better. Those T Third trains will go directly into the central subway and get to Union Square and Powell Street in 15 minutes or less. So the BART connection gets stronger. We'll continue to run the buses to the BART. We'll continue to run the buses up Van Ness Avenue. We'll also run buses or muni metro shuttles along the Embarcadero into the Market Street tunnel and out to West Portal. So the options will get better when that central subway opens. So that's the story for the best option, which is getting there by transit.

The other questions that I know all of us are facing are what's the story going to be with parking and traffic. The first piece of this is, as was described by the previous speaker, discouraging single-occupant-automobile use as much as possible and giving people much better options. But there will, of course, be people who choose to drive to the arena. We'll be flooding the zone with parking patrol officers who are always our first line of defense against congested intersection blocking the box. We're committed to putting up to 26 PCOs out there.

That's a level of deployment that is actually more than what we put out for a Giants game. That just kind of shows how seriously we're taking this. the PCOs will have three jobs, just as they have three jobs when they're working downtown at rush hour: traffic control, reducing gridlock and congestion; parking and curb enforcement, making sure that double parking at the wrong time doesn't block up entire blocks; and finally, ensuring safe access. And that, at times, can mean moving pedestrians across busy streets. That, at times, can mean moving vehicles onto streets where it's safer for them to operate.

The major driving routes to the center are focused on Third Street and the Seventh to 16th Street route. We've got them marked out in great detail here. We do expect that we'll have fans trying to drive or visitors to the center trying to drive from the north, the south and the west just as we have folks trying to drive from the north, the south and the west to Mission Bay today.



You may have already seen that we've put up new Oracle Park signage around the Mission Bay area. We're putting up new signage guiding drivers to the Chase Center. Those guiding streets will go all the way back to the major freeway entrances up along Bryant and Harrison and as far south as Chavez. Once you get closer into the arena, our focus shifts from simply managing traffic congestion to ensuring the safety of everyone who is trying to walk, drive or take transit in and around the center. So you see the next slide here we've got all the streets that will be blocked off to general traffic during events. That's Illinois, Warriors Way, 16th Street.

the regulations will certainly evolve as we get a better handle for how access works on game nights and on event nights. But the primary role for the streets that are marked off in the dark color here is that they're reserved for emergency vehicle access. They're reserved for either mass transit pick up and drop off or for the heavy flows of pedestrians entering and leaving the arena safely. We'll be coupling those traffic restrictions with parking restrictions. This is a tool that we've been using at the Giants ballpark for years. You may recall that, on the blocks around the ballpark, we leave the meters on till 10:00 p.m. on game nights. We use a pricing structure that is based on discouraging baseball fans from parking a few blocks away from Third and King and walking to the park. The same thing will happen at the Chase Center.

We'll be leaving the meters on later in the evening in that extended special event area that we've drawn out on the map there. We'll be pricing parking in such a way that no one is tempted to try to get away with parking on a residential or commercial block in Mission Bay to go to the Chase Center. Zooming back in on the arena, every block has got some very tailored curb regulations. I'm not going to get into the really arcane details here but we'll be managing the streets for the most efficient uses.

When there's no games, there'll be metered parking around the arena. But during events, our approach is to maintain access for the businesses that abut the arena, to free up as much curb space as possible for the safe loading and unloading of people who are arriving in car pools, taxis, Uber, Lyft and other kinds of vehicles. The primary location for that activity is going to be on Terry Francois Boulevard to the east of the arena along the waterfront just from the place where the sort of elbow is formed in Terry Francois north of 17th Street up to north of Warriors Way.

Fans inside the arena will be guided out through signage to taxi stands and pick-up/drop-off zones along Terry Francois. The two stars represent places that'll be dedicated for taxi-only pick up and drop off in both the north and southbound direction on Terry Francois. Then, the rest of that street will be available for other forms of passenger loading. We've specifically chosen to put this loading activity over here to the east of the arena so that it doesn't affect the performance of the T line, which is going to move the majority of people in and out.

It doesn't affect the other use that we're trying to protect here, which is the hospital and medical biotech campus. We've now zoomed out here, and we're back to a commitment that the Warriors and the MTA have made to maintain safe and reliable vehicle access to the hospital even when there's a game going on at both the arena and the stadium.

The lines that are shaded yellow on this map, Owens and Fourth Street, are the streets that will have limited access. There will be parking control officers at both ends and every access point to those streets ensuring that they remain free flowing and that the use of those is for folks who are in a vehicle trying to access the hospital campus itself. Look at all those dots that are surrounding the hospital uses. We're going to create a ring of parking control to protect the safe flow of traffic within that campus.

We also think cycling is a great way to get to all these events. The Giants have, by far, the highest rate of people bicycling to any baseball stadium in the country. We think the Warriors ought to be able to achieve the same thing for the NBA. We'll be building a new painted parking-protected or physically separated bike lane along Terry Francois to make that experience as safe and convenient as possible. In addition to the existing GoBike bike share stations around the arena, we'll be adding new stations and adding a new bike valet similar to the one that's at the Giants stadium that's been so successful there.

In conclusion, I want to echo what was said by the previous speakers about the primary focus is going to be on getting to the arena in a sustainable way, in a way that promotes our goals of limiting private auto trips and maximizing the use of our great transit system. There's a special focus on protecting the adjacent land uses, especially the hospital and medical uses from any traffic impacts through the day-to-day control that our parking control officers will be bringing to the games.

David Beaupre - Within Mission Bay, the Port streets that require the harbor traffic code amendment are highlighted here and include Illinois Street, 16th Street, Warriors Way and Terry Francois Boulevard. Within the staff report is exhibit three that calls out the specific curb-use classifications that we would be amending into the harbor code. Then, finally, just wanted to talk about other projects that we're working on with both the Warriors and MTA as it relates to facilitating access to the Chase Center. Those can be broken down into two categories including ancillary parking where the Warriors are working with the Giants on the use of Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 for using the parking that's available there. We have the Pier 52 boat launch parking lot where there is parking that's designated for vehicles with boat trailers. But there's capacity for other vehicles as well. There are Mission Bay shuttles that need to be queued during the fourth quarter of events. We think that lot, based on its usage, has some capacity to support those shuttles. You should all be familiar with the 19th Street parking lot that's being constructed along with Crane Cove Park in the Pier 70 area. That should be done in the spring of 2020 and have a capacity of about 170 spaces that could be utilized for Chase Center patrons.

Lastly, the Port has agreed with the city and the Warriors on allowing the use of the Western Pacific site at the eastern terminus of Cesar Chavez Street for dual-event times.

We're working with the Warriors and our parking operator to open that up during dual events. We're working away on the permanent Mission Bay Ferry Landing at the eastern terminus of 16th Street. Our hope is that we'll begin construction of that later this year or at least put it out to bid with construction beginning early next year, and the final facility being built in the latter half of 2021. Some of that is contingent on RM3 but we heard yesterday that at least one of the two lawsuits was pushed out of the courts. So we're down to one lawsuit.

We continue to work with WETA on funding that project through RM3 funding. Then working with both Golden Gate Ferry and WETA, we're looking at a temporary ferry landing at Pier 48 where WETA has offered up a float and piles and a gangway to bridge the gap between the final delivery of the Mission Bay Ferry Landing at 16th Street and the opening of the arena in September. Our hopes are that we'll have something in place by the first game at the arena.

I'd like to thank other Port staff from the real estate and development division for helping pull this together and their coordination on this. I also wanted to recognize Mari Hunter from SFMTA who's done a heroic job of pulling together a lot of the different divisions of MTA to develop this plan.

Commissioner Brandon - Thank you, David. Can you do a brief presentation on the proposed amendments?

David Beaupre – Our next steps are to continue the community outreach, as Peter had mentioned. We'd return to the Port Commission on May 14th to amend the harbor code. We'll continue to collaborate with all the agencies to monitor and adjust the plan. We'll also need to enter into a license agreement with the Warriors for the use of the curb space.

Warriors Way is the northernmost east-west street that has a red hatched on the top north curb and a red dashed line on the south curb. Essentially, on all the curbs immediately adjacent to the arena that are within the Port's jurisdiction will be restricting parking to loading and no parking at all.

On Terry Francois Boulevard, the curb directly adjacent to the arena, again, will be no parking but for loading only. On the east side of Terry Francois Boulevard between Warriors Way on the north and 16th Street on the south, there will be no parking and loading only during events.

However, during non-events, on the east side of the street there will be metered parking. So that's non-event, and that's event. Moving south along Terry Francois Boulevard, during an event, half of the portion between 16th

Street and Mariposa Street will be reserved for loading and unloading so no metered parking on Terry Francois Boulevard.

At the southern half between Mariposa and 16th Street will be general metered parking. What we've requested of MTA during events to support our tenants including Mission Rock and The Ramp restaurant and patrons that may want to drive to the parks is that we put a two-hour maximum time on those meters across from Mission Rock and the boat launch ramp.

Lastly, on Illinois Street, which is a Port street, during events there will be no parking and restricted access. But during non-events, there will be general metered parking. An overlay for all of this area would be the special event rates and special event durations. Essentially, that's what's covered in the harbor traffic code amendment.

Commissioner Gilman - I actually have a technical question. I don't know if it's for the MTA or staff. And it could be because I don't drive. How do you switch meters from being one thing to another? Because that seems what the amendment code is. I'm curious only because I work in the Tenderloin on a street now that has no parking but the meters are still there all red, and people park there all the time. Can you explain to me how you enforce that?

Tom Maguire - First of all, the meters have a digital display on them. So if a person parks at the meter and gets out and looks at the meter, they'll see a no parking, special event display on the face of the meter. Secondly, we'll do some signage that will make it clear to drivers that this is a parking space except during special events. We'll continue to work with the Warriors to find ways to publicize that as best we can. But it's really a mix of the signage and the display on the meter itself. What's different about this location and the place you may be talking about in the Tenderloin is that there will be parking control officers one to two on every single block of the area here. There will be some very friendly folks from the MTA to remind people that they're likely to get ticketed or even towed if they actually do leave their car at those meters.

Commissioner Woo Ho - I have some questions related to how this whole flow is. I remember when we were looking at 30/32 when the Warriors came in and they were telling us they were going to have all this smart technology to support the parking and every fan if they were going to drive. I understand transit first. But I'm talking about the issue probably is going to be traffic congestion. It is still going to be the issue that's going to pop up in front of our minds, not the people that use the transit if that works well and that when you got your ticket, you would drive. You would know exactly where to park. You wouldn't be running around looking for the garage. I don't know if that technology is still something they are going to employ so that they could avoid having people driving around looking for a space. They would know exactly which garage, what location, what space to go in, which would expedite traffic flow. The other observation is even today when the Giants have their games, the traffic backs up onto the bridge coming from the East Bay. The traffic from

either 280 or 101 coming into the city backs up. What you've addressed is the neighborhood vicinity and I understand that. Is there a bigger picture that we need to worry about especially when both of them are going to be engaged? Because we already see it today with the Giants. How is that being addressed? The arena has 20,000 capacity. I don't know what's the capacity at the ballpark. Is it about 30,000?

Tom Maguire - The ballpark, I believe, is 43,000.

Commissioner Woo Ho - We're increasing it again in terms of the number of participants now. Obviously, some of them will come by transit. But I'm just wondering how big and worse is the congestion going to be that goes beyond just even the areas that you described? Has that been simulated? I was wondering whether all these things that you put the codes and everything else because a lot of computer simulations can be very sophisticated today whether there's been a lot of simulation going on to say, well, if you have these many cars coming in and out, how can you anticipate how this is going to work out? The design on paper looks great but do we know, and have we tried simulation to figure out whether it really will flow the way we hope?

Tom Maguire - We've used a lot of different analytical tools to determine what will work and what will not work. The point you made about making sure that the drivers on the freeways are not backing up as a result of games -- the flow to the arena is a little different than the flow to the stadium because the flow to the stadium -- a large number of those drivers are getting off the freeways at the downtown exists along Harrison and Bryant Street.

For the arena, we expect to see drivers getting off at Cesar Chavez, at Mariposa and coming from the west and from the south as well as from the north. The arena, while it's further from downtown and further from the Bay Bridge, it does have different options for access from the arena, which we think will actually help spread the traffic out. That said, I don't think any of us believe that there won't be congestion on game days. Our goal here is to make sure that, first of all, the surrounding land uses including Port tenants, including UCSF, including the businesses in Mission Bay and residents in Mission Bay, of course, are protected from the impacts of that traffic and then, secondly, that the people who make the choice that we are all encouraging them to make, to take mass transit, are able to get in and out smoothly and are also not subject to that level of traffic. Our plan, which we've seen work in lots of special events around the city, is that, if we make that transit choice work great, people will experience it for game one and they'll just keep making that choice going forward.

Commissioner Woo Ho - It doesn't matter whether you're coming from the east or maybe less across the Golden Gate Bridge but coming from the south to the north on the peninsula is just even letting people know. When I go by Sears Point Raceway sometimes, way in advance they'll say race day. Then, I'm not going on Highway 37 today because I know it's just going to be backed up if I'm

going up to Napa. I think thinking about signage much further away, so people know not to go that route if there's another alternative way to get somewhere. It seems like you have to go way beyond because the impact is pretty immediate. That kind of information is important for people to know even if they're not going to the game. These are people that are not going to the game, but they're affected by the congestion of the game, which gets everybody frustrated.

Tom Maguire - That's a very good point. We've worked really closely with Caltrans, who owns those giant electronic boards on the freeways. Whenever we have a special event or even just a traffic crunch downtown, we're always working with them to find ways to give that message to drivers, so they don't even try to drive into San Francisco if they don't need to.

Commissioner Woo Ho - You did mention temporarily that WETA going to increase the amount of ferries. Do we know what the schedule is? Elaine, can we have an update to understand how they're going to change their schedule or increase it when there's combined Giants and Warriors games? So it still looks like the first alternative is a bit of a walk but when the Mission Bay is up, it'll be much better.

Elaine Forbes - Yes. I think David Beaupre has some initial responses. We will do an update on Mission Bay Ferry Landing. So we'll go in more detail on the schedule at that point.

David Beaupre - We've been working with both WETA and Golden Gate, who have both committed to serving arena events of all the games and large events that they know well enough ahead of time. The service to the temporary facility will be somewhat limited. But again, WETA and Golden Gate have committed. WETA and Golden Gate are working on a service plan for the permanent facility for both games and commuter service. When we come back with an update on those projects, we can ask both WETA and Golden Gate to give us a tentative look at what their service plan will be.

Commissioner Woo Ho – So it will be transit first, Uber/Lyft second and then parking third. How are we going to communicate that as a strategy?

David Beaupre - Peter can answer the question about the game day ticketing and events. Then, Tom will talk about Uber and Lyfts.

Peter Bryan - To address the question you had about technology, we are in the final phases of developing the Chase Center app. It will encompass many things, both when you're at the event center but, to your point, back to the discussions from Piers 30/32 and the approval of Chase Center at blocks 29 and 32. It will help our patrons understand how they're going to get to Chase Center on an event day. For example, we're still working with MTA. We think we're close to having an opportunity to have muni fare bundled with tickets,

which would allow someone to use their mobile ticket to board muni both getting to Chase Center but also leaving Chase Center.

In addition to the question about, if someone does insist on driving, how do they know where they're going? The lots that are at our property and immediately adjacent to the property, those are all pre-bundled parking spaces. Those people already have tickets associated with their ticket package. They know where to go. For the people who might be choosing to drive on an event day, we're finalizing the contracts with several of the local parking lots to get commitments in terms of the number of spaces that would be available to us. That would be pushed out to people as hopefully a second or third option that they could pre-purchase the space. Additionally, we're working with Google to be able to have live traffic information and even transportation update information, so people understand how long it will take them to get to Chase Center connected via our mobile app.

Tom Maguire - Uber and Lyft will certainly be the choice for lots of people who want to get to the game. From the point of view of managing traffic and managing congestion, we don't think that's necessarily any better than a single-occupant vehicle unless, of course, the vehicle has multiple passengers in it. The approach with Uber and Lyft is the same as the approach with the drivers who will come and park and that is to manage the impact on the location.

One area that's been encouraging recently is that we've been able to partner with Uber and Lyft to steer their passengers to specific pick-up and drop-off zones and to even prevent passengers from being picked up and dropped off in areas where there is congestion and double parking. We've got a few locations around the ballpark we're going to start trying out this month. I think that's going to be the approach that's necessary here. I think we're creating a really good, safe pick-up/drop-off zone on Terry Francois in a place where that pick-up and drop-off activity is out of the way of the big pedestrian loads and out of the way of the transit traffic. We're going to work collaboratively with Uber and Lyft to make sure that pick-ups and drop-offs happen in places like that.

Commissioner Gilman – As someone who uses Uber/Lyft frequently, unlike the airport, which also now has drop-off locations, or you pay a premium charge, I really would encourage a lot of signage. No matter how much you work with the companies or they put it in their GPS, I've seen some congestion relief at the airport. I'd actually like to see that citywide where we have massive drop-off points and congestion. Particularly for this, I would love to see signage that says ride-share drop-off points and some way, if possible, through technology, to make it inaccessible to have those drop-off points be right in front of the stadium or pick up in front of them.

Tom Maguire - That's right. There will be signage inside the stadium so that, when fans are exiting a concert or a game, they'll see the sign and that'll lead them out to that curb on Terry Francois.

Commissioner Woo Ho - I'm going to make one comment totally unrelated to what you're doing. But I just came back from the Final Four in Minneapolis so that's 70,000 people. I was there also in Minneapolis for the Super Bowl. It just occurred to me being part of the 90,000 and then the 70,000, there are no hotels that are very close. All of these out-of-town people who I think are going to come to games and events, it's very difficult. It's something that the city did not think enough about, that we should have had some hotels built close by that people can walk to because, in both instances, I didn't stay at the same hotel. I stayed at a new hotel this time. We walked to the stadium. It was a lot better experience.

Tom Maguire - When the central subway opens and there's a direct subway right into Union Square, folks who are coming from hotels will have a great muni ride.

Commissioner Makras - Thank you for the presentation. Very well done. I'd like to focus in on the ferry service. I didn't get a clear and distinct belief that it's going to be up and rolling for the first game. Is that an accurate impression that I got from the presentation? Or do we have an operator, we have a site, and we will have ferry service?

David Beaupre - We will have ferry service. The permanent facility will not be done until 2021, but we've made a commitment. We have willing partners in both WETA and Golden Gate. It's been quite a collaborative process with both of them. WETA has come to the table and thought creatively on how to help us do it. It's not as close as the 16th Street station but it's only a few blocks away towards the direction where people will be parking.

Commissioner Makras - I'm comfortable that there's a temporary location. I'm just talking about the service as a whole.

David Beaupre - Both WETA and Golden Gate are committed to doing it. In fact, the Warriors provided both those entities with their season ticket holder numbers by zip code. WETA has completed what they think is their service areas, and the numbers look very favorable for them. In fact, in looking at those season ticket holders, they knew there would be a demand from the East Bay. But WETA has indicated that they think there's a strong demand from the South Bay as well.

Commissioner Makras - Could you walk me through how that works? Who takes a permit for the ferry landing? Do we issue it? Do they apply?

David Beaupre - We'll be coming back to you on the details of that but likely, the way that it's being considered right now is we would enter into an MOU with both Golden Gate and WETA on the construction and fabrication of the facility at Pier 48. Then, we would enter into a separate MOU with WETA on the



operations of it since it's their facility. But we'll need to be coming back to the commission in probably June or July with a proposed MOU.

Commissioner Makras - Okay. That suggests that there's a deal made. What about the private sector cannot compete for this business and participate or use the same dock and have more than one operator?

David Beaupre - We actually have been working with Tideline, the Port's water taxi operator. They've just started a service at Pier 52, which is right next to the arena. As part of the entitlement for the Mission Bay Ferry Landing, we have entitled and designed a dock that could be utilized for a private operator. However, we don't have the funding in place for that. The deal for Pier 48 is not done. It requires your approval and it will also require WETA's board approval. Part of the proposed arrangement is utilizing WETA's facilities should their board be comfortable with that and approve that and using our landing area as real estate and water area for it. Golden Gate is participating in a variety of different ways. The MOU that we would be seeking your approval for may have conditions on it that are the request of WETA and not necessarily ours. But there is an operation that's serving Pier 52 today.

Commissioner Makras - I'll take just a crack at what I'd like to see, since it's not so shaped. If we're going to have a dock and we want the public to use it, we should see and make it as accessible as possible. We should not limit ourselves to one operator. We should be wide open. We should let the private sector be able to step in and provide water taxi service or any way we can bring them in. The more people we bring in from that way, the happier we are. We'll get congestion off the street. What I'm hearing seems like a deal that's already set. People know exactly what it's going to be. If we have a dock, I think anybody should be able to pull up and drop off guests that come into the city and go to the game.

David Beaupre - I can bring that to our partners at WETA and Golden Gate.

Commissioner Brandon - David, Peter and Tom, thank you so much for this report, very detailed. It's hard to believe that the new arena is opening this year, which is so exciting. I hear what everyone is saying but I think just stay away the first couple months. Just do not try to go into that area because you guys spent a lot of focus on surrounding the arena. But it just doesn't seem like a lot of thought and consideration has gone into the existing communities and the existing traffic and what we're dealing with today versus what we're going to deal with when this arena opens and there's something at Oracle Park, such as the T line. The T line has serious issues serving its existing communities. Taking more resources away from that to go towards this is not helping existing communities. For the baseball games, people come from the South Bay, the East Bay, and they use the existing exits like Mariposa, Cesar Chavez, and downtown. All that is just going to increase. For the first couple months, the city will just be shut down until we work out the kinks. I do hope that, with all these changes, we do take the existing communities into consideration and those of

us who live in San Francisco who have to get to work, who have to get home. That would really be helpful. When does the central subway open?

Tom Maguire - We're expecting to have open-to-the-public service in early 2020. It won't be for opening day of this season but during the very first basketball season.

Commissioner Brandon - That will be some relief. With your community outreach, I would also hope that you go to the Southern Waterfront Advisory Committee because they, too, will be affected by all of this.

Thank you so much for the presentation. I'm going to wish you guys lots of luck.

- B. Request approval of Memorandum of Understanding No. M-16511 with the City's Recreation and Park Department for rent-free use of a Port property consisting of The EcoCenter at Heron's Head Park, located at 32 Jennings Street, at the foot of Cargo in Heron's Head Park for a term of nine (9) years. (Resolution No. 19-12)

Carol Bach, the environmental affairs manager in the Port's planning and environment division - At your meeting on February 26th, you heard an informational presentation about The EcoCenter at Heron's Head Park and the Port's proposed memorandum of understanding with San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department to operate The EcoCenter for public benefit.

The Port constructed Heron's Head Park in 1999. It consists of seven acres of restored tidal salt marsh habitat and 14 acres of upland. Visitors to Heron's Head Park enjoy walking, viewing, fishing, bird watching and picnicking. Since it opened, the Port has been supporting environmental education and volunteer participation programs in Heron's Head Park.

The EcoCenter was constructed by a former Port tenant, Literacy for Environmental Justice. It opened on Earth Day in 2010. It was the city's off-the-grid building. Its only connection to municipal utilities is the drinking water supply. It was also the city's first LEED platinum zero net energy building.

The EcoCenter's green building features include 100 percent solar power, rainwater capture and reuse, a living roof, sustainable building materials, all native plant landscaping and onsite wastewater treatment that mimics the natural processes that treat water in the wetlands outside in the park.

Since 2010, the Port and San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department have partnered to provide environmental education and public participation programs at Heron's Head Park. The Port has funded and Rec and Park has delivered environmental education programs that serve thousands of school-age, college-age and adult participants each year. Students and volunteers participating in these programs have the opportunity to experience nature,

learn about the environment and participate in hands-on engagement and stewardship of their parklands.

Beginning in 2012, San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department started leading the Greenagers program, which serves young teens who live or go to school in District 10 and use Heron's Head Park as a home base for many of their activities. The proposed MOU would enable Rec and Park to operate The EcoCenter, which would in turn allow them to integrate the programs that they are already providing in the park with programs inside and related to The EcoCenter.

It would allow Rec and Park to build on resources that it has at other Rec and Park facilities and programs. It would allow them to build on existing long-term relationships that they have in the Bayview-Hunters Point community and to continue existing partnerships and programs that are going on now at The EcoCenter.

Rec and Park has committed to staff The EcoCenter five days a week including weekends when most visitors are there. The Port will be contributing \$40,000 to match Rec and Park funding to add additional staff during this first operating year.

When I gave the informational presentation, the question arose about how much it costs the Port to operate The EcoCenter. There are two categories of expenses related to operating The EcoCenter. One is Port maintenance division staff, their labor. That's mostly plumbers but also electricians, carpenters and other trades who operate the energy, water and wastewater systems in the building. That includes inspection and record keeping, repairing things that need to be repaired just due to normal wear and tear. Those labor expenses average approximately \$27,500 per year.

Operation and maintenance of the wastewater treatment system at The EcoCenter also requires specialty contractors including laboratory analysis of wastewater samples that are collected weekly, inspection and reporting by a licensed and specialized in wastewater treatment system operations engineer. It requires semiannual servicing of the system by a manufacturer's certified technician. The cost for that averages approximately \$42,000 a year. The terms and conditions of the proposed MOU remain consistent with those presented in the informational presentation.

The only significant change is that, instead of a five-year term with two two-year options to renew, we recommend executing the MOU with a nine-year term. More certainty about the length of the term will give Rec and Park the opportunity to fully develop the programs. It takes a while to gain traction and for schools and other groups in the community to understand and know the programs that are being offered and how to access them. The additional certainty about the nine-year duration of the MOU is well advised.

Rec and Park will provide public benefits as established through a mutually agreed-upon operations and program plan. Port staff and Rec and Park staff are working on that now. It will include specific goals for Rec and Park in terms of the type and quantity of activities that are provided, the type of number of visitors served and regular reporting to hold them accountable to meeting those goals. The Port will continue to be responsible for building maintenance and repair.

Patrick Rum, Executive Director of the Literacy for Environmental Justice – I came to speak today on behalf of this MOU. I think it's an incredible thing for The EcoCenter. Our organization, in partnership with ORC and many others got the facility built. I had the opportunity to be the park's first naturalist and programs manager back in the early 2000s. I've worked doing environmental education in Bayview-Hunters Point for 20 years. I really think that this move to Rec and Park will actually help the center accomplish much more than it has in the past to really see its full potential. I have a lot of confidence in the programming that Rec and Park provides. I'm very excited about the presence of Rec and Park because they also have natural resource management experience, which I think will be good for the park. This is a really great thing for Bayview, really great thing for the future of India Basin and the idea of kind of eventually connecting that area of Heron's Head to the future India Basin development. I strongly encourage the Port Commission to approve this.

Brenda Cartagena – I'm with the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department, the volunteer division that will be overseeing the programming aspect of The EcoCenter at Heron's Head Park. I definitely want to continue to relay the same information you've heard. We're really excited to be continuing on and extending our partnership with the Port with all of the programming that we've been able to do. We really want to leverage our existing partnerships in the Bayview to continue to enhance the programming that we have happening at The EcoCenter. It does take a lot of time, a lot of groundwork, a lot of developing and partnering, connection, communicating with different organizations to make this happen. The nine-year term will help us develop that. For this first year, we will be continuing with the existing programs that we have. Just this first month, our unofficial first month in keeping The EcoCenter open, we've already welcomed about 427 visitors in The EcoCenter. We know that, once we make it official, things will continue to increase in terms of the people that we're able to serve and the youth in the community so want to thank you for this opportunity, do hope that you guys move forward and adopt this plan.

Commissioner Woo Ho – Thank you, Carol, for this report. It's really been a pleasure to see how this EcoCenter over time, since I've been on the commission has proceeded to where it is now where we have a very good working model. I can remember when we had some debates about how to operate this in the past. I'm here to support it. I think we've come up with the model. It seems like we've got the right partners in the community. I'm very supportive.

Commissioner Makras - I support the item.

Commissioner Gilman - I'm really excited about it, and I support the item. I think it's a great investment for everyone, the environment and particularly for the youth program out at D10.

Commissioner Brandon - Carol, thank you so much for this report. As far as the Port maintenance responsibility and expenses, is this the same setup we have with Bay.org where we're responsible for these expenses?

Carol Bach - It is exactly the same.

Commissioner Brandon - Okay. The \$40,000 is that just for the first year?

Carol Bach - Yes.

Commissioner Brandon - And then, after that, for the next eight years?

Carol Bach - Rec and Park has committed to adding staff to serve The EcoCenter. During this transition period, there was just a need for a little bit of assistance from the Port.

ACTON: Commissioner Gilman moved approval; Commissioner Woo Ho seconded the motion. All of the Commissioners were in favor. Resolution No. 19-12 was adopted.

## 9. ENGINEERING

- A. Request authorization to award four contracts to (1) Arcadis/Lotus Water Joint Venture, (2) Parsons/Ryan Joyce Structural Design Joint Venture, (3) Stantec/McGovern McDonald Engineers Joint Venture, and (4) Terra Engineers, for as-needed engineering and related professional services, each contract in an amount not to exceed \$3,000,000. (Resolution No. 19-13)

Boris Delepine, Port's contracts administrator - The item before you is an action item to recommend approval for the Port's as-needed engineering request for qualifications to the four highest-ranked scoring firms - Arcadis/Lotus Water, Parsons/Ryan Joyce Structural Design, Stantec/MME Joint Venture and Terra Engineers. Each contract has a value of \$3 million with a four-year term and an option for one additional year.

This project complies with a number of our Port-wide strategic goals including utilizing engineering services to implement infrastructure projects that maintain the Port's financial strength by addressing deferred maintenance, maximizing the value of Port property and increasing revenue. It also increases the portion of funds spent by the Port with LBEs and micro-LBE firms. Due to the nature of

as-needed or on-call services, it's not feasible to define a specific scope for the work in advance of the proposed contracts.

What we do is enter into master agreements under which we issue contract service orders. The specific scopes of work will vary with each differing project need. But Port staff anticipates the same types of services that were utilized under previous as-needed engineering master agreements. These services may include but are not limited to mechanical engineering, electrical engineering, architectural services, landscape design, transportation engineering, environmental engineering, naval architecture, many projects that fall under these contracts.

By way of background, Port staff entered into four master agreements for as-needed engineering services in fiscal year 2016-'17. Those contracts were valued at \$1.5 million each and were slated to last through October 2020. However, those funds have nearly all been expended in advance of the contract expiration dates. With your approval, on November 19, 2018, we issued a request for qualifications to solicit proposals for a new pool of engineering consultants.

On December 4th, we held a pre-proposal meeting at Pier 1. We were pleased with the attendance and interest in the opportunity. Over 95 individuals attended that pre-proposal meeting. We then convened a three-member evaluation panel. Panel members included: Raymond Lui, a structural engineer from the Department of Public Works; Nicolas King, a project manager also with the Department of Public Works; and Wendy Proctor, a senior architect with the Port.

A list of the selection panel was provided to and approved by the contract monitoring division. On the submittal deadline, January 18, 2019 we received 13 proposals. By comparison, we received six proposals for the same solicitation three years ago.

I'd like to personally thank and commend our panel members, as it took a great deal of effort and diligence to review and score the submittal responses. Most of the narrative proposals were over 100 pages in length. In addition, we held 11 oral interviews that lasted over two days. City staff volunteered to serve on evaluation panels in addition to their regular workload without any additional compensation. This evaluation process was a heavy lift. We want to thank the panelists for their hard work.

The first step in the evaluation process is to review each proposal for compliance with the RFQs minimum qualifications. All 13 firms met the MQs. One firm, Van Deusen and Associates, was deemed non-responsive by the contract monitoring division for failure to meet pre-award LBE requirements.

The RFQ was divided into two phases. The written proposal phase was worth a total of 100 points. Eleven of the 12 firms scored over 75 points and were invited to oral interviews. The oral interviews were also worth 100 points.

The most qualified respondents were the top four with the highest combined scores. This slide shows the final scores. We are recommending contract award to Stantec/MME, Parsons/RJSD, Arcadis/Lotus Water and Terra Engineers, the four highest ranked proposers.

Three of the firms are new joint venture leads. And three teams include new joint venture partners. Parsons is the sole returning incumbent lead firm. And Lotus Water is the sole returning joint venture partner.

As you can see from the final scores, the LBE rating bonus played a significant role in determining the winners. Additionally, the Port has become an attractive target for consultants due to the increase in contract amount from \$1.5 million to \$3 million. Also working in partnership with our seawall team and increased and targeted outreach saw a very competitive bidding environment for this opportunity. We are pleased and excited to engage with these four firms.

Representatives from Arcadis/Lotus Water are here today. Arcadis is a coastal engineer lead on the Seawall Resiliency Project. This is their first on-call contract with the Port. Lotus Water is a full-service civil engineering LBE firm with experience working on SFPUC sewer system improvement program, the Mission Rock development and Pier 70.

Parsons is also here. They have been operating in San Francisco since 1948. They currently manage one of our as-needed engineering contracts. This time, they'll be partnering with Ryan Joyce Structural Design, a newly certified micro LBE firm that has experience with the Exploratorium project, Wharf J9. We have representatives from that team here today as well.

Stantec/McGovern McDonald Engineers have partnered together on on-call contracts at the PUC and DPW. This is their first as-needed engineering contract with the Port. They were our highest ranked proposers. They assembled a strong multidisciplinary team that meets the Port's strategic objectives. And McDonald McGovern Engineers is a woman-owned LBE firm.

Terra Engineers is also a woman-owned engineering firm based in San Francisco since 2003. They have experience working on all-call contracts with the Department of Public Works and East Bay MUD. Representatives from Terra are also here today.

All four teams and their partners will be available to answer questions at the conclusion of my presentation. In early March, we issued the notice to proceed and invited firms to sit down with us to debrief, review score sheets, discuss what were their proposal strengths and weaknesses. To date, we've met with 11 of the 12 firms.

If you award this contract today, we will issue notices to proceed by mid-May. The contracts are scheduled for completion in the spring of 2023. In conclusion, we're respectfully requesting that you award the contracts to Arcadis/Lotus Water, Parsons/RJSD, Stantec/MME and Terra Engineers. The contracts have a \$3 million value with a four-year term.

Commissioner Makras - I'm supportive of the item. If I recall, they have a 10-year experience requirement?

Boris Delepine - This solicitation had a minimum qualification of seven continuous years in the most recent 10. So they've had to perform seven years within the past 10. Yes.

Commissioner Makras - If say a joint venture partner doesn't have it, does it carry it?

Boris Delepine - Each joint venture partner must meet the minimum qualifications. However, the lead had the seven in 10. For the joint venture partner, we reduced that to five within the last seven years. We originally issued the RFQ with a combined minimum qualifications. At our pre-proposal meeting, we opened it up so that they would have different qualifications for the lead and the joint venture partner.

Commissioner Gilman - I have no comments. I'm supportive of the item.

Commissioner Woo Ho - Boris, good report. I just want to be sure that I understand correctly. Did we pick the four firms? Now, do we have individual contracts with them not to exceed three million? Or is it one bucket of money, three million, which could be awarded to each of them?

Boris Delepine - We will enter into four \$3 million contracts with each of them.

Commissioner Woo Ho - This is \$12 million you're talking about.

Boris Delepine - \$12 million, yes.

Commissioner Woo Ho - Up to \$12 million. Can you refresh my memory, did we know in the beginning we were seeking four?

Boris Delepine - Yes, up to four.

Commissioner Woo Ho - So this was not a result of scoring. It wasn't that there's a good pool here. We were actually looking for four.

Boris Delepine - Yes. In previous iterations, we've had three firms under our as-needed umbrella and decided to extend that to four.



Commissioner Woo Ho - Right. You said the previous group that originally did have but we've already used up the funding for the project.

Boris Delepine - Correct.

Commissioner Woo Ho - This now supersedes any contracts that we have with any previous firms.

Boris Delepine - We will continue. There are a few percentages of dollars still available on the existing contracts. We are closing those out now.

Commissioner Woo Ho - The existing contracts but there's no commitments being made under that pool.

Boris Delepine - No.

Commissioner Woo Ho - Okay. So it now transfers over to this pool.

Boris Delepine - Correct.

Commissioner Woo Ho - And given what we know, you mentioned a little bit about seawall and other things. Did the panel also look at the specific skills and expertise of these firms versus what the future needs are? I know that you gave us a whole laundry list of all the skillsets that we look at, which is everything that you can think of in terms of all the different types of things. But did we cater towards saying, well, we're going to need more of this versus that, therefore, we decided that this firm met that qualification better?

Boris Delepine - Prior to scoring the individual proposals, we sat down. The chief harbor engineer goes over the scope of work and explains what these services are going to be used for and what we think will be coming in the future. For instance, Nicolas King, one of our panelists, his specialty was alternative delivery methods. It's something that we're going to be looking at for projects in the near future. That was the expertise that he brought to the table. So we begin each solicitation review with an overview from the chief harbor engineer of what we're looking for. Then, we score based on the evaluation criteria that we've set out in the RFQ.

Commissioner Woo Ho - All these comprehensive engineering services, which ones do you think we're going to feature most in the next few years?

Boris Delepine - Civil and structural engineer are always principal. But there is a laundry list of different scopes of work that can include and I can actually defer to the chief harbor engineer, his expertise. But within each of the different contracts we've had in the past, we use a wide variety of multidisciplinary engineering teams.

Rod Iwashita, chief harbor engineer - I think we'll always be looking to strengthen the piers. The underside of the piers continue to support gravity loads. The one thing that I noticed in the previous contracts was that we had very little access to coastal engineers. As a Port, I think it's quite important that we look at things like sedimentation, the morphology. Our Port maintenance department right now, we are in the middle of supporting them, looking at building a new pile-driving crane barge. We need naval architecture support for that. I have schooling as a naval architect. It's been a long time since I've practiced. I think that this is another large project or significant project that we need to move forward. So when I was outlining the tasks or the projects that we're looking forward, those are some of the items that I was talking about with Boris and the team.

Commissioner Woo Ho - Basically you would say we've got really the best match for all these various things. These firms are not obviously skilled in every single item here. They're skilled in certain areas on this list.

Rod Iwashita - The way we structured the RFP and when we talked about it at the pre-bid meeting and open houses, I think we mentioned that we wanted as wide a breadth of services as possible. I think I've mentioned this before that we seem to get stuck on the weird things that happen, that we have trouble with our own little Port engineering department covering. It's this breadth that helps us cover one-off items that come up.

Commissioner Brandon - Thank you, Boris, for this presentation. It's great that we got so many respondents and that all the respondents had so many LBEs and subcontractors a part of their team. I was just wondering, WSP and Freyer have the highest scoring written proposal but yet didn't do well on the oral interview. I'm just wondering what happened with that one.

Boris Delepine - Very good question. All the written proposals were actually very close. The first six were within four or five points. With our oral interview, we changed it up a bit. We had a case study that we allowed firms to go in, review half an hour before and come in and explain how they would tackle a specific project and they answered one question. I think WSP didn't manage their time as well as they could have and didn't answer all of the questions that we had put to them. That was where they fell off in the oral interview phase.

ACTON: Commissioner Gilman moved approval; Commissioner Woo Ho seconded the motion. All of the Commissioners were in favor. Resolution No. 19-13 was adopted.

- B. Request approval to execute Amendment No. 2 to Contract No. 2790, Marine Structural Project IV, with Power Engineering Construction Co., to increase the contract in excess of the 10% original contract amount by \$2,287,500 due to unforeseen site conditions and for window repairs for tenant occupancy, resulting in an amended contract amount of \$12,075,000, and authorize a contract contingency fund of \$228,750 for a total authorization of \$12,303,750.

as well as extend the contract duration until January 31, 2020. (Resolution No. 19-14)

Jonathan Roman - I'm the project manager for contract 2790, marine structural project IV for the Port of San Francisco. This project is for the substructure repairs of piles, soffits and beams within the area shown on the Embarcadero on the northern waterfront. The original contract scope of work encompasses Pier 31½, which is the Alcatraz Ferry Landing and includes portions of Pier 31 and 33. This work was authorized in 2018 and is nearly complete.

The Port Commission also authorized contract amendment number one for substructure work at Pier 29 in August 2018. The scope of work included daylighting or cutting holes in the deck to allow access to areas that were inaccessible for assessment of condition. Again, the purpose of this presentation is to request amendment #2 to contract 2790 with Power Engineering Construction, as detailed in the staff report. Amendment #2 will authorize additional funds to repair unforeseen conditions in the inaccessible areas that were assessed as part of amendment #1. Amendment #2 will also authorize window rehabilitation in areas deemed critical before the Department of Elections moves in in mid-July at Pier 31. Amendment #2 will support Port objectives of productivity and stability. The substructure repairs will make Pier 29 an attractive leasing opportunity as well as protect critical electrical infrastructure that supports multiple piers.

At Pier 31, the Department of Elections is the incoming tenant this summer. Fifteen windows in the leasehold area are in need of repair to prevent water intrusion. The upcoming election calendar requires these repairs to be completed at the earliest possible day in order to facilitate Department of Elections move-in schedule and protect their equipment and records.

In 1900, a ferry slip was built at what we now know as Pier 29. The ferries pulled into Y-shaped berths that ended at a concrete wall to allow bow-first egress onto the Embarcadero. In 1915, Pier 29 was built over the ferry structure. Since then, the remnant walls prevented access for inspection and assessment. In the bottom left-hand corner is a picture of the current Pier 29 scope of work and was awarded as amendment #1 in 2018.

This is a blowup of that scope of work, the bottom of the page, the Embarcadero, and Pier 29 extends into the bay towards the top of the page. All colors were the scope of work under amendment #1. The dark green is work that's already in progress and will be completed without need of amendment #2. The white and gray areas represent the inaccessible areas behind the remnant wall. Amendment #1 authorized to inspect and assess this area. The purple box is the location where critical electrical equipment sits.

As part of amendment #2, Port staff is proposing to defer or de-scope work in the areas that are light green, yellow and red to officially address the damage

in the inaccessible areas. Any remaining funds will then be applied to the deferred areas.

The costs in amendment #2 is informed by the work done in amendment #1. In this picture, we were inside Pier 29 looking west towards the Embarcadero. This is the electrical equipment which provides power for the cruise ship terminal as well as for Piers 29, 31 33½ and 33. The left side, or above the white line in the picture, is the location of the inaccessible areas. As noted, the electrical equipment is supported by this substructure. Port staff strongly recommends repairing the substructure that supports the critical electrical equipment.

There are several types of repairs but this is a basic concept. Access holes are cut into the deck as needed. That's the top left-hand picture. Scaffolding is installed one bend at a time. All of this work is over water. Then, spalled or damaged concrete is chipped away, collected and hauled off. You can see the representative of the debris in the top right-hand picture. All rebar is then cleaned. New rebar is installed, and the forms are placed. Then, new concrete is poured and then the forms and scaffolding removed. In most cases, the material and debris are hand carried. Port staff is also requesting adding rehabilitation of 15 windows at Pier 31 in amendment #2.

The Embarcadero is on the left-hand side of the page. Pier 31 extends east towards Berkeley on the right. The Department of Elections will be the tenant as shown. The Port has been preparing to rehabilitate all of the windows at this pier under a separate contract. However, Department of Elections will be occupying the building in July prior to when the windows can be repaired. Department of Elections has blackout periods where no work can be done three months before an election and one month after.

If we do not repair the windows by August 3rd, then we would not be able to start and complete the work until 2020. This could leave their equipment and records vulnerable to water damage. Port staff is requesting that we repair the 15 windows under Powers' contract before Department of Elections installs their facilities.

This is a summary of the cost of funding. Approximately \$10 million was already awarded under the original contract and under amendment #1. Eleven million dollars was authorized including contingency. The estimated forecast of work already completed is approximately \$9.8 million. We are asking for amendment #2 for \$2,287,000 as well as a 10 percent contingency fund of \$228,000. The total contract would be increased to \$12,303,000.

Funding has been secured to cover all the costs including soft costs and contingency. By including the work in this contract, we would save approximately \$600,000 to \$800,000 in mobilization costs and bidding costs. This is a brief summary of schedule. If the Port Commission approves this today, amendment #2 would allow the windows to be installed prior to the

Department of Elections move in. The final completion of substructure work would be January 31, 2020. We respectfully request your approval to amend the contract to add the scope of work under amendment #2.

Commissioner Woo Ho - This is very technical. It sounds like we got surprised along the way so that we now have a major new amendment. Part of it was that we didn't see all the substructure deterioration. We're surprised by the fact that we have to have these windows ready. Is that a good summary?

Jonathan Roman - In October of 2017 when we asked to advertise for bid, we did bring up the inaccessible areas was part of that work. That was part of the scope. Then, we split up the contract because of funding into Pier 31 and then in the summer to add Pier 29 amendment #1. The actual work wasn't started until December of this year.

Commissioner Woo Ho - Since we do want to get this part of the pier in the long term up and running, I guess this is a major down payment in the infrastructure here?

Elaine Forbes - Yes. That's a very good way to describe it, a major down payment. The unforeseen conditions, the poor substructure underneath the electrical equipment is something that we can't defer because of that electrical equipment on top. That's exactly where the inaccessible area happened to be. So we had bad luck. The condition was just much worse in the inaccessible areas than in other parts of the project.

Commissioner Woo Ho - So I'm going to ask a financial question since I can't really discuss all the engineering side of it very well with much expertise. I assume that you're figuring out how you're going to put this in the capital plan or budget or whatever.

Elaine Forbes - These funds are already budgeted. The funds have already been approved. Jonathan, is there a table that shows all the various funding sources? It's on page number seven of your staff report.

Commissioner Woo Ho - So from that standpoint, we're whole.

Elaine Forbes - We're whole. That's right.

Commissioner Gilman - Asked and answered my questions.

Commissioner Makras - No questions.

Commissioner Brandon - Thank you so much for this report. So we originally did this in 2017. Right?

Jonathan Roman - That's when we asked to advertise in 2017. Correct.

Commissioner Brandon - The first amendment was in August of 2018?

Jonathan Roman - Correct.

Commissioner Brandon - But we didn't know then about the unforeseen conditions.

Jonathan Roman - We knew that the inaccessible area existed. We needed a construction crew to be able to peek behind the curtain.

Commissioner Brandon - So what did we do between 2017 and 2018?

Jonathan Roman - We went to bid in --

Commissioner Brandon - So we asked for an amendment before we did anything.

Jonathan Roman - That's correct.

Commissioner Brandon - So we had done no work but we came back for an amendment.

Jonathan Roman - The first amendment was for Pier 29. That included this inspection assessment. We needed a construction crew to be able to cut holes, to be able to see what the assessment is. So we were kind of in a catch-22 situation. We actually used maintenance to open up one hole. There was some debris down in there but they weren't available to do a full assessment. So we had this catch-22. We couldn't come to the commission to give a full assessment because we couldn't get behind the walls because we didn't have a construction crew.

Commissioner Brandon - When we originally did the contract, we didn't include the windows?

Jonathan Roman - That's correct. That's an item that's been added out of expediency since we're already doing work at Pier 31.

Commissioner Brandon - But we knew we were going to need windows.

Jonathan Roman - I'm going to defer to Rod at this point then. The windows were recently added.

Commissioner Brandon - I'm just wondering why it wasn't in the original contract.

Rod Iwashita, chief harbor engineer - The windows were going to be a separate contract. It was a window and wall repair project. The bids came in much higher than what we were expecting. The occupancy of DOE was

looming. We are still going to do the rest of the windows and wall repair project. We are still figuring out how we're going to split that up so that we can address it efficiently. But these 15 windows for the Department of Elections are critical. So we thought, because the contractor who is repairing the substructure is already onsite, that they could sub this out to a window repair subcontractor and meet this deadline with the DOE.

Commissioner Woo Ho - On the windows, it strikes me every time I've gone out to see Orton that they talk a lot about how much work they had to do on the windows. Have we compared their cost in terms of repairing windows out in their projects and what we're doing here? Because it seems like they have a lot of experience with restoring windows.

Rod Iwashita - My understanding is that there is one local contractor in the Bayview district whose experience and expertise is restoring these windows. I believe Power has gone out to that same contractor.

Commissioner Woo Ho - It's the same contractor that Orton is using. I remember that they were somewhat surprised that they had to do a lot of work. And the before and after is amazing.

Rod Iwashita – Yes, it is. We did look at replacement costs as well. It still turns out that repair is less expensive than replacement in this context.

Commissioner Brandon - So with these funds, will we be able to complete this project?

Elaine Forbes - No, it's a de-scope and reprioritization.

Jonathan Roman - It's a de-scope. Any remaining funds would be applied towards finishing the original scope. We would stop as the funds are exhausted.

Commissioner Brandon - Well, maybe we can understand what we originally funded to where we are now on our second amendment.

Jonathan Roman - This is Pier 29. The original scope of work included all of the colored areas so the dark green, the light green, yellow and red. And then, the inaccessible areas were added to scope. We had 17 holes as part of the scope to open that up and do an assessment. Currently, we are finishing up at the dark green area. Any funds left over from the day lighting and assessment would be applied to the light green area first and then towards the yellow. We don't think that we have enough funding to complete the last two bends of the red area.

Commissioner Brandon - So the original contract was to do the entire red, the green, the yellow, the dark green, and the light green sections.

Jonathan Roman - Yes.

Elaine Forbes - Everything.

Commissioner Brandon - And now, for \$14 million, we can only do the green area.

Jonathan Roman – No, the green is already done.

Commissioner Brandon - As part of that funding. Right?

Jonathan Roman - Correct.

Commissioner Brandon - So we're doing the green area and the black and white area and that's \$14 million? The light green, the yellow and the red still have to be completed and we don't have funding.

Elaine Forbes - That's right.

Jonathan Roman - We did not request additional funding for that.

Elaine Forbes - We do not have funding for the complete project. So what's happened here is we thought it would cost less to do more. The substructure in the areas where we couldn't get to is much worse. It's costing more in that area. We are having to scope down.

Commissioner Brandon - Have we done an analysis of what the entire project is going to cost?

Elaine Forbes - This project was repairing substructure in Pier 29 to allow for 10 to 15 more years of use for, at that time, it was our Jamestown tenant. They couldn't move forward because of financial infeasibility. So this area is going to be part of the RFP for a developer.

Commissioner Brandon - I'm still at the point where we had a \$10 million contract, which is now \$14 million and we're only doing a small portion of what the original project was.

Rod Iwashita - Commissioner Brandon, the construction contract is only going to be \$12.3 million. The additional two million is soft costs, construction management, design, the testing of the soil that we encountered in the inaccessible area. I've been around marine structures for 28 years. If you've got a wall that's blocking off access to the structure, I'd assume that the water intrusion would also be minimal. So I was expecting there to be minimal damage to the substructure that was supporting the electrical infrastructure. Now that we've gone in there and seen that the water intrusion was worse, we know that the electrical infrastructure supporting the cruise ship terminal, the



Alcatraz Ferry Landing, it's a critical piece of infrastructure that we want to protect.

Commissioner Brandon - Definitely but what is the cost going to be for the entire project?

Commissioner Woo Ho - What's the range, at least, to do everything if we're only doing a portion now?

Elaine Forbes - What would it cost to put back in scope the areas, the yellow and red?

Commissioner Brandon - The red, the yellow, the light green.

Elaine Forbes - I think the light green is done.

Commissioner Brandon - No. The light green is not in it.

Commissioner Makras - The light green is. It's implied it's going to be that way, but we're not being told it will.

Commissioner Woo Ho - It's not part of this contract. Because when you put it out to the RFP, people will have to know what that is.

Elaine Forbes - Absolutely.

Commissioner Woo Ho - We should have to disclose in full because we don't want to find out later they said that's a surprise.

Elaine Forbes - We'll provide the full condition of the substructure. It will depend on the proposer's use what they would require for seismic and other improvements to substructure.

Jonathan Roman - Unfortunately I don't have that number. I'd have to get back to you.

Elaine Forbes – How much it would for the de-scoped areas? And for the light green as well? It's the yellow, the red and the light green are de-scoped?

Jonathan Roman - That's correct.

Commissioner Woo Ho - But you could easily just double what we're talking about. Would that make any sense?

Jonathan Roman - From the experience that I have, it would probably be about a \$1.5 million additional.

Elaine Forbes - Because those areas aren't in as poor condition.

Jonathan Roman - They're not in as poor condition. They're easier to get to. The access is not as difficult.

Commissioner Brandon - How much of this amount went to the black and the white area?

Jonathan Roman - That would be approximately \$1.9 million.

Commissioner Brandon - So two million went there. We have a cost of \$12 million to complete the green and the black and white.

Elaine Forbes - Can you describe the scope of the whole project?

Jonathan Roman - Approximately \$7.5 million went to the repairs at Alcatraz Landing at Pier 31. It was \$6.8 million and then, we used the authorized contingency on that portion

Commissioner Brandon - So this should cost about five million, so we thought until we spent two million.

Jonathan Roman - We awarded for \$3.8 million.

Commissioner Brandon - How are we going to complete this? Are you guys going to come back for another amendment? Are you going to bid it out? What are you going to do? How are you going to complete it?

Elaine Forbes - We're not planning to propose completion of the original scope. Because we are going out for an RFP, we'll see what proposal comes in as a winning proposal. What's required for substructure will change based on what goes on top. We're taking the money that we have plus this additional request, which is already budgeted, to allocate it to the most critical areas of the Pier 29 substructure. It's moving away from that whole area you saw to the white-and-black hatched area underneath the electrical equipment. We're losing some of the span of what we thought we could accomplish with the funding we had because the condition is worse than we thought it would be.

Commissioner Gilman - If we do this, does it position us better for the RFP or RFI when it goes out? Because we've done this work that will benefit the whole section of the pier, not just the elections department?

Elaine Forbes – There are two piers implicated here. Pier 29 is for a future operator. Thirty-one is the Department of Elections with those 15 critical leaking windows. So we have already a rent payer set up for Pier 31. Here, it does position us better for a successful response to our RFP for Pier 29 because it provides for more ability for a higher occupancy in that front area of the bulkhead, which is why we mirrored it with Jamestown. However, because the condition of the facility was worse, we're making a tradeoff to protect our

electrical infrastructure. That is where the de-scope and re-target of the funds is going, away from completing the whole area of what could be a retail use in the bulkhead building to targeting improvements underneath our electrical equipment.

Commissioner Makras - Could you point out just in this presentation where it says that we're asking for more money to do additional work and we're not going to finish the job? Because I missed it. I don't want to have to go read the whole thing. The title doesn't say that. So is it in the material?

Jonathan Roman - In the staff report, it's in the executive summary. I briefly did say in this presentation.

Commissioner Makras - No. I understand the presentation.

Jonathan Roman – In the executive summary of the staff report as well as a picture in the back, the last page talking about that. I apologize if it wasn't as clear.

Commissioner Makras - I'm going to take a crack at least at the subject matter. It should say the whole description of what we're doing. It's material to say that we're asking to extend a job, and we're pulling back what the job is, just fair play in the public process where they review it and people can participate. I've got to tabletop manage. The right way to do it is we need X amount of dollars to do the whole thing the way we planned to do it with all the stuff that we found out that's new. And then, we're recommending against that. We want you to par back. And then, we make a conscious decision from it. You're actually undoing your own decision here. You came before, asked us to go forward and do this entire area. And in a soft way, we're pulling back on it. I think we should do it in a forthright way and understand that this may cost us \$18 million to fix. We should be able to make a conscious decision if we want to put our \$18 million there or not. In a sloppy way, we're passing the buck on to the people that are going to bid on Pier 29 because we anticipated that that would have been done. We're just passing it on to the people that will be bidding on Pier 29. I think we have to be a lot more transparent in that. For me, I second it. I think a better way to do business, just do that. We should know what it would cost. We should know the impact on Pier 29. We should make a conscious decision. I empower staff to come with a recommendation to par it back. But understand you're backing off of your own recommendation that this was a priority over a lot of other items. Then, we will have the option to participate if that prioritization is correct. Or we agree with it, or we don't agree with it.

Commissioner Brandon - I think it goes back to what was our original intent with this project. Do we still think we need to do that?

Elaine Forbes – No, it's a long story. We started this project when we had Jamestown to come in and do 20,000 square feet of retail. We were going to put some Port improvements into that substructure as part of that agreement.

When Jamestown couldn't move forward because of financial infeasibility, we decided to continue on with our project, which we talked a lot about internally to continue on with that recommendation because we'd done so much of the engineering work.

We'd done the design work. We were ready to go to bid. The real estate team felt it was a very good retail opportunity in that bulkhead building. So already, we had moved away from the impetus to match the footprint of Jamestown. When we got under there and saw these really bad conditions under the electrical equipment, that was the time in which staff made a recommendation to de-scope areas away from the Jamestown original footprint to pour more money into the bad areas supporting the electrical.

That's why we're not asking to come back and complete the whole project because, at this point, we need to go out for a solicitation, see who our partner will be, etc. There could be requirement for more seismic improvements. There could be requirement for the substructure as is depending on the occupancy and the plan that will be the preferred plan from a solicitation. So we wouldn't recommend at this point to augment the budget to complete that original scope. But it is a fair point that Commissioner Makras made. We should have put that part in the report more straightforwardly.

Commissioner Brandon - This is a wonderful picture but I'm still trying to figure out what we're getting for \$12 million.

Commissioner Makras - You may be getting 70 percent of what we originally bargained for.

Commissioner Brandon - I think it's less than 70 percent.

Commissioner Gilman - I think we're getting a part of it. We're going to pass on all the costs to whoever answers the RFI and bless them. That's what I heard.

Commissioner Brandon - But why didn't we do that originally? We have no idea who is going to come in and what the requirements are going to be. So why did we put all this money in this pier if that was the intention?

Elaine Forbes - Because we knew we had substructure improvements to make to keep the bulkhead viable without a change of use for many years. We'd done a lot of work leading up to Jamestown which showed what was required investment in the Pier 29 substructure. We wanted to continue on in improving that substructure for a leasing opportunity. That's why we kept recommending the investment. So for the total \$12 million, can you talk through what are the improvements in Pier 31 plus Pier 29? Or would you need to give that in writing?

Commissioner Brandon - So Pier 31 is done except for the windows.

Elaine Forbes - Except it's part of the budget. I don't want you to lose that piece.

Commissioner Brandon - That's about \$6.5 million.

Jonathan Roman – That was \$6.9 million and then there was some contingency used towards that pier.

Commissioner Woo Ho - Do you want to rephrase this motion then?

Commissioner Makras - Well, the motion is to approve staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Gilman - On this one piece of work. I think we should maybe clarify that, so there's not misconception that we're approving something that's going to fix the whole pier. I don't know if that's necessary.

Commissioner Brandon - Where is the motion?

Commissioner Makras - Motion is to increase the contract by \$2.2-plus million and extend the completion date to January 31, 2020. And that result is the entire original work scope will not be completed. If I may suggest a solution here, unless it's time sensitive, maybe we continue the item. We shape it up a little bit better.

Elaine Forbes - It is time sensitive.

Jonathan Roman - It is time sensitive for the Department of Election window.

Commissioner Woo Ho – Yes, they have to get the windows done.

Elaine Forbes - We have the contractor mobilized.

Jonathan Roman - The contractor is mobilized.

Elaine Forbes - And we have electrical equipment that's in jeopardy.

Jonathan Roman - I understand your concern. I think it's a lesson learned for us in the future when we come for the further amendment to present the full picture. But we would like to proceed just for efficiency at this point and, in a future amendment on any other project, we'll present in that manner that you presented.

Commissioner Woo Ho - The minutes do record the conversation and dialogue of what we request.

Commissioner Brandon - So my only question is, is this it? There will be no more amendments to this contract?

Elaine Forbes - This is it. There will be a future request on additional window and spalling repair in Pier 31.

Commissioner Makras - But we don't know what we're getting for it. They'll just stop working when the money runs out. I'm saying I don't think we know what we're getting for it the way it is. When we run out of money, it looks like we're going to stop at some point. I don't know what we're going to have as the project that we're paying for.

I don't know on the map at what point we're finishing. You're saying the green is done. You're saying maybe the light green is. We talked about maybe the yellow being done. We should be able to define our whole scope of work and say that's what we're fixing.

Elaine Forbes - Jonathan, can you describe what will be done if the commission approves the \$2.2875 million?

Jonathan Roman - It would be the dark green areas as well as the black and white area down here. So you do have it right. Any remaining funds would be applied towards the light green. Then, we would move into the yellow. With construction-type work or rehabilitation work like this, it's hard for us to fully define what that scope is going to be in the inaccessible areas. We're able to now visit 60 percent of it. Then, from the other 40 percent of it, we're able to make a projection based on our other experience with the other areas.

Commissioner Makras - This is what we do in my shop. We tell you to go. And next month, you're going to bring me the amendment to finish the job. And we'll know what the next step is to get to it. And then, we decide if we want to finish that component of it or not. Then, we know what the complete job is. And we know what a complete job costs. Anything less than that, I promise you all of us will have a different view of what the completed job would be. And I promise you, at the end, probably none of us will be right. It's owed to us to know if we're going to spend the reserve honorably as a reserve, or we're going to spend the reserve just to do a little bit more of the project. Reserve is truly a reserve. It shouldn't be used to do more. We should know what the more is under the base contract.

Commissioner Woo Ho - I think the concern that I'm hearing is a little bit that we do not wish to see any more amendments to increase the amount of the contract other than this one. The question is if we don't exceed the amount that is authorized in this motion, whether it would cover more than what you have presented to us today. But minimally, it will cover the work that you said. But it did not cover the original scope.

Elaine Forbes - That's right.

Commissioner Woo Ho - So we just want to know that there's a commitment that we'll not exceed this amount going forward and that it should cover the work that you've described, which was not the original scope. Is that correct?

Elaine Forbes - Yes. We can commit to both of those things. Maybe what would be best is we come back at the end of the project and describe all the piles that were able to be improved through the project. And we can give much more information once all of those unseen areas are seen and repaired, so we'll know how far into the light green we got, if at all.

Commissioner Woo Ho - But there is a ceiling on this contract. That's what I think is what is being questioned here. It's not like you're going to come back and get another amendment for the same work.

Elaine Forbes - So are we certain we can get to the black and white areas with this additional amount?

Rod Iwashita - The project manager says yes. I want to say though that we've had access to 60 percent of the area in that black and white area. Based on what we've seen, we can extrapolate. I think we're pretty confident that, with the 10 percent contingency that we are also asking for, that we can get to that entire black and white area and repair.

Commissioner Gilman - I would appreciate you coming back afterwards and letting us know what we did and also with an illustration of what you've leveraged, how it's going to improve the RFI process for folks coming into that pier.

ACTON: Commissioner Gilman moved approval; Commissioner Makras seconded the motion. All of the Commissioners were in favor. Resolution No. 19-14 was adopted.

## **10. NEW BUSINESS**

Elaine Forbes - On new business, I marked down that staff will be researching and recommending a naming for Ms. Corinne Woods. Is there any other new business?

Commissioner Gilman - I would like to, at a later date when we have a reasonable agenda, I would like us to maybe look at our permitting and fees for local nonprofits that use our Port properties that have an annual operating budget of under \$5 million. We have so many people and non-profits that use pier space and use it for events they're running, and it's been called to my attention. There's a difference between the U.S. Cancer Society that has a \$20 million budget and small, very local non-profits, some of them who are on our seawalls who need to use Port property sometimes and the pricing is the same. I thought maybe we could look at that or have a staff report on that.

Commissioner Woo Ho - This is not really new business, Elaine, but I think that we did hear the sentiment of the community today to continue the discussions on Seawall Lot 330. I think we would ask that you continue to convey that sentiment to City Hall.

Commissioner Makras - I'm not sure how far it's to our jurisdiction. It may be an offline discussion. It may be a report in the executive director's report but I heard that ferry service for opening day at the Giants didn't happen. If that's true, false, who's responsible? Maybe a little mini report, so we understand because my understanding was there was a commitment to ferry service. If we didn't have it, I'd like to understand what happened.

## **11. ADJOURNMENT**

The Port Commission adjourned the meeting in memory of Community Leader, Corinne Woods.

ACTON: Commissioner Woo Ho moved approval to adjourn the meeting in memory of Corinne Woods; Commissioner Gilman seconded the motion. All of the Commissioners were in favor.

Port Commission President Commissioner Brandon adjourned the meeting at 6:40 p.m.